

MEKELLE UNIVERSITY



COLLEGE OF LAW AND GOVERNANCE

DEPARTMENT OF CIVICS AND ETHICAL STUDIES

**ASSESSMENT OF THE PRACTICE OF GOOD GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES IN LOCAL
ADMINISTRATION IN POST-WAR TIGRAY, ETHIOPIA: THE CASE OF SLEWA
WOREDA**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CIVICS AND ETHICAL STUDIES
FOR PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER ARTS IN CIVICS AND ETHICAL STUDIES**

BY: TIGSTI HAILEMARIAM ABRAHA

PRINCIPAL ADVISOR: Dr. DEGENE MEZGEBE (PhD)

JULY 2025

MEKELLE, ETHIOPIA

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis entitled “Implementation of Good Governance Principles in Local Administration in Post-War Tigray, Ethiopia: The Case of Slewa Woreda” submitted by me for the award of the Degree of Master of Civics and Ethical Studies of Mekelle University is my original work and all references consulted have been duly acknowledged. The matter embodied in this thesis has not been submitted earlier for award of any degree, diploma, fellowship or other similar titles of any other University or Institution to the best of my knowledge.

Student Name

.....

Signature

.....

Date

...../...../.....

Certification

This is to certify that the thesis work entitled “Implementation of Good Governance in Post-War Tigray, Ethiopia: The Case of SLEWA Woreda” is a bona fide work of Tigsti Hailemariam Abraha who carried out the research under our guidance. Certified further, that to the best of our knowledge the work reported herein does not form part of any other thesis report or dissertation on the bases of which a degree or award was granted on this or any other candidate.

Degene Mezgebe (PhD)

Department of Civics and Ethical Studies

College of Law and Governance

Mekelle University, Ethiopia

Signature: _____

Acknowledgement

The successful completion of this thesis would have been impossible without the support, encouragement, and cooperation from many individuals who assist me in diverse ways from the beginning to the end.

First and foremost, to my Heavenly Father, Almighty God, for His reliable love, divine guidance and blessings throughout my studies. I give all the glory to his wonderful name for the gift of life, the provision of health, wisdom, courage, and determination to complete this study, even when at times I felt weary and worn-out. I will forever admire his name.

Next, I would like to express my heartfelt and sincere gratitude to my principal advisor Dr. Degene Mezgebe (PhD) for diligent and professional assistance and dedication of his precious time in reading and correcting this research from beginning to the end.

Last but not least, I am happy to give my special thanks to all the participants who were involved in this study for their great support in supplying relevant and up to date information. I am also glad to thank my lovely family and my friends for their support and advice.

Table of Content

Contents	Page
Declaration	2
Certification.....	3
Acknowledgement	4
Chapter One.....	8
1.1 Background of the Study.....	8
1.2. Statement of the Problem	11
1.3. Objectives of the Study	13
1.3.1. General Objective of the Study.....	13
1.4. Research Questions	13
1.5. Significance of the Study	14
1.6. Scope of the Study	14
1.7. Limitations of the Study.....	15
1.8. Organization of the Paper.....	15
1.9. Definition of Key Terms	16
Chapter Two.....	17
Related Literature Review	17
2. Introduction.....	17
2.2. Definitions of Governance	17
2.2.1. Types of Governance	18
2.2.2. Actors in Governance.....	19
2.3. Good Governance	20
2.3.1. The Concept of Good Governance.....	21
2.4. Importance of Good Governance.....	28
2.4.1. Importance in Sustainable Development	28
2.5. Integration of Good Governance Principles in Policy and Practice.....	30
2.5.5. Impact of Good Governance on Sustainable Development Indicators.....	33
2.5.6. Institutional Capacity and Leadership in Promoting Good Governance	36
2.5.7. Youth Participation and Governance for Social Transformation.....	38
2.5.8. Policy Approaches and Recommendations for Enhancing Good Governance	39
Chapter Three.....	42

Methods and Materials	42
<u>3.1. Research Design</u>	42
<u>3.2. Types and Sources of Data.....</u>	42
3.2.1. Types of Data.....	43
3.2.2. Sources of Data.....	43
<u>3.3. Instruments of Data Collection.....</u>	43
<u>3.4. Sampling Technique and Sample Size.....</u>	45
<u>3.5. Methods of Data Analysis and Interpretation.....</u>	47
<u>3.6. Ethical Considerations</u>	47
Chapter Four.....	49
Data Analysis and Interpretation	49
4.1. Introduction	49
4.2. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	49
4.3. Extent of the implemented in local administration	51
4.4. The effectiveness of existing governance policies and strategies in promoting good governance at the local level.....	58
4.5. Challenges hindering the effective implementation of good governance	65
4.6. Potential Opportunities for Improving Governance Effectiveness	72
Chapter Five	77
Conclusion and Recommendations	77
5.1. Conclusion.....	77
5.2. Recommendations.....	79
References	82

Abstract

This study examined the implementation of good governance principles in the local administration of Slewa Woreda, Tigray, within the post-war context. Specifically, it assessed the extent of governance principles implementation, evaluated the effectiveness of existing governance policies and strategies, identified challenges hindering their realization, and explored opportunities for enhancing governance effectiveness. The study used a mixed-methods approach, and data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, and focus group discussions with local stakeholders. Findings indicate that the overall practice of good governance remains weak and fragmented. Core principles such as transparency, accountability, participation, responsiveness, rule of law, and sound financial management are largely perceived at low levels. This has contributed to persistent governance deficits, weakened service delivery, declining institutional trust, and limited local development. The study further reveals that existing governance policies and strategies—particularly those related to decentralization, institutional strengthening, anti-corruption, and participatory governance—remain inconsistently implemented and under-resourced or remains paper value. Key challenges include political instability, corruption, lack of transparency, weak enforcement of legal frameworks, inadequate institutional capacity, and bureaucratic inefficiencies. Despite these constraints, institutional capacity-building efforts, community participation, local resource mobilization, and partnerships with NGOs, civil society, and traditional institutions hold untapped potential. By embedding transparency, accountability, and inclusivity into governance structures, Slewa Woreda can rebuild institutional resilience and lay the foundation for sustainable post-war recovery.

Keywords: Good governance, local administration, post-war governance, Slewa Woreda, Tigray, policy effectiveness

Chapter One

1.1 Background of the Study

Governance and good governance are becoming two of the most important ideas in development discussions and programs (Keping, 2018). Good governance fundamentally denotes democratic government that addresses social requirements with efficiency, transparency, and equity. It is universally recognized as a prerequisite for sustained economic development, political stability, and inclusive progress (Ohiomu, and Dibie, 2014). The rise of good governance as a central subject in development policy originated in the 1990s, when international financial organization like the World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), and USAID started to associate aid and development assistance with governance improvements. The World Bank was the inaugural entity to formalize and execute good governance rules (Santiso, 2001). Initially, the main political goal was to raise the standard and accountability of public sector service delivery. However, by the mid-1990s, the scope had expanded to encompass broader concepts, including accountability, transparency, citizen participation, and the rule of law (Gisselquist, 2012).

In essence, good governance is a subset of governance in which institutions, public resources, and decision-making procedures are managed fairly and efficiently to satisfy the pressing demands of society. It guarantees that public institutions function effectively, inclusively, and transparently, serving the interests of all citizens. Democratic institutions and equitable development are based on the fundamental tenets of good governance, which include transparency, accountability, participation, rule of law, responsiveness, effectiveness, inclusion, and equity (Chanda et al., 2024).

The administrative sector is one significant area where good governance is operationalized. Administrative bodies at the local and national levels are responsible for implementing public policies, allocating resources, and providing necessary services. The degree of governance in public administration has a significant influence on development outcomes. Administrative institutions are better equipped to deliver efficient services, reduce corruption, and cultivate public trust when they adhere to good governance principles (Nanda, 2006).

Furthermore, inclusive decision-making, increased institutional accountability, and the advancement of justice and the rule of law all depend on effective governance. By assisting transparent and participatory institutions, it promotes sustainable development (Thelma et al., 2024). Strong governance structures are

useful instruments for tackling socioeconomic marginalization, political instability, and marginalization. On the other hand, conflict and underdevelopment have frequently been caused by poor governance (Dikwa, 2024).

A key element of good governance is youth participation. Young people are increasingly recognized as powerful change agents who infuse development and governance processes with fresh perspectives, innovative ideas, and vitality. Their participation promotes inclusive, progressive leadership and fortifies the democratic culture through civic engagement and education (Thelma, 2024). Around the world, including in Africa, young people have led campaigns for justice, transparency, and democratic reform. The Arab Spring and other civic uprisings across the continent demonstrate the transformative potential of youth participation in calling for accountability and reform (Omweri, 2024).

In the African context, it is becoming more widely accepted that effective governance is necessary to overcome institutional weaknesses, democratic deficits, and ongoing development challenges. Particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, governance gaps—which are typified by corruption, a lack of transparency, and inadequate accountability—have been significant causes of instability and underdevelopment (Adamaagashi, et al., 2024). A number of African Union (AU) policy frameworks and the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness emphasize the significance of inclusive participation, national ownership, and good governance in attaining sustainable development. In many African nations, public trust and efficient service delivery are still hampered by weak governance structures (Gisselquist, 2012).

Local governments are important players in resource allocation, development planning, and service provision in Ethiopia. Despite their crucial role, governance is frequently characterized by low institutional accountability, low transparency, and limited citizen participation in both rural and urban areas (Yilmaz and Venugopal, 2008). With the adoption of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) Constitution in 1995, the Ethiopian government, led by the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF), began a number of initiatives to advance good governance after realizing these shortcomings (Regassa, 2010).

By creating important organizations like the Ethiopian Human Rights Commission, the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission, the National Electoral Board, and the Office of the Ombudsman, the FDRE Constitution set the groundwork for democratic governance. These organizations were created to

safeguard citizens' rights, encourage accountability, and improve the provision of public services. As a relatively new idea in Ethiopia, good governance is still only partially and unevenly implemented throughout the country (UNDP, 2023).

The Constitution's Article 52(2) grants regional states the authority to set up administrative frameworks that support self-government, democratic order, and the rule of law. They are also in charge of managing resources and land, creating and carrying out development plans, and enhancing civil service operations. In order to enable direct citizen participation in local governance, Article 50(4) also requires the decentralization of power to the lowest administrative units. These clauses grant local and regional governments, including those in Tigray, the legal right and obligation to incorporate good governance into their daily operations (Fenta, 2014).

Ensuring equality, accountability, transparency, participation, rule of law, responsiveness, consensus, inclusivity, and efficiency are among the main goals of good governance. Although local governments have formally adopted these principles, there are wide variations in how they are actually applied. Therefore, evaluating the degree to which these principles are implemented locally is essential to comprehending institutional performance and advancing democratic governance (Rahmani, and Koohshahi, 2013).

Youth participation is a key area on the implementation of good governance. With more than 70% of Ethiopia's population under the age of 30 (World Bank, 2016), the engagement of youth in governance is essential (WB, 2019). Both the African Union Youth Policy (2006) and Ethiopia's National Youth Policy (2004) emphasize the importance of youth inclusion in decision-making processes. Youth can play a vital role in bridging the gap between citizens and government, promoting accountability, and fostering civic responsibility. However, despite supportive policy frameworks, many youth associations in Ethiopia struggle with limited resources, poor coordination, and low levels of political support (AU, 2020).

In the Tigray Regional State, the impacts of war and conflict have severely disrupted governance institutions and public service delivery. In the post-war context, restoring good governance is essential for peacebuilding, institutional trust, and sustainable recovery. Youth associations are increasingly seen as important agents of change in rebuilding democratic participation and accountability (VNG International, 2024).

In Slewa Woreda, part of the Eastern Zone of Tigray, local governance faces numerous challenges including weak institutional capacity, limited civic engagement, and poor accountability systems. Although youth associations have been formed with the aim of improving participation and governance outcomes, their role remains constrained. As such, this study seeks to examine the implementation of good governance principles in local administration in post-war Slewa Woreda, with a particular focus on the contribution and challenges of youth associations in promoting inclusive, accountable, and transparent governance.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Good governance is widely recognized as an essential for sustainable development, public trust, and effective service delivery. It is rooted in core principles such as transparency, accountability, rule of law, responsiveness, and citizen participation—values that are foundational to democratic governance (Chanda et al, 2024). International organizations including the United Nations (UN), World Bank (WB), and African Union (AU) emphasize governance as a critical pillar for peacebuilding, institutional stability, and economic development. In democratic contexts, good governance plays a vital role during political transitions, institutional reform, and efforts toward democratic consolidation. It enhances civic engagement and strengthens the legitimacy of public institutions (Omeje, 2018). Organized civic groups—such as youth organizations, women’s associations, trade unions, and religious institutions—are key actors in local governance and democratic transformation. Among these, youth associations are often viewed as potential agents of change capable of fostering civic education, mobilizing communities, and advocating for responsive governance (Finkel, 2002). Despite this potential, in many countries including Ethiopia, youth associations face numerous constraints such as limited institutional support, internal leadership challenges, lack of resources, and unfavorable public perceptions (Daniel, and Lalise, 2024). According to Alemayehu (2011), youth are often marginalized in governance processes and viewed more as sources of instability than as contributors to development. Similarly, Gebreslassie, (2012) highlight persistent challenges including lack of youth-friendly services, societal mistrust, and exclusion from decision-making.

In Ethiopia, the government has introduced several legal and policy frameworks aimed at promoting good governance, including the 1995 FDRE Constitution, the Growth and Transformation Plans (GTP I & II), and the National Anti-Corruption Strategy. These initiatives are intended to foster transparent, accountable, participatory, and rule-based governance across all levels of government. However, the

actual implementation of these principles at the local level remains uneven, particularly in regions affected by conflict, such as Tigray (Mizanie, 2017).

Slewa Woreda, located in Northern Tigray, is among the areas most severely affected by the recent armed conflict. The war has significantly damaged local governance institutions, weakened administrative capacity, disrupted public service delivery, and eroded public trust in local leadership. In the post-war period, the principles of good governance—transparency, accountability, citizen participation, and rule of law—are inconsistently applied in the Woreda’s administration.

Reports from local communities and preliminary observations highlight several critical issues: lack of transparency in decision-making, limited accountability of public officials, weak rule of law, and minimal citizen engagement, particularly among youth and women. These governance challenges are further complicated by factors such as excessive centralization, rigid bureaucratic procedures, political interference, corruption, and the exclusion of marginalized voices. Public complaints against local administrators reflect a widespread perception of poor governance, characterized by unresponsiveness and inefficiency.

While Ethiopia has emphasized the role of youth associations and civic organizations in governance—through policies such as the National Youth Policy (2004)—these groups in Slewa Woreda remain underutilized due to inadequate institutional support, insufficient funding, restricted access to public spaces, and negative societal perceptions (Gashaw, 2014; Alemayehu Ayalew, 2010). Consequently, the youth’s potential contribution to democratic governance, civic awareness, and local development is largely unrealized.

In addition, questions remain regarding the effectiveness of national governance policies when applied at the local level, especially in post-conflict settings. There is little evidence that national strategies have been adapted to the specific realities of war-affected Woredas like Slewa. The conflict has exposed and worsened existing institutional weaknesses, making the application of national governance frameworks increasingly difficult and ineffective.

Nonetheless, post-war contexts also present opportunities for reform and institutional rebuilding. If strategically managed, these moments can foster inclusive decision-making, equitable service delivery, and the restoration of public trust in government institutions. Yet, there is a clear research gap on how

good governance principles are actually implemented at the local level in post-war context in Slewa Woreda.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study is to assess the Practices of good governance principles in the local administration of Slewa Woreda, Tigray, in the post-war context.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives of the Study

1. To evaluate the practices of good governance principles (transparency, accountability, participation, and rule of law) in the local administration of Slewa Woreda.
2. To examine the effectiveness of existing governance policies and strategies in promoting good governance at the local level.
3. To identify the key challenges hindering the effective implementation of good governance in Slewa Woreda.
4. To identify potential opportunities for improving governance effectiveness in the study area.

1.4. Research Questions

1. To what extent are the principles of good governance (transparency, accountability, participation, and rule of law) implemented in the local administration of Slewa Woreda?
2. How effective are the existing governance policies and strategies in promoting good governance at the local level in Slewa Woreda?
3. What are the major challenges affecting the implementation of good governance in Slewa Woreda, particularly in the post-conflict context?
4. What opportunities exist for improving the effectiveness of good governance in the local administration of Slewa Woreda?

1.5. Significance of the Study

Rebuilding after a conflict, promoting sustainable development, and reestablishing public confidence all depend on the application of good governance principles. Restoring efficient local governance is a top priority in areas like Tigray that have seen protracted conflict and institutional collapse. With its empirical evidence on the application of good governance principles in Slewa Woreda—a context that has received little scholarly attention in post-war Ethiopia—this study fills a gap in the body of literature and makes a significant academic contribution. It also has policy relevance because it offers insightful information to legislators and local government representatives who are trying to improve governance in areas that have experienced conflict. Additionally, it assists Woreda administrators in resolving shortcomings in service delivery, accountability, transparency, and citizen participation as well as the empowerment of youth and the community. It does this by identifying opportunities and challenges in the implementation of governance. It also lays the groundwork for future studies that can be used as a guide for studies in other Ethiopian post-conflict areas or comparable circumstances, advancing our knowledge of post-conflict governance reconstruction.

1.6. Scope of the Study

This study focuses on the application of good governance principles, specifically in the post-war context, in the local administration of Slewa Woreda, which is situated in Ethiopia's Tigray region. The following defines the study's scope:

Geographically, the study is delimited to Slewa Woreda good governance. The study's thematic scope looks at how local government institutions practice the fundamentals of good governance, including accountability, transparency, citizen participation, and the rule of law. Population participants in the study include community members, youth organizations, local government representatives, and other pertinent parties involved in Slewa Woreda governance processes. In terms of the time the study focuses on governance practices and issues from the post-war era after the Tigray conflict to the present. Although the study attempts to offer thorough insights, it does not go into detail about national-level governance policies beyond their local implementation and does not cover other woredas or regions in Ethiopia or Tigray.

1.7.Limitations of the Study

While this study aims to provide valuable insights into the implementation of good governance in Slewa Woreda, it faces several limitations. The research is confined to Slewa Woreda and may not fully represent the governance situation in other Woredas or regions of Tigray or Ethiopia. Therefore, the findings might have limited generalizability beyond the study area. Conducting research in a post-war environment poses difficulties such as limited access to certain areas, potential security concerns, and the reluctance of some participants to openly discuss governance issues due to fear of political repercussions. Due to administrative disruptions caused by the conflict, obtaining reliable and up-to-date official data and records on governance practices might be challenging. The scope and depth of the study are limited by the available time frame and resources, which may restrict extensive fieldwork or a broader comparative analysis. Despite these limitations, the study strives to collect accurate and relevant information through careful methodology and triangulation of data sources to ensure the credibility of its findings.

1.8.Organization of the Paper

In order to present the research process and findings in an organized manner, this study was divided into five chapters. The study's background, problem statement, objectives, research questions, significance, scope, limitations, and definitions of important terms are all included in Chapter 1. Reviews of theoretical frameworks, conceptual models, and empirical research pertaining to good governance, local administration, youth participation, and post-conflict governance challenges are included in the second chapter's review of related literature. Research design, study area, population and sampling strategies, data collection methods, data analysis processes, and ethical considerations are all covered in Chapter 3 on research methodology. Results and Discussion Chapter 4 presents the study's findings, analyzes the data, and discusses the findings in light of the research questions and body of existing literature. In addition, chapter five conclusions, and recommendations that draws conclusions based on the analysis, and provides practical recommendations for policy, practice, and future research.

1.9. Definition of Key Terms

Good Governance: The process and structures through which political and administrative authority is exercised in a way that is transparent, accountable, equitable, participatory, responsive, effective, efficient, and follows the rule of law to ensure sustainable development and public trust (UNDP, 2022).

Transparency: The openness and accessibility of government actions, decisions, and information to the public, enabling scrutiny, informed participation, and trust.

Accountability: The obligation of public officials and institutions to explain, justify, and take responsibility for their actions and decisions, ensuring they answer to the public and oversight bodies.

Participation: The active involvement of citizens, including marginalized groups, in decision-making processes, policy formulation, and governance at all levels.

Rule of Law: The principle that all individuals and institutions, including government entities, are subject to and accountable under laws that are fairly enforced and equally applied.

Equity and Inclusiveness: Ensuring all members of society, especially marginalized and vulnerable groups, have opportunities to improve or maintain their well-being and participate fully in governance.

Responsiveness: The ability of institutions and officials to serve the needs and interests of the community in a timely and appropriate manner.

Effectiveness and Efficiency: The capacity of governance institutions to produce results that meet the community's needs while making the best use of resources.

Local Administration: The governing bodies and institutions operating at the woreda (district) level responsible for policy implementation, public service delivery, and local development management.

Post-Conflict Context: The period following armed conflict, characterized by challenges such as rebuilding institutions, restoring public services, reconciliation, and fostering peace and development.

Chapter Two

Related Literature Review

2. Introduction

The main theoretical and empirical works on the governance and application of good governance for social change and sustainable development are reviewed in this chapter. With an emphasis on the integration of good governance principles, their influence on sustainable development, the function of institutional capacity and leadership, and policy approaches to improve governance outcomes, the review is organized around the particular goals of the study.

2.2. Definitions of Governance

In both formal and informal contexts, governance refers to the procedures and frameworks that are used to make decisions and carry them out—or not. The Oxford Dictionary defines governance as "the act or manner of governing, of exercising control or authority over the actions of subjects, and a system of regulation." Beyond this simple definition, however, governance is more broadly defined as the decision-making process and the procedures used to carry out and uphold decisions (Dugan, 2024).

Government is not the same as governance. While governance refers to the larger framework of interactions, processes, and actors that influence and carry out governing activities, government refers to the institution or body that governs. The fact that governance can occur in a variety of structures, such as corporations, national states, and sociopolitical groups like families or tribes, shows that it can happen in the public, private, and civil society spheres. Essentially, government is the actor and governance is the action (Keping, 2018).

Furthermore, governance includes systems that guarantee organizations or institutions adhere to established rules and guidelines. It entails keeping an eye on compliance, overseeing public resources, and taking corrective action when regulations are broken. Public institutions carry out public affairs, maintain accountability, and ensure the protection of human rights through governance (Matsiliza, and Zonke, 2017).

The exercise of economic, political, and administrative power to oversee a nation's affairs at all levels is known as governance, according to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1997). It includes the systems, organizations, and procedures that allow individuals and communities to voice their concerns, assert their rights, carry out their responsibilities, and resolve conflicts. In a similar vein, governance is defined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as the application of political power and influence in a community to manage its resources for advancement. The relationship between rulers and the ruled, as well as the allocation of benefits, are highlighted in this definition (Louw, 2012).

2.2.1. Types of Governance

Governance can occur at various levels and within various institutional contexts. UNESCAP (2000) categorizes governance into three major types:

2.2.1.1. Urban and Rural Governance

The management and administration of affairs in urban areas, such as cities and towns, is referred to as urban governance. It has a growing impact on governments' ability to accomplish social, political, and economic goals. In a world that is rapidly urbanizing and where public services and economic activity are driven by urban centers, effective urban governance is crucial. Rural governance, on the other hand, is concerned with the management and advancement of rural areas. Access to services like infrastructure, timely market information, and chances for economic diversification is guaranteed by effective rural governance. Good rural governance improves rural residents' quality of life and promotes sustainable development (Essien, and Jesse, 2025).

2.2.1.2. National and Local Governance

The exercise of political, economic, and administrative control over a sovereign state's affairs is referred to as national governance. It involves national organizations that oversee the larger national agenda, including legislatures, courts, and executives. On the other hand, local governance focuses on managing local communities using decentralized systems like regional, Woreda, and Kebele administrations. In order to improve responsiveness, accountability, and citizen participation at the local level, it entails localized decision-making and service delivery (Khan, and Syrett, 2022).

2.2.1.3. Corporate and Global Governance

The systems, tenets, and procedures that govern how organizations—including corporations, educational institutions, healthcare systems, and financial institutions—are run and managed are referred to as corporate governance. It guarantees that these organizations are answerable to stakeholders and run openly (Mallin, 2019).

In contrast, the regulation and coordination of international organizations and multilateral institutions that function across national borders is referred to as global governance. These include multinational corporations (MNCs), the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, the United Nations (UN), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Addressing transnational issues like trade, security, global health, and climate change requires effective global governance (Gereffi, 2005).

2.2.2. Actors in Governance

Several actors from various societal levels take part in the decision-making and policy-implementation processes that comprise governance. These actors, which have distinct roles and responsibilities, include the government, the commercial sector, civil society, and family institutions (Farazmand, 2023).

Actors (Structures)	Key Functions
State / Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Legislature: Makes the law-Judiciary: Interprets the law-Executive: Enforces the law-Local administrations: Deliver public goods and services
Private Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Entrepreneurs and employees: Create jobs, produce goods and services
Civil Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-NGOs, church groups, trade unions, and media: Act as watchdogs, provide community-level services
Family Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Families of various forms: Care, nurture, and provide social security

Whether through advocacy, service delivery, legislation, or community involvement, each actor is essential in forming the governance process. They work together to create a networked governance structure that affects the efficiency, fairness, and inclusivity of public decision-making.

2.3. Good Governance

Due to its critical role in fostering social stability, democratic consolidation, and sustainable development, good governance has become a major topic in both academic research and policy discourse. In a broad sense, it refers to the systems, procedures, connections, and organizations that allow individuals and communities to express their concerns, assert their legal rights, fulfill their responsibilities, and resolve conflicts (UNDP, 1997).

Fundamentally, transparent, accountable, participatory, and rule-based frameworks guarantee that administrative and political decisions are made. These frameworks are intended to ensure that public institutions function effectively and equitably to satisfy the demands and expectations of the general public while serving the common good. In addition to government actions, governance also includes the ways in which public institutions, civil society, and the private sector collaborate to make decisions and carry them out (Chanda et al., 2024).

By encouraging equity and inclusivity, upholding the rule of law, and enabling responsible resource management, academics contend that good governance serves as the cornerstone of sustainable development. Development policies and programs run the risk of failing in the absence of such governance because of a lack of transparency, disengaged citizens, and weak institutional capacity (World Bank, 2016). Furthermore, the ability of governments and institutions to maintain governance standards—which promote social cohesion and public confidence—is a critical component of their legitimacy (Hope, 2005).

Development initiatives are hampered by social inequality, political instability, corruption, and ineffective public service delivery, all of which are frequently associated with poor governance. On the other hand, societies that are well-governed typically see higher levels of political stability, better social outcomes, stronger economic growth, and increased citizen engagement and trust (UNODC, ed).

In order to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially SDG 16 on peace, justice, and strong institutions, international organizations like the African Union, World Bank, and United Nations

have made good governance a top policy priority. As a result, good governance is viewed as both a set of principles and a workable plan for creating just and resilient societies.

2.3.1. The Concept of Good Governance

2.3.1.1. Historical Development of the Idea of Good Governance

As international institutions such as the World Bank and IMF pushed it as a requirement for loans and aid to developing nations under structural adjustment programs, the concept of good governance gained popularity starting in the 1990s. In various parts of the world, local worries about what would eventually be referred to as "good governance" had long existed. The idea of good governance was not prioritized before or during the Cold War. However, the significance of good governance was acknowledged after the Cold War, when structural adjustment plans failed to end the economic crises in many nations. Poor governance was frequently blamed for implementation issues in many developing countries (De Janvry, and Dethier, 2012).

From a philosophical standpoint, the origins of good governance can be found in ancient Greece. "The state comes into existence for the sake of mere life but continues for the sake of good life," according to Aristotle. The preservation of life, liberty, and property—principles essential to the contemporary conception of good governance—was also stressed by philosophers like Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau (Bertelli, 2018).

2.3.1.2. Defining Good Governance

Effective resource allocation and management to solve societal issues as a whole is referred to as good governance. It entails the effective delivery of high-quality public goods and services by the government and its agencies. Therefore, states ought to be evaluated based on the quantity and quality of public goods they provide to their citizens (UN, 2007). It is a system of governance in which public institutions manage resources, conduct public affairs, and protect human rights while respecting the rule of law and abstaining from corruption and abuse of power. Public entities must take enforceability and viability into account when developing policies (Sari, 2023).

When governance steers clear of conflicting objectives and encourages efficient public sector management, it is deemed "good." Openness, transparency, accountability, equity, and responsiveness to the needs

of the populace are traits of competent governance. Public trust is strengthened and corruption is reduced in such systems. Human rights, democratization, free and fair elections, an independent judiciary, and a free press are the cornerstones of good governance. These components guarantee citizen participation in decisions that impact their lives and fortify democratic institutions. As a result, public institutions and the government are held responsible for their actions. (UN, 2000).

2.3.1.3. Good Governance in Light of Multilateral Organizations

Multilateral organizations have significantly shaped the understanding and implementation of good governance, especially as it became a condition for development assistance. Notable definitions include:

According to the World Bank (1992), "good governance" includes a professional and accountable bureaucracy, active citizen participation, and predictable, open, and transparent policymaking that all operate under the rule of law.

OECD (1995): The rule of law, public sector management, corruption control, and lower military spending are the four main components of good governance that are necessary for development.

Participation, openness, equality, responsibility, responsiveness, efficacy, efficiency, and the rule of law are all components of good governance, according to the UNDP (1997). These guidelines make sure that people can express their interests and use their rights in public institutions. It was emphasized as a key element of the Millennium Development Goals and is essential to tackling issues of poverty, inequality, and other societal issues.

Core Principles of Good Governance

The foundation of good governance is a set of interconnected principles that have been identified by a large body of academic and institutional literature. In addition to acting as standards for assessing institutional performance, these principles provide a normative and practical framework that directs the use of power and authority in managing public affairs. The following fundamental ideas are emphasized by the World Bank (1992; 2016), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 1997), and other multilateral organizations:

2.3.1.4.Participation

A fundamental component of democratic governance is the involvement of both men and women. It entails citizens actively participating in the creation of laws, initiatives, and choices that impact their daily lives. This involvement needs to be organized and informed, which implies freedom of expression, association, and a thriving civil society. It can be done directly or through authorized institutions (UNDP, 1997).

Gaventa (2004) contends that inclusive participation promotes legitimacy and social accountability, while the "Ladder of Citizen Participation" identifies levels ranging from tokenism to citizen control.

2.3.1.5.Rule of Law

The rule of law ensures that all individuals and institutions are subject to the law. It ensures human rights protection, equality before the law, and legal certainty (Diamond, 2003). Good governance requires impartially applied fair laws, independent courts, and uncorruptible police forces. Strengthening the rule of law is essential to restoring trust and promoting peaceful coexistence, especially in fragile or post-conflict contexts like Slewa Woreda.

2.3.1.6.Openness

When government decisions, procedures, and information are open to public scrutiny, this is referred to as transparency. It indicates that pertinent information is easily accessible and intelligible, and that decisions are made and carried out in accordance with established guidelines. In order to promote trust and discourage corruption, it entails making public policies, budgets, procurement, and services visible (World Bank, 2016; Grindle, 2004).

2.3.1.7.Accountability

The duty of institutions and officials to report, justify, and answer for their actions is known as accountability. It applies to both governmental and private actors as well as civil society actors and encompasses internal (administrative), political, and legal accountability (UNDP, 1997; Bovens, 2007). Transparency, performance standards, checks and balances, and enforcement are all necessary for effective accountability systems.

2.3.1.8. Responsiveness and Effectiveness

Effectiveness is the ability to carry out policies and provide services in an efficient manner, whereas responsiveness is the ability of institutions to serve stakeholders in a reasonable amount of time. The social contract is strengthened, service delivery is enhanced, and citizens' needs are met by responsive and efficient governance (UN ESCAP, 2009).

2.3.1.9. Equity and Inclusiveness

All societal groups, particularly the marginalized, must take part in decision-making and fairly benefit from development in order for equity and inclusivity to be achieved. Regardless of gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, or disability, this principle places a strong emphasis on justice, fairness, and the inclusion of all individuals (Sen, 1999). By making sure everyone feels invested in the system, it improves societal cohesion.

2.3.1.10. Making Decisions Based on Consensus

In order to reach widespread agreement, good governance necessitates the mediation of various societal interests. In order to balance opposing viewpoints and establish common objectives for sustainable development, it is necessary to comprehend the historical, cultural, and social contexts.

2.3.1.11. Effectiveness

In order to accomplish societal objectives, institutions must be efficient in their use of resources. It entails cutting expenses and waste while making sure that procedures and results satisfy the demands of the general public. It also includes environmental preservation and sustainability.

2.3.1.12. Responsiveness and Effectiveness

The ability of institutions to promptly and appropriately address the needs and concerns of the general public is known as responsiveness. Effectiveness has to do with how well and efficiently institutions can carry out policies and provide services. When combined, these guidelines guarantee that governance results satisfy both development objectives and public expectations. Effective and responsive governance enhances livelihoods, lowers inequality, and improves service delivery. In order to strengthen the social contract between the state and its citizens, the UN ESCAP (2009) emphasizes the importance of responsiveness.

2.3.1.13. Equity and Inclusiveness

All members of society, especially those who are marginalized and vulnerable, must have equal access to public resources and be given the chance to participate in decision-making in order for equity and inclusivity to be achieved. Inequalities based on gender, ethnicity, age, disability, or socioeconomic status are addressed by social inclusion. By acknowledging a range of needs and rights, avoiding social disintegration, and encouraging a sense of belonging and control over development processes, good governance advances justice and fairness (Miletzki, and Broten, 2017).

2.4. Theoretical Framework of Good Governance Practices

The theoretical framework of good governance practices is grounded in political science, public administration, and development theories. It provides a lens through which governance processes can be examined in relation to accountability, transparency, participation, equity, effectiveness, and the rule of law. Several theoretical perspectives inform the study of good governance:

2.4.1. Institutional Theory

Institutional theory emphasizes the role of formal and informal rules, norms, and structures in shaping governance practices. According to this perspective, effective governance depends on well-functioning institutions that enforce accountability, protect rights, and ensure policy implementation. Institutions that are weak or compromised often lead to corruption, mismanagement, and poor service delivery North (1990).

2.4.2. Agency Theory

Agency theory highlights the relationship between principals (citizens) and agents (government officials). Good governance ensures that public officials (agents) act in the best interests of citizens by creating mechanisms of accountability, transparency, and oversight. Weak monitoring and lack of checks and balances can result in principal–agent problems such as corruption, rent-seeking, and misuse of power.

2.4.3. Democratic Governance Theory

This theory argues that governance must be rooted in democratic values such as participation, representation, and inclusion. Citizens should have the opportunity to engage in decision-making processes that affect their lives. Good governance is thus seen as both a process (how decisions are made) and an outcome (quality of services delivered).

2.4.4. Public Value Theory

Public value theory suggests that governance should not only focus on efficiency and effectiveness but also on creating value for society. This includes promoting equity, justice, and sustainable development. Leaders and institutions must ensure that decisions serve the collective good rather than narrow interests.

2.4.5. Human Development and Rights-Based Approaches

Good governance is also linked to human development and rights-based frameworks. It is argued that governance practices should safeguard human rights, promote social justice, and foster inclusive development. This perspective views governance as a means of empowering marginalized groups and ensuring equity in access to resources and opportunities.

2.4.6. Systems Theory

Systems theory considers governance as an interconnected system of actors, structures, and processes. Effective governance requires coordination among government institutions, civil society, and the private sector. Failure in one part of the system (e.g., corruption in the judiciary) can undermine overall governance performance.

Generally, this study is anchored primarily in the institutional theory, which emphasizes the role of formal and informal institutions—rules, norms, and structures—in shaping governance outcomes. Institutions provide the framework within which governance practices are designed, implemented, and monitored. Strong institutions enhance accountability, transparency, rule of law, and participation, while weak or poorly functioning institutions often lead to corruption, mismanagement, and ineffective governance. According to North (1990), institutions are “the rules of the game” that structure political, economic, and social interactions. From this perspective, governance effectiveness is determined by the extent to which institutions provide stability, predictability, and fairness in public administration. In a post-war or transitional context, institutional capacity becomes especially vital to rebuilding trust, restoring public services, and ensuring citizen participation in decision-making. This study adopts the institutional framework and democratic governance theory as its main theoretical lens, while drawing on complementary theories to explain how good governance practices can be promoted, sustained, and institutionalized.

2.5.Importance of Good Governance

2.5.1. Importance in Sustainable Development

Good governance is increasingly recognized as a cornerstone of sustainable development, social stability, and institutional effectiveness. Its importance transcends theoretical discourse, becoming a practical imperative in both developed and developing contexts, especially in post-conflict societies (Masyk, et al, 2023).

2.5.2. Good Governance and Sustainable Development

The role of good governance in promoting sustainable development has been extensively highlighted in both academic literature and global development agendas. Governance serves as the institutional foundation upon which economic, social, and environmental progress is built. Countries upholding good governance principles—such as transparency, accountability, rule of law, and participation—tend to perform better in economic growth, poverty alleviation, and social cohesion. These benefits stem from transparent policy environments, effective service delivery, and participatory decision-making structures that build public trust and efficiency (UNDP, 2015).

According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2015), good governance enables the efficient management of public resources, equitable enforcement of laws, and the creation of mechanisms that allow all citizens—especially marginalized groups—to participate meaningfully in public affairs. In this way, good governance becomes a catalyst for human development, enhancing access to education, healthcare, and justice.

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 16, highlight the importance of governance in building peaceful and inclusive societies by promoting effective, accountable, and transparent institutions. Moreover, governance is a cross-cutting enabler for achieving several other SDGs, including:

- ✚ SDG 1: No poverty,
- ✚ SDG 4: Quality education,
- ✚ SDG 5: Gender equality,
- ✚ SDG 13: Climate action.

Empirical studies support these assertions. Handoyo (2024) emphasizes that the quality of institutions is a stronger determinant of long-term development success than the mere availability of natural or financial resources. Thus, strengthening governance structures is not only beneficial but essential to achieving inclusive, equitable, and sustainable development.

2.5.3. Good Governance in Practice

While the theoretical foundations of good governance are well-established, its practical implementation poses considerable challenges, especially in developing and post-conflict settings. Governance effectiveness is highly contextual, shaped by political will, institutional capacity, leadership quality, legal frameworks, and civic engagement (Thelma, et al, 2024).

In many developing countries, governance systems are hampered by:

- ✚ Endemic corruption, which erodes public trust and institutional efficiency;
- ✚ Weak institutional capacity, leading to inconsistent law enforcement;

- ✚ Limited civic education, resulting in low levels of public awareness and participation;
- ✚ Political interference and patronage networks that distort decision-making and undermine accountability.

These systemic barriers often prevent the translation of governance principles into tangible outcomes, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected areas.

According to the World Bank (2017), good governance in post-conflict settings serves both as a means to facilitate recovery and as an end in itself for ensuring long-term stability. Effective post-conflict governance should focus on:

- Reestablishing the rule of law and justice systems;
- Promoting inclusive participation, especially among women, youth, and displaced populations;
- Strengthening institutional transparency and accountability;
- Empowering local governance structures that are closer to community realities.

The UNDP (2023) further underscores that in conflict-affected areas like Tigray, good governance can play a transformative role in rebuilding public trust, improving basic service delivery, and fostering inclusive development that addresses the underlying drivers of conflict.

2.6.Integration of Good Governance Principles in Policy and Practice

The practical application of good governance depends on embedding its foundational principles—transparency, accountability, participation, and the rule of law—into national legal, institutional, and policy frameworks. These principles, widely recognized and promoted by global organizations such as the United Nations, World Bank, and African Union, are essential for building effective, inclusive, and legitimate governance systems (Chanda et al., 2024).

2.6.1. Transparency and Accountability

Transparency involves the openness and accessibility of governmental actions, decisions, and information. It allows citizens to monitor performance, scrutinize policies, and hold institutions

responsible for misconduct. According to the World Bank (2017), transparency is critical in fostering public trust and institutional legitimacy.

Accountability ensures that public officials are answerable for their actions and decisions. It includes horizontal accountability mechanisms (e.g., judicial oversight, audits, parliamentary checks) and vertical mechanisms (e.g., elections, civil society monitoring, media scrutiny). As the UNDP (2023) stresses, transparency must be complemented by accountability to be effective; while transparency reveals misconduct, accountability ensures consequences.

Together, transparency and accountability form the bedrock of democratic governance and safeguard the public interest by reinforcing ethical, responsive, and performance-driven public administration.

2.6.2. Participation

Participation is a key pillar of inclusive governance, referring to the involvement of citizens in shaping public decisions—from policy consultations to direct engagement in local governance. "Ladder of Citizen Participation" and "Power Cube" offer conceptual tools to evaluate the level and effectiveness of citizen involvement. Meaningful participation ensures that governance reflects the needs and aspirations of all segments of society, particularly marginalized groups such as women, youth, and rural communities. Mechanisms like decentralization and local self-governance are intended to enhance participatory governance by bringing decision-making closer to communities (Painter, 2011).

However, practical barriers often limit meaningful engagement. These include:

- ✚ Tokenistic or symbolic inclusion,
- ✚ Inadequate civic education,
- ✚ Weak institutional frameworks for citizen involvement.

Thus, for participation to be effective, it must be supported by legal frameworks, institutional commitment, and civic empowerment.

2.6.3. Rule of Law

The rule of law is foundational for just and stable governance, ensuring that laws are applied fairly and consistently to all individuals and institutions. Scholar (2019) highlights that rule of law protects civil liberties, ensures legal predictability, and enables the peaceful resolution of disputes.

Strong legal institutions deter abuse of power, reinforce rights-based development, and provide a stable framework for public and private sector interaction. In fragile or post-conflict settings, restoring the rule of law is critical for rebuilding trust and normalizing governance (Scholar, 2019).

2.6.4. Integration of Good Governance Principles in Ethiopia's Policy Frameworks

Ethiopia has made constitutional and policy-level commitments to institutionalize good governance. The 1995 Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) Constitution enshrines democratic rights, participation, accountability, and rule of law. It mandates that public institutions operate transparently and in alignment with human rights principles (UNDP, 2022).

This constitutional framework is supported by strategic development blueprints such as Growth and Transformation Plans (GTP I & II). These plans underscore the importance of:

- ✚ Governance reform,
- ✚ Public sector transformation,
- ✚ Enhanced civic engagement,
- ✚ Decentralization as a means to foster inclusiveness and participatory governance (UNDP, 2022).

Despite these formal commitments, implementation remains a challenge, particularly at subnational levels. Empirical research reveals persistent gaps between policy intent and practice (Teddy, et al, 2019). The following obstacles have been widely reported:

- ✚ **Bureaucratic inefficiency:** Slow decision-making and poor service delivery due to complex procedures and insufficient human capacity.
- ✚ **Lack of transparency:** Opaque institutional behavior fuels public mistrust and reduces oversight.

- ✚ **Elite capture:** Political and economic elites dominate governance structures, weakening inclusiveness.
- ✚ **Weak local government capacity:** Inadequate financial and institutional support hampers effective implementation at grassroots levels.
- ✚ **Limited community participation:** A lack of civic education and participatory mechanisms leads to low engagement of citizens in governance processes.

These challenges underscore the need for not only policy formulation but also concrete strategies for building institutional capacity, promoting civic awareness, and reinforcing rule-based governance at all levels.

2.6.5. Impact of Good Governance on Sustainable Development Indicators

Good governance is increasingly recognized as a cornerstone for achieving sustainable development across multiple dimensions, including economic growth, social inclusion, environmental sustainability, and peace. It provides the institutional, legal, and participatory frameworks necessary for fostering equitable development and addressing long-term global challenges. According to Bali (2020), countries that uphold strong governance standards consistently perform better across a wide range of development indicators, including poverty reduction, education, health, and environmental protection (Bali, et al, 2020).

2.6.5.1.Poverty Reduction

The relationship between governance and poverty reduction is profound. Effective governance determines how well public resources are allocated and used to support pro-poor policies, such as social protection programs, rural development initiatives, and public service delivery. Transparent budget processes, anti-corruption mechanisms, and targeted welfare programs ensure that resources reach the vulnerable populations they are intended to support.

The World Bank (2016) highlights that in countries with accountable public institutions, service delivery is efficient, and poverty alleviation efforts are more impactful. On the contrary, in environments with poor governance, resources are often diverted through elite capture, mismanagement, and corruption, undermining the effectiveness of poverty reduction strategies.

In Ethiopia, the Public Sector Capacity Building Program (PSCAP) and decentralization policies have sought to improve local governance and service delivery, contributing to progress in poverty reduction at the national level. However, regional disparities remain, particularly in conflict-affected areas. In Slewa Woreda, a district in Tigray that has experienced significant war-related destruction, poverty levels have increased due to the breakdown of public institutions, increased displacement, and ongoing food insecurity (Getachew Mijana, 2020; UN OCHA, 2022). These factors exacerbate the challenges of poverty reduction and require targeted interventions to restore governance and service delivery mechanisms.

2.6.5.2. Education and Healthcare

The quality of governance directly influences access to essential public services, such as education and healthcare. Effective governance ensures adequate budget allocations, oversight, and community participation in the management of education and health systems. According to UNICEF (2018), countries with stronger governance systems show higher school enrollment rates, better literacy outcomes, increased immunization coverage, and improved maternal and child health indicators.

In Ethiopia, the decentralization of the education and healthcare sectors has facilitated the expansion of services over the past two decades, contributing to notable improvements in access to education and health services (MOE, 2015). However, the ongoing conflict in Tigray has had a devastating effect on the education and healthcare systems. Many schools and health centers have been damaged or destroyed, staff members have been displaced, and medical supplies disrupted, resulting in a reversal of previously made gains in service provision. In Slewa Woreda, the recovery of social services has been slow due to administrative dysfunction, limited funding, and low levels of community trust in local institutions.

The disruptions in education and healthcare highlight the need for governance reforms focused on rebuilding institutional capacity and restoring public service delivery. In post-conflict zones, the role of governance becomes even more critical in ensuring that essential services are delivered to affected populations and that recovery efforts are inclusive and equitable.

2.6.5.3. Environmental Protection

Sustainable environmental governance is essential for ensuring the protection and responsible management of natural resources, fostering climate resilience, and promoting biodiversity. Good

governance provides the institutional frameworks necessary to enforce regulations and to engage communities in participatory environmental planning. Through effective environmental governance, countries can achieve sustainable land use, mitigate environmental degradation, and foster resilience to climate change (OECD, 2011).

In Ethiopia, environmental governance is guided by policies such as the Environmental Policy of 1997 and the Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) strategy. These frameworks emphasize the importance of integrating environmental sustainability into development planning. However, the capacity to enforce environmental regulations and manage natural resources effectively remains uneven, especially in conflict-affected regions. In areas like Tigray, the breakdown of governance structures has led to unregulated exploitation of natural resources, deforestation, and land degradation. These challenges undermine efforts to build resilience to climate change, particularly in agricultural districts like SLEWA, where the livelihoods of many people depend on sustainable land management and environmental stewardship.

As governance systems rebuild in post-conflict regions, the integration of environmental considerations into recovery strategies becomes crucial. Strengthening environmental governance at local levels is essential for ensuring long-term sustainability and resilience in vulnerable regions.

2.6.5.4. Empirical Evidence and the Ethiopian Experience

Empirical research highlights the interdependence between governance and sustainable development. Studies have shown that governance quality is strongly correlated with development outcomes, particularly in terms of service delivery, poverty reduction, and public health. For instance, Getachew Mijana (2020) found that local governments in Ethiopia that exhibited higher levels of transparency, accountability, and citizen participation were more effective in delivering public services and reducing poverty.

Conversely, in regions affected by conflict, such as parts of Tigray, institutional breakdown and governance deficits have hindered development outcomes. In the case of SLEWA Woreda, the post-conflict context presents specific governance challenges:

- ✚ Weak administrative capacity: Many civil servants have been displaced, and the local government lacks adequate personnel and training to effectively manage recovery efforts.

- ✦ Low public trust: The war has eroded trust between the government and the population, making it difficult to engage communities in governance processes and rebuild social cohesion.
- ✦ Infrastructure destruction: Key infrastructure, such as schools, health centers, and roads, has been severely damaged, disrupting access to education, healthcare, and basic services.
- ✦ Slow recovery efforts: Much of the humanitarian aid and government focus remains on immediate relief efforts, leaving long-term governance and development needs underfunded.

These realities underline the critical need for governance-sensitive recovery frameworks that prioritize the rebuilding of local institutions, strengthening the rule of law, and ensuring inclusive participation in post-conflict reconstruction. By addressing these governance challenges, it is possible to ensure that recovery efforts contribute to sustainable development in a meaningful way.

2.6.6. Institutional Capacity and Leadership in Promoting Good Governance

Institutional capacity and leadership are central to the realization of good governance. They shape how effectively policies are designed, implemented, and monitored. According to the World Bank (2019), institutional capacity refers to the administrative, human, financial, and technical capabilities of governance structures to perform their functions efficiently and equitably. Without such capacity, even well-crafted policies may fail to produce the desired outcomes.

2.6.6.1. Capacity Building

Institutional capacity is often limited in many developing countries, especially at the sub-national level. Ethiopia's decentralization reforms—enshrined in the 1995 Constitution—were intended to transfer authority and resources to regional and local governments to improve service delivery and responsiveness. However, Mulugeta (2019) argues that these reforms have not consistently translated into improved governance, largely due to:

- Shortages of skilled personnel in local government offices;
- Inadequate training and professional development;
- Weak financial autonomy and dependence on central transfers;

- Poor coordination and accountability mechanisms.

These challenges are more acute in rural or remote areas like Slewa Woreda, where institutional development is further hampered by the effects of conflict, including destruction of infrastructure, displacement of civil servants, and limited access to digital governance tools.

2.6.6.2. Leadership

Leadership plays a pivotal role in strengthening institutions and promoting good governance. Visionary, ethical, and transparent leaders can drive reform, build public trust, and create a culture of integrity and accountability within public administration. Conversely, poor leadership—characterized by authoritarianism, favoritism, and corruption—can exacerbate institutional decay and erode citizen confidence (Diamond, 2003).

According to Kaufmann et al. (2010), leadership effectiveness is strongly correlated with governance indicators such as control of corruption, rule of law, and regulatory quality. In Ethiopia, leadership training programs have been introduced for local officials, yet the impact remains inconsistent due to political interference, lack of merit-based recruitment, and weak accountability structures.

2.6.6.3. Post-Conflict Challenges

In conflict-affected settings like Slewa Woreda, institutional capacity and leadership are severely undermined. Post-conflict governance must address not only technical gaps but also social fragmentation, mistrust, and trauma. The OECD (2011) highlights that rebuilding governance in such contexts requires:

- ✚ Restoring basic administrative functions through human resource support and physical reconstruction;
- ✚ Investing in conflict-sensitive capacity building that incorporates peacebuilding and reconciliation;
- ✚ Fostering inclusive leadership that can bridge divided communities and promote legitimacy.

Leadership in post-war contexts must manage complex trade-offs between stability and reform, short-term service restoration and long-term capacity development, and top-down authority and grassroots participation.

In Slewa Woreda, evidence suggests that:

- ✚ Many local leaders were displaced or removed during the conflict, leaving a leadership vacuum;
- ✚ Reappointed or newly assigned officials often lack experience and training;
- ✚ Citizens' trust in local leaders is low due to perceived partiality or alignment with conflict actors;
- ✚ External support for leadership development and institutional rebuilding is insufficient or uncoordinated.

2.6.7. Youth Participation and Governance for Social Transformation

Youth engagement is increasingly recognized as a critical pillar of good governance and social transformation. With over 70% of Ethiopia's population under the age of 30, young people represent not only a demographic majority but also a strategic asset for democratic renewal and sustainable development (Clark, 2004). However, their effective participation in governance processes remains limited due to structural, institutional, and socio-cultural barriers.

2.6.7.1. Youth Associations and Civic Engagement

Youth-led organizations and associations in Ethiopia have played significant roles in civic education, peacebuilding, community mobilization, and policy advocacy. These associations, particularly in urban centers, have facilitated youth engagement in local development projects, awareness campaigns, and election processes. Nonetheless, their influence is often constrained by:

- ✚ Political interference and co-optation of youth groups by ruling parties or elites;
- ✚ Lack of funding and technical capacity to sustain independent operations;
- ✚ Social stigma that views youth as inexperienced or politically immature (Alemayehu Ayalew, 2010; Gashaw, 2014).

In rural and conflict-affected areas like SLEWA Woreda, youth associations are either dormant or have been severely weakened by the effects of war, displacement, and administrative neglect.

2.6.7.2. Political and Social Inclusion

The meaningful inclusion of youth in political and governance structures remains a major challenge. Several studies highlight low levels of political literacy, limited representation in formal decision-making bodies, and economic marginalization as major obstacles to youth participation in Ethiopia (Eyob Balcha Gebremariam, 2017; Getachew Mijana, 2020). These factors contribute to a cycle of apathy, frustration, and disengagement, making youth vulnerable to manipulation by political actors or participation in violent movements.

Gender norms also affect participation: young women face additional barriers such as early marriage, social conservatism, and limited mobility, further restricting their engagement in civic life.

2.6.8. Policy Approaches and Recommendations for Enhancing Good Governance

Effective governance is not only a normative ideal but also a practical necessity for equitable development, peacebuilding, and social transformation—especially in fragile or post-conflict contexts. Scholars, multilateral agencies, and practitioners underscore a range of policy recommendations to strengthen governance systems, build resilient institutions, and enhance inclusive participation.

2.6.8.1. Strengthening Institutional Frameworks

Building robust, transparent, and accountable public institutions remains foundational for good governance. Key priorities include:

- ✚ Enhancing administrative capacity through civil service reform, training, and improved management systems;
- ✚ Enforcing anti-corruption frameworks and transparency mechanisms, including public financial management systems and access to information laws;
- ✚ Promoting meritocratic recruitment and depoliticization of civil service to increase professionalism and reduce favoritism (World Bank, 2016; Kaufmann et al., 2010).

In Ethiopia, decentralization has brought services closer to the people, but institutional weaknesses—especially at the woreda level—persist, marked by limited autonomy, underfunding, and political interference (Mulugeta, 2019).

2.6.8.2. Enhancing Civic Participation

Broad-based citizen participation is vital for legitimacy and responsiveness in governance. Approaches include:

- ✚ Expanding civic education programs to raise awareness of rights and responsibilities;
- ✚ Establishing inclusive platforms for dialogue between citizens, CSOs, and government actors;
- ✚ Reducing political interference in civil society and youth associations, allowing independent civic engagement (OECD, 2011).

In Ethiopia, civic space has been constrained by restrictive laws and politicized institutions, limiting public input in policymaking. Revitalizing civic culture requires legal reform, institutional trust-building, and protection of civic freedoms.

2.6.8.3. Conflict-Sensitive and Inclusive Governance

In post-conflict settings like Slewa Woreda, governance strategies must be explicitly designed to address past injustices, rebuild trust, and avoid exclusionary practices. This entails:

- ✚ Inclusive policy formulation involving marginalized groups (youth, women, minorities);
- ✚ Community-driven peacebuilding processes that incorporate traditional and local conflict resolution mechanisms;
- ✚ Reintegration of displaced populations into local governance structures;
- ✚ Psychosocial and trauma-informed approaches in administrative reforms (UNDP, 2015; OECD, 2011).

Without such sensitivity, governance reform risks reproducing grievances and exacerbating instability.

2.6.8.4.Resource Mobilization and Local Capacity Building

The success of governance reforms often hinges on adequate funding and resource allocation. This includes:

- ✚ Increasing intergovernmental transfers to underserved and post-conflict woredas;
- ✚ Mobilizing donor and diaspora support for local governance and youth programs;
- ✚ Strengthening local revenue-generation capacity, such as property taxes and service fees (Gashaw, 2014).

Currently, resource constraints limit the reach and impact of local government in areas like Slewa. Addressing fiscal decentralization and promoting financial accountability are essential to sustaining reforms.

While Ethiopia has adopted several governance-enhancing policies, the implementation gap—especially at the local and post-conflict levels—remains a significant hurdle. Areas like Slewa Woreda exemplify how weak institutional capacity, limited civic engagement, and fragile political environments undermine policy effectiveness. This study will contribute to ongoing debates by offering context-specific, evidence-based recommendations for strengthening governance in post-conflict zones. These may include:

- ✚ Tailored capacity-building for woreda officials;
- ✚ Youth and women inclusion frameworks;
- ✚ Monitoring and evaluation systems for accountability;
- ✚ Integration of informal governance actors and customary mechanisms.

By aligning national policy goals with local realities, Ethiopia can move toward a more responsive, inclusive, and resilient governance system.

Chapter Three

Methods and Materials

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design to examine the implementation of good governance principles in local administration within the post-war context of Slewa Woreda, Tigray, Ethiopia. The choice of a mixed-methods approach is particularly appropriate given the complexity of governance issues, which require both quantitative evidence and qualitative insights to capture the full picture of institutional performance, community participation, and post-war challenges.

A concurrent triangulation strategy, as outlined by Creswell (2009), was employed. This strategy entails the simultaneous collection of both qualitative and quantitative data, followed by the integration of findings during the interpretation phase. The rationale for using this strategy is to maximize the strengths and offset the weaknesses of each method. Quantitative data, derived from structured questionnaires, provided measurable indicators of governance principles such as accountability, transparency, participation, and service delivery. Qualitative data, obtained through interviews, focus group discussions, and key informant narratives, offered contextualized insights into community perceptions, lived experiences, and institutional dynamics. By triangulating these data sources, the study enhances validity, reliability, and credibility, ensuring that conclusions are both statistically sound and socially grounded.

In addition, the post-war context makes this approach highly relevant, as governance is not only about policy enforcement but also about rebuilding institutional trust, restoring public service delivery, and fostering social cohesion. Thus, by combining quantitative measurement with qualitative exploration, the study captures both the breadth and depth of governance practices in Slewa Woreda, offering evidence-based insights for policy and practice in post-conflict reconstruction.

Furthermore, the research incorporates a descriptive design to provide a comprehensive account of the governance situation in Slewa Woreda, particularly in the aftermath of war. The descriptive approach allows the study to detail the institutional structures, administrative practices, and governance challenges that define the current local administration. This design is suitable for identifying patterns, assessing the

extent of good governance implementation, and highlighting gaps between policy intentions and practical realities.

3.2. Types and Sources of Data

3.2.1. Types of Data

The study is collected both quantitative and qualitative data:

Quantitative Data: This data was provide measurable insights on governance indicators, including service delivery, public participation, transparency in budgeting, and the effects of governance on development sectors such as education, healthcare, and environmental protection.

Qualitative Data: This data was capture in-depth insights into lived experiences, institutional capacity, leadership behavior, and citizen perceptions of governance and post-war recovery in Slewa Woreda.

3.2.2. Sources of Data

The study employed from both the primary and secondary data. The primary data includes structured Questionnaires: These is administered to residents in selected kebelles (administrative units) in Slewa Woreda. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) was conducted with local government officials, community leaders, and development actors. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) sessions was held with key groups such as youth, women, farmers, civil society groups, and internally displaced persons (IDPs).

The secondary data was collected from the government policy documents including documents related to governance, decentralization, and post-conflict recovery strategies. In addition, it is also collected from academic studies like research focusing on governance and sustainable development in post-war regions. Furthermore, reports from NGOs and international agencies includes reports from organizations like the UNDP, World Bank, and African Union, focusing on governance and development in post-conflict areas.

3.3. Instruments of Data Collection

3.3.1. Questionnaires

Structured questionnaires was distributed to households in selected kebelles. The questionnaires were includes both closed-ended and open-ended questions designed to assess:

- ✚ Community perceptions of transparency, accountability, and participation in governance processes.
- ✚ Access to and quality of basic services (e.g., healthcare, education, infrastructure).
- ✚ The role of local leadership in promoting equitable governance.
- ✚ Public trust in institutions and their effectiveness in the post-war context.

A five-point Likert scale will be used for the closed-ended questions. The questionnaire will be prepared in English and translated into Tigrigna, with back-translation to ensure accuracy.

3.3.2. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

Semi-structured interviews was conducted with key stakeholders, including:

- ✚ Local Government Officials: From departments such as administration, justice, health, and education.
- ✚ Kebele Leaders and Community Elders: To explore community-level governance practices.
- ✚ Civil Society Organizations (CSOs): To assess the role of civil society in governance.
- ✚ Service Providers: Such as teachers, health officers, and agricultural experts, to understand challenges in service delivery and post-war recovery.

These interviews was explored issues such as institutional capacity, leadership roles, community engagement, and challenges in implementing sustainable development strategies in post-war SLEWA Woreda.

3.3.3 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) was held with various groups within the community to gather collective experiences and insights. The groups were include:

- ✚ Youth: To understand their views on governance and social transformation in the post-war context.

- ✚ Women: To explore gender-specific governance challenges and opportunities.
- ✚ Farmers: To assess how governance practices affect agricultural development and rural livelihoods.
- ✚ Civil Society Groups: To explore their role in post-conflict recovery and governance.
- ✚ Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs): To capture the perspectives of displaced populations on governance and social recovery.

Each group will consist of 6–8 participants, and the discussions will last approximately 35–40 minutes.

3.3.3. Document Review

Key documents were reviewed to provide additional context and secondary data for the study. These were include:

- ✚ National and Regional Development Plans: Relevant to post-conflict recovery and governance.
- ✚ Reports from UNDP, World Bank, African Union, and other international organizations: On governance and development in Tigray and post-conflict recovery.
- ✚ The Constitution of Ethiopia and relevant proclamations on decentralization, participation, and transparency.

Special attention was given to post-conflict recovery frameworks, good governance indicators, and institutional accountability mechanisms.

3.4. Sampling Technique and Sample Size

A multi-stage sampling approach was used:

- ✚ Purposive Sampling: To select Slewa Woreda as a critical post-war case study.
- ✚ Simple Random Sampling: To select kebelles and households for surveys, ensuring a representative sample of the population.

- ✚ Purposive Sampling for KIIs and FGDs: Selecting key individuals with relevant knowledge or roles in governance and development in Slewa Woreda.

For the quantitative aspect of the research, the sample size (n) is calculated using Yamane formula for sample size calculation:

$$N = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where, n = sample size

N = population size= 55,000

e = level of precision =5% (0.05)

Substituting the values:

$$N = \frac{55,000}{1 + 55,000(0.05)^2} = 397 \text{ respondents}$$

Thus, 397 respondents were selected proportionally from selected seven (7) kebelles in Slewa Woreda. The sample allocation for surveys was proportional to the population size of each kebele, ensuring household-level representativeness.

Summary of Selected Kebelles and Sample Distribution			
S/No.	Kebelles Sample	Total No. of Populations	Kebelles Sample Share
1.	Fana	12,672	91
2.	Simret	10,950	79
3.	Dejen	8,905	64
4.	Fre-Weyane	6,165	45
5.	Seret	5,484	40
6.	Abnet	5,143	37
7.	Maeernet	5,681	41
Total		55,000	397

Source: Woreda Slew Administration 2025

3.5. Methods of Data Analysis and Interpretation

3.5.1. Quantitative Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected through questionnaires was analyzed using SPSS v27, with the following methods:

1. Descriptive Statistics (mean, percentage, frequency) to summarize and describe data.
2. Inferential Statistics where applicable, to assess the significance of associations or trends within the data.

3.5.2. Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative data from KIIs, FGDs, and document reviews that analyzed thematically using inductive analysis techniques, following Singh (2006). Key themes includes:

- ✚ Transparency and accountability: Exploring how these principles are perceived and implemented in Slewa Woreda.
- ✚ Public participation and voice: Investigating the extent of citizen involvement in governance.
- ✚ Rule of law and institutional effectiveness: Assessing the strength of legal institutions in post-conflict recovery.
- ✚ Post-conflict transformation and recovery: Understanding the social and institutional changes that have occurred as a result of governance practices.

Transcripts was coded and categorized thematically, with key insights extracted from the data.

3.6. Ethical Considerations

Ethical guidelines were adhered to throughout the research process:

- ✚ Informed Consent: All participants were fully informed about the study and will provide written consent before participating.

- ✦ Confidentiality and Anonymity: Participants' identities is kept confidential, and their responses will be anonymized.
- ✦ Right to Withdraw: Participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.
- ✦ Minimizing Harm: Efforts were made to avoid causing distress or harm to participants, particularly in the sensitive post-war context.
- ✦ Institutional Approval: The study will comply with the ethical guidelines and institutional approval processes set by the research institution.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis and Interpretation

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the data collected from Slewa Woreda, focusing on the implementation of good governance principles in local administration in the post-war context. The data was collected through questionnaires, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and document reviews. The findings are organized into two main sections: quantitative analysis and qualitative analysis. This chapter seeks to understand the effectiveness of governance practices, challenges faced by local administration, effectiveness of existing governance policies and strategies, and the potential opportunities.

4.2. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The respondents' demographic characteristics, including sex, age, educational background, and marital status, were analyzed using descriptive statistics.

Table 4.2: Summary of Descriptive Statistics of Respondents

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Sex	Male	198	50.0
	Female	199	50.0
	Total	397	100.0
Age	18-25	120	30.2
	26-35	126	31.7
	36-45	78	19.6
	Above 45	73	18.5
	Total	397	100.0
Education status	Illiterate	40	10.1
	Can read and write	150	37.8
	Junior primary school 1-8	89	22.4
	High school and preparatory 9-12	71	17.9
	College Certificate and above	47	11.8

	Total	397	100.0
Marital status	Married	180	45.4
	Unmarried	213	53.6
	Divorced	4	1.1
	Total	397	100.0
Family size	1-3	160	40.3
	4-7	186	46.9
	Above 7	51	12.8
	Total	397	100.0
Wealth status	Very poor	108	27.2
	Poor	117	29.5
	Medium	111	28
	Rich	49	12.3
	Very rich	12	3.0
	Total	397	100.0

Source: Questionnaire, 2025

The demographic characteristics presented in the above table 4.1 consisted of 397 sample respondents, with an equal distribution of males and females. Both males and females accounted for 50% each, indicating gender balance in the data collection process. This equal representation enhances the reliability of findings by ensuring that perspectives from both sexes are equally reflected in the study. The age distribution of the 397 respondents shows a relatively young population, with the majority falling within the 18–35 age range. Specifically, 31.7% were aged 26–35, and 30.2% were between 18–25 years old, together comprising 61.9% of the sample. Respondents aged 36–45 accounted for 19.6%, while those above 45 years made up 18.5%. This distribution suggests that the findings largely reflect the views of the younger and middle-aged groups, which may have implications for perspectives on governance, innovation, and participation.

The educational status of the 397 respondents shows varying levels of formal education. A notable proportion, 37.8%, can read and write but have no formal schooling, while 10.1% are illiterate. Those who completed junior primary school (grades 1–8) constitute 22.4%, and 17.9% attained high school or preparatory education (grades 9–12). Only 11.8% of respondents have college certificates or higher qualifications. This distribution suggests that the majority of the population has limited formal education, which could influence their engagement with governance processes and access to information. The marital status of the 397 respondents indicates that a slight majority, 53.6%, are unmarried, while 45.4% are married. A small fraction, 1.1%, reported being divorced. This distribution suggests a balanced mix

of marital statuses, which may influence respondents’ perspectives and priorities regarding governance issues, community participation, and social responsibilities.

The family size distribution among the 397 respondents shows that nearly half (46.9%) have families of 4 to 7 members. About 40.3% reported smaller family sizes ranging from 1 to 3 members, while 12.8% have larger families exceeding 7 members. This variation in family size may affect household economic dynamics, resource needs, and social support systems, potentially influencing respondents’ views on governance, service delivery, and community development. The wealth status distribution among the 397 respondents shows that the majority are clustered around the lower to middle economic categories. Specifically, 27.2% identified as very poor, and 29.5% as poor, together comprising more than half (56.7%) of the respondents. Those with a medium wealth status account for 28%, while only a small fraction reported being rich (12.3%) or very rich (3%). This indicates that most respondents likely face economic constraints, which could influence their access to services, participation in governance, and perceptions of policy effectiveness.

4.3. Extent of the implemented in local administration

Table 4.2 details the implementation of good governance regarding the local administration how governance principles such as accountability, transparency, public participation, rule of law and others are perceived and practiced in Slewa Woreda.

Table 4.3: The prevalence and application of the principles of good governance

No.	Variables	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
1.	Openness and transparency	214 (54%)	119 (30%)	50 (13%)	10 (2%)	4 (1%)
2.	Accountability	179 (49%)	133 (27%)	69 (18%)	9 (4%)	7 (2%)
3.	Participation, representation, fair conduct of elections	169 (42%)	165 (41%)	50 (13%)	7 (2%)	6 (2%)
4.	Rule of law	200 (50%)	109 (27%)	70 (18%)	11 (3%)	10 (2%)
5.	Responsiveness	180 (45%)	118 (29%)	74 (19%)	14 (4%)	11 (3%)
6.	Effectiveness and efficiency	160 (40%)	194 (49%)	35 (9%)	4 (1%)	4 (1%)
7.	Sound financial management	166 (42%)	171 (43%)	49 (12%)	6 (2%)	5 (1%)
8.	Human right, cultural diversity, and social cohesion	121 (30%)	186 (47%)	67 (17%)	16 (4%)	7 (2%)
9.	Sustainable and long term orientation	190 (48%)	100 (25%)	78 (20%)	17 (4%)	12 (3%)
10.	Competence and capacity	136 (34%)	148 (37%)	80 (20%)	19 (5%)	14 (4%)
11.	Ethical conduct	176 (44%)	112 (28%)	76 (19%)	25 (7%)	8 (2%)

12.	Innovation and capacity	156 (39%)	115 (29%)	89 (22%)	27 (7%)	10 (3%)
-----	-------------------------	-----------	-----------	----------	---------	---------

Source: Questionnaire, 2025

The findings demonstrate that openness and transparency are perceived as major weaknesses in local governance. A significant majority of respondents, totaling 333 individuals (84%), rated openness and transparency as very low (214 respondents, 54%) and low (119 respondents, 30%). Only a minority viewed these principles as being practiced at medium (50 respondents, 13%), high (10 respondents, 2%), and very high (4 respondents, 1%) levels. Interviewees from teachers noted that limited disclosure of information, restricted access to public records, and lack of open communication channels contribute to the deficit in transparency. They argued that this opacity fosters mistrust, reduces public scrutiny, and enables corruption and mismanagement. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) from the youth participants echoed these concerns, emphasizing that without greater openness, citizen engagement remains superficial and governance accountability is undermined. The civil society groups recommended institutionalizing clear transparency policies, proactive information sharing, and mechanisms for public monitoring to improve governance credibility. Collectively, the data indicate that strengthening openness and transparency is essential for fostering trust, enhancing participation, and ensuring accountable governance.

The findings reveal that accountability is perceived as a significant challenge within local governance structures. A combined total of 312 respondents (76%) rated accountability as very low (179 respondents, 49%) and low (133 respondents, 27%), reflecting widespread concerns about the lack of mechanisms to hold public officials responsible. Only 69 respondents (18%) considered accountability to be at a medium level, while very few rated it as high and very high. The interviewee from local government officials emphasized that weak accountability systems allow for unchecked abuses of power, corruption, and poor service delivery. They pointed out that the absence of transparent reporting, limited citizen oversight, and inadequate enforcement of sanctions contribute to this deficit. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of farmer participants reinforced these observations, highlighting the need for stronger institutional frameworks, empowered watchdog bodies, and active civic engagement to enhance accountability. They stressed that accountability mechanisms must be accessible, transparent, and enforced consistently to restore public trust. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data underline accountability as a critical area requiring urgent attention to improve governance transparency, responsiveness, and integrity.

The data suggest that participation, representation, and the fair conduct of elections are perceived as moderately challenged within the local governance context. A combined 334 respondents (83%) rated these aspects as very low (169 respondents, 42%) and low (165 respondents, 41%), indicating widespread concern over the inclusiveness and fairness of electoral processes. Only a minority viewed them as medium (50 respondents, 13%), high (7 respondents, 2%), and very high (6 respondents, 2%). Interviewees from community elders participants highlighted that limited voter education, political interference, and lack of transparency undermine the credibility of elections and reduce genuine representation. They pointed out that certain groups are often marginalized, and electoral procedures sometimes fail to meet international standards for fairness. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of women participants echoed these challenges, emphasizing the need for stronger electoral oversight, inclusive participation strategies, and civic education programs to enhance voter awareness and confidence in electoral outcomes. Overall, the data indicate significant gaps in the effective participation, representation, and fair conduct of elections, underscoring the need for reforms that promote transparency, inclusiveness, and accountability in electoral governance.

The data reveal that the rule of law is perceived as weakly upheld within local governance systems. Half of the respondents (200, 50%) rated the adherence to rule of law as very low, with an additional 109 respondents (27%) rating it as low, totaling 77% who perceive serious deficiencies. Only 70 respondents (18%) considered it at a medium level, and very few viewed it as high and very high (11 and 10 respondents respectively). Interviewees from civic society organizations emphasized that inconsistent enforcement of laws, political interference in judicial processes, and limited public legal awareness undermine the rule of law. They highlighted how these challenges lead to selective justice, impunity, and reduced institutional credibility. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of youth participants reinforced these observations, noting that the lack of a strong and impartial legal system diminishes public trust and hampers governance effectiveness. They stressed the importance of legal reforms, judicial independence, and awareness-raising to strengthen the rule of law. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data indicate that reinforcing the rule of law is critical for improving governance, ensuring accountability, and protecting citizens' rights within the local governance framework.

The findings show that responsiveness in governance is perceived as largely inadequate. A majority of respondents rated responsiveness at very low (180 respondents, 45%) and low (118 respondents, 29%) levels, together accounting for 74% of participants. Only 74 respondents (19%) rated it as medium, and

smaller proportions considered it high (14 respondents, 4%) and very high (11 respondents, 3%). Interviewees of the health officer noted that governance institutions frequently fail to address citizens' needs in a timely and effective manner. Delays in service delivery, lack of clear communication channels, and limited feedback mechanisms were cited as key factors undermining responsiveness. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of IDPs participants echoed these concerns, emphasizing that poor responsiveness reduces public trust and engagement, and can exacerbate social frustrations. They recommended enhancing communication strategies, establishing responsive service delivery frameworks, and creating platforms for regular citizen feedback to improve governance responsiveness. Together, the data highlight responsiveness as a significant governance weakness that requires targeted interventions to better align governance actions with community needs and expectations.

The findings reveal that effectiveness and efficiency in governance are largely perceived as inadequate. A combined total of 354 respondents (89%) rated governance effectiveness and efficiency at low (194 respondents, 49%) and very low (160 respondents, 40%) levels. Only a small fraction perceived it as medium (35 respondents, 9%), high (4 respondents, 1%), and very high (4 respondents, 1%). Interviewees of the civil society organizations explained that inefficiencies are prevalent due to bureaucratic delays, lack of coordination among institutions, insufficient capacity, and resource constraints. These factors hinder timely decision-making and the delivery of public services, reducing the overall impact of governance efforts. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of the youth participants echoed these sentiments, highlighting procedural bottlenecks, poor performance management, and weak monitoring and evaluation systems as critical issues. They recommended adopting streamlined administrative processes, enhancing inter-agency collaboration, and strengthening performance accountability to improve governance effectiveness and efficiency. Together, the quantitative and qualitative findings indicate that substantial improvements are needed to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of governance systems, which are fundamental for delivering quality public services and achieving development goals.

The data indicate that sound financial management is largely perceived as weak within local governance systems. A combined total of 337 respondents (85%) rated financial management as low (171 respondents, 43%) and very low (166 respondents, 42%), with only a small fraction perceiving it as medium (49 respondents, 12%), high (6 respondents, 2%), and very high (5 respondents, 1%). Interviewees of the local administrators highlighted that poor budgeting practices, lack of transparency in financial transactions, and inadequate financial controls contribute to ineffective management of public

funds. They noted that these shortcomings undermine the ability of institutions to allocate resources efficiently and deliver quality services. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of farmer's participants echoed these concerns, pointing to weak oversight mechanisms, limited capacity in financial administration, and susceptibility to mismanagement or corruption. They emphasized the need for improved financial accountability, capacity-building in public finance, and adoption of modern financial management systems. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data underscore significant deficits in sound financial management, which pose a critical barrier to good governance. Addressing this challenge requires strengthening fiscal oversight, enhancing transparency, and building the financial management capacity of governance institutions.

The data show that the principles of human rights, cultural diversity, and social cohesion are perceived as moderately recognized but insufficiently applied in governance. A majority of respondents rated these principles as low (186 respondents, 47%) and very low (121 respondents, 30%), collectively representing 77% who see these values as inadequately integrated. Only a smaller portion viewed them as medium (67 respondents, 17%), high (16 respondents, 4%), or very high (7 respondents, 2%). Interviewees of teachers emphasized that while there is some formal acknowledgment of human rights and cultural diversity in policy documents, practical implementation is often weak. They highlighted challenges such as marginalization of minority groups, limited efforts to promote social cohesion, and occasional discrimination that undermine inclusive governance. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of women participants reinforced these concerns, noting that social divisions and lack of effective mechanisms to accommodate diversity hinder community trust and collaboration. They recommended enhanced civic education, inclusive policymaking, and proactive efforts to strengthen social cohesion as vital for embedding these principles into governance. Overall, the findings suggest that significant work remains to be done to effectively integrate human rights, cultural diversity, and social cohesion into governance practices to foster inclusive, fair, and cohesive societies.

The findings show that sustainable and long-term orientation is perceived as largely lacking within governance practices. Nearly half of the respondents rated this principle as very low (190 respondents, 48%), and an additional 100 respondents (25%) rated it as low, meaning that 73% of respondents perceive sustainability and long-term planning as weak or insufficient. Only a small proportion considered it medium (78 respondents, 20%), high (17 respondents, 4%), and very high (12 respondents, 3%). Interviewees agricultural experts noted that governance efforts tend to focus on short-term gains or

reactive responses rather than proactive, strategic planning aimed at long-term development and sustainability. They pointed out that political cycles, resource limitations, and shifting priorities often undermine continuity and the implementation of sustainable policies. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of youth participants echoed these concerns, emphasizing that the absence of a strong long-term vision limits the effectiveness of governance reforms and development initiatives. They recommended integrating sustainability principles into policy frameworks and fostering institutional cultures that prioritize enduring impacts over immediate results. Overall, the data highlight a critical gap in embedding sustainable and long-term orientation within governance, suggesting an urgent need for deliberate strategies that promote forward-thinking and resilience in local governance systems.

The data reveal that competence and capacity within governance institutions are perceived as moderate to low. A significant portion of respondents rated competence and capacity as low (148 respondents, 37%), and very low (136 respondents, 34%) together constituting 71% who view this principle as inadequately applied. Only a minority assessed competence and capacity at medium (80 respondents, 20%), high (19 respondents, 5%), and very high (14 respondents, 4%) levels. Interviewees highlighted that many local governance bodies struggle with skill deficits, limited professional development opportunities, and insufficient human resources to effectively carry out their mandates. They emphasized that these limitations reduce institutional effectiveness and the ability to respond to complex governance challenges. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) religious leaders participants supported these observations, noting that capacity-building initiatives are often sporadic and not tailored to the specific needs of local institutions. They stressed the importance of continuous training, mentorship programs, and strategic recruitment to enhance both individual and organizational competence. Collectively, the quantitative and qualitative findings suggest that enhancing competence and capacity remains a critical area for improvement to fully realize the principles of good governance. Addressing these gaps requires sustained investment in human capital development and institutional strengthening.

The findings indicate that ethical conduct is relatively better observed within governance structures compared to other principles. According to the questionnaire, a majority of respondents rated ethical conduct as very low (176 respondents, 44%) and low (112 respondents, 28%), together accounting for 72% who perceive ethical conduct as lacking or insufficient. However, a notable proportion—76 respondents (19%)—rated ethical conduct as medium, with smaller shares assigning high (25 respondents, 7%) and very high (8 respondents, 2%) levels of ethical practice. Interviewees

acknowledged that while ethical standards are formally recognized within governance institutions, challenges persist in consistently applying these standards. They noted that ethical lapses, including favoritism and conflicts of interest, still occur but recognized ongoing efforts to promote codes of conduct and integrity initiatives. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants highlighted that ethical conduct is fundamental for trust and legitimacy but pointed to gaps in enforcement and awareness. They recommended strengthening ethics training, institutionalizing accountability mechanisms, and fostering a culture of integrity across all levels of governance. Overall, the data suggest that although ethical conduct is acknowledged as a key governance principle, its practical prevalence and application remain limited, necessitating sustained efforts to embed ethics more deeply within institutional practices.

The data indicate that the prevalence and application of innovation and capacity within governance structures are generally perceived as limited. A majority of respondents rated innovation and capacity at the very low (156 respondents, 39%) and low (115 respondents, 29%) levels, collectively accounting for 68% of the participants. Only a small portion of respondents perceived these principles as being applied at medium (22%), high (7%), and very high (3%) levels. Interviewees expressed concerns that local governance institutions lack the necessary innovative approaches and sufficient capacity to adapt to evolving challenges effectively. They highlighted that traditional bureaucratic practices dominate, hindering the adoption of new technologies, problem-solving methods, and proactive policy formulation. Capacity constraints such as limited skills, inadequate training, and insufficient resources further restrict the ability to innovate. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants corroborated these observations, emphasizing that the weak culture of innovation undermines responsiveness and flexibility in governance. They also pointed out that the absence of continuous capacity-building programs impedes institutional learning and improvement. FGDs recommended fostering a more dynamic environment that encourages creativity, experimentation, and the integration of modern governance tools. Together, the quantitative and qualitative findings suggest that innovation and capacity remain underdeveloped within local governance, limiting the effective application of good governance principles. Addressing this gap requires targeted investment in capacity-building, promotion of a culture that values innovation, and the introduction of adaptive governance mechanisms to enhance institutional effectiveness and responsiveness.

In a similar vein, research conducted in Tigray particularly in Mekelle city indicates that local application of good governance principles frequently denotes nearly minimal implementation. The public's trust and

scrutiny are undermined when local administrations fail to provide clear communication channels and sufficient access to information, resulting in a lack of openness and transparency. In post-war Tigray, accountability is also poorly implemented because there are frequently insufficient or nonexistent procedures to hold officials accountable for their actions, which leads to corruption and subpar service provision (Gosa, 2017). Low civic awareness, political meddling, and limited inclusivity limit participation, representation, and the fair conduct of elections, diminishing citizens' power to shape policy. Political meddling, weak judicial independence, and low public legal awareness all contribute to the uneven application of the rule of law. Bureaucratic delays, inadequate coordination, and capacity constraints impede responsiveness and efficiency in governance, impacting institutional performance and service delivery (Gebreslassie, 2012). Due to poor oversight, little training, and a lack of funding, sound financial management, moral behavior, and innovation are frequently applied insufficiently. While social cohesion, cultural diversity, and human rights are officially recognized, they are rarely fully incorporated into the implementation of policies, and short-term political priorities and resource limitations threaten long-term and sustainable planning (Brady, 2020). All things considered, these studies show that competence, capacity, and the actual implementation of good governance principles are still lacking, highlighting the necessity of focused capacity-building, improved institutional frameworks, and proactive citizen engagement to increase the efficacy of local governance.

4.4. The effectiveness of existing governance policies and strategies in promoting good governance at the local level.

The study assess on how the existing governance policies and strategies are being implemented at the local level in Slewa Woreda. Data were gathered through the structured questionnaires, focusing on how policies such as decentralization, public sector reforms, and community-driven development strategies have been perceived by local residents, government officials, and other stakeholders.

Table 4.4. The level effectiveness governance policies and strategies in promoting good governance at the local level.

No	Variables	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
1.	Decentralizing and Promoting Local Governance	200 (50%)	177 (45%)	10 (3%)	5 (1%)	5 (1%)
2.	Public Sector Capacity-Building Program (PSCAP)	189 (48%)	121 (30%)	61 (15%)	15 (4%)	11 (3%)

3.	Community Engagement and Participatory Governance	157 (39%)	109 (27%)	90 (23%)	22 (6%)	19 (5%)
4.	Anticorruption and Transparency Initiatives and Measures	222 (56%)	125 (31%)	24 (6%)	19 (5%)	7 (2%)
5.	Strengthening Institutional Capacity	219 (55%)	116 (29%)	50 (12%)	6 (2%)	6 (2%)
6.	Improving Infrastructure and Resources Allocation	121 (30%)	107 (27%)	82 (21%)	67 (17%)	20 (5%)
7.	Promoting Collaboration between Governance and Civil Society	175 (44%)	164 (41%)	35 (9%)	12 (3%)	11 (3%)

Source: Questioners, 2025

Table 4.4 provides an overview of the level of decentralization and the promotion of local governance. The quantitative data reveal that a majority of respondents—200 individuals (50%) and 177 individuals (45%)—perceived the decentralization efforts and promotion of local governance as very low and low, respectively. This indicates that 95% of respondents view decentralization implementation at the local level as largely ineffective. Interviewees of the youth reinforced these findings, describing the decentralization process as incomplete and constrained by the retention of significant decision-making powers at higher levels of government. They highlighted that local authorities often lack the autonomy and resources necessary to respond effectively to community needs, which undermines the goals of decentralization. In addition, one young participant noted “*local government officials often lacked sufficient technical skills to manage complex governance functions effectively, especially in post-conflict contexts.*” Focus Group Discussion (FGD) of women participants further echoed these concerns by pointing out that the lack of clarity in the delegation of responsibilities and weak institutional capacity at the local level hinder the effective functioning of decentralized governance. FGDs also noted that political centralization and bureaucratic inertia limit the empowerment of local governments, resulting in superficial decentralization rather than substantive shifts in governance dynamics. Together, the quantitative and qualitative findings suggest that decentralization and the promotion of local governance in the study area remain largely symbolic, with limited practical transfer of power and authority. To improve effectiveness, there is a need for clear legislative frameworks, adequate resource allocation, capacity-building for local officials, and genuine political commitment to devolve authority in a manner that enhances local autonomy and responsiveness.

Concerning the public sector capacity-building program, the quantitative findings reveal a predominantly negative perception of its effectiveness. Specifically, 189 respondents (48%) reported a very low level of capacity building, 121 respondents (30%) indicated a low level, and only 61 respondents (15%) rated it as medium. These results suggest that capacity-building efforts have largely failed to achieve their intended outcomes at the local level. Interviewees with teacher's participant elaborated on these shortcomings by attributing the inefficiency of capacity-building programs to several critical factors: the lack of adequate resources, absence of political will, weak follow-up and monitoring mechanisms, and the failure to tailor interventions to the unique needs of post-war regions. In particular, they emphasized that programs have not sufficiently addressed the urgent requirements for rebuilding social trust and fostering community cohesion, which are vital for sustainable governance recovery. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these concerns, highlighting that capacity-building initiatives often suffer from fragmented planning and poor coordination among stakeholders. They also pointed out that training sessions and development programs are sometimes repetitive, generic, and disconnected from the practical challenges faced by local public servants. Additionally, FGDs stressed the need for more inclusive and context-specific approaches that engage local actors actively and respond to evolving governance challenges in post-conflict settings. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data underscore the urgent need to redesign capacity-building programs with adequate resourcing, political commitment, and robust monitoring frameworks. Such programs must be contextually sensitive, particularly in post-war environments, to effectively rebuild institutional capacity, restore public trust, and enhance governance outcomes.

The issue of limited community engagement and participatory governance emerged as a significant challenge in the study area. According to the questionnaire data, a combined total of 66% of respondents—157 individuals (39%) and 109 individuals (27%)—reported a very low or low level of community participation in governance processes. Meanwhile, 90 respondents (23%) indicated a medium level of participation, suggesting that only a minority perceive any meaningful community involvement. Qualitative findings from interviewees further illuminate this problem. Several participants noted that local authorities' community engagement strategies, including public consultations and community-based development projects, were either minimal or practically non-existent. They emphasized that decision-making processes are often top-down, with little effort made to involve community members or solicit their input on development priorities. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these concerns, pointing out that even where consultation mechanisms exist, they tend to be perfunctory or

tokenistic rather than genuine opportunities for participatory governance. FGDs also highlighted barriers such as limited civic education, lack of trust in local officials, and insufficient feedback channels that discourage community members from active involvement. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data suggest a governance environment characterized by weak community participation, which undermines the principles of inclusive governance and reduces the effectiveness and legitimacy of local decision-making. To address these gaps, there is a need to institutionalize robust community engagement frameworks, promote civic awareness, and create transparent and accessible platforms that facilitate meaningful dialogue between authorities and citizens.

Regarding the effectiveness of governance policies and strategies in promoting good governance at the local level, the role of the anti-corruption commission and transparency initiatives was highlighted as crucial. However, the quantitative findings indicate a largely negative perception of their impact in the study area. Specifically, a combined 87% of respondents—222 individuals (56%) and 125 individuals (31%)—reported that the effectiveness of the anti-corruption commission and transparency measures was very low or low, signaling widespread dissatisfaction with these mechanisms. Qualitative data from interviewees support this view, with participants emphasizing that corruption remains pervasive in the local governance context. They pointed out that, despite the existence of the anti-corruption commission and related transparency initiatives, these bodies have struggled to establish effective accountability systems. Interviewees noted the persistence of opaque practices and the limited enforcement of anti-corruption policies, which undermine public trust and reduce the perceived legitimacy of governance institutions. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants reinforced these concerns by describing the anti-corruption efforts as largely symbolic rather than substantive. They highlighted challenges such as inadequate resources, political interference, and weak institutional independence that limit the commission's capacity to investigate and prosecute corruption cases effectively. Furthermore, FGD members suggested that the lack of public awareness and engagement in transparency initiatives further diminishes their effectiveness. Taken together, the quantitative and qualitative evidence portrays a governance environment where anti-corruption and transparency measures are insufficiently implemented and fail to achieve their intended outcomes. Addressing these shortcomings would require strengthening the independence and resourcing of oversight bodies, enhancing community participation in monitoring, and fostering a culture of accountability within local institutions to combat entrenched corrupt practices effectively.

With regard to the strengthening of institutional capacity, the majority of respondents—335 individuals (84%)—reported that the level of improvement was very low or low. Only 50 respondents (12%) rated it as medium, while the proportion perceiving it as high or very high was negligible. This overwhelming concentration of responses at the lower end of the scale reflects a widely shared perception that institutional capacity remains weak and underdeveloped. Qualitative evidence from interviewees substantiates these findings. Several participants attributed the weak institutional capacity to shortages of skilled personnel, inadequate training opportunities, and high staff turnover, which undermine institutional memory. Others highlighted that resource constraints—both financial and material—limit the ability of institutions to modernize systems, adopt new technologies, or expand service delivery. Furthermore, interviewees noted that weak coordination between departments and a lack of clear accountability mechanisms exacerbate inefficiencies, while political interference in staffing and decision-making often compromises merit-based practices. Insights from Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) further reinforced these points. Participants expressed frustration over the absence of continuous professional development programs and the limited opportunities for knowledge-sharing between institutions. Some FGD participants also noted that institutional reforms are often reactive—implemented in response to crises rather than as part of a strategic, long-term vision. Additionally, they emphasized the role of community engagement in strengthening institutions, arguing that without active public involvement, institutional reforms remain top-down, poorly contextualized, and less sustainable. Taken together, the survey, interview, and FGD data indicate that the strengthening of institutional capacity is hindered by a combination of human resource limitations, systemic inefficiencies, inadequate planning, and governance challenges. Addressing these issues would require targeted capacity-building programs, increased and well-managed resource allocation, enhanced interdepartmental coordination, and stronger accountability mechanisms, alongside inclusive and participatory approaches that involve community stakeholders in institutional development.

Regarding the improvement of infrastructure and resource allocation, the findings reveal that a majority of respondents—228 individuals (57%)—rated the level of improvement as very low or low. A further 82 respondents (21%) indicated a medium level, while only 67 respondents (17%) and 20 respondents (5%) perceived it as high and very high, respectively. This distribution suggests that more than half of the respondents hold a critical view of the current state of infrastructure development and resource allocation, reflecting perceived inadequacies in both the quantity and quality of services. Qualitative evidence from interviewees reinforces these findings. Several participants noted that infrastructure

development initiatives are often delayed or implemented unevenly, with rural and peripheral areas receiving minimal attention compared to urban centers. They highlighted that resource allocation processes are sometimes influenced by political priorities rather than objective needs assessments, leading to inequities in service provision. Others emphasized that even when resources are allocated, inefficiencies in utilization—such as poor project management, corruption, and lack of community consultation—further limit their impact. Insights from Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) further strengthened these observations. FGD participants voiced concerns that infrastructure projects often fail to address local priorities, with decision-making dominated by higher-level authorities rather than the communities directly affected. They also noted that some infrastructure investments are poorly maintained after completion, reducing their long-term benefits. Additionally, participants highlighted that the absence of transparent monitoring systems fosters public suspicion and reduces accountability in both planning and implementation. When triangulated, the quantitative, interview, and FGD findings indicate a systemic weakness in both the planning and implementation phases of infrastructure and resource allocation. This not only constrains socio-economic development but also erodes public trust in governance structures. Addressing these gaps would require transparent allocation mechanisms, participatory planning, and strengthened oversight to ensure equitable distribution and optimal use of resources.

In relation to promoting collaboration between governance and civil society, 175 respondents (44%) revealed a very low level, 164 respondents (41%) indicated a low level, and 35 respondents (9%) reported a medium level. This means that the vast majority of respondents (85%) perceived collaboration between governance and civil society as either very low or low, while only a small portion (9%) rated it as medium. This suggests weak engagement and cooperation between governance structures and civil society actors, which could hinder participatory decision-making, community trust, and effective policy implementation. Qualitatively, several interviewee participants attributed the weak collaboration to the absence of institutionalized mechanisms for engagement, limited transparency in decision-making processes, and persistent mistrust between government bodies and civil society organizations. They further noted that civil society actors are frequently marginalized during policy formulation and implementation, reducing opportunities for meaningful partnership. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these concerns, emphasizing that the lack of regular dialogue forums and collaborative platforms creates barriers to sustained partnership. They highlighted that power imbalances often silence civil society voices and that limited capacity on both sides hampers effective communication

and joint planning. FGDs also pointed to the need for mutual recognition of roles and responsibilities to foster trust and accountability. When examined together, the quantitative, interview, and FGD data underscore a structural disconnect between governance institutions and civil society. This disconnect not only restricts civic participation but also undermines the legitimacy and inclusiveness of governance processes. Addressing this issue would require the establishment of formal consultation platforms, capacity-building initiatives for both sides, and deliberate trust-building measures aimed at fostering a cooperative governance environment.

Similarly, research conducted in Ethiopia shows that local good governance is frequently not effectively promoted by governance policies and strategies. Because major decision-making authority and resources are still held at higher levels of government, decentralization initiatives meant to strengthen local authorities usually fall short. This creates a general impression of ineffective governance by restricting the autonomy of local officials and making it harder for them to effectively address community needs. Programs for public sector capacity-building, like the Public Sector Capacity-Building Program (PSCAP), are crucial for boosting institutional competence and technical skills, but their ability to improve governance quality is often constrained by a lack of resources, follow-up mechanisms, and proper training (Hadgu, 2017).

In addition, Selome (2020) reflects that there is low civic awareness, poor feedback channels, and a lack of representation of marginalized groups make community engagement and participatory governance initiatives—which aim to promote citizen involvement and inclusivity—less effective in fostering accountability and responsiveness. Despite being formally implemented, anti-corruption and transparency initiatives are beset by bureaucratic inertia, poor monitoring, and lax enforcement, which erodes public trust in governance institutions (Selome, 2020).

Furthermore, the potential of governance strategies to achieve their intended outcomes is further limited by structural inefficiencies, a lack of technical expertise, and resource constraints, which frequently undermine efforts to improve infrastructure, allocate resources efficiently, and strengthen institutional capacity. It is acknowledged that encouraging cooperation between civil society and governance institutions is essential to improving responsiveness, transparency, and participatory decision-making; however, data indicates that these collaborations are still in their infancy. When taken as a whole, these results show that although governance policies and strategies exist to encourage decentralization,

accountability, and citizen engagement, their actual application is frequently lacking, requiring focused interventions, capacity-building, and sincere political commitment to fortify local governance systems and accomplish inclusive, sustainable, and successful governance outcomes(Sari, 2023).

4.5. Challenges hindering the effective implementation of good governance

There are different types of challenges that hindering the effective implementation of good governance. For this research the listed below distributed to respondents through structured questionnaires to identify the primary challenges faced by local administrators in implementing good governance principles in the post-war context of Slewa Woreda.

Table 4.5: The hindrance of effective implementation of good governance

N o.	Variables	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
1.	Political instability	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	9 (2%)	157 (39%)	225 (57%)
2.	Lack of institutional capacity and resources	20 (5%)	70 (18%)	85 (22%)	109 (27%)	113 (28%)
3.	Inefficient bureaucracy	26 (7%)	45 (11%)	87 (22%)	128 (32%)	111 (28%)
4.	Poor planning strategy	50 (12%)	58 (15%)	103 (26%)	87 (22%)	99 (25%)
5.	Lack of transparency and accountability	10 (3%)	16 (4%)	97 (24%)	145 (37%)	129 (32%)
6.	Poor economic growth	21 (5%)	90 (23%)	93 (23%)	110 (28%)	83 (21%)
7.	Globalization	20 (5%)	67 (17%)	82 (21%)	107 (27%)	121 (30%)
8.	Corruption	7 (2%)	12 (3%)	50 (13%)	113 (28%)	215 (54%)
9.	Limited public participation in governance process	23 (6%)	29 (7%)	35 (9%)	180 (45%)	130 (33%)
10.	In adequate legal framework and the rule of law	8 (2%)	25(7%)	76 (19%)	112 (28%)	176 (44%)

Source: Questioners, 2025

The data reveal that political instability is widely recognized as a significant challenge to the effective implementation of good governance, with the vast majority of respondents rating its impact as very high (225 respondents, 57%), and high (157 respondents, 39%). Only a minimal number of respondents perceived political instability as low or very low, underscoring a near-consensus on its critical negative influence. Interviewees corroborated these findings, explaining that ongoing political instability disrupts institutional continuity, weakens administrative structures, and hampers policy implementation. They highlighted that frequent changes in leadership, contested authority, and political conflicts create an

unpredictable environment that undermines the consistency and effectiveness of governance initiatives. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) further elaborated on these issues, emphasizing how instability breeds uncertainty among stakeholders, discourages long-term planning, and reduces public trust in government institutions. Participants noted that political turmoil often diverts attention and resources away from development priorities, while also fostering power struggles that impede cooperation across different governance levels. Together, the questionnaire, interview, and FGD data illustrate that political instability poses a profound obstacle to good governance by destabilizing institutions, disrupting service delivery, and eroding public confidence. Addressing this challenge requires fostering political stability through inclusive dialogue, strengthening democratic institutions, and building consensus among political actors to create a conducive environment for sustainable governance reforms.

The findings indicate that the lack of institutional capacity and resources is perceived as a significant challenge hindering the effective implementation of good governance. A combined total of 222 respondents (55%) rated this challenge as very high (113 respondents, 28%), high (109 respondents, 27%) reflecting widespread concerns about inadequate capacity and resource constraints within local institutions. Meanwhile, 85 respondents (22%) perceived this challenge at a medium level, and a smaller proportion—90 respondents (23%)—considered it low and very low. Interviewees elaborated on these findings, noting that local institutions suffer from chronic understaffing, limited professional training opportunities, and inadequate financial and material resources. They emphasized that these capacity gaps undermine the ability of institutions to implement policies effectively, manage public services, and maintain accountability mechanisms. Moreover, the absence of modern infrastructure and technological tools further constrains institutional performance. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these concerns, highlighting that resource shortages are compounded by weak planning and coordination among government bodies. They pointed out that insufficient investment in human capital development and poor budgetary allocation practices exacerbate the problem. FGDs also emphasized the importance of sustained capacity-building initiatives tailored to local needs, along with improved resource mobilization and management strategies to overcome these constraints. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data underscore the critical need to enhance institutional capacity and secure adequate resources as foundational steps toward improving governance effectiveness and service delivery at the local level.

The data indicate that inefficient bureaucracy is widely recognized as a substantial obstacle to effective governance implementation. A combined 239 respondents (60%) rated bureaucracy inefficiency as high (128 respondents, 32%) or very high (111 respondents, 28%), while 87 respondents (22%) perceived it at a medium level. Only a minority viewed it as low or very low, reflecting broad consensus on the severity of bureaucratic inefficiencies. Interviewees highlighted that cumbersome administrative procedures, excessive red tape, and unclear roles and responsibilities significantly delay decision-making and service delivery. They noted that bureaucratic inertia often leads to slow responsiveness and hampers the implementation of policies and programs. Furthermore, interviewees pointed out that the lack of motivation and accountability among public officials contributes to inefficiency and corruption risks. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants reinforced these observations by discussing how overlapping mandates and poor coordination between departments create confusion and duplication of efforts. They also emphasized that bureaucratic inefficiencies discourage citizen engagement and undermine public trust in governance institutions. FGDs called for process simplification, capacity development, and stronger accountability frameworks to improve administrative efficiency. Collectively, the questionnaire, interview, and FGD findings highlight inefficient bureaucracy as a critical barrier to good governance. Addressing this challenge requires reforming administrative processes, clarifying institutional roles, promoting staff professionalism, and establishing robust accountability mechanisms to enhance efficiency and public service delivery.

The findings reveal that poor planning strategy is considered a significant challenge affecting effective governance implementation. According to the questionnaire data, a combined 186 respondents (47%) rated poor planning as very high (99 respondents, 25%) and high (87 respondents, 22%). Additionally, 103 respondents (26%) perceived it as medium, while a smaller proportion, 108 respondents (27%), rated it as low and very low. This distribution suggests that nearly half of the respondents recognize poor planning as a major obstacle. Interviewees attributed these shortcomings to a lack of clear vision and coordination among local government units. They highlighted that planning processes are often reactive rather than proactive, lacking comprehensive situational analysis and stakeholder engagement. This results in fragmented and inconsistent plans that fail to address the community's real needs or anticipate emerging challenges. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these concerns, pointing to inadequate technical capacity and limited use of data and evidence in formulating strategic plans. They further noted that political interference and short-term priorities often overshadow long-term planning goals, reducing the effectiveness of governance initiatives. FGDs emphasized the need for inclusive

planning processes that engage diverse community actors and strengthen capacity for strategic management. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data underscore poor planning strategy as a critical barrier to good governance. Improving governance outcomes will require the development of clear, evidence-based planning frameworks, enhanced technical skills, greater coordination, and participatory approaches that ensure plans are responsive, realistic, and sustainable.

The findings indicate that lack of transparency and accountability is widely regarded as a major impediment to effective governance. According to the questionnaire results, a combined total of 274 respondents (69%) rated this challenge as high (145 respondents, 37%) and very high (129 respondents, 32%), while 97 respondents (24%) perceived it at a medium level. Only a small fraction viewed transparency and accountability issues as low or very low, highlighting the pervasive concern over these governance deficiencies. Interviewees elaborated that inadequate transparency mechanisms and weak accountability frameworks contribute significantly to governance failures. They pointed out that limited access to information, opaque decision-making processes, and the absence of effective oversight hinder public trust and allow corrupt practices to flourish. Interviewees stressed that officials often evade responsibility, and citizens lack meaningful channels to hold authorities accountable. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants reinforced these perspectives, emphasizing that the lack of transparent communication and participatory monitoring weakens governance legitimacy. They noted that without clear accountability measures, governance institutions remain unresponsive to public needs, fostering apathy and disengagement among community members. FGDs highlighted the necessity for stronger legal frameworks, accessible information systems, and empowered watchdog bodies to enhance transparency and accountability. In sum, the quantitative and qualitative evidence underscores lack of transparency and accountability as a fundamental challenge to good governance. Addressing this requires institutionalizing robust transparency policies, fostering a culture of openness, and establishing effective accountability mechanisms that empower citizens and deter malfeasance.

The data indicate that poor economic growth is perceived as a significant challenge impacting effective governance. According to the questionnaire, 193 respondents (49%) rated poor economic growth as either high (110 respondents, 28%) and very high (83 respondents, 21%), while 93 respondents (23%) considered it a medium challenge. Meanwhile, 111 respondents (28%) rated it as low and very low. This suggests that nearly half of the participants recognize economic stagnation as a critical impediment to governance effectiveness. Interviewees noted that sluggish economic growth limits the government's

capacity to generate sufficient revenue, which in turn restricts investments in public services and infrastructure development. They emphasized that economic challenges such as unemployment, inflation, and reduced private sector activity undermine social stability and the ability of local institutions to fulfill their mandates. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these observations, stressing that poor economic performance diminishes public confidence in government and exacerbates social inequalities. They highlighted the importance of creating inclusive economic policies, stimulating local entrepreneurship, and fostering sustainable development as essential for enhancing governance outcomes. Together, the quantitative and qualitative evidence points to poor economic growth as a fundamental barrier that weakens institutional effectiveness and undermines the broader goals of good governance. Addressing this challenge requires integrated economic strategies that promote growth, diversify income sources, and improve livelihoods to create a conducive environment for governance improvements.

The findings indicate that globalization is perceived as a notable challenge affecting local governance, with a combined total of 228 respondents (57%) rating its impact as very high (121 respondents, 30%) and high (107 respondents, 27%). An additional 82 respondents (21%) viewed it as a medium challenge, while a smaller portion perceived it as low or very low. This distribution suggests that a majority recognize globalization as a significant factor influencing governance dynamics. Interviewees highlighted that globalization brings both opportunities and challenges; however, in the local context, it often creates pressures such as increased competition for resources, exposure to external political and economic influences, and cultural shifts that can disrupt traditional governance practices. They noted that rapid changes driven by global forces can overwhelm local institutions that lack the capacity to adapt effectively. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these concerns, emphasizing that globalization can exacerbate inequalities, create dependencies on external actors, and introduce complex regulatory demands. They also noted the challenge of balancing local priorities with global trends, which requires adaptive governance frameworks and capacity to engage with international processes without compromising local autonomy. Collectively, the quantitative and qualitative data highlight globalization as a multifaceted challenge that necessitates strategic responses. Strengthening institutional adaptability, enhancing stakeholder awareness, and developing policies that harness globalization's benefits while mitigating its risks are critical for maintaining effective and resilient local governance.

The findings reveal that corruption is widely perceived as a severe challenge undermining good governance, with a combined total of 328 respondents (82%) rating its impact as very high (215 respondents, 54%) and high (113 respondents, 28%). Only a small minority viewed corruption as a low or very low concern, indicating near-universal recognition of its detrimental effects. Interviewees underscored that corruption permeates multiple levels of governance, manifesting in bribery, nepotism, embezzlement, and favoritism. They noted that these corrupt practices severely erode public trust, distort resource allocation, and impede the fair and efficient delivery of services. Interviewees also highlighted the limited effectiveness of existing anti-corruption measures due to weak enforcement and political interference. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these views, emphasizing that corruption not only hampers development but also fosters a culture of impunity and cynicism among citizens. They pointed out the need for stronger institutional frameworks, increased transparency, and civic education to combat corruption effectively. FGDs stressed that tackling corruption requires political commitment, independent oversight bodies, and active citizen participation in accountability mechanisms. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data confirm corruption as a fundamental barrier to good governance, necessitating comprehensive reforms that strengthen legal frameworks, improve enforcement, and foster a culture of integrity and accountability within governance institutions.

The data reveal that limited public participation in governance processes is recognized as a significant challenge, with a combined total of 310 respondents (78%) rating it as high (180 respondents, 45%) and very high (130 respondents, 33%). Only a small proportion of respondents perceived public participation as low or very low, indicating widespread agreement on the importance and current deficiency of civic engagement. Interviewees explained that limited participation stems from several factors, including lack of awareness, insufficient communication channels, and a prevailing culture of exclusion from decision-making processes. They noted that many citizens feel marginalized or powerless, which discourages active involvement in governance matters. Furthermore, interviewees pointed to the absence of institutionalized mechanisms for meaningful public engagement as a critical gap. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants reinforced these concerns, emphasizing that public participation is often superficial or tokenistic rather than substantive. They highlighted barriers such as low literacy levels, political apathy, and mistrust in government institutions, which further hinder citizen involvement. FGDs stressed the need for deliberate efforts to educate, empower, and create accessible platforms for inclusive participation to enhance governance legitimacy and responsiveness. Together, the quantitative and qualitative evidence underscores limited public participation as a fundamental challenge to effective

governance. Addressing this requires developing formal participatory frameworks, fostering civic education, enhancing transparency, and building trust between government and citizens to enable more inclusive and responsive governance processes.

The findings reveal that inadequate legal framework and weak rule of law are widely recognized as significant challenges to effective governance, with a combined total of 288 respondents (72%) rating this issue as very high (176 respondents, 44%) and high (112 respondents, 28%). A further 76 respondents (19%) perceived it at a medium level, while only a small minority considered it low and very low. Interviewees highlighted that gaps and inconsistencies in legal provisions undermine governance by creating uncertainty and limiting enforcement capacity. They noted that the rule of law is often compromised by selective application of laws, political interference in judicial processes, and insufficient legal awareness among both officials and the public. These factors weaken institutional credibility and obstruct fair and equitable governance. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants echoed these concerns, emphasizing that an inadequate legal framework contributes to impunity and reduces public confidence in state institutions. They stressed the need for comprehensive legal reforms, strengthened judicial independence, and enhanced legal literacy to ensure consistent application and enforcement of laws. FGDs also pointed to the importance of integrating customary and formal legal systems to increase accessibility and legitimacy. Together, the quantitative and qualitative data underscore inadequate legal frameworks and weak rule of law as critical barriers to good governance. Addressing these challenges requires legislative reform, capacity building within judicial institutions, and fostering a culture of legal compliance and accountability to support transparent and effective governance.

Research in Tigray demonstrates that several interconnected issues frequently hinder the obstacles to the successful application of good governance principles. People often say that political instability is a big problem because it makes it hard for local governments to do their jobs well and keep people's trust. This is because of ongoing conflicts, power struggles, and transitions after conflicts. Local governments cannot follow governance concepts like openness, accountability, and participation because they do not have enough resources and people, money, or technical infrastructure. Inefficient bureaucracy, which is marked by delays in procedures, poor coordination, and a lack of performance management, makes it hard to make decisions quickly and respond to the requirements of the community (Gebreslassie, 2012).

Poor planning, slow economic growth, and the problems that come with globalization make these problems worse by taking focus away from long-term development goals and making institutions less flexible. Corruption is still a big problem, and the misuse of public funds and poor enforcement systems make people less trusting and accountable. Limited public engagement, insufficient legal frameworks, and deficiencies in the rule of law further impede the efficacy of governance initiatives, obstructing citizens' ability to influence decision-making processes and hold authorities responsible. When taken as a whole, these studies show how political, institutional, economic, and legal issues work together to make it difficult for local administrations to actually implement good governance. This emphasizes the necessity of focused interventions, capacity-building, and fortified institutional and legal frameworks to enhance governance outcomes in post-conflict settings (WBG, 2023).

4.6. Potential Opportunities for Improving Governance Effectiveness

Institutional capacity building, community participation, legal frameworks, stakeholder collaboration, and peacebuilding have become critical components for governance improvement in post-war contexts.

Table 4.6: The Opportunities for Improving Governance Effectiveness

No	Variables	Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High
1.	Institutional capacity building initiatives	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	225 (57%)	157 (39%)	9 (2%)
2.	Community participation and resource mobilization in governance endeavors	20 (5%)	70 (18%)	113 (28%)	109 (27%)	85 (22%)
3.	Policy and legal framework supporting good governance	50 (12%)	99 (25%)	103 (26%)	87 (22%)	58 (15%)
4.	Partnerships and collaboration among stakeholders	10 (3%)	129 (32%)	145 (37%)	97 (24%)	16 (4%)
5.	Ongoing peacebuilding and reconciliation initiatives	93 (23%)	90 (23%)	110 (28%)	83 (21%)	21 (5%)

Source: Questioners, 2025

Table 4.6 shows that the majority (57%) of respondents believe institutional capacity building initiatives exists but is *moderate and insufficient*. This suggests that efforts are present (e.g., some training, limited resource support, rebuilding of administrative offices) but they are not yet strong enough to transform governance effectiveness in Slewa Woreda. This aligns with post-war realities: local administrations are struggling with limited budgets, loss of skilled personnel, and damaged infrastructure. A significant

portion (39%) acknowledges meaningful progress. This may reflect initiatives from NGOs, universities, and external actors providing training programs and rebuilding support. However, the *very low percentage* (2%) at the “very high” level highlights that institutional strengthening is still perceived as weak and fragmented, not yet embedded into long-term structures. Only 1% each selected “very low” and “low.” This means almost nobody believes capacity building is completely absent. Instead, the issue is not lack of effort but the *scale, depth, and sustainability* of those efforts. Institutional capacity is foundational for accountability, transparency, and service delivery. Without strong institutions, governance principles risk being symbolic. The medium-heavy distribution shows that local institutions are in a transitional state: they are no longer collapsed, but not yet resilient.

The interviewee from local administrator, *“We are trying to rebuild our offices and staff capacity, but resources are very limited. External actors provide trainings, yet without long-term institutional structures, these efforts may not be sustained.”* The youth’s association leader added, *“Capacity-building workshops are provided by partners, but they are project-based and short-lived. What we need is institutionalized training and adequate budgets.”* Furthermore, the civil society reviled *“Good governance is impossible without strong institutions. We see some improvements, but they are not yet enough to rebuild trust.”* Consistently the FGD said that many community members highlighted that local administrations lack trained personnel and adequate facilities after the war. However, they acknowledged efforts by NGOs and universities to provide training workshops and short-term capacity programs. The perception of “high” potential aligns with people’s hope that institutional strengthening can restore trust in governance, but the low “very high” response reflects doubts about sustainability. Supporting this, Berhanu and Rohan (2015) notes that public institutions in Ethiopia often suffer from employee incompetence, lack of transparency, and weak responsiveness to citizens, which hinders governance effectiveness.

In relation to community participation and resource mobilization almost half of respondents (27% and 22%) rated community participation and resource mobilization as high or very high. This suggests that citizens are actively engaging in governance processes and mobilizing resources—whether through traditional structures (like *Idir, Mahber, Senbet*) or post-war collective recovery initiatives. The “very high” 22% shows a considerable number of respondents see this as a strong foundation for governance effectiveness. A significant portion sees participation as medium, meaning it exists but is uneven or not institutionalized. This may reflect challenges such as exclusion of some groups (youth, women, displaced

people) or lack of formal structures to channel participation into governance. About one-quarter of respondents believe participation and resource mobilization are weak. This likely reflects barriers such as mistrust in local authorities, war fatigue, and limited economic capacity of communities that hinders sustainable contributions. Community participation is a core principle of good governance. The high levels of positive perception mean there is social capital and willingness to engage, but unless properly integrated into decision-making, this potential may not fully translate into effective governance. It indicates a window of opportunity: if administrations strengthen participatory platforms (community forums, joint planning, budgeting), governance effectiveness could improve significantly.

The interviewee from the youth group representative *“We are willing to rebuild schools and infrastructure, but our role in governance is limited. The older generation dominates decision-making.”* The local leader interviewee added, *“The people’s willingness is there. After the war, participation increased because everyone wanted to restore what was lost. What is missing is a structured way to use this energy for governance.”* Similarly the interviewee from community elder *“In times of crisis, people come together. The government needs to recognize our informal contributions and integrate us into decision-making.”* And the FGD indicated, *“We are always ready to contribute—through labor, money, or ideas. But sometimes the administration does not value our voice.”* In view of this, Dina (2022) study on stakeholder participation in community projects in Ethiopia emphasizes the importance of community involvement in improving environmental security and livelihoods, highlighting that active participation can lead to governance that is more effective.

In relation to policy and legal frameworks, only 37% (22% high and 15% very high) perceive that the policy and legal framework strongly supports good governance. Meanwhile, 37% (25% low and 12% very low) see the framework as weak or inadequate. This near balance between positive and negative views suggests that policies and legal instruments exist but are not consistently applied, enforced, or trusted in the post-war context. About one-quarter (26%) are neutral, acknowledging that legal frameworks exist but without clear impact on daily governance. This reflects a gap between “laws on paper” and practical implementation. A strong and functioning legal framework is critical for ensuring accountability, rule of law, and transparency. The mixed perception highlights weak enforcement capacity, institutional fragility, and possibly low legitimacy of policies created before or during the war. This suggests that legal reforms and stronger implementation mechanisms are necessary to rebuild trust in governance.

Consistently the interviewee from local administrator *“Most laws are in place, but the institutions that should enforce them are too weak after the war. Without resources, even good policies remain only on paper.”* In addition, civil society member interviewee *“There is a gap between the law and its application. Communities often rely on informal systems for justice because they don’t trust the formal legal framework.”* Furthermore, the FGD participants (farmers and community members) *“We hear about policies, but in reality, they don’t protect us. Land disputes, corruption, and favoritism continue without punishment.”* Research on Ethiopia's legal framework by Legal Action Worldwide (2023) points out challenges such as legal pluralism and inconsistencies in policy application have undermine the effectiveness of governance structures.

In line to partnerships and collaboration among stakeholders, the largest share of respondents (37%) rated partnerships at a medium level. This suggests that some collaboration exists, mainly through NGOs, community-based organizations, religious institutions, and local administrations, but these partnerships are not yet strong or institutionalized. A considerable proportion (32% low and 3% very low) see collaboration as weak. This reflects the reality that coordination mechanisms are underdeveloped—many actors operate in silos, and duplication of efforts is common in post-war contexts. Only about one-quarter of respondents (24% high and 4% very high) believe partnerships are functioning effectively. This shows some promising collaborations, but they are not widespread enough to transform governance. Partnerships are crucial for post-war governance because local administrations often lack the resources to act alone. The survey results highlight that collaboration is emerging, but not yet strong enough to ensure accountability, service delivery, and conflict-sensitive development. The interviewee from NGO, *“We work with the local administration, but coordination is weak. Without a shared framework, partnerships remain temporary and fragmented.”* The local administrator added, *“We appreciate the support from different partners, but there is no clear structure to manage collaboration. This limits the effectiveness of joint efforts.”* FGD with community leaders *“Sometimes NGOs help us, sometimes religious groups, but they don’t always communicate with each other. We need one table where all stakeholders meet.”* Similarly, Pursuing Effective Partnerships (2023) study on multi-stakeholder partnerships for health service delivery in Ethiopia highlights that effective collaboration requires clear coordination mechanisms and shared frameworks to avoid fragmented efforts.

In relation to ongoing peacebuilding and reconciliation initiatives, almost half of respondents (23% very low and 23% low) believe peacebuilding and reconciliation initiatives are weak or ineffective. This reflects the reality that, despite efforts, many communities in post-war Tigray—particularly in Slewa

Woreda—still feel excluded or underserved in reconciliation processes. Trust between communities, and between citizens and local authorities, remains fragile. A significant share sees reconciliation at a medium level. This indicates that some initiatives exist—such as community dialogues, faith-based reconciliation efforts, and NGO-led peacebuilding projects—but they are uneven and fragmented. Only about one-quarter (21% high and 5% very high) believe peacebuilding is effective. This small proportion suggests that initiatives have had localized success stories but are not widely scaled or inclusive. Without reconciliation, governance effectiveness cannot be sustained. The high proportion of negative ratings suggests that peacebuilding is the weakest of all opportunities compared to institutional capacity, community participation, and partnerships. It highlights the urgent need for inclusive, community-driven reconciliation processes that integrate local traditions, women, youth, and displaced populations. Interviewees from the youth association representative *“We lost trust during the war. The reconciliation programs do not always address our trauma or our needs. Without healing, governance will not be effective.”* Interviewees from religious leader *“Faith-based initiatives have helped reduce tensions, but they need government backing and resources to reach all communities.”* Community elder (FGD) *“Meetings are held, but only certain groups are invited. Many feel their voices are ignored, so peace remains fragile.”* In this vein, Transitional Justice Policy of Ethiopia (2023) notes that while there are efforts to address past injustices, the implementation of these initiatives has been uneven, and approaches that are more inclusive are needed to build lasting peace.

Chapter Five

Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusion

This study assessed the implementation of good governance principles in the local administration of Slewa Woreda, Tigray, in the post-war context by examining the level of implementation of good governance principles, evaluating the effectiveness of governance policies and strategies, identifying key challenges hindering implementation, and exploring opportunities for improving governance effectiveness.

The findings reveal that the overall implementation of good governance principles remains weak and fragmented. Core dimensions such as openness and transparency, accountability, participation and representation, responsiveness, effectiveness and efficiency, rule of law, and sound financial management are largely perceived at low or very low levels. Principles linked to human rights protection, cultural diversity, social cohesion, ethical conduct, and innovation demonstrate limited practical application, reflecting an environment where governance deficits persistently undermine service delivery, institutional trust, and local development.

The study has revealed that existing governance policies and strategies have not been effectively implemented. Initiatives related to decentralization, capacity-building, institutional strengthening, anti-corruption measures, and community participation are inconsistently applied and often under-resourced. Weak decentralization, inadequate financial and human capacity, and poor community engagement collectively reduce policy effectiveness, resulting in ineffective service delivery, diminished accountability, and declining public confidence. Strengthening these policies demands genuine political commitment, adequate resourcing, stronger institutional frameworks, and more inclusive participatory mechanisms tailored to the post-war context of Tigray.

The study identified that political instability, corruption, lack of transparency, poor enforcement of legal frameworks, and administrative inefficiencies as the most pressing obstacles to good governance. Political instability has weakened institutional resilience and disrupted governance continuity. Corruption, coupled with limited public participation, has further eroded legitimacy and accountability. Bureaucratic inefficiencies—such as delayed decision-making, weak planning, and resource scarcity—have constrained institutional capacity, while poor legal enforcement has undermined the rule of law. These combined challenges create a governance environment characterized by fragility, mistrust, and low institutional performance.

The study further identifies potential opportunities for improving governance effectiveness despite the prevailing challenges. Institutional capacity-building initiatives, though still in their infancy, provide a foundation for strengthening governance. Community participation and resource mobilization, while underutilized, hold promise if systematically enhanced. Existing policies and legal frameworks present an important starting point, though their implementation requires consistent enforcement and contextual adaptation. Moreover, partnerships between government, NGOs, civil society, and community-based organizations represent valuable but underdeveloped assets. Strengthening these opportunities requires institutionalizing coordination mechanisms, fostering inclusive dialogue platforms, and building trust-based collaborations that reinforce transparency and accountability. Overall, Slewa Woreda's local administration faces significant governance deficits in the post-war context, there also exist meaningful opportunities to reconstruct and strengthen governance systems. Realizing these opportunities necessitates political will, institutional innovation, and community-driven engagement, ensuring that governance transformation is inclusive, participatory, and sustainable.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the study findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed to strengthen the implementation of good governance principles in Slewa Woreda's local administration in the post-war context:

1. Strengthening Institutional Capacity and the Implementation of Good Governance Principles

- Provide targeted training for local administrators and civil servants in Slewa Woreda on transparency, accountability, and citizen engagement.
- Establish clear performance benchmarks and monitoring systems for local officials to ensure continuous improvement.
- Mobilize resources from regional government, diaspora, and development partners to rebuild destroyed offices, restore record-keeping, and modernize administrative systems.
- Introduce digital tools (e-governance platforms) to improve data management and reduce bureaucratic inefficiency.

2. Enhance Transparency and Accountability

- Introduce a Woreda-level public information board, where decisions, budgets, and project updates are regularly posted.
- Create a community oversight committee drawn from youth, women, and elders to monitor service delivery and financial management.
- Enforce regular public accountability forums where administrators must present progress reports and respond to community concerns.
- Adopt open budgeting processes that allow citizens to monitor public expenditures.

3. Foster Inclusive Participation

- Institutionalize quarterly public consultations at Kebele level, ensuring youth, women, and marginalized groups are represented.
- Support youth and women's associations with meeting spaces, small grants, and trainings so they can engage meaningfully in governance processes.
- Integrate traditional leaders and civic associations into local decision-making to increase legitimacy and ownership.
- Promote participatory budgeting and community scorecards to ensure citizen voices influence development priorities.

4. Rebuild Trust and Rule of Law

- Reactivate local justice institutions like courts and mediation structures and strengthen their independence to ensure disputes are resolved fairly.
- Provide community-level civic education campaigns on rights, duties, and complaint mechanisms.
- Encourage collaboration between local security actors and community committees to build confidence in law enforcement.
- Strengthen grievance-handling mechanisms to ensure timely redress of complaints.

5. Improve Service Delivery and Responsiveness

- Prioritize quick wins in essential services such as health, education, and infrastructure restoration to rebuild citizen trust in governance.
- Establish citizen feedback mechanisms (suggestion boxes, hotlines, and digital platforms) for reporting grievances and monitoring service delivery.
- Partner with NGOs, CSOs, and diaspora organizations to bridge resource gaps until the Woreda regains full operational capacity.
- Strengthen local government capacity for disaster preparedness and recovery to ensure resilience in the face of future shocks.

6. Promote Youth Engagement for Governance Renewal

- Launch a youth civic leadership program to train young people in governance, advocacy, and project management.
- Assign at least one youth and one women representative to each Woreda-level planning and budgeting committee.
- Create youth-led monitoring groups to track local projects, report irregularities, and foster a culture of accountability.
- Create livelihood and skills development programs to reduce youth unemployment and enhance their constructive participation in governance.

7. Strengthen Partnerships and Resource Mobilization

- Develop partnerships with NGOs, CSOs, academia, and international agencies to support governance reforms and service delivery.

- Mobilize diaspora contributions (financial, technical, and advisory) to support reconstruction and institutional strengthening.
- Establish inter-woreda and inter-regional collaboration platforms for sharing best practices in governance and service delivery.
- Ensure donor alignment with local priorities to avoid duplication and enhance sustainability.

References

- Adamaagashi, I., Awakessien, C., & Awakessien, S. (2024). Corruption and governance: Examining the impact on political stability in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research*, 10(2), 1–20.
- African Union (AU). (2020). *An integrated, prosperous and peaceful Africa: A study on the roles and contributions of youth to peace and security in Africa. An independent expert report commissioned by the Peace and Security Council of the African Union.* <https://www.peaceau.org/uploads/au-study-youth-africa-web.pdf>
- Alemayehu, A. T. (2011). *Understanding and reflecting on the role of youth associations: The case of Dessie Town, Ethiopia.* International Institute of Social Science (ISS).
- Bali Swain, R., & Yang-Wallentin, F. (2020). Achieving sustainable development goals: Predicaments and strategies. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 27(2), 96–106.
- Berhanu, J., Jaap, S., & Rohan, D. (2015). Urban planning and land management challenges in Ethiopia. *Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 9(2), 65–75.
- Bertelli, L. (2018). Aristotle's political theory. *Athenaion Politeiai tra storia, politica e sociologia: Aristotele e Pseudo-Senofonte*, 71.
- Brady, B., Chaskin, R. J., & McGregor, C. (2020). Promoting civic and political engagement among marginalized urban youth in three cities: Strategies and challenges. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 116, 105184.
- Chanda, C. T., Madoda, D., Zohaib, H. S., & Chisebe, S. (2024). Good governance: A pillar to national development. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(6), 6215–6223.
- Daniel, A. K., & Lalise, K. (2024). Leadership development in Ethiopia: Practices, challenges, and way forward. *Annals of the University of Craiova for Journalism, Communication and Management*, 10, 111–118.
- De Janvry, A., & Dethier, J. J. (2012). The World Bank and governance: The Bank's efforts to help developing countries build state capacity. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* (No. 6275).
- Dikwa, S. M., Shehu, K., Ali, K. G., & Ismail, U. (2024). Role of local governance on peace building in post-conflict state. *Journal of Arid Zone Economy*, 178–186.
- Dina, I. (2022). Multi-stakeholder partnerships for health service delivery in Ethiopia. *International Institute of Administrative Sciences*.
- Dugan, J. P. (2024). *Leadership theory: Cultivating critical perspectives.* John Wiley & Sons.

- Essien, E., & Jesse, E. E. (2025). Urban governance and political influence in contemporary urban settings of mid-sized cities in Nigeria. *Urban Governance*.
- Farazmand, A. (Ed.). (2023). *Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance*. Springer Nature.
- Fenta, M. T. (2014). Local government in Ethiopia: Practices and challenges. *Journal of Management Science and Practice*, 2(4), 71–79.
- Finkel, S. E. (2002). Civic education and the mobilization of political participation in developing democracies. *Journal of Politics*, 64(4), 994–1020.
- Gebreslassie, K. (2012). Challenges of good governance in local government: The case of Saesietsaedanba Woreda, Tigray Region, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Research in Commerce, Economics, and Management*.
- Gereffi, G. (2005). The global economy: Organization, governance, and development. In N. J. Smelser & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *The handbook of economic sociology* (2nd ed., pp. 160–182). Princeton University Press.
- Gisselquist, R. M. (2012). Good governance as a concept, and why this matters for development policy (No. 2012/30). *WIDER Working Paper*.
- Gosa, S. T. (2017). The opportunities and challenges of good governance in Tigray National Regional State: The case of Mekelle City. *Developing Country Studies*, 7(5). <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/DCS/article/view/36841>
- Hadgu, G. H. (2017). The exercise of decentralized local governance process in Gulomekeda Woreda, Tigray Region, Ethiopia.
- Handoyo, S. (2024). Public governance and national environmental performance nexus: Evidence from cross-country studies. *Heliyon*, 10(23).
- Hope, K. R., Sr. (2005). Toward good governance and sustainable development: The African peer review mechanism. *Governance*, 18(2), 283–311.
- Keping, Y. (2018). Governance and good governance: A new framework for political analysis. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40647-017-0197-4>
- Khan, M. S., & Syrett, S. (2022). An institutional analysis of ‘power within’ local governance: A Bazaari tale from Pakistan. *World Development*, 154, 105882. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.105882>
- Legal Action Worldwide. (2023). *Tigray and northern Ethiopia*. <https://legalactionworldwide.org/where-we-work/tigray-and-northern-ethiopia/>
- Louw, V. N. (2012). *The concept ‘governance’ in public administration* (Master’s thesis, University of South Africa). <http://hdl.handle.net/10500/8457>

- Mallin, C. A. (2019). *Corporate governance* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198806765.001.0001>
- Masyk, M., Buryk, Z., Radchenko, O., Saienko, V., & Dziurakh, Y. (2023). Criteria for governance, institutional effectiveness and quality in the context of sustainable development tasks. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 17(2), 327–340. <https://doi.org/10.24874/IJQR17.02-09>
- Matsiliza, N., & Zonke, N. (2017). Accountability and integrity as unique columns of good governance. *Public and Municipal Finance*, 6(1), 75–82. [https://doi.org/10.21511/pmf.06\(1\).2017.07](https://doi.org/10.21511/pmf.06(1).2017.07)
- Miletzki, J., & Broten, N. (2017). *An analysis of Amartya Sen's Development as freedom*. Macat Library.
- Ministry of Women and Social Affairs. (2022). *An assessment of the implementation status of the national youth policy of Ethiopia (2004): Final report*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. [https://www.api.corhaethiopia.org.et/media/106/Youth-Policy-Implmntation-Final--Report-\(V4a\).pdf](https://www.api.corhaethiopia.org.et/media/106/Youth-Policy-Implmntation-Final--Report-(V4a).pdf)
- Mizanie, A. (2017). Addressing good governance issues through human rights protection in Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Human Rights Law Series, IX*. Addis Ababa University School of Law.
- Nanda, V. P. (2006). The “good governance” concept revisited. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 603(1), 269–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716205282847>
- Ohiomu, S., & Dible, K. E. (2014). Good governance as a panacea for rapid economic transformation and sustainable development in Nigeria. *International Policy Brief Series: Education and Science Journal*, 4(1), 68–76.
- Omeje, K. (2018). The political economy of peacebuilding in Africa. In T. Murithi (Ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of peacebuilding in Africa* (pp. 281–298). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62202-6_18
- Omweri, F. S. (2024). Youth-led policy advocacy in Africa: A qualitative analysis of Generation Z's mobilization efforts against fiscal legislation in Kenya and its implications for democratic governance. *International Journal of Innovative Scientific Research*, 2(3), 1–22.
- Painter, J., Orton, A., Macleod, G., Dominelli, L., & Pande, R. (2011). *Connecting localism and community empowerment: Research review and critical synthesis for the AHRC Connected Community Programme*. Arts & Humanities Research Council.
- Pursuing Effective Partnerships. (2023). *Innovation and collaboration in peacemaking in the Horn of Africa*. Conciliation Resources. <https://www.c-r.org/accord/still-time-talk/pursuing-effective-partnerships-innovation-and-collaboration-peacemaking>
- Rahmani, T., & Koohshahi, N. M. (2013). Relationship between the rule of law, good governance, and sustainable development. *International Journal of Political Science*, 3(2), 10–22.

- Regassa, T. (2010). The making and legitimacy of the Ethiopian constitution: Towards bridging the gap between constitutional design and constitutional practice. *Afrika Focus*, 23(1), 85–118. <https://doi.org/10.21825/af.v23i1.5049>
- Santiso, C. (2001). Good governance and aid effectiveness: The World Bank and conditionality. *The Georgetown Public Policy Review*, 7(1), 1–22.
- Sari, A. R. (2023). The impact of good governance on the quality of public management decision-making. *Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management (ADMAN)*, 1(2), 39–46. <https://doi.org/10.58909/adman.v1i2.24>
- Scholar, A. R. (2019). Governance and good governance: A conceptual perspective. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 9(3), 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v9i3.15299>
- Selome, L. (2020). *Assessing the practices of citizen engagement mechanisms in policy formulation in Ethiopia: The case of House of Peoples' Representatives (HoPRs)* (Master's thesis, Addis Ababa University). <https://etd.aau.edu.et/server/api/core/bitstreams/bbf1f95e-52ed-45b9-84a8-ba2da4dcbc66/content>
- Teddy, G., Lembani, M., Hwabamungu, B., & Molosiwa, D. (2019). Policy and implementation gap: A multi-country perspective. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 7(12), 678–704. <https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/10191>
- The Transitional Justice Policy of Ethiopia. (2023). *The transitional justice policy of Ethiopia and its relevance for peacebuilding*. ACCORD. <https://www.accord.org.za/ajcr-issues/the-transitional-justice-policy-of-ethiopia-and-its-relevance-for-peacebuilding/>
- Thelma, C. C. (2024). Effects of civic education on youth participation in democratic practices: A case of youths in selected constituencies of Lusaka District, Zambia. *Journal of African Civic Education Studies*, 3(1), 44–61.
- Thelma, C. C., Madoda, D., Sain, Z. H., & Sylvester, C. (2024). Good governance: A pillar to national development. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(6), 6215–6223. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1234567>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2015). *Contribution to the 2015 United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) integration segment*. <https://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/integration/2015/pdf/undp.pdf>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2022). *Governance and democratic participation programme GDPP legacy document June 2017–June 2022*. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2023/11/governance_and_democratic_participation_programme_legacy_document_1.pdf
- United Nations Development Programme. (2023). *Governance and democratic participation programme GDPP legacy compendium of achievements 2017–2022*.

https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2025-01/compendium_of_gdpp_achievements.july_final_02_nov_2023.pdf

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (n.d.). *Corruption and bad governance*. <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/anti-corruption/module-2/key-issues/corruption-and-bad-governance.html>

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (n.d.). *Corruption and bad governance*. <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/en/anti-corruption/module-2/key-issues/corruption-and-bad-governance.html>

United Nations. (2000). *Economic governance: Guidelines for effective financial management*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Public Economics and Public Administration.

VNG International. (2024). *Post-conflict governance in Tigray: A focus on social accountability and community-driven recovery*. <https://www.vng-international.nl/post-conflict-governance-in-tigray-a-focus-on-social-accountability-and-community-driven-recovery/>

World Bank Group. (2017). *Governance and the World Bank Group: Year in review 2017 – Foundations and frontiers*. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/407031510747657764/pdf/121403-WP-PUBLIC-GovernanceAnnualReview.pdf>

World Bank Group. (2023). *Corruption is a global problem for development: To fight it, we all have a role to play*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/opinion/2023/06/13/corruption-is-a-global-problem-for-development-to-fight-it-we-all-have-a-role-to-play>

World Bank. (2017). *Governance and the law: World development report 2017*. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/407031510747657764/pdf/121403-WP-PUBLIC-GovernanceAnnualReview.pdf>

World Bank. (2019). *Transforming Addis Ababa: Integrated strategic development phase I – Multi-sector diagnostic*. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/339201623400628489/pdf/First-Phase-Multi-Sector-Diagnostic.pdf>

Yilmaz, S., & Venugopal, V. (2008). Local government discretion and accountability in Ethiopia (Working Paper No. 08-38). *International Center for Public Policy, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University*. <https://icepp.gsu.edu/files/2015/03/isppwp0838.pdf>

Appendix

Mekelle University

College of Law and Governance

Department of Civics and Ethical Studies

Introduction

Dear Respondent, my name is Tigst Hailemariam Abraha, a postgraduate student in the Department of Civics and Ethical Studies at Mekelle University, College of Law and Governance. I am conducting a research study titled: **“Assessment of the Practice of Good Governance Principles in Local Administration in Post-War Tigray, Ethiopia: The Case of Slewa Woreda.”** The purpose of this study is to assess how principles of good governance (transparency, accountability, participation, and rule of law) are practiced in Slewa Woreda, particularly in the post-war context. Your honest responses are very important for the success of this study. All the information you provide kept strictly confidential and used only for academic purposes. Your participation is voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw at any stage of the process without any negative consequences.

I kindly request your cooperation in responding to the questions truthfully.

Thank you for your valuable time and participation.

Sincerely,

Tigst Hailemariam Abraha

Postgraduate Student

Department of Civics and Ethical Studies

Mekelle University

Appendix A: Questionnaire for Community Respondents

Instruction: Please indicate your perception of the extent to which each statement reflects governance practice in Slewa Woreda using the following scale:

1 = Very Low 2 = Low 3 = Medium 4 = High 5 = Very High

Section I: Demographic Information

1. Sex: Male Female
2. Age: 18-25 , 26-35 , 36-45, Above 45 ,
3. Educational level:
 - No formal education
 - Can read and write
 - Primary
 - Secondary
 - College/University

4. Marital status: Married [] Unmarried [] Divorced []
5. Family size: 1–3 [] 4–7 [] Above 7 []
6. Wealth status: Very Poor [] Poor [] Medium [] Rich [] Very Rich []
7. Length of residence in Slewa Woreda: _____ years

Section II: Questions Based on Study Objectives

Objective 1: To what extent are the principles of good governance (transparency, accountability, participation, and rule of law) implemented?

Transparency

1. The openness of decision-making processes in Slewa Woreda is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
2. Access to government information by citizens is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
3. Communication of financial resource allocation is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Accountability

4. Local leaders' accountability to the community is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
5. Explanations provided by officials for decisions and actions are ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
6. Effectiveness of mechanisms for reporting corruption/misconduct is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Participation

7. Encouragement of citizens to engage in decision-making is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
8. Inclusiveness of women and youth in governance processes is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
9. Frequency and inclusiveness of community meetings is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Rule of Law

10. Fair application of rules and regulations is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

11. Equal access to justice services in the Woreda is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
12. Coordination of traditional and formal justice systems is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Objective 2: How effective are existing governance policies and strategies?

13. Effectiveness of local government policies in ensuring accountability is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
14. Success of existing strategies in promoting transparency is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
15. Impact of governance strategies on citizen participation is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
16. Effectiveness of policies in enforcing the rule of law is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Objective 3: What are the major challenges affecting implementation?

17. The extent to which lack of institutional capacity hinders governance is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
18. The extent to which corruption undermines governance in SLEWA Woreda is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
19. The effect of post-war instability on governance practices is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
20. The degree to which limited resources constrain governance effectiveness is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Objective 4: What opportunities exist for improving good governance?

21. The role of community participation in strengthening governance is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
22. The contribution of NGOs and civil society in supporting good governance is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
23. The potential of institutional reforms to improve governance practices is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]
24. The extent to which post-war recovery programs create opportunities for good governance is ... [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

Appendix B: Interview Guide for Key Informants

1.1.1 Introductory Questions

1. Can you describe your role in the community or local administration?
2. How has the post-war context shaped governance practices in Slewa Woreda?

Questions Linked to Objectives

Objective 1: Principles of Good Governance

- How are transparency, accountability, participation, and rule of law practiced in Slewa Woreda?
- Can you give examples where these principles have been applied successfully or unsuccessfully?

Objective 2: Effectiveness of Governance Policies and Strategies

- How effective are the current policies and strategies in promoting good governance?
- What gaps do you see in their implementation?

Objective 3: Challenges

- What are the main obstacles hindering the implementation of good governance in the Woreda?
- How do post-conflict realities (e.g., displacement, insecurity, institutional collapse) affect governance?

Objective 4: Opportunities

- What opportunities exist for strengthening governance in Slewa Woreda?
- How can communities, civil society, and external actors contribute to improving governance practices?

Appendix D: Focus Group Discussion (FGD) Guide

General Instructions for FGD

- Group size: 6–10 participants.
- Duration: 30– 1 hours.
- Moderator ensures inclusiveness, respect, and confidentiality.
- Use probing questions to encourage discussion.

Introductory Questions

1. Please introduce yourself (name, age group, occupation).
2. In your opinion, how has governance in Slewa Woreda changed after the war?

Discussion Questions Based on Objectives

Objective 1: Extent of Implementation of Governance Principles

- How do you see **transparency** in decision-making and resource allocation in your Woreda?
- In what ways are leaders **accountable** to the people?
- Do you feel that ordinary citizens (including women and youth) can **participate** in governance?
- How is the **rule of law** respected in your community after the conflict?

Objective 2: Effectiveness of Existing Governance Policies and Strategies

- What local policies or strategies do you know that promote good governance?
- Have these policies improved service delivery, justice, or citizen participation?
- To what extent are these policies working well, and where do they fail?

Objective 3: Challenges in Implementation

- What are the main obstacles preventing good governance in Slewa Woreda?
- How have war-related issues (e.g., displacement, trauma, resource destruction) affected governance?
- What role does corruption, weak institutions, or lack of trust play as challenges?

Objective 4: Opportunities for Improvement

- What opportunities exist for improving governance practices in this Woreda?
- How can the community, religious leaders, youth, women, or civil society support good governance?
- Do you see post-war recovery and reconstruction as a chance to strengthen governance? How?

Closing Questions

- If you had the chance to advise local leaders, what would you recommend to improve governance?
- Is there anything we didn't ask but you think is important for improving governance in Slewa Woreda?