

Effects of Political-Administration Dichotomy in Decision Making Process in Tanzania – A Case of Temeke Municipality

Euzebyo Rodrick Msigwa^{1*}, Joan Owade², Kassim Rashid Kiliza³

^{1,2,3}Department of Social Science, Kampala International University in Tanzania, Dar es salaam, Tanzania

Abstract: The study assessed Effects of political- administration dichotomy in decision making process in Tanzania. A case of Temeke Municipality. The objectives were to analyze the relationship between politicians and administrators in the decision-making process in Temeke Municipality, to examine how stakeholder engagement affects decision-making in Temeke Municipality. The study used both primary and secondary data and mixed approaches of both Qualitative and quantitative methods in analyzing the effects of political administration dichotomy in decision making process in Tanzania. This study was comprised 191 respondents included comprise of all Councilors, Heads of departments, WEO's, VEO's, DED and all village chairmen. Data were collected through questionnaires, and interviews and analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 27 and thematic analysis. The findings reveal that significant political pressures undermine the quality of decisions made by administrators, with respondents indicating that political influence often prioritizes agendas over objective analysis, leading to favoritism and delays in the decision-making process. Additionally, stakeholder engagement is shown to enhance decision-making quality and accountability, although many respondents' express skepticism regarding the seriousness with which public feedback is integrated into governance. Furthermore, the research identifies that conflicts between political agendas and administrative priorities hinder effective decision-making, exacerbated by inadequate communication and the current political climate, which complicates the separation of roles between political leaders and bureaucrats. In conclusion, the study emphasizes the necessity of fostering collaboration between politicians and administrators to improve governance outcomes, advocating for the establishment of independent oversight bodies to monitor political influence, the implementation of training programs to enhance understanding of the political-administration dichotomy, and the promotion of transparent communication channels to clarify roles and responsibilities. By prioritizing evidence-based decision-making and stakeholder engagement, local governance in Temeke Municipality can be strengthened, ultimately serving the community's genuine needs and restoring public trust in governmental institutions.

Keywords: political-administration dichotomy, decision making process, stakeholders' engagement.

1. Introduction

The political-administration dichotomy is a theoretical framework that separate the roles and responsibilities of politics

and administration within governance systems. This concept posits that political leaders are responsible for setting policies and making decisions, while administrative officials are tasked with implementing these decisions effectively (Usman, et al., 2024). Worldwide public officials and politicians are faced with the hard time in the process of making decisions; this is due to the differences of ideas that exist between them, in one way or another each group is complaining its role to be interfered with other group (Geddes, 2023).

The decision-making process is inherently complex, involving multiple stakeholders, including political leaders, administrative officials, and civil society. This complexity is compounded by the interplay between political considerations and administrative realities. Political leaders may prioritize populist policies to secure electoral support, while administrators might advocate for decisions rooted in practicality and resource constraints. This tension can lead to conflicts that hinder effective governance and, ultimately, the achievement of national development goals (Waddell, 2017).

The origins of the political-administration dichotomy in America can be traced back to the writings of early public administration theorists such as Woodrow Wilson and Frank J. Goodnow.

Wilson argued for a clear distinction between politics and administration, asserting that effective governance requires a neutral and efficient bureaucracy that operates independently of political pressures (Wilson, 1887). This perspective was aimed at promoting professionalism and accountability within the administrative state, particularly in response to the rampant corruption and inefficiency of the political machines of the late 19th century (Overeem, 2017).

In America they implement this dichotomy through various institutional frameworks and legal structures. The civil service system, established in the late 19th century, was a significant reform aimed at reducing political patronage and ensuring that government officials are selected based on qualifications rather than political connections. This system encourages a professional bureaucracy where administrators are tasked with executing policies set by elected officials, thereby maintaining a degree of separation between political appointees and career

*Corresponding author: euzebyomsigwa9@gmail.com

civil servants (du Gay and Lopdrup 2024).

In India, the implementation of the political-administration dichotomy in the decision-making process is fundamentally rooted in the country's constitutional framework, which delineates the roles of elected representatives and bureaucratic officials, thereby establishing a clear separation of powers that is intended to enhance governance efficiency and accountability. This dichotomy is primarily reflected in the functioning of various governmental layers, where political leaders are tasked with formulating policies while bureaucrats are responsible for executing these policies, a dynamic that aims to ensure that administrative actions remain insulated from political whims, thereby promoting a more effective governance structure (Singh & Kumar, 2021).

In African context since the 1990s, many African countries have moved from being single party autocratic states and have adopted democratization and multiparty systems of governments. These political reforms have transformed the political and social contexts within which local governments operate and have led to the emergence of new formal and informal norms and rules of the game, wherein many cases have had an impact on the actual interaction and traditional relationship between political leaders and public administrators (Southall, 2019).

In Nigeria, the political-administration dichotomy is often challenged by a history of political instability and corruption. The country's federal system includes multiple layers of government, but the interplay between political leaders and bureaucrats can be fraught with tension. Political patronage frequently undermines administrative efficiency, as politicians prioritize loyalty over merit in appointments. This dynamic complicates the decision-making process, leading to inefficiencies and a lack of accountability within public administration (Koledoye, 2017).

In Kenya, the political-administration dichotomy is characterized by a strong influence of political interests on bureaucratic functions. The legacy of colonialism and subsequent governance challenges has led to a bureaucratic system that often prioritizes political alignment over professional expertise. This has resulted in a decision-making process that is frequently marred by inefficiency and corruption, impacting service delivery and public trust in government. Recent reforms aim to enhance accountability and professionalism within the civil service, yet challenges remain (Benyera, 2024).

In Tanzania, there are two categories of decision-makers: the politicians and the administrators. The councilors are categorized into two types: those elected from their wards and those elected as special representatives for women, alongside the village chairpersons elected by their local communities during local government elections. In Tanzania, these politicians primarily belong to two major political parties: CCM and CHADEMA. This group of political leaders collectively engages in crafting policies, establishing various by-laws, orders, rules, and regulations, ensuring the implementation of CURT, and approving the district budget. The second group includes both permanent and temporary employed public

officials. This group is crucial and comprises various professionals tasked with executing CURT as well as the policies, orders, rules, regulations, and all decisions made by the first group (political leaders) (Mkuku, 2016).

A. Statement of the Problem

The political-administration dichotomy in Tanzania, particularly within Temeke Municipality, has a significant impact on decision-making processes and enhance effective governance. This framework highlights the distinct functions of political leaders and administrative officials, revealing that tensions between the two can hinder development initiatives. For example, a water supply project intended to provide clean drinking water to over 50,000 residents became a failure due to political influence, escalating from an initial budget of 500 million TZS to 800 million TZS due to delays and alterations insisted upon by political leaders seeking electoral advantage. Similar issues plagued a major road construction project; budgeted at 1 billion TZS, it was halted for six months over contractor disputes, driving the final cost to 1.5 billion TZS and causing significant traffic congestion (Tonya, 2015).

The construction of a health center for over 30,000 residents also illustrates the detrimental effects of this dichotomy. Originally budgeted at 300 million TZS and set for a one-year completion, the project faced delays and increased costs to 450 million TZS as political leaders pushed for unnecessary facilities, ultimately delaying its opening by two years. A waste management initiative aimed at enhancing sanitation was similarly affected, struggling under mismanagement and conflicting directives, which prevented full implementation and cost the municipality over 400 million TZS in remediation efforts. Furthermore, attempts to upgrade educational facilities encountered challenges as political leaders insisted on incorporating unnecessary features into a renovation budget that ballooned from 600 million TZS to 900 million TZS, leaving many schools in disrepair and adversely impacting the quality of education for students. (Mkuku, 2016).

Conflicts and misunderstandings between Tanzania's two important political groups, Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) and the CHADEMA Party, date back to 2015. This period was characterized by heightened political tensions and ideological differences, leading to a lack of trust in decision-making processes and project implementation between the two parties. These divisions became particularly acute during the 2015 general elections, when CHADEMA sought to challenge the long-held rule of the CCM, which had been in power since independence in 1961, as the main opposition party. The increasing disconnects, misunderstandings, and conflicts between political leaders and public administrators are becoming more pronounced in Temeke, creating a mistrustful environment that affects public administration's effectiveness. Pressure from political leaders to prioritize short-term electoral gains reported by 65% of administrator's compromises policy execution and undermines public trust in government institutions. This lack of clear distinction between political and administrative roles fosters a culture of mistrust, compelling administrators to align with political demands instead of

adhering to their professional duties (Victoria, 2022).

Consequently, this fierce competition for control over decision-making adversely impacts the delivery of essential services to the community, highlighting a critical inefficiency in local governance. (Waddell, 2017). Therefore, this study seeks to investigate the effects of political-administration dichotomy in decision making process in Tanzania. A case of Temeke Municipality, this research aims to provide valuable insights that can help to identify the key roles played by politician and administrators in decision making process and being able to identify their scope of roles and responsibilities.

B. Specific Objectives

- i. To determine the relationship between politicians and administrators in the decision-making process in Temeke Municipality.
- ii. To examine the effects of stakeholder engagement in decision-making in Temeke Municipality.

2. Literature Review

A. Relationship between Politicians and Administrators in Decision Making Process

Sinnaiah et al. (2023), who emphasize the significance of decision-making styles among managers within the realm of strategic management. The findings argued that the interplay between political directives and administrative execution is crucial for achieving organizational performance, highlighting how these dynamics can shape the effectiveness of governance. They proposed that different decision-making styles, whether intuitive or analytical, can significantly influence how policies are implemented and the overall effectiveness of organizational strategies. This finding resonates with perspective that understanding and leveraging these diverse decision-making styles can empower both political leaders and administrators to collaborate more effectively, aligning their objectives and enhancing outcomes. The study underscores the need for adaptability in decision-making processes, suggesting that a nuanced approach can facilitate better alignment between strategic objectives and operational execution. The study supports the notion that when decision-makers are flexible and responsive to the complexities of their environments, they are more likely to drive improved performance within organizations. By fostering a culture that values diverse decision-making approaches and encourages collaboration, organizations can better navigate the challenges posed by political influences and administrative constraints.

Abuhjeeleh et al. (2018) into the impact of political influence on administrative decision-making provides critical insights into the challenges faced by public administration. Their findings suggest that when political leaders exert undue influence over bureaucratic processes, it can lead to significant inefficiencies and a pronounced lack of accountability within governance. This observation resonates with understanding of governance dynamics, as excessive political intervention often compromises the integrity of administrative actions, resulting in decisions that prioritize political agendas over evidence-based practices. Such misalignment not only hampers the

effectiveness of public administration but also erodes public trust in governmental institutions, creating a detrimental cycle of skepticism and disengagement among citizens. It was emphasized the necessity for a clear separation between political oversight and administrative functions, advocating for frameworks that empower bureaucrats to operate independently. This perspective aligns with the study which suggest that enhancing the autonomy of public administrators is essential for improving governance outcomes. By establishing boundaries that delineate political influence from administrative execution, organizations can foster an environment where decisions are made based on merit and empirical evidence, thereby enhancing overall efficiency and accountability.

Nguyen (2020) provides a nuanced exploration of the relationship between political leadership and administrative effectiveness, emphasizing the critical interplay between these two spheres in the decision-making process. The study revealed that successful decision-making hinges on achieving a balance between political vision and administrative expertise, a notion that resonates with perspective on effective governance. Politicians are responsible for setting the strategic direction and priorities based on public needs and political considerations, while administrators contribute the technical knowledge and practical insights necessary for the effective implementation of policies. This collaborative dynamic is essential for fostering a responsive governance structure capable of addressing the complexities inherent in public administration. The findings underscore the importance of recognizing and leveraging the strengths of both political leaders and bureaucrats in improving decision-making processes. By fostering an environment where collaboration is prioritized, governments can enhance their responsiveness to constituent needs, ultimately leading to more effective governance outcomes. This insight aligns with knowledge about when both spheres work cohesively, it not only improves administrative efficiency but also strengthens public trust in governmental institutions.

Elrehail et al. (2020) delve into the critical role of bureaucratic autonomy in the decision-making process, revealed that when administrators are granted a degree of independence from political influence, they are significantly better positioned to make informed decisions that genuinely reflect the best interests of the public. This autonomy enables bureaucrats to draw upon their expertise and knowledge without the constraints imposed by political pressures, thereby facilitating more effective and evidence-based policy implementation. The findings of implis that enhancing bureaucratic independence can lead to improved governance outcomes, as it empowers administrators to prioritize public welfare and operational efficiency over political expediency. The findings underscore the necessity of maintaining a clear boundary between political directives and administrative functions to create a more conducive decision-making environment. This notion resonates with understanding of effective governance, as such boundaries are essential for preserving the integrity of administrative actions and ensuring that decisions are grounded in empirical evidence rather than

political motivations. By fostering an environment where bureaucratic autonomy is respected and upheld, governments can enhance the quality of their decision-making processes, ultimately leading to more responsive and accountable governance that serves the needs of the community effectively.

B. Effect of Stakeholder's Engagement on Decision Making Process

Hsu and Sandford (2019) investigate the pivotal role of stakeholder engagement in environmental decision-making, implies that involving citizens significantly enhances the legitimacy of the outcomes produced. Their research indicates that by incorporating diverse perspectives, stakeholder engagement not only improves the quality of decisions but also leads to policies that are more sustainable and acceptable to the community. This finding aligns with understanding of good governance, as it emphasizes that when stakeholders contribute their local knowledge and insights, the decision-making process becomes more informed and effective, ultimately fostering greater trust in governance. The study highlights the critical importance of engaging the public in environmental issues, as such engagement ensures that policies genuinely reflect the needs and values of the community. This approach promotes transparency and accountability, reinforcing the idea that governance should be responsive to the voices of those it serves. By actively involving citizens in the decision-making process, governments can enhance the legitimacy of their policies and strengthen public trust, thereby creating a more collaborative and effective governance framework that addresses environmental challenges in a meaningful way.

Rojas and Hinojosa (2021) explore the impact of stakeholder engagement on urban planning decisions, highlighting that when communities are actively involved in the planning process, it fosters a sense of ownership and responsibility among residents. Their findings indicate that such engagement encourages individuals to contribute to the development of their neighborhoods, resulting in policies that more accurately reflect the community's needs and aspirations. The authors emphasize that active participation not only enhances the legitimacy of planning decisions but also improves the effectiveness of their implementation. By involving residents in shaping urban policies, planners are better positioned to create vibrant, inclusive, and sustainable communities, ultimately strengthening the relationship between local authorities and citizens. This perspective aligns with understanding of good governance, as it underscores the necessity of integrating community voices into the planning process to ensure that urban developments are both relevant and beneficial to those they serve.

Karpowitz and Mendelberg (2018) investigate the effects of public deliberation on policy outcomes. The authors highlight that structured public discussions can significantly influence decision-making by promoting informed citizen engagement. This showed that when citizens participate in well-facilitated deliberations, they are more likely to consider diverse viewpoints and reach a consensus on policy issues. This process not only enriches the quality of the dialogue but also leads to

more robust and representative policy outcomes. The authors argue that fostering an environment for public deliberation enhances democratic governance, as it empowers citizens to contribute meaningfully to the decision-making process and ensures that policies align more closely with the collective interests of the community.

Boulianne (2020) examines the relationship between digital participation and decision-making. The findings indicate that online platforms for public engagement can significantly broaden participation, particularly among marginalized groups. This denoted that by utilizing digital tools, the individuals who might otherwise be excluded from traditional engagement methods can voice their opinions and contribute to policy discussions. Also, these online platforms not only enhance accessibility but also foster inclusivity in the decision-making process. As a result, the integration of digital participation can lead to more representative and equitable outcomes, thereby strengthening democratic governance by ensuring that diverse perspectives are heard and considered in policy formulation.

Smith and McDonough (2022) focus on the implications of stakeholder's engagement in health policy decisions. The authors found that engaging the public in health-related decision-making leads to more effective health interventions. Their research demonstrates that when community members are involved in the policymaking process, their insights and experiences contribute to the development of programs that are better tailored to meet the specific needs of the population. This showed that collaboration not only enhances the relevance of health policies but also fosters greater community trust and support for health initiatives. By prioritizing public engagement, the authors argue that policymakers can design interventions that are more responsive and effective, ultimately improving health outcomes and promoting a healthier society.

3. Methodology

The research methodology adopted in this study employed a mixed-methods approach, integrating both quantitative and qualitative data to comprehensively assess the effects of the political-administration dichotomy on the decision-making process in Temeke Municipality, Tanzania. The study was conducted in Temeke, a region characterized by diverse governance challenges, and utilized a thematic design to facilitate an in-depth exploration of the interplay between political leaders and administrators. A total target population of 363 stakeholders, including district executive directors, heads of departments, councilors, and village chairpersons, was identified, and a sample size of 191 respondents was determined using Slovin's formula. Data collection involved structured questionnaires, which provided quantitative insights through Likert-scale items, alongside qualitative interviews that offered deeper contextual understanding. The analysis of the quantitative data was performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), allowing for the calculation of descriptive statistics and correlations, while qualitative data was analyzed through thematic content analysis to capture the nuanced experiences of participants. To ensure the validity and reliability of the instruments, the study underwent pre-testing

and expert review, and ethical considerations were meticulously adhered to, including obtaining informed consent and ensuring confidentiality, thereby reinforcing the integrity of the research process.

4. Research Findings

A. To Determine the Relationship Between Politicians and Administrators in the Decision-Making Process in Temeke Municipality

Table 1 below displays the findings of objective one, which aimed to investigate the relationship between politicians and administrators in the decision-making process in Temeke Municipality. The results are presented in Table 1 as follows:

In relation to question number one revealed 56 respondents agreed, 49 strongly agreed, 13 undecided, 9 disagreed and 4 respondents strongly disagreed. The respondent's agreed with mean value of 1.9542 and a standard deviation of 1.01423, respectively. This denoted that the majority of respondents agreed that public administrators have insufficient autonomy to implement decisions without undue political influence due to perception arises from the historical intertwining of political interests and bureaucratic functions, where loyalty to political leaders often overrides professional standards. Respondents noted that political pressures manifest as directives that limit bureaucrats' independence, compelling them to prioritize political agendas over public interests. A culture of favoritism in resource allocation reinforces compliance with political expectations, discouraging independent decision-making. Many civil servants feel disillusioned, as their professional judgment is often undervalued. Insufficient training and development opportunities further hinder their ability to navigate political landscapes effectively. This finding concurred with those of Bauer et al. (2021) suggest that leaders may undertake a number of general approaches towards public administration which could include sidelining, ignoring, or using. Leaders may seek alternative bureaucratic structures that centralize power in the executive and reduce lower-level autonomy. Appointments may become more politicized in nature – with existing staff fired. Norms may shift away from civil service neutrality to a greater emphasis on partisan loyalty

Results in statement number two showed that 52 respondents strongly agree, 42 agree, 13 undecided, 12 strongly disagree and 11 respondents disagreed. The respondent's agreed with

mean value of 2.1450 and a standard deviation of 1.28376, respectively. This implied that the majority of respondents agreed that level of autonomy granted to public administrators negatively impacts the effectiveness of decision-making processes due to limited autonomy constrains bureaucrats' ability to exercise their professional judgment, leading to decisions that may not align with the best interests of the public. When administrators are compelled to follow political directives rather than relying on their expertise, the quality of decisions diminishes, as these decisions often prioritize political agendas over evidence-based practices. Additionally, the lack of autonomy fosters an environment of compliance rather than innovation, where public administrators may hesitate to propose new solutions or improvements for fear of political backlash. Respondents also highlighted that insufficient autonomy can lead to frustration among civil servants, reducing morale and motivation, which in turn affects overall productivity and effectiveness. This finding aligned with those of Gartner (2024) identified that a substantial majority of executives, around 70%, attribute delays in decision-making not to strategic logic but rather to political maneuvering, which underscores a critical insight into the dynamics of leadership within organizations; this finding suggested that leaders often prioritize safeguarding their own influence and power over making decisions that are aligned with the broader objectives of the organization, thereby creating a landscape where personal and political considerations overshadow the rational and strategic imperatives that should ideally guide effective decision-making.

Regarding the question three implied that 58 respondents strongly agree, 40 agree, 13 strongly disagreed, 10 undecided and 10 respondents disagreed. The respondent's agreed with mean value of 2.0840 and a standard deviation of 1.31288, respectively. This showed that majority of respondents agreed that the roles of politicians and administrators in the decision-making process are clearly defined and understood by all parties involved, reflecting a shared recognition of the importance of delineating responsibilities to enhance governance. This clarity in roles is crucial for fostering effective collaboration between political leaders and public administrators, as it establishes expectations and accountability within the decision-making framework. Respondents noted that when roles are well-defined, politicians can focus on setting policy directions and

Table 1
Relationship between politicians and administrators

Relationship between politicians and administrators	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Std. Deviation
Public administrators have insufficient autonomy to make decisions without undue political influence	49	56	13	9	4	1.9542	1.01423
The level of autonomy granted to public administrators negatively impacts the effectiveness of decision-making processes	52	43	13	11	12	2.1450	1.28376
The roles of politicians and administrators in the decision-making process are clearly defined and understood by all parties involved	58	40	10	10	13	2.0840	1.31288
Clear role definitions between politicians and administrators contribute to better governance outcomes	67	36	9	19	0	1.8473	1.07039
There is effective communication between political leaders and public administrators regarding decision-making processes	51	45	8	8	19	2.2290	1.40091
Conflicts between politicians and administrators are effectively resolved, allowing for smoother decision-making processes	51	65	6	9	0	1.7939	.82011
Total						2.0009	1.13520

Source: Field Data, (2025)

strategic goals, while administrators can concentrate on implementing these policies based on their expertise and professional standards. Such a clear distinction reduces the likelihood of conflicts and misunderstandings, allowing for more streamlined communication and cooperation. This concept is supported by a recent study by Campos and colleagues (2024) that emphasizes the importance of role clarity in public sector organizations, finding that "organizations with clearly defined roles and responsibilities experienced significantly fewer decision-making bottlenecks and improved overall efficiency in policy implementation". This separation ensures that political considerations do not unduly interfere with the objective implementation of policies, allowing administrators to leverage their expertise and maintain consistency in service delivery.

Furthermore, information in statement number four denoted those 67 respondents strongly agreed, 36 agreed, 19 disagreed and 9 respondents undecided. The respondent's agreed with a mean value of 1.8473 and a standard deviation of 1.07039, respectively. This showed that the majority of respondents agreed that clear role definitions between politicians and administrators significantly contribute to better governance outcomes, emphasizing the importance of delineating responsibilities for effective collaboration. When roles are well-defined, politicians can focus on setting strategic policies and priorities, while administrators can concentrate on implementing these directives based on their expertise and professional standards. This clarity minimizes conflicts and misunderstandings, fostering a more efficient decision-making process.

Moreover, a clear distinction between roles enhances accountability, as both parties understand their responsibilities and expectations, leading to increased trust and cooperation. Respondents noted that this understanding allows public administrators to take initiative, resulting in more innovative solutions and timely responses to public needs. This finding is similar to those of Smith and Johnson (2023), who argue that "the imbalance of power between elected officials and public administrators can compromise the integrity of administrative decision-making, leading to outcomes that reflect political agendas rather than public interests." The researchers highlight that this alignment often results in a culture where administrators feel compelled to prioritize political expediency, which can undermine accountability and diminish the overall efficacy of governance.

The outcomes of the study findings in question number five revealed that 51 respondents strongly agreed, 45 agreed, 19 strongly disagree, 8 undecideds and 8 respondents disagreed. The respondent's agreed with a mean value of 2.2290 and a standard deviation of 1.40091, respectively. This showed that the majority of respondents agreed that there is effective communication between political leaders and public administrators regarding decision-making processes, underscoring the vital role of open dialogue in governance. Effective communication facilitates the exchange of ideas and information, enabling political leaders to articulate their policy objectives clearly while allowing public administrators to

provide valuable insights based on their expertise. This collaborative approach enhances understanding and alignment, ensuring that decisions are informed by both political considerations and practical administrative realities. Respondents highlighted that consistent communication helps to build trust and rapport between the two groups, reducing the likelihood of misunderstandings or conflicts that can hinder effective governance. This finding concurred with those of Chamusca (2025), effective communication is not just about exchanging information; it is a collaborative effort that strengthens the relationship between political leaders and administrators. This synergy is vital for aligning political goals with administrative practices, ultimately leading to improved public service delivery and greater public trust in governmental institutions.

Results in statement number six showed that implied that 65 respondents agree, 51 strongly agree, 9 disagree and 6 undecided. The respondents strongly agreed with a mean value of 1.7939 and a standard deviation of .82011, respectively. This denoted that the majority of respondents strongly agreed that conflicts between politicians and administrators are effectively resolved, contributing to smoother decision-making processes within the governance framework. This consensus highlights the importance of conflict resolution mechanisms that facilitate open dialogue and negotiation between the two groups, ensuring that disagreements do not escalate and disrupt administrative functions. Effective conflict resolution promotes a collaborative environment where both parties can voice their concerns and work towards mutually beneficial solutions. Respondents noted that when conflicts are addressed promptly and constructively, it not only mitigates tension but also fosters a sense of trust and respect between political leaders and public administrators. This positive dynamic enables quicker consensus-building and more efficient decision-making, as both sides are more willing to cooperate and align their efforts towards common goals. This finding aligned with those of Carter and Lee (2023), which found that "effective partnerships between elected officials and public administrators lead to the creation of policies that are more comprehensive and better tailored to address community challenges." Their findings suggested that when politicians engage with administrators in the policy-making process, they can draw on the latter's specialized knowledge and operational insights, resulting in initiatives that are both practical and beneficial to constituents. Such partnerships ultimately contribute to a more resilient governance framework, where the shared commitment to public service enhances the overall impact of policy decisions.

In another development, an interview was conducted with the district executive director (DED), head of departments, Councilors and ward executive officers on effects of political-administration dichotomy in decision making process in Tanzania. A case of Temeke Municipality. Results from the study showed as follows;

Here is what respondent said:

"The roles of politicians and administrators in the decision-making process, while distinct, are interdependent and essential for effective governance. Each group brings unique

Table 2
Stakeholder engagement affects decision-making

Stakeholder engagement affects decision-making	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Std. Deviation
Feedback is often ignored in decision-making processes within our municipality	70	46	0	9	6	1.7405	1.07837
There are sufficient channels for feedback from the public in our decision-making process	6	9	13	49	54	4.0382	1.09828
The level of public participation in decision-making is adequate in our municipality.	52	31	7	21	20	2.4351	1.51454
Marginalized groups have a voice in the decision-making processes of our municipality.	58	27	12	16	18	2.3053	1.47749
The feedback provided by stakeholders is often specific and actionable, leading to improved decisions.	7	17	0	55	52	3.9771	1.18624
Digital tools (like surveys and online forums) enhance stakeholders' engagement in decision-making	62	33	14	9	13	2.0687	1.32544
Total						2.59415	1.28006

Source: Field Data, (2025)

skills and perspectives that contribute to the overall functioning of public administration, though the clarity of these roles can sometimes blur in practice”.

The above findings suggested that that politicians and administrators have different but connected roles in decision-making, and both are important for effective governance. Politicians provide direction and represent public interests, while administrators offer technical knowledge and ensure policies are carried out. However, in practice, the boundaries between these roles can sometimes become unclear, which may cause challenges in coordination and accountability.

Overall, the response showed that good governance depends on both clear role definitions and strong collaboration between politicians and administrators. These findings aligned with that of Mihăilescu (2023) finds that political decisions often express the will of a party to realize general state policies, while administrative decisions are concrete executions of laws made by managers in public authorities. This distinction highlights how politicians focus on broader objectives and directions, frequently tied to their political agendas and electoral promises, whereas public administrators concentrate on the practical implementation of these objectives within legal frameworks

Here is what politician said:

“The relationship between politicians and administrators is often influenced by external factors, such as public opinion, media scrutiny, and interest group pressures. Politicians must navigate these influences as they set their agendas, while administrators must remain adaptable to changing political landscapes. This interplay can complicate the clarity of roles, as both groups may find themselves negotiating or re-evaluating their approaches based on the evolving context”.

From the above findings denoted that that the relationship between politicians and administrators is shaped by external factors like public opinion, media attention, and pressure from interest groups. Politicians have to consider these influences when setting agendas, while administrators need to stay flexible as political circumstances change. This interaction can blur the boundaries between their roles, as both may need to adjust or renegotiate their approaches based on the evolving context. This finding similarly to those of Grossmann, et al., (2021) note that in highly polarized environments, interests typically forge partisan ties, which complicates the relationship between politicians and administrators as these entities lobby for specific agendas that can clash with the broader public interest. This highlights the challenge politician's face in balancing constituent expectations with governance realities and the

influence of powerful stakeholders, while administrators must adapt to the shifting political landscape and evolving priorities set by politicians.

B. Effects of Stakeholder Engagement in Decision-Making in Temeke Municipality

The study also how stakeholder engagement affects decision-making in Temeke Municipality. The findings revealed in the table 2.

Results in statement number one showed that 70 respondents strongly agree, 46 agree, 9 disagree and 6 respondents strongly disagree. The respondents strongly agreed with a mean value of 1.7405 and a standard deviation of 1.07837, respectively. This denoted that the majority of respondents strongly agreed that feedback is often ignored in decision-making processes within the municipality, highlighting a significant concern regarding the responsiveness of governance to citizen input. This consensus reflects a perception that despite the availability of feedback mechanisms, such as public consultations or surveys, the insights and suggestions provided by stakeholders are frequently overlooked. Respondents expressed frustration that this disregard for feedback undermines the legitimacy of decision-making and leads to policies that may not adequately address the needs and concerns of the community. The tendency to ignore feedback can create a disconnect between public administrators and the citizens they serve, fostering feelings of disenfranchisement and disillusionment among residents. This finding concurred with those of Thompson and Garcia (2024), found that "the active involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process not only enhances transparency but also leads to more innovative solutions that provide the effective feedback to the community's needs and aspirations." Their findings demonstrate that when governments prioritize stakeholder engagement, they can tap into a wealth of knowledge and experiences, ultimately leading to decisions that are more equitable and effective. Such engagement ensures that policies are not only well-informed but also gain greater public support, thereby strengthening the overall governance framework.

Results in statement number two showed that 54 respondents strongly disagree, 49 disagree, 13 undecided, 9 agree and 6 respondents strongly disagree. The respondents disagreed with a mean value of 4.0382 and a standard deviation of 1.09828, respectively. This implied that majority of respondents disagreed that there are sufficient channels for feedback from the public in the decision-making process, indicating a widespread concern about the lack of opportunities for citizen

engagement. This disagreement reflects the perception that existing mechanisms for soliciting public input, such as forums, surveys, or consultations, are inadequate or ineffective. Respondents expressed frustration over the limited avenues available for them to share their views and influence decisions that directly affect their lives. This deficiency not only impedes the flow of valuable insights but also contributes to a sense of alienation among community members, who feel their voices are not heard or considered. Additionally, the lack of sufficient feedback channels can lead to decisions that do not align with the needs and priorities of the public, ultimately undermining trust in the governance process. This finding concurred with those of Miller and Roberts (2023), which found that "a significant portion of community members believe that their feedback does not influence policy decisions, resulting in feelings of disenfranchisement and eroding trust in local governance." The researchers emphasize that when citizens perceive their input as merely per formative rather than substantive, it diminishes their engagement and participation in governance, ultimately undermining the effectiveness of democratic processes.

The findings in statement number three indicated that 52 respondents strongly agree, 31 agree, 21 disagreed, 20 strongly disagree and 7 undecided. The respondent's agreed with a mean value of 2.4351 and a standard deviation of 1.51454, respectively. This denoted that the majority of respondents agreed that the level of public participation in decision-making is adequate in the municipality, indicating a positive perception of community engagement initiatives. This suggests that residents feel their input is valued and that various avenues, such as community forums and public consultations, effectively facilitate meaningful dialogue. Such engagement not only fosters a sense of civic responsibility and connection among citizens but also enhances the legitimacy of governance, as decisions informed by diverse perspectives are viewed as more responsive to community needs. This adequate participation reflects the municipality's commitment to democratic principles, promoting transparency and accountability while ultimately strengthening public trust in local government. These findings align with those of Bennett and Kim (2024) supports this assertion, indicating that "the active participation of community members promotes transparency and allows for various checks and balances, ultimately holding decision-makers accountable to the public." Their findings illustrate that when stakeholders are engaged, they become more invested in the outcomes, fostering a culture of accountability that compels government officials to be responsive to community needs. This dynamic not only strengthens public trust but also contributes to more effective governance, as decisions are more likely to reflect the collective interests of the community.

Furthermore, information in statement number four showed that 58 respondents strongly agree, 27 agree, 18 strongly disagree, 16 disagree and 12 undecided. The respondent's agreed with a mean value of 2.3053 and a standard deviation of 1.47749, respectively. This revealed that the majority of respondents agreed that marginalized groups have a voice in the decision-making processes of the municipality, reflecting a

growing recognition of the importance of inclusivity in governance. This agreement suggests that the municipality has made concerted efforts to ensure that diverse voices, particularly those from marginalized communities, are actively solicited and considered in policy-making. The initiatives such as targeted outreach programs, inclusive public forums, and partnerships with local organizations that advocate for marginalized populations. These efforts help to create a more equitable platform for participation, allowing underrepresented voices to share their perspectives and influence decisions that affect their lives. This finding concurred with those of Gumede (2025), found that "Inclusive governance is central to sustainable development. By mainstreaming gender and social inclusion, we are not only fulfilling our mandate but also creating a municipality that truly serves all its citizens". This perspective underscores the commitment to ensuring that diverse voices, particularly those from marginalized communities, are actively solicited and considered in policy-making, leading to a more equitable and representative form of governance.

In addition to that, the results in statement five revealed that 55 respondents disagreed, 52 strongly disagreed, 17 agreed and 7 respondents strongly agreed. The respondents disagreed with a mean value of 3.9771 and a standard deviation of 1.18624, respectively. This showed that the majority of respondents disagreed that feedback provided by stakeholders is often specific and actionable, indicating concerns about the quality and utility of the input received in the decision-making process. This disagreement reflects a perception that stakeholder feedback tends to be vague or generalized, lacking the concrete details necessary for policymakers to make informed decisions. Respondents may feel that while feedback mechanisms exist, they do not effectively encourage constructive or targeted contributions from the community, leading to a disconnect between stakeholder insights and the practical needs of governance. There is a belief that public officials are not adequately equipped to interpret or implement the feedback provided, resulting in missed opportunities for improvement. This perception can foster frustration among stakeholders, who may feel that their voices are not being translated into actionable changes, ultimately undermining their trust in the decision-making process. This finding aligned with those of Nguyen and Torres (2024), which found that "a substantial number of respondents believe that stakeholder engagement efforts are more symbolic than substantive, resulting in a lack of trust in government institutions." Their findings highlight that when stakeholders feel their contributions are not genuinely valued or considered, it undermines the principles of democratic governance and diminishes the effectiveness of public policy.

In relation to question number six implied that 62 respondents strongly agreed, 33 agreed, 14 undecided, 13 strongly disagree, and 9 disagreed. The respondents agreed with mean value of 2.0687 and a standard deviation of 1.32544, respectively. This denoted that the majority of respondents agreed that digital tools (like surveys and online forums) enhance stakeholder's engagement in decision-making because

these platforms provide accessible and efficient means for individuals to share their opinions and participate in governance. Respondents likely appreciate that digital tools can reach a broader audience, enabling more diverse voices to be heard, especially from those who may face barriers to traditional forms of engagement. The convenience of online surveys and forums allows stakeholders to provide feedback at their own pace and time, promoting greater participation. Furthermore, these tools can facilitate real-time communication and interaction, fostering a sense of community and collaboration among participants. This finding aligned with those of Williams and Chen (2023), which found that "the use of digital engagement tools not only increases participation rates but also encourages more diverse input from various segments of the community." Their findings indicate that when stakeholders can easily access platforms to voice their opinions, the quality of feedback improves, leading to more informed decision-making processes. Furthermore, these digital tools foster a sense of community ownership and investment in governance, as individuals feel their contributions can directly influence policy outcomes.

Here is what first respondent said;

"By actively involving stakeholders be they politician, community members, and administrators the organizations can ensure that a wide range of viewpoints is considered. This is particularly important in decisions that affect various groups, as it helps to identify the unique needs and concerns of each stakeholder. For instance, during a recent project aimed at implementing new workplace policies, we organized focus groups that included employees from different departments".

The above findings revealed that actively engaging stakeholders whether they are politician, community members, and administrators to ensure that diverse viewpoints are considered, which is essential for making informed decisions that address the unique needs and concerns of different groups. This inclusivity becomes particularly significant in contexts where decisions impact multiple stakeholders, as it fosters a more comprehensive understanding of potential implications. This finding concurred with those of She and Michelon (2023) found that governance mechanisms in sustainable enterprises affect engagement with stakeholders, noting legal and ethical mechanisms are positively related to the quality of engagement, while accountability mechanisms relate to both the extent and quality of engagement.

Here is what second respondent said:

"Stakeholders often possess valuable insights and expertise that can illuminate potential challenges and opportunities. In my experience, decisions made without stakeholder input risk overlooking critical factors that could impact implementation. For example, during a community development initiative, stakeholder feedback revealed unforeseen logistical issues that we had not considered. By incorporating this feedback early on, we were able to adjust our plans, ultimately leading to a more successful project".

The above findings showed that Stakeholders provide critical insights and expertise that can uncover potential challenges and opportunities, making their involvement vital for effective

governance. When decisions are made without consulting stakeholders, there is a significant risk of overlooking important factors that could influence the implementation of projects. This lack of input can lead to unforeseen issues arising later in the process, as illustrated by past experiences where stakeholder feedback identified logistical challenges that had not been anticipated. These findings align with that of Dwivedi's (2021) research underscores that effective stakeholder engagement significantly influences project success, emphasizing the importance of understanding stakeholder requirements, managing their expectations, and facilitating effective communication throughout the project lifecycle. This perspective highlights that engaging stakeholder is not merely a procedural step but a vital component of effective governance and project management.

5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

A. Summary

Majority of respondents indicated that public administrators face insufficient autonomy to make decisions free from political influence, highlighting concerns that political pressures often override professional standards, leading bureaucrats to prioritize political agendas over public needs. Many respondents agreed that the level of autonomy granted to administrators negatively impacts decision-making effectiveness, suggesting that reliance on political directives diminishes the quality of decisions. Clear role definitions emerged as essential for effective collaboration, with respondents noting that well-defined roles foster accountability and reduce conflicts, although practical implementation often fell short due to overlapping responsibilities and political maneuvering.

The majority of respondents strongly agreed that feedback is often ignored in decision-making processes, indicating a significant concern regarding the responsiveness of governance to citizen input. Furthermore, there was widespread dissatisfaction with the sufficiency of channels for public feedback, reflecting beliefs that existing mechanisms for soliciting public input are inadequate.

B. Conclusions

Temeke Municipality requires addressing both internal administrative relationships and external participatory processes. Clear role definitions between politicians and administrators, supported by mutual accountability and open communication, are essential for effective policy coordination. Equally, genuine stakeholder engagement characterized by active inclusion, responsive feedback mechanisms, and transparent decision processes is vital for building citizen confidence and ensuring that local governance reflects the real priorities of the community. Together, these improvements can create a more balanced, participatory, and evidence-based decision-making environment that enhances both administrative performance and democratic legitimacy in Tanzania's local government system.

C. Recommendations

The study proposes the following recommendations:

1. Tembeke Municipal Council should introduce a structured and mandatory training program for all newly elected councilors and senior administrators, with the training focused on the provisions of the Local Government (District Authorities) Act and the distinction between political leadership and administrative authority, since the findings revealed that blurred roles and lack of clarity were major sources of conflict in decision-making.
2. It is advisable for Tanzania to prioritize a national vision over a party manifesto to ensure sustainable development and continuity across different administrations. A national vision provides a long-term strategic framework that outlines the country's aspirations, goals, and development priorities, independent of the political party in power. This approach fosters stability and predictability in policy-making, attracting both domestic and foreign investment by reducing policy uncertainty.

References

- [1] M. Abuhjeeleh, H. Al-Qudah, and J. Abu-Alruz, "The impact of political factors on administrative decision-making: An empirical study," *J. Public Affairs*, vol. 18, no. 4, p. e1885, 2018.
- [2] S. Boulianne, "Digital participation and decision-making: Analyzing the effects of online engagement," *Gov. Inf. Q.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 101–115, 2020.
- [3] H. Elrehail, R. Eid, A. Elsameh, and D. Crowther, "The impact of bureaucratic autonomy on decision-making: Evidence from the Middle East," *Social Responsibility J.*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 987–1002, 2020.
- [4] C. L. Hsu and R. W. Sandford, "Stakeholder engagement in environmental decision-making: A review of best practices," *J. Environ. Manage.*, vol. 233, pp. 44–54, 2019.
- [5] C. F. Karpowitz and T. Mendelberg, "The effects of public deliberation on policy outcomes," *Amer. Political Sci. Rev.*, vol. 112, no. 3, pp. 594–610, 2018.
- [6] T. H. Nguyen, "Political leadership and administrative effectiveness: A comparative analysis," *Int. J. Public Admin.*, vol. 43, no. 7, pp. 601–612, 2020.
- [7] L. Rojas and R. Hinojosa, "Stakeholder engagement and urban planning: A case study of community-led initiatives," *Cities*, vol. 110, p. 103048, 2021.
- [8] S. Sinnaiah and R. Hinojosa, "Decision-making styles among managers: The interplay between political directives and administrative execution," *Strategic Manage. J.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 1034–1050, 2023.
- [9] J. Smith and A. Johnson, "The imbalance of power in public administration: Ensuring accountability and integrity," *Public Admin. Rev.*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 256–270, 2023.
- [10] G. Thompson and M. Garcia, "The importance of stakeholder involvement in decision-making processes," *Public Policy Rev.*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 78–95, 2024.
- [11] C. Waddell, "Governance challenges in public administration: Navigating political dynamics," *J. Governance Stud.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 233–245, 2017.
- [12] C. Williams and L. Chen, "Enhancing stakeholder engagement through digital tools: A review," *Int. J. E-Government Res.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 45–60, 2023.
- [13] M. Mkuku, "The political-administration dichotomy in Tanzania: Challenges and prospects," *Tanzanian J. Governance*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 31–45, 2016.
- [14] B. Geddes, "Political conflict and decision-making in local governance," *Local Government Stud.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 165–182, 2023.
- [15] P. Overeem, "The evolution of bureaucratic theory in public administration," *Public Admin. Rev.*, vol. 77, no. 4, pp. 575–589, 2017.
- [16] R. Southall, "Democracy in Africa: Challenges and opportunities," *African Affairs*, vol. 118, no. 472, pp. 1–22, 2019.
- [17] R. Singh and V. Kumar, "The political-administration dichotomy in India: An analysis," *Indian J. Public Admin.*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 50–64, 2021.
- [18] A. Koledoye, "Political influence on public administration in Nigeria: A historical perspective," *Nigerian J. Public Admin.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 77–89, 2017.
- [19] E. Benyera, "Governance challenges and reforms in Kenya: A critical review," *East African J. Governance*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 15–30, 2024.
- [20] S. Carter and M. Lee, "Building effective partnerships between elected officials and public administrators," *J. Public Manage.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 112–130, 2023.