

Assessment of the Effects of One Stop Service Centers in Service Delivery to Small and Medium Enterprise in Manufacturing Sector: The Case of Mekelle City Tigray

Abrehet Mehari Gebreselassie

Lecturer, Ethiopian Civil Service university, Addis Ababa Ethiopia

PhD Student in Azerbaijan State University Of Economics

Baku, Azerbaijan

Supervisor: Professor Rovshan Guliev

Abstract:- This study was aimed at assessing the effects of “One stop center” in service delivery to the customers of Small Medium Enterprise in manufacturing sector. It was conducted at Wood and Metal Work, Textile and Garment, Agroprocessing, Leather and Leather Product and Construction input in Mekelle City. The study was guided by one stop shop and service reception, processing and returning models. Using these two models the researcher identified the followings as crucial variables affecting the service delivery at “One stop service Centers” accessibility, transparency, fair and equal treatment, efficiency and effectiveness. This study was employed cross sectional mixed approach method. The data were collected using 123 personally administered based on proportional stratified sampling after pilot test was managed and descriptive and inferential statistics were applied for data analysis using SPSS version 25 statistical package. The results of the data analysis were presented using frequency and percentage. Interviews with 15 people (10 SMEDA leaders and stakeholder, 5 selected SMEs owners) and 8 focus group discussion with SMEs council and experts including non-participatory observation of the researcher. The quantitative results indicate that the centers have failed to establish inclusive service delivery set ups and are still extractive. Mainly, One Stop service centers have no net effect of giving the customers the opportunity to get multiple interrelated services in one place to ensure better accessibility. Therefore, it is recommended that the centers have to re-design the service delivery system and establish integrative service delivery system, give due attention to human resource development and equipping the centers with office facilities. The study also recommends future research on effects of physical location of the centers upon customers with disability.

Keywords:- One Stop Centers, One Stop Shop, Service Delivery, Efficiency and Effectiveness.

I. INTRODUCTION

In countries all over the world the governments are working to improve the relationship with and services for their citizens. Also, the increasing demand and expectations of citizens to get quality services; and the existence of red tape and bureaucratic system necessitated governments to respond to the situations (Peters and Pierre 2007). As Wimmer (2002) indicated, to respond to the need and expectations of citizens to get quality services in effective and efficient manner, and to eliminate the red tape and bureaucracy, the governments introduced different reform programs and established innovative ways of service delivery.

One of the innovative ways to improve the service delivery is one stop shop concept. A one stop shop is an office where multiple services are offered, and it was used in several developed countries several years ago (Matula 2010). Since then, it has gradually spread to many developing countries. In relation to this, the public administration reform in Kazakhstan has introduced one stop shop as an innovative approach to citizen centered service delivery (Saltan and Pansuk 2016). In the past, Kazakhstan citizens need to move almost all over government town to attain related services at different places so that a one stop shop became an attractive reform agenda in Kazakhstan (Hagen and Kubick 2000). Countries like Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam have introduced the one stop shop concept to provide integrated services to their citizens (Barrett and Fudge 1981). They have been successful in reducing administrative burdens on business and the public especially are license and permit requirements (Barrette and Fudge, 1981).

In Africa the government Egypt and Kenya adopted the concept of One stop shop too. According to Stone (2006) one clear deterrent to new investment in Egypt, was the bureaucracy, delay, discretion and uncertainty surrounding business start-up. Delays, discretion and a lack of transparency also encouraged the practice of speed payments where bureaucrats would demand, or investors and their agents would willingly offer informal payments to obtain a quick approval.

To improve this situation, the Egyptian government in June 2001 decided to establish a one stop shop that would assemble officials from all government entities in one place to provide quality and efficient services to investors in Cairo. Similarly, the government of Kenya has grappled with the problem of poor service delivery in the public sector and has introduced a range of interventions to remedy the situation (Kenya 2012). In 2013 the Kenyan government has introduced the concept of Huduma centers to transform public service delivery by providing citizens access to various public services and information. Consequently, both the Egyptian and Kenyan Governments were successful with the introduction of one stop shop concept. Like other countries, public services in Ethiopia have long been characterized by limited access to wider publics and lack of transparency (Sirgut 2006).

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Ethiopian Government introduced different reform programs and tools such as BPR, BSC (Naod cited in Tesfaye and Atakilti 2011). Furthermore, in order to enhance accessibility, improve transparency, fairness & equal treatment, efficiency and effectiveness the government established a one stop service centers (Konjit, D.2011).

It was envisaged that the centers would be the place where all the necessary services from different sectors become available under one roof for customers of (Small and medium Enterprises manual 2010). Even though the implementation of One Stop Service Center is in progress, still Small and Medium Enterprise Development Agency in Tigray have been facing challenges (SMEDA report, 2019). Some of the challenges are:- many enterprise failed due to lack of counseling & business knowledge, the loans from failed enterprises remain unpaid, some of the existing enterprises are unwilling to repay the loans, enterprises get mature growth stage and transformed to middle income level are few in number. Despite the said advantages for implementing one stop service concept there is no evidence in SMEs sectors in Tigray Mekelle city. Consequently, it is not known to what extent the centers have had impacted the service delivery in the sector. Thus, it needs to fill the knowledge gap by determining the effects of one stop centers in service delivery in Small and Medium Enterprises in Tigray Mekelle City.

III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE CONCEPT AND MODELS OF ONE-STOP-SHOPS

One-stop-government is a relatively new concept, nowadays often used in public administration reform and research. The concept refers to the integration and rationalization of public services from a citizen's point of view (Onxayvieng et al. 2015). According to a study on best practices in one-stop services in the United States Under the one-stop paradigm, all of a customer's business can be completed in a single contact, be it face to face or via phone, fax, Internet or other means. One-stop

customers do not have to hunt around, call back, or repeatedly explain their situation is convenient, accessible, and personalized '(Andrews et al 2012).

In other words, the key idea behind one-stop-shops is to bring services together under one roof, both in order to share costs and to make it easier for people to access a range of services in one place. The idea of concentrating information and services at a single point is a business model that was applied initially in the private sector and became very popular during the last decades. One of the first applications of this idea was supermarkets, which allowed clients to do all their shopping in one place instead of visiting different stores (Howard 2014).

One-Stop-Shops (in a physical location) ideally go beyond single authorities about the fact that many different transactional services, which satisfy the needs of many different categories of citizens, are in a single office. Therefore, the citizen would find in one spot, representatives of the authorities competent for pensions, health, issuance of civil status certificates, tax administration etc.

Under this ideal model, representatives of the administration delivering specific services would be concentrated in one location, thus creating a public administration supermarket. However, this model is usually extensively complicated to implement. In most cases, and in the present report, one-stop-shops will be understood to refer to the model where the citizen has a single-entry point for his transactions with the public administration (Margaret and Daniel 2016).

One Door for Many Services" Model This model can be called as One Stop Shop, One Stop Center. According to this model, the customer (arrow) visits one office for his service application and he/she can obtain a range of different types of services from the same and single office. According to PWC, (2012), the basic idea of one stop shop is to change the way administrative services are provided from Many Doors to One Service to One Door to Many Services.

Reception, Processing and Return (RPR) Model

Under this model, representatives of the administration delivering specific services would be concentrated in one location, thus creating a public administration supermarket and all the needed steps for the provision of the services are accomplished at the one stop center. The request from customers are received at all the one stop center desk, which are also processed and handled by the one stop center staff that provide this type of services to the citizens. According to this model, the center receives customers' requests process them and provide the customers with desired end products in the centers PWC (2012). In addition, the introduction of One-Stop-Shops not only served as a vehicle for quicker and more convenient delivery of administrative services, but also as a trigger for application of good governance, transparency in the administrative decision-making process, higher

responsiveness, accountability and equality in public administration. Main results achieved due to the introduction of One Door for Many Services model are higher accessibility, transparency, fairness, efficiency, effectiveness and customer satisfaction (Asia Brief 2010).

Effects of One Stop Service Centers The number of studies has explored One Stop shop concept as a strategy to change the way administrative services are provided from "many doors for one service" to "one door for many services". The Concept has not only served as a vehicle for quicker and more convenient delivery of administrative services, but also for the application of principles of good governance, accountability, equality, and public participation. Main results achieved are higher accessibility, transparency, fairness, efficiency, effectiveness, and customer satisfaction Asian Brief (2010). Wimmer (2002) argues that the implementation of one-stop government highly depends on the structure of government and the constitution of a respective country. For a government to implement this concept, it is necessary to make a huge change in organizational responsibilities and duties. She states that the traditional governments are usually fragmented into functional units that are independent of each other.

SDC (2003) indicated that one of the strategic objectives of the Public Administration Reform in Viet Nam is to enhance the delivery of administrative services to the people. The Government implemented as a pilot endeavor and One-Stop-Shops (OSS) is now recognized as an integrated part of the country 's public administration system. After the introduction of One-Stop-Shops, administrative services in many provinces, cities and rural districts have significantly improved in terms of accessibility, transparency, effectiveness and efficiency.

In addition, experience in Vietnam clearly shows that One-Stop-Shop has greatly improved the efficiency of the public administration procedures and results in a positive impact on socio- economic development and poverty reduction. **Decisive Factors for Successful Implementation of the One Stop Shop Concept** SDC (2003) also tried to identify the major decisive factors for successful implementation of the one stop shop concept. The major factors are: -Government commitment, human resource development and adequate facilities. Each factor is described as follows: -

Commitment from the highest-Level Commitment from the highest level is a condition for the successful establishment and operation of One-Stop-Shops. Commitment is the degree to which a senior official not only supports an initiative, but also puts a great deal of effort and energy into its realization (2003).

Human Resource Development Building the capacity of the staff is the backbone of the Public Administration Reform process. Only knowledgeable and skilled staffs can provide a good service. Much attention should therefore be paid to the training of the staff. Besides improved

understanding of the legally required administrative procedures, capacity building should include customer-relation skills (2003). **Modern Facilities in a central Location** Convenient facilities and modern equipment not only increase the work productivity, but also create a sense of pride, innovation and motivation for One Stop-Shop staff .After the introduction of one stop shop concept as indicated in this literature, a few different types of administrative services involving different bureaus or departments are provided through a single office. At the same time, one stop shops are conveniently located, easily accessible, and equipped with modern facilities to provide a customer-oriented services. In this case procedures are streamlined.

Also, Bryden et al. (2007) recognized the following factors that facilitate the success of one stop shop: careful attention to design and location, and community-owned and run facilities. The study also points out that one stop shop should be a means of including the local community in service delivery, rather than as a means of centralizing services. The Study conducted by Brown et al (2005) indicates that the main concept of providing several administrative services at one central place in the municipality has already been practiced in Kosovo. They confirmed that OSS leads to a more effective, efficient and transparent service provision that is equally accessible to larger parts of the population.

Another different framework is provided by Onxayvieng et al. (2015), who suggest four possible aspects of assessing one stop shop: governance, performance management, information sharing and workforce. Governance relates to the hierarchical position of the one stop shop in the administrative chain, including issues related to who funds the facility and who commands it. Performance management relates to the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, Information sharing refers to the range of services made available and the extent to which applications are processed , Workforce aspects refer to human resource development, including training of staff and keeping the staff motivated to perform efficiently.

The above literatures indicate that for successful implementation of one stop shop concept the major decisive factors such as convenience of the location, availing full range of services at one place, equipping the center with modern facilities, knowledgeable and motivated staffs, streamlined procedures, clearly defined and publicized fees, procedures and time needed for specific request should be fulfilled. The idea of one stop shop to improve service delivery has been tried out with several degrees of success in various countries like Egypt, Singapore, and Malaysia and Ireland as a means to promote investment (Kenya 2012). According to Stone (2006), one clear deterrent to new investment in Egypt, was the bureaucracy, delay, discretion and uncertainty surrounding business start-up. To improve this situation, the Egyptian government in June 2001 decided to establish a one stop shop that would assemble officials from all government

entities in one place to provide quality and efficient services to investors in Cairo.

Similarly, the government of Kenya has grappled with the problem of poor service delivery in the public sector and has introduced a range of interventions to remedy the situation (Kenya 2012). In 2013 the Kenyan government has introduced the concept of Huduma centers to transform public service delivery by providing citizens access to various public services and information. Here the central innovation introduced to the new one stop shop was the separation of the front and back office which limits the points of contact. Main results achieved are better accessibility, transparency, fairness, efficiency, effectiveness, and customer satisfaction. One stop shop concept became a widely used approach in different countries several years ago (European Journal, 2010). It is seen as the innovative ways to transform and improve service delivery, simplify administrative procedures, enhance accessibility and transparency.

In general, it is acknowledged that one stop shop approach is an integrated service delivery system which brings all the necessary services at one place to provide services in a quick and fairways to the customers. Thus, the potential of one stop shop concept is remarkable. The advantages associated with the adoption of one stop shop concept would result in increased efficiency and effectiveness, better accessibility, transparency, fairness and equal treatment of customers. However there is a considerable gap between the expected outcomes that has to be brought due to the adoption of one stop service centers and what has been achieved in the reality. In whole spectrum, especially in the study area the effect of one stop service centers in service delivery have not extensively discussed in the literature. Therefore, there is a need to assess the implementation of one stop service centers and its effects on service delivery in the study area.

IV. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

➤ *General objectives*

The main objective of the study is to assess the effects of one stop Service Centers in service delivery to the customers of Small-Scale Enterprise manufacturing sectors within some selected sub sectors in Tigray Mekelle City. Also, it was specifically aimed: -

- To analyze whether the centers provide full range of services (better accessibility);
- To ascertain if the centers enhance the effectiveness of the service delivery;
- To ascertain if the centers enhance the efficiency of the service delivery;
- To establish if the centers influence transparency in service delivery;
- To ascertain if the centers enhance fairness and equal treatment and
- To suggest possible means of maintaining quality service delivery in the center.

➤ *The study set the following basic research questions:*

What are the Effects of One stop service Centers in service delivery to the Customers of MSEs in Tigray Mekelle City?

To what extent the establishment of the centers improved the service delivery in terms of accessibility, in the study area?

To what extent the establishment of the centers improved the service delivery in terms of transparency, in the study area?

To what extent the establishment of the centers improved the service delivery in terms of Efficiency & Effectiveness in the study area? To what extent the establishment of the centers improved the service delivery in terms of fairness and equal treatment, in the study area?

V. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a case study research design which is cross sectional mixed approach method in nature. Also it employed a combined research approach (qualitative & quantitative) in order to supplement data obtained in one approach with that of another and to provide full picture of the issue under consideration. To attain the aim of this study, both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered from primary sources.

The study populations of this paper were operators of Small and medium enterprises which are 1448 in number from purposively selected 5 sub sector of manufacturing sector. To carry out this study, 123 operators were selected through stratified sampling method after pilot test was managed for questionnaire. For interview purpose, 15 small and medium enterprise development agency leaders and experts and stakeholders, 8 group of SMEs council members were selected purposively Focus Group Discussions.

The researcher used both questionnaire (for quantitative data) and semi- structured interview questions for qualitative data. In addition, focus group discussion was employed. The data collected from primary sources and non-participatory observations were recorded, edited organized, analyzed, interpreted and presented in relation to research questions. The quantitative data were analyzed by using descriptive statistical tools such as percentage, mean, standard deviations and cross tabs and were presented by tables, figures, graphs and charts whereas description of findings was used for data collected through interview and focus group discussions.

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Pilot Study

Pilot test was managed from December ,2018-February,2019 to determine the appropriateness and relevance of the questions in the instrument. Test of content validity was performed which was measuring to the extent of the instrument provides adequate coverage, representativeness of the universe, specificity and clarity of

the topic under study. The instrument was assessed for each item thoroughly. The draft was also distributed and piloted on 24 small and medium enterprises operators in the city engaged in Metal, Textile, agroprocessing, Leather and Construction input

➤ *Reliability of the Instrument*

According to Bryma& Bell (2003), the Cronbach Alpha result use of acceptable level of internal reliability.Cronbach Alpha Reliability Statistics were used to confirm the reliability of the instrument. Then, a pilot test was made on enterprises before the actual distribution of the instrument for the fall scale survey. 12 respondents were involved from different subsector manufactures in the pilot test. Therefore, the coefficients of reliability of items measuring all variables are found to be Cronbach’s alpha $\alpha = 0.87$. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was evaluated using the guidelines suggested by George and Mallery (2016) where > 0.9 excellent, > 0.8 good, > 0.7 acceptable, > 0.6 questionable, > 0.5 poor, and ≤ 0.5 unacceptable. Hence, the instrument can be accepted as reliable because the reliability coefficient, $\alpha > 0.5$. This statistic was used to test the internal consistency of responses for variables. According to Gay (1980) if a reliability coefficient is, $\alpha > 0.5$, the instrument can be accepted as reliable, and so that the items for survey instrument had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.81, indicating good reliability.

➤ *Validity of the instrument*

As validity refers to whether an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure, given the context in which it is Applied (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995).In order to maintain the validity, a comment of city and sub city SMEs Experts were consulted in providing comments. Additionally, for clarity of the instrument, the English version was translated into Tigrigna by having expert consultation. Hence, some confused questions were modified.

➤ *The Demographic data of Respondents*

This section provides the demographic information concerning the study population samples. It provides a picture of the demographic composition of participants for readers. The socio-demographic data of the respondents consists of the sex, age, level of education, monthly income, the main activity of enterprises, source of funds to start up business, year of establishment, and category of enterprise of the respondents. The reason to describe these factors is that they assist to explain variables connected with main questions.

The data shown larger proportion of small and medium manufacturing enterprises about 69 (71.9%) of the respondents were male involved in the study while 27(28.1%) were female. This indicates that there is a gap between the two genders that manufacturing industry offers challenges to the city leaders in empowering women in manufacturing.

Regarding the age structure of the business owners, 56 (58.3%) of respondents were found in 30-49 age categories, while 21(21.9%) of the respondents were found in the range of 50-65 years age group. Age groups 15-29 and above 65 years constitute 16 (16.7%) and 3 (3.1%) of respondents respectively. Most of the respondents are found in the age range of 30-49 years. This result shows that the active sections of the societies of both sexes is not benefit from the SMEs sector, which is the main objective of the manufacturing and urban development strategies is not fully achieved (MOFED, 2006).

In response to the level of education, the enterprises are found in different levels of education status. Most of the respondents 29 (30.2%) have diploma followed by equally 19(19.8%) primary school(1-8complete), 19(19.8%) (9-12complete) and 19 (19.8%) are degree and above This is of course the manufacturing industry is a means to create employment opportunities and economic growth.5 (3.4%) are illiterate. This indicates most of the respondents had educational background diploma.

Convenience of Physical location of the Centers			Equipping the center with office furniture and facilities		
Response	Frequency	Percentage	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	22	22.2	Strongly Disagree	18	18.2
Disagree	26	26.3	Disagree	36	36.4
Neutral	31	31.3	Neutral	24	24.2
Agree	9	9.1	Agree	10	10.1
Strongly Agree	11	11.1	Strongly Agree	11	11.1
Total	99	100		99	100

Table 1:- Convenience of Physical location of the Centers and Equipping the center with office furniture and facilities

22.2 %(22) strongly disagreed while 26.3% disagreed about the convenience of physical locations of the centers in their respective wordas. On the other side, 11.1% (11) respondents were strongly agreed about the physical location and 9.1 % (9) agreed about it. But, the remaining 31.3 % (31) responded neutral. From these data, we can

infer that 48.5% of the respondents believe that the physical location of centers was inconvenient.

Regarding the facilities of the centers, 18.2 % (18) strongly disagreed that their centers are well equipped with office furniture and facilities and 37.4 %(36) disagreed about the issues. On the other side, 24.2 %(24) agreed that

the centers are well equipped with the necessary office furniture and facilities while the rest 22, 2% (22) remained neutral. This implies that 55.6% of the respondents

responded that the centers are not well equipped with the necessary facilities Table 4: Availing all services at one place

Availing all services at one place in the center	Installing the signs on the street indicating the location of one stop center				Availability of the signs inside the centers	
	Response	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
Strongly Disagree	24	24.2	29	29.3	41	41.4
Disagree	32	32.2	34	34.3	20	20.2
Neutral	20	20.2	19	19.2	19	19.2
Agree	12	12.1	9	9.1	8	8.1
Strongly Agree	11	11.1	8	8.1	11	11.1
Total	99	100	99	100	99	100

Table 2

In this regard, 24.2 %(24) of the respondents strongly disagreed that all services are available at the center, while 32.3% (32) disagreed it. When we talk about the availability of all services, 12.1 %(12) agreed and the 11, 1 %(11) respondents strongly agreed that the centers provide all services at one place. In this case, the remaining 20.2% (20) responded neutral. This implies that majority of the respondents (56.6%) have the same outlook about the failure of the centers to provide all the necessary services at one place as compared to those who agreed (23,2%) about the availability.

Of the respondents who responded about the availability of the signs on the street, 29.3% (29) strongly disagreed while 34.3% (34) disagreed about it. In this regard 17.2% (17) agreed that the signs are installed on the street, even though the rest 19.2% remained neutral as can be seen from the above bar-graph, 41.4% (41) strongly disagreed, 20.2% (20) disagreed about the presence of signs inside the centers while 19.2% (19) remained neutral. On the other side, 8.1% (8) agreed and 11.1% (11) respondents strongly agreed about the presence of the signs inside the centers. From this response one can infer that 61.4% of the respondents supported the idea about the absence of signs inside the centers that say where customers should go.

Visible and clear internal processes			Clearly defined, publicized fees & procedures	
Response	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	28	28.3	23	23.2
Disagree	27	27.3	19	19.2
Neutral	29	29.3	39	39.4
Agree	5	5.1	8	8.1
Strongly agree	10	10.1	10	10.1
Total	99	100	99	100

Table 3:- Visible and clear internal processes and administrative decisions

As the date on the above table indicates 28.3% (28) of the respondents strongly disagreed, 27.3% (27) disagreed about the existence of visible and clear internal processes and administrative decisions in the centers. The other 15.2% agreed that the internal processes and administrative decisions are visible and clear for everybody in the centers. But the remaining 29.3% responded neutral about the issues. In other words, 55.6% of the respondents recognize

that the internal processes and administrative decisions are not visible and clear for everybody in the center of 99 respondents, 23.2% (23) strongly disagreed and 19.2% (19) disagreed about the presence of clearly defined and publicized fees, procedures and time needed for specific requests in the centers. Even though 18.2 %(18) of the respondents agreed about this idea, the remaining 39.4% (39) replied neutral. Fairness and Equality

Case treatment and administrative decisions			Enforcing the customers to pay extra payment	
Scale	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	32	32.3	23	23.2
Disagree	29	29.3	33	33.3
Neutral	34	34.3	19	19.2
Agree	4	4.0	14	14.1
Strongly agree	-	-	10	10.1
Total	99	100	99	100

Table 4:- Case treatment and administrative decisions are based on conditions outlined in the law.

The table indicates that 32.3% (32) of the respondents strongly disagreed about the fair and equal treatment of administrative decisions in the centers while 29.3% (29) disagreed about it. Even though 4 % (4) agreed about the fairness and equality of the issues, 34.3% remained neutral. From this we can grasp that 61.6% believe that case treatments and administrative decisions in the centers are not based on conditions outlined in the law. When

respondents were asked to respond whether the customers are enforced to pay extra fee to speed up services, 23.2% strongly disagree the idea that says paying extra fee in the centers is not common while 33.3% (33) disagree the same idea. When 19.2% (19) remained neutral, the rest 24.2% agreed that enforcing customers to pay extra fee to speed up the service is not common.

➤ *Increased Efficiency*

Helping customers			Accommodating Customers		Availability of easy forms		lay out & Service delivery setup	
Scale	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	14	14.1	15	15.1	23	23.1	29	29.3
Disagree	19	19.2	37	37.4	38	38.4	19	29.3
Neutral	33	33.3	19	19.2	19	19.2	19	19.1
Agree	18	18.2	5	5.1	9	9.1	9	9.1
Strongly agree	15	15.2	23	23.2	10	10.1	13	13.1
Total	99	100	99	100	99	100	99	100

Table 5:- helping customers find where they need to go as they move through

As the above data indicates 33.3% of the respondents disagreed while 33.4% of the respondents agreed about the above issues. But the remaining 33.3% gave neutral answer about whether the staff members help the customers find where they need to go as they move through the services in the centers. Regarding the accommodation of customers in the centers, 15.2% (15) strongly disagreed, 37.4% (37) disagreed about the presence of warm and welcoming reception to accommodate then customers in the centers. But 28.3% of the respondents agreed that there is a warm and welcoming reception to accommodate customers. The remaining 19.2% responded as neutral.

Even though 19.2% of the respondents agreed about the existence of easy forms to fill out at any time on the shelf, equal number of respondents (19.2%) were neutral about the issues. This shows that 61.6% of the respondents confirmed that the centers have failed to provide easy forms to fill out at any time on the shelf.

This indicates that about half of the respondents (52.5%) believe that centers are not on the position to provide a warm and welcoming reception to accommodate the customers. As the respondents gave the response, 23.2 % (23) strongly disagreed, 38.4 % (38) disagreed about the availability of easy forms to fill at the time of their needs.

In this regard respondents were asked to respond whether the lay out and service delivery set up allows customers to go up and down to different offices for services or not, 58.6% disagreed about the idea that says the lay out service delivery set up does not allow the customers to go up and down to many offices for service. But 22.2% of them agreed that the lay out service delivery set up does not allow the customers to go up and down to many offices for services while 19.2% remained neutral. This implies that 77.8% believe that service delivery set up and the lay outs obliged customers to go to different offices.

Handling more cases with the same number of staffs			solving Customers request in quick & fairways	
Scale	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	29	29.3	18	18.2
Disagree	28	28.3	37	37.4
Neutral	24	24.2	20	20.2
Agree	9	9.1	10	10.1
Strongly agree	9	9.1	14	14.1
Total	99	100	99	100

Table 6:- The center can handle more cases with the same number of staff members

As the above table indicates 29.3% (29) strongly disagreed that the center can handle more cases with the number of staff members as 28.3% (28) disagreed. When 18.2 % (18) agreed that the center can handle more cases with the number of staff members and the remaining 24.2 % (24) replied neutral. From this we can infer that 57.6% of

the respondents have similar outlook about the capacity limitations of the centers to handle more cases with the same number of staff members.

Respondents were asked to respond whether the centers solve the customer 's request in a fair and quick

way even replacing the colleagues in the case of absence. Of 99 respondents, 18.2% strongly disagreed, 37.4% disagreed while 20.2% remained neutral. On the other side, 24.2% agreed that staff members usually solve the customer 's request in a quick and fair way even replacing the colleagues in the case of absence. This implies that 56.6% of the respondents feel that customer request might not be solved in a quick and fairways and the staff members might not be willing to replace their colleagues in the case of absence.

response	Frequency	Percent
no data	41	41.4
increasing	24	24.2
Remain the same	20	20.2
decreasing	14	14.1
Total	99	100

Table 7:- The number of cases remained unsolved in the center

Regarding the number of cases, 41.4% responded as they have no data, 24.2% responded as the number of cases increases while 20.2% responded as the number remains the same. But 14.1% of the respondents said the number of cases is decreasing in the centers. This implies that 44.4% of the respondents perceive either the cases are increasing or remain the same in the center

Scale	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	28	28.3
Disagree	37	37.4
Neutral	14	14.1
Agree	10	10.1
Strongly agree	10	10.1
Total	99	100

Table 8:- Center Continuously Solicit and implement Customer Feedback in a user-friendly way

Concerning the solicitation of information and implementing of customer feedback in the centers, 28.3% of the respondents strongly disagreed that the centers solicit information and implement customer feedback, 37.4% disagreed about it and 14.1% remained neutral. In this case the remaining 20.2% agreed that the centers solicit and implement customer feedback in a user-friendly way.

	Frequency	Percent
Both	33	33.3
RR	41	41.4
RPR	25	25.3
Total	99	100

Table 9:- Organizational Setup your Center employ for service provision

When the respondents were asked about the type of models their centers employ, 33.3% responded as both (RR &RPR) models, 41.4% responded as RR model while the remaining 25.3% responded as RPR model. This shows that the centers didn't 't implement the same type of model for cases and it depend up on the type of cases. This further

indicates that, all services are not available at one place in the centers.

Response	Frequency	Percent
below 5	41	41.4
6-8	34	34.3
9-11	24	24.2
Total	99	100

Table 10:- Number of Staffs at one stop center

Of the total respondents, 41.4% responded as their centers have below 5 staffs, 34.3% believe that their centers do have 6-8 staffs and the rest 24.2% said that their centers have 9-11 staff members. This indicates that majority (75.8%) believe that the centers have not adequate number of staffs to provide full service.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

This study provides different issues that can help as input for research on the effect of one stop service centers in service delivery. First, the discovery from this study indicates that the centers at all woredas under the study settings have lacked the major decisive factors for successful implementation of one stop shop concept and the existing set ups of one stop centers are not inclusive. Second, the centers haven't established a communication system promoting type of services, procedures, time, fees and standards to customers to improve transparency; the centers lack well-trained and adequate staffs , lack office facilities; attractive and well-coming reception; quick and fair case handling and management mechanisms; feedback and solicitation mechanisms, in order to enhance efficiency and effectiveness.

Third, the result of this research maintains the positions of past researches about the effect of one stop shop concept in service delivery and the existence of decisive factors for successful implementation of one stop service centers.

As can be seen from the findings of both survey and qualitative research, the existing set up of one stop centers is not inclusive in order to bring services from different offices at one place, the centers haven't established a communication system promoting type of services, procedures, time, fees and standards to customers to improve transparency, the centers lack well-trained and adequate staffs, lack office facilities; attractive and well-coming reception; quick and fair case handling and management mechanisms; feed-back and solicitation mechanisms.

In addition, one stop service Centers have been grappled with problems of requesting extra payment for speedy up services, unnecessary delays and bureaucracy for those who can't afford, providing services on the basis of personal relationship rather than on the basis of conditions

outlined. This result confirms past research done by Walter Meyer (2003) which was reported as the major decisive factors for successful implementation of the one stop shop concept are: Government commitment, human resource development and adequate facilities. The study further elaborates that for successful implementation of one stop shop concept factors such as convenience of the location, availing full range of services at one place, equipping the center with modern facilities, knowledgeable and motivated staffs, streamlined procedures, clearly defined and publicized fees, procedures and time needed for specific request should be fulfilled.

This study substantiated the findings of different past and current researches describing the success of implementing one stop shop concepts and their effects due to the establishment of the decisive factors in the centers. Specifically, Bryden et al. (2007) recognized the following factors that facilitate the success of one stop shop: careful attention to design and location, and community owned and run facilities. The study also points out that one stop shop should be a means of including the local community in service delivery, rather than as a means of centralizing services.

The result of this study also matches with the findings reported by Onxayvieng et al. (2015), who suggest four possible aspects of assessing one stop shop: governance dealing about the hierarchical position of the one stop shop in the administrative chain; performance related with to the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that assess the functioning of one stop shop management; information sharing referring to the range of services made available and the extent to which applications are processed by the One stop shop ; and workforce aspects dealing about human resource development, including training of staff and keeping the staff motivated to perform efficiently.

B. Conclusions

Many significant issues come out as a result of this study. From the result of this study we can conclude that: The introduction of One Stop service centers has no net effect of giving the customers the opportunity to get multiple interrelated services in one place to ensure better accessibility. 2. The transparency issues have not been improved. 3. The issue of fairness & equal treatment of the customers has 't been guaranteed. 4. The efficiency & effective service delivery practice has 't been established. 5. Mainly, the inconveniences in obtaining services from different offices haven 't been solved by the establishment of one sop service centers in the study area.

C. Recommendations

This study emphasizes on customers point of view in need of establishing the successful one stop service centers providing efficient and effective service in a fairway based on conditions outlined. Based on the result of this study the following recommendations for practice, for program designers and for future research are forwarded.

➤ *Recommendations for practice*

- To enhance the service delivery at the centers, the woreda governments in the study areas must establish inclusive service delivery set up that provides multiple services at one place and ensure better accessibility
- The centers must set different promotion mechanisms of the services being provide, standards, fees, and time needed for specific activities
- The centers should train the existing employees with customer reception, case handling mechanisms, and the existing administrative procedures and laws
- The centers should employ more employees to fill HR gap
- The centers must establish solicitation and customer feedback
- The centers must be well equipped with office furniture & facility.
- The centers must establish ethical standards and strong monitoring and evaluation systems to minimize rent seeking practices.

➤ *Recommendation for program Designers*

- Policy makers and program designers should design and revise the implementation manual of the one stop service centers with consideration of establishing integrative service delivery model.

➤ *Recommendations for future research*

- Further research must be done on the areas of the effects of physical locations of the centers up on disabled MSE operators.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Addis Ababa Micro and Small Enterprises Development Bureau (2016), Micro And Small Enterprise Census Report 2016\
- [2]. Amir Ghalib Abdalla, Joseph Karanja Kiragu, Florence Adhiambo Waswa , Felix Tebangura Ono, Josephine Wanjugu Kariuki, Duncan M. Ikua, (2015). Effect Of Huduma Centers (One Stop Shops) In Service Delivery– A Case Study Of Mombasa Huduma Centre. International Journal Of Academic Research In Business And Social Sciences June 2015, Vol. 5, No. 6 issn: 2222-6990
- [3]. Assefa Tasisa (2014) Micro And Small Enterprises Development Agency (2010), The Impact Of Mses In Addis Ababa; A Diagnostic Study, Addis Ababa City Administration Ministry Of Finance And Economic Development The Contribution Of Micro And Small Enterprises In Community Development In Addis Ababa Gullele Sub City May 2014. Asia Brief (2010), One Stop Shops-In The Service Of Vietnam.
- [4]. Berihu Assefa, Abebaw Zerfu, And Biruk Tekle (2014) Identifying Key Success Factors And Constraints In Ethiopia's Mse Development: An Exploratory Research Ethiopian Development

- Research Institute Addis Ababa, Ethiopia October 2014 Brown, James & Fahmy, Salama; Guidelines For Development Of One-Stop Shops (Oss) For Licensing; 2005 Case Summary Drawn From Gudrun Klee-Kruse, In One-Stop-Government In Europe, Hagen, Martin/Herbert Kubicek Eds. (Bremen, University Of Bremen, 2000) Pp. 209-466
- [5]. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry Of Trade And Industry (1997), Micro And Small Enterprises Development Strategy,
- [6]. Federal Micro and Small Enterprises Development Agency (2011), Femseda Annual Report 2011
- [7]. Federal Micro and Small Enterprises Development Agency (2011), Micro and Small Enterprises Development Strategy, Provision Framework and Methods Of Implementation
- [8]. Howard C., Rethinking Post-Npm Governance: The Bureaucratic Struggle to Implement One Stop-Shopping for Government Services In Alberta, Springer Science Business Media New York, 2014, Pp. 13
- [9]. Konjit Debela (2011) Women In The Development of Micro & Small Enterprises To Ensure Sustainable Development & Food Security Ensure Sustainable Development & Food Security Addis Ababa Ethiopia manual of the New Small & Micro Enterprises Development Strategy of Ethiopia (Published 2011)
- [10]. Mutuku, D. (2015, July 14) How Huduma Is Transforming the Public Service The Standard Newspaper, Page 13.
- [11]. Mutula, S. (2010) Comparison of Sub-Saharan Africa 's E-Government Status With Developed and Transactional Nations. Inf. Manage. Compute. Security. 16 (3) 235-250.
- [12]. Naod Mekonen, (2011). Prospects and Challenges to Implement Bpr In Ethiopia Public University Unpublished Ma Thesis Addis Ababa
- [13]. OECD. (2013). Reliability of Public Services: Ensuring Citizens' Rights, In Government At A Glance 2013, Oecd Publishing.
- [14]. Onxayvieng, C. Shukui, T. Viensany, D. Malagy K. (2015). —Public Service Improvement: A Case Study of One-Door Service in Lao People 's Democratic Republic. Journal of Public Administration and Governance 5(1): 137-157
- [15]. Osborn, S. And Brown, K. Managing Change and Innovation in Public Service Organizations, London: Routledge, 2006, Pp. 17 - 23 78
- [16]. Peters Guy and Pierre Jon, Handbook of Public Administration, Sage Publication, 2007, Pp. 3-5
- [17]. Pwc. (2007). The Road Ahead for Public Service Delivery on The Customer Promise. Public Sector Research Centre. P. 3
- [18]. Pwc. (2012). Transforming the Citizen Experience. One Stop Shop for Public Services. Pp. 4-6. Salazar, A., Costa, J. & Rita, P. (N.D.). Relationship Between Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions: A Case Study Of The Hospitality Sector, Proceedings Of The 33rd Emac, May, 2004, Murcia, Spain.
- [19]. Sirgut Mitchel, (2006). Achievements and Challenges In The Implementation Of Result Oriented Performance Management System In The Ethiopian Federal Civil Service, Addis Ababa.
- [20]. Stone, A. (2006). Establishing A Successful One Stop Shop the Case of Egypt. Imf/Amf.
- [21]. Swiss Agency For Development And Cooperation, Sdc; Evaluation Of One-Stop Shops In Vietnam, Hanoi 2003; Www.Sdc.Org.Vn
- [22]. Tesfaye Debela, And Atakilti Hagos (2009). Business Process Re-Engineering in Ethiopian Public Organizations, The Relationship Between Theory And Practice Vol.1 No.2
- [23]. United Nations Development Program, Undp; One-Stop Shop (Oss) In Public Administration Reform To Improve Public Service Delivery, A Vietnam's Case; Hanoi 2004 Wimmer Maria A., A European Perspective Towards Online One-Stop Government: The Egov Project, Electronic Commerce Research And Applications 1, Elsevier, 2002, Pg. 94.
- [24]. Wimmer M.A. And Tambouris, E. 2002. Online One-Stop Government: A Working Framework and Requirements in Traummuller, R. (Ed.) Information Systems: The E-Business Challenge (Pp. 117-130). Kluwer Academic Publishers