

PUBLIC SERVICES IN NEPAL: CITIZEN'S EXPERIENCES



NEPAL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COLLEGE

PUBLIC SERVICES IN NEPAL: CITIZEN'S EXPERIENCES



NEPAL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COLLEGE

Research Team

Trilochan Pokharel

Rajendra Adhikari

Achala Dahal

Fieldwork and Data Management Team

Anil Kumar Gupta

Shailaja Upadhyaya

Anita Poudel

Mishree Lal Shah

Damodar Basyal

Disclaimer: The opinion expressed in this research report do not represent official position of Nepal Administrative Staff College and are of the authors.

Copyright: Research and Consulting Services Department, Nepal Administrative Staff College

Recommended Citation

Pokharel, T., Dahal, A. & Adhikari, R. (2017). Public Services In Nepal: Citizen's Experiences. Lalitpur, Nepal: Nepal Administrative Staff College.

Acknowledgements

This research is an outcome of the constructive support of several persons. Their support was always instrumental to move forward and bring this research in present shape. We would like to express sincere thanks to all of them.

We begin by thanking the participants of 30th Basic Administration Training for their valuable time to collect data. Without their support, we would not be able to bring this research in the present shape.

We thank to Research Committee, Nepal Administrative Staff College for approval and financial support to carry out this research. We are also thankful to Punya Prasad Neupane, Executive Director, Tarak Bahadur KC, Deputy Executive Director, Kedar Bahadur Rayamajhi, Senior Director and Bharat Thapa, Senior Director for constructive suggestions and encouragement for conducting this research.

We extend our sincere thanks to Hari Dhungana through the early stage of proposal and invaluable suggestions to make the research a productive and worthy.

Likewise, we express our gratitude to Anil Kumar Gupta, Shailaja Upadhaya and Anita Poudyal for their generous support at different stage of the research. We thank to all those who constantly supported to make this research happen.

Finally yet importantly, we acknowledge all the respondents who agreed to share their experience and provided inputs for this research.

Abstract

Our role at Nepal Administrative Staff College is to contribute in public sector capacity building for efficient public service delivery. During this process, we have realized unless we understand public service from people's perspective, it is challenging to deliver quality and efficient service. Informed by this observation, the objective of this survey was to examine the quality of public services from service recipient's perspectives.

We used cross-sectional exploratory research design and collected information from a total of 1374 respondents covering 38 districts in the second round in 2016. Four major public organizations at district level were selected for study through a semi-structured questionnaire.

The study reveals that people have mixed experiences about public services. Respondents appreciate convenient service process, friendly behaviours and low cost. Voice of dissatisfaction is strong for complicated process, unfriendly behaviours of service providers and costly services. Citizens receive services in multiple attempts, spent many days and hours, travel long distance and pay additional cost for services. People are paying double cost for provision of public services- through tax paid to the state and direct cost while accessing the services. This has made public service costly.

We conclude that Nepal requires critical analysis of public provisions of services to make services accessible and efficient from user perspectives. There is necessity of developing methodological approach to evaluate public service from user's perspective and redesign public services to increase public value from people's perspective.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Historical perspectives of public services	2
1.3 Debates on public services	3
1.4 Public services in Nepal	3
1.5 Cost of public services	4
1.6 Statement of problem	5
1.7 Objectives	7
1.8 Significance of the study	7
Chapter Two: Methodology	8
2.1 Theoretical framework	8
2.2 Data and sampling design	8
2.3 Study variables and survey instruments	9
Chapter Three: Service Experience	10
3.1 Background of characteristics	10
3.2 Experience about services	12
3.2.1 Type of services	12
3.2.2 Accompany to receive services	13
3.2.3 Attempts made to receive service	14
3.2.4 Perception towards service process	15
3.2.5 Source of information	16
3.2.6 Assistance to receive services	16
3.3 Cost of service	17
3.3.1 Distance to service organization	17
3.3.2 Service fee	19
3.3.3 Additional expenses	19
3.3.4 Time spent to receive service	20
3.4.5 Service from intermediary	22
3.4.6 Follow-up visit	23
3.5 Satisfaction on services	24
Chapter Four: Discussion and Conclusion	26
References	28
Annex 1: Sample distribution	31
Annex 2: Survey questionnaire	32

List of Tables

Table 1: List of variables	9
Table 2: Demographic characteristics	10
Table 3: Socio-spatial characteristics	11
Table 4: Type of services received	12
Table 5: For whom service received	13
Table 6: Accompany to receive service	13
Table 7: Attempts made to receive service	14
Table 8: Perception towards service process	15
Table 9: Sources of information about service	16
Table 10: Assistance to receive service	16
Table 11: Relationship with service provider	17
Table 12: Distance to service organization	18
Table 13: Service fee	19
Table 14: Additional expenses	20
Table 15: Additional expense with payment for intermediary	20
Table 16: Days to receive services	21
Table 17: Time spent to receive after reporting to office	22
Table 18: Support from intermediary	22
Table 19: Follow-up visit	23
Table 20: Satisfaction with services	24

CHAPTER

1

Introduction

1.1 Background

Public services are designed to meet the demands and expectations of the citizens. Government institutions have primary responsibilities to deliver public commitments in the form of public services. There are always contending issues in the characteristics and quality of public services. It is even difficult to exactly define the composition of public services. However, there some generic principles that define quality and characteristics of the services. The debates on public service are not a new phenomenon. It is always an issue of public concern since the services are defined as public. The state-citizens relationship is often displayed by the characteristics of the public services.

The debates begin from the definition of public and publicness. Simply, we use public to explain a sphere that does not belong to an individual's private custody and involves the society, government or state in any form. However, there is a risk of fully relying on this definition. Because there are many public areas that share contradictory characteristics of public and private spheres. Important is to explain publicness in public services. Publicness is quality or state of being public or owned by public. As defined by Haque (2001), publicness of public services needs five characteristics- the extent of its distinction from private sector, the scope and composition of service recipients, the

magnitude and intensity of its socio-economic role, the degree of its public accountability and the level of public trust. Hence, public services can be defined as the services of fundamental importance and certain type of government intervention (Grand, 2007).

Public services are the core functions of the government. Such services can be both tangible or intangible, direct or indirect and immediate or long term. There are always debate in quality of such services. The thresholds are influenced by the status of socio-economic, cultural, political and market developments of a country. Therefore, the measurement of the quality could be contextual. Nevertheless, a common understanding is that citizens should have opportunities for progressive realization of quality improvement and value for cost.

Although, state is responsible for designing, delivering and regulating public services, there could be different modalities of delivery. Government may deliver services either through direct provisions or through using private or non-government institutions and networks. Whatever the modality is, the government's responsibility to ensure provisions facilitates smooth delivery of the public services.

Principally, citizens are entitled to services that state has committed to deliver with the proposed specifications. Classically, the

state-people relationship is defined by social contract, which argues that people entertain the authority of the state to protect their rights in exchange of some rights (Rousseau, 2008). However, the modern state-people relationship has evolved around the public services. Hence, the quality of the services may define the strength of relationship. The qualities are so dynamics so the state-people relationships.

In Nepal, although there are multiple actors of governance, the government is the main provider of the public services. People depend on the government's provision for their entitlement. The design, delivery, monitoring, and evaluation of public services is the major responsibility of the government. Public service in Nepal is constrained by the general tendency of what the government defines public services and depends on the government processes and functions. In other words, it depends on the controlling principle rather than facilitation and devolution principles. However, there are contending issues on references of pricing of public services. Design of public service in Nepal lacks objective specifications. There are no objective evidence on how public service progressed in specification delivered today. The providers define most of the public services. There has been little opportunities for the receivers to define quality and processes. It has made public service input focused, dominated by providers perception, safety, comfort and generally, input focused. The supply driven design may have impact on cost of public service delivery.

1.2 Historical perspectives of public services

There is no uniform reference how and

when the concept of public service evolved. Nevertheless, public sector dominant roles in producing public services expanded beyond the historical norms in nineteenth century (Alford & O'Flynn, 2012). Two major reasons are popular for greater government interventions in public service in nineteenth century. First, industrial revolution of nineteenth century and the new world frontier expansion encouraged for the government's involvement in the provisions of public infrastructures (Madrick, 2009). Necessity to maintain social order by brining improvements in public lives and reducing social problems like poverty, hunger, homelessness and disease is considered as the second reason for increasing government's involvement (May, 1997). Nevertheless, this tendency may differ for the countries where the ways of governing the society and people were different. The basis for the state formation could lead to different debates of service delivery. A common argument can be generated around the modern state ideology where the roles of state in service delivery has been defined (Nelson, 2006) in the framework of democratic values (Pierson, 2004). This framework guides to define the scope and characteristics of public services. The rise of mass working-class parties in the nineteenth century pressurized government for taking business of providing social services such as education, health care, housing and income security (Alford & O'Flynn, 2012) which still constitutes a significantly large proportion of modern state affairs.

The ancient provisions of public services were guided by the private interests (Grabosky, 1995), particularly of those who were able to pay tax or support government in means (Alford & O'Flynn, 2012). This relationship later encouraged establishing

a social and economic class that continue to influence public affairs in present time. Thus, social class and stratification became an important perspective to explain public services (Saunders, 1990).

1.3 Debates on public services

Debates on public services are continuous and will continue. Recent debates are on public service efficiency (Adnrews & Entwistle, 2014). Four faces of public sector efficiency are under discussion- productive, distributive, dynamic and allocative efficiency. Productive efficiency explains maximization of outputs over inputs. Distributive efficiency demands equity in the distribution of services to the citizens within the resource constraints. Dynamic efficiency is balance between current and projected service consumption. Allocative efficiency reduces the gap between demand and supply of the services.

Arguments on these four dimensions of efficiency are nevertheless criticisms free. Some fundamental criticisms are towards the orientation of efficiency. Schachter (2007) argues 'public sector efficiency receives meaning through political framework'. This implies stating efficiency orientation is not self-content unless integrated in political practices. Some scholars criticize for efficiency-focused public sector through critical and interpretive theories (Forester, 1993). Efficiency in economic terms demands reduction in cost in relation to output. In public services, it calls for reduction in public spending which may seriously reduce the distributive justice required for the poor and disadvantaged. The debate of efficiency versus justice becomes a critical aspect of service delivery (Butler & Williams, 2002) at everyday public sector discourse, which implies for tradeoff between

efficiency and justice (Mathis, 2009). Mathis further argues, in economics, these principles can be used as substitutable but in people's lives, the tradeoff is not a welcome agenda. Therefore, a big debate is to achieve a fair balance.

Public sector efficiency has been a prime reform agenda of the time (Afonso, Schuknecht, & Tanzi, 2005; OECD, 2013; Borge, Falch, & Tovmo, 2008). The agenda is driven by reducing public sector expenditure. However, it is equally important to analyze the impact of cuts in public expenditure. Jones & Morris (2010) proposes three types impacts of reduction in public expenditure- direct impact on public sector employment, indirect impact on public sector supply chain and induced impact on consumption resulting from the reduced income available to individuals who formerly received monies directly or indirectly from the public sector.

Whatever the issues scholars present on public sector efficiency, the debates should move forward with some fundamental questions. Do citizens perceive efficiency in same way that proponent of public sector efficiency or government is explaining? The trend as of now is more focused to measure efficiency from provider's perspective. This is requires a significant shift to citizen's perspective.

1.4 Public services in Nepal

Although argued that Nepal carries an aged old history of public services, it has young experience of organized public service delivery system. Unlike the western industrial countries, it is hard to refer when and how government's systematic involvement in public service delivery was initiated in Nepal. However, we can refer around the mid- twentieth century

when Nepal ended a century long autocratic Rana Regime, a modern democratic practices of public service were initiated. Despite of having two and half century modern history, much has to be explored on public service system before 1950s. For example, Lichhavi dynasty who ruled between first AD to 880 AD promoted public welfare put in priority to improve public satisfaction (Regmi, 1978). In Malla dynasty that succeeded Lichhavi, the government was responsible for law and order, defense, revenue collection, construction and maintenance and foreign affairs (Regmi, 1979). This system continued in Shah dynasty with a little extension in services and design of administrative structure to maintain state affairs. With the emergence of Rana Regime in 1846, family members of a ruling clan controlled the entire system of public services. They occupied all higher positions. The design and delivery of services were guided by the thinking and necessity of the key position holders. They did not make any distinction between public and private wealth and used national wealth for personal benefits (Whelpton, 2005).

Unlike global phenomenon, there is no specific analysis how public service emerged in Nepal. As Nepal has not experienced any industrial revolution, we do not have evidence to support industrialization as a reason for increasing government intervention in public services. Nevertheless, the authoritarian governance system practiced for long period controlled state affairs and defined public services in ruling class interest.

Despite the shift in the macro political environment, the fundamental practices and culture in public affairs has remained unchanged (Baral, 2000; Upreti, 2010) allowing state authority to define public

services in their interests. Public services are still criticized for being authority centric and less concerned on people's expectation.

Recent political changes and increasing civic awareness has expressed high expectation on public sector performance. The political change has been grounded on the past poor performance of public institutions, political institutions and wider gap between the state and citizens. In the backdrop of democratic movement from early 1950s, expression of public interests in different times, popular political movement in 1990s and decade long armed conflict (1996-2006), Nepali people once again expressed their desire for transformation in public sector structures and behaviours. This would provide a sense of belongingness and nationalism. However, understanding and ideology of state authority has mainly guided the fundamental assumptions of public service (Lawoti, 2007).

1.5 Cost of public services

What determines cost of public service is still debatable. There are several contending arguments what actually explain the cost of the public services provided by the government. It is yet to bring into public decision-making process that cost of public services need to be determined from citizen's perspective (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2007). Nevertheless, the quality of public sector institutions always be critical to access and cost of the public services (Recanatini, 2008). Another factor that influence cost is the philosophy of public sector efficiency. As of today, the idea of efficiency is inclined to reducing public sector spending (Adnrews & Entwistle, 2014). There is no point to argue against the principle of reducing public sector expenditure but the concern is does it reduce

the cost people have to pay for receiving services? Public organizations are designed to serve people. They work for maximizing public value and regulate other governance actors to work for public interests. Public institutions survive on taxpayer's funding. This requires careful examination to what extent efficiency principle suggests reduction in cost of public service from citizen's perspectives. The argument of fairness versus efficiency is still relevant in service delivery (Bultler & Williams, 2002).

Usually there is limited practice of evaluating cost of the public services from citizen's landscape. This could be complicated but important aspect of public sector delivery. Standing on the principles of social justice and welfare, state may declare negligible or zero service fee for many public services. This does not ensure that people are not paying cost for that. People might have been paying huge cost for receiving them for which providers consider cheap or free service.

Do people feel they have received public service at an affordable or lower cost as claimed by the state mechanisms? Prottas (1981) argues nonmonetary cost could be higher for demeaning experiences of public services. This could be because of delays and complex processes that impose people to pay both psychological and time cost to obtain services. Prottas further calls:

[T]he complexity of the programme allows street-level bureaucrats to control access to many aspects of services via their monopoly over programme information. Many public service agencies ration the services they are charged with delivering. This rationing is not formally sanctioned by responsible institutions and is therefore

illegitimate... There is often a class difference between providers and recipients of public services. These 'social' advantages allow street-level bureaucrat to impose considerable psychological cost on clients in the course of interaction.

There could have been improvements in the situation than Prottas has argued some three decades ago. However, the questions on the cost of public services are always relevant. In fact, this question needs to be asked continuously and rigorously for correcting the partial concept of public sector efficiency.

1.6 Statement of problem

What do citizen expect from the government? Or what do they expect from the public money that is spent on public services and they may have a simple answer—a good service (Grand, 2007). This opens up several follow up questions. What does good service mean? What are the indicators of good services? Are there perceptual differences of good services between demand and supply side? Within demand side, does cost differ based on characteristics of citizen? Does cost explain quality of services? When we use cost as one of the indicators of the good public service, it implies for further explanation. The derivation of cost estimation needs to be analyzed. If the basis of estimating public service cost is quality, it should, then, have at least these attributes: efficiency, responsiveness, accountability and equality (Grand, 2007). But the problem lies in the ways of measuring these attributes. The basis for evaluation differs greatly between citizens and the service providers.

As proposed by Stanley (1999), there are three levels of measurement of the quality of the services: impressionistic, the

impressions of people towards public services; presumptive, structural arrangements to deliver a good service; and proven, delivering what has been agreed or meeting the expectations. However, the last level of measurement is always contradictory. The major contradiction is for what we measure-programme or service provider. The approach of this research is not to analyze all aspects of quality of public service but to confine in the experience of the people while accessing public services in Nepal. There are not such established framework that can be used to evaluate the cost of public services from user's perspective. But there are general comments that public services in Nepal are expensive. Users have to pay high cost for a minor services because of several factors and most of them are associated with the government functions (Administration Reform Recommendation Committee [ADRRRC], 2014 [2070 BS]). The cost of services in rural areas is expected to increase, as the public institutions in those areas are not functioning with expected capacity because of systemic errors and irregular presence of service providers (Bhattarai, 2014).

Following are the some fundamental questions this research would explore. How much should citizen pay for public service? What are the cost indicators? Who defines cost? What is the relationship between cost and quality? Does cost involve both monetary and non-monetary indicators? We suppose the answer is not straightforward. There are contending arguments on the cost of public services. The arguments are always divided for supply and demand sides. Both sides derive cost on different basis representing their characteristics and frame of reference. There may be different forms of

cost. Citizens may calculate cost based on the direct payment to receive the service, time consumed and satisfaction or care provided by the service providers and indirect cost like tax paid to the government. On the other hand, the government may derive cost based on the direct expenses (staff salary, product cost, logistics arrangement, institutional investment etc.) incurred to deliver the services. There could a serious gap between these two calculations.

Whatever the approach of cost calculation is, the general principal is that the cost of public services increases the burden on citizen. This research has analyzed the cost of public services based on the citizen perspectives with an argument that citizen's voices are basic sources of service design. By virtue, public services are designed to meet the needs of the citizens. Therefore, they are entitled to those services. The government should then design public services in response to public demands.

Calculating the cost of public services from citizen's perspective is a daunting task. There are several factors that influence the cost. There cannot be uniform measure and a universal approach to derive cost. No such universal method has been developed. Most of the approaches are derived based on public spending to deliver the services (Paul, Balkrishnan, Thampi, Sekhar, & Vivekananda, 2006; Doherty, Horne, & Wootton, 2014). Prevalent practices are generally ignorant to the cost estimation based on the expenses of citizens to receive the services. Despite the limitations of deriving cost from recipient's perspectives, this study explores on the central research question 'What cost do citizen pay for receiving a public services in Nepal'? We narrow down the public services into few

fundamental services provided to people by public institutions. (Methodology section describes services and institutions proposed to cover in detail).

1.7 Objectives

The major objective of this research is to document citizen's experience of public services and make basic estimation of cost of public services from citizen's perspective. In addition, this study focuses on the following specific objectives:

- Assess the public service environment of the selected public institutions.
- Estimate the cost incurred to receive a public service in the selected public institutions.
- Analyze the perception of service recipient towards the quality of the public services.

1.8 Significance of the study

This study serves three major significance. First, estimating cost of public service from user's perspective is a challenging but very crucial for evaluating the service quality. It helps to know public perceptions towards the services. Second, since there are not many researches of this kind, it will be a reference for academic purpose. Researchers can build on this for further study. It may be optimistic but this research can help to develop a methodology to evaluate public services from user's perspective. Third, it will have policy implications. It may be helpful for public policy and governance actors to understand policy and governance context. It may be helpful to revisit policy and governance approaches to improve the situation. As Nepal has adopted federal form of governance with devolution of powers to sub-national governments, this study would support for their service reform plan.

CHAPTER

2

Methodology

2.1 Theoretical framework

This study uses user experiences framework for assessing quality of services. User experiences is a framework of analysis that allows to understand responses of users towards the services they have used (Högström, Davoudi, Löfgren, & Johnson, 2014). The experiences can be unbundled into the several indicators. The limitation of experience being subjective can be made objective by using tangible indicators that can be measured. The basic idea of this approach is to explain the characteristics of the services from the user's perspective. In other words, it is to examine how service recipients explain the characteristics of the services they received. For this study, the experiences of service users were measured in terms of experiences and cost they pay to receive the services.

The Constitution of Nepal 2015, which documents the commitment of the state, in aftermath of the April 2006 revolution and peace accord ending the ten years armed conflict, has assured the access of all citizens in public service without discrimination. The Constitution is not just a legal document but also a commitment of the state to deliver public service efficiently, equitably and effectively to the citizens of Nepal, reduce gap between state and people, and promote inclusive governance and development. The basic philosophy as mentioned in the preamble is to recognize people's right to

access the public services by restructuring the state to resolve the problem of class, caste, region and gender.

This study assumes that several factors can detriment people's right to access public service against the public commitments. Public services are designed on certain assumptions and factors that always may not address the public problems. One of the biggest constraints is the financial circumstances (Titumir & Hossain, 2004) associated with access to services. Affordability or the economic cost of purchasing a good or service relative to income, can be an important barrier to access (OECD, 2013) public services. Affordability implies a broader context beyond direct cost of purchasing services. The cost associated with the time, process and payment for additional services also determine the affordability of the services. User's experiences towards the services is not as simple to understand and present. It may differ based on the recipients' characteristics (Dunn & Morgan, 2001) which requires to methodology to capture people's experiences.

2.2 Data and sampling design

The field survey comprised of both rural and urban setting. A total of 38 districts across the country were selected for this study using eco-administrative diversity. Public institutions, particularly District Administration Office (DAO), District

Development Committee (DDC), District Land Revenue Office (DLRO) and Municipality (MNC) were selected considering the public flow and generic services. The public flow is high in these institutions and provide most common and regular public services. (See Annex 1 for sample distribution).

A general criterion was prepared for selecting respondents for the survey. Client exit interview method was used to select respondents. Interviewers were trained to select service recipients who were there for general services. They were provided a list of general services and criteria to select respondents. We defined general services as the services that are required for all citizens, commonly used and state is committed for providing those services at a minimum service fee. We used the service list to select

respondents from each institutions. The fieldwork was conducted between May-June 2016.

2.3 Study variables and survey instruments

We selected variables to measure research questions based on the objectives of study and available literatures. As we suffered limitations on literature that could explain methodology for cost estimation of public services from recipient's perspective, we use our own experience and some past researches to define proxy indicators. We prepared questionnaire in Nepali for convenience of interviewer and respondents. We also pretested questionnaire and made necessary correction. (See Annex 2 for questionnaire)

Following table presents study variables used in this study:

Table 1: List of variables

S.N.	Category	Variables
1.	Background Characteristics	Sex, caste/ethnicity, age, education, place of residence, occupation
2.	Service Experience	Type of service received, purpose of service, accompanying person, reasons for accompany, attempts made to receive service, reasons for multiple attempts, source information, support received, relationship with service provider
3	Cost and Time for Receiving Service	Distance, time taken to travel, means of transportation, service fee, transportation fare, accommodation, foods, days/ time spent to receive, role of intermediary, additional cost for receiving service
4.	Quality of Service and Satisfaction	Satisfaction towards service, reasons

This study also documents some cases that explain experiences of service recipient while accessing the services focusing on the cost they paid to receive the service. Cost does not necessarily mean the direct payment but can involve in number of ways and can be indirect.

CHAPTER

3

Service Experiences

This chapter presents data on customer's experiences on public service delivery. The chapter is organized around three major subjects- background of respondents, experiences and cost of services. The background introduces citizens with their fundamental characteristics. The background characteristics is used to examine the differences in service quality and experiences. The experience sub-section deals citizen's experiences on public service. Cost of services from citizen's perspective is highlighted in next sub-section. Cost and experience differentials are analyzed where appropriate.

3.1 Background of characteristics

This sub-section presents background characteristics of service recipients. We include sex, place of residence, caste/ethnicity, age, occupation and education as background characteristics. Characteristics of service recipients may have impact on service quality and cost (Prottas, 1981). We have used to background characteristics to evaluate experiences of service recipients.

Of the total, nearly 68 percent respondents were male. Although, there could be selection biases, this could be common and expected phenomenon as females are less likely to participate in public affairs unless essential. Highest proportion (39.4%) of

respondents were Brahmin/Chhetri, followed by Janajatis/Nationalities (31.7%) Madhesi/ Terai Origin (17.2%), and Dalits (10.2%). Age of respondents was broadly classified into five groups- 20 years and below, 21-35, 36-45, 46-55 and 55 years and above. Almost 60 percent respondents belonged to 21-45 years age group, 16 percent to 46-55 years and around 12 percent to 56 years above and 11 percent 20 years and below. The mean age was 38 year with 14 years as the lowest and 89 years the highest age (Table 2).

An overwhelmingly large proportion (88.4%) of respondents were literate. Of the total, half had secondary and above level of education, while less than a quarter were literate only and slightly more than 10 percent were illiterate. Slightly higher than 4 in 10 respondents were from agriculture occupation, followed by business (16.0%), non-government service (10.8%) and public service (5.9%). Around 16 percent reported to be unemployed, four percent in daily wages and two percent self-employed. We also asked for current place of residence in order to know distribution of respondents. Almost all respondents were from the same districts while around 56 percent respondents from urban area and 44 percent from rural area (Table 3).

Table 2: Demographic characteristics

Characteristics	N	%
Sex of respondents		
Male	927	67.5
Female	447	32.5
Caste/ethnicity		
Brahman/Chhetri	542	39.4
Janajati/Nationalities	436	31.7
Dalits	140	10.2
Madhesi/Terai Origin	237	17.2
Others	19	1.4
Age group		
20 years and below	147	10.7
21-35	536	39.0
36-45	318	23.1
46-55	213	15.5
56+	160	11.6
Mean age	37.64	
Lowest age	14	
Highest age	89	
Total	1374	100.0

Table 3: Socio-spatial characteristics

Characteristics	N	%
Education status		
Illiterate	159	11.6
Literate only	307	22.3
Primary	89	6.5
Lower secondary	122	8.9
Secondary	361	26.3
Higher secondary	334	24.3
Others	2	0.1
Occupation		
Agriculture	601	43.7
Unemployed	226	16.4
Business	220	16.0
Private sector employment	145	10.6
Public sector employment	81	5.9
Daily wages	54	3.9
Self employed	28	2.0
Social Worker	19	1.4
Place of residence		
Urban	769	56.0
Rural	605	44.0
Total	1374	100.0

3.2 Experience about services

This sub-section highlights basic experiences of respondents while receiving services. Within this we have explored type of services, purpose of service, accompanying persons, frequency of attempts made, reasons for multiple attempts, perception towards services, source of information about services, support received for accessing service, relationship with service providers and means of transportation used to reach service providing organizations. Basic purpose

of this section is to disclose experiences of service recipients while accessing services.

3.2.1 Type of services

We regrouped different services into broad three categories – general administration, land administration and development activities related. General administration includes services like citizenship, passport, relationship certificate, document correction, evidence verification, vital registration and relief related services. Land administration includes services like land

purchase, transfer, revenue, status update, registration etc. Development related services include planning and programme approval, fund release, contract, reporting etc. Over

half of the respondents received general administration related services, followed by land administration (32.2%) and development activities related services (14.1%).

Table 4: Type of services received

Type of services	N	%
General administration	733	53.3
Land administration	442	32.2
Development activities related	199	14.5
Total	1374	100.0

We asked for whom the respondents received services. The intention of asking this question was to know tendency of accessing service. Around 67 percent respondents

received services for themselves while 17 percent each received for family members and for others (neighbor, society or collective benefits).

Table 5: For whom service received

Service for	N	%
Self	917	66.7
Family members	230	16.7
Others	227	16.5
Total	1374	100.0

3.2.2 Accompany to receive services

We wanted to explore how people visit public institutions for receiving services. The intention was to know whether they have confidence to access services on their own. Interestingly, little higher than 6 in 10 respondents were accompanied by someone

else. We further wanted to decompose who accompanied them and what the reasons were for accompany. Among those having accompany, more than half came with family members, followed by neighbours/relatives (20.9%), friends (14.9%) and social workers (5.4%).

Table 6: Accompany to receive service

Accompany	N	%
Alone	531	38.6
With others	843	61.4
Total	1374	100.0
Number accompanying persons		
2 and less	571	67.7
3-5	257	30.5
More than 6	15	1.8
Mean	2.48	
Total	843	100.0
Who accompanied		
Family Members	479	56.8
Neighbor or Relatives	159	18.9
Friend	97	11.5
Intermediary and others	108	12.8
Total	843	100.0
Reasons for accompany (N=843)*		
Required to receive service	474	57.2
For convenience to receive service	222	26.8
Lacking information about service	342	41.3
Convenient to interact with service provider	106	12.8

*Percentage total may exceed 100 due to multiple responses.

Of those who had a company, around 68 percent had two and less persons with them, 31 percent with 3-5 persons and 2 percent with 6 and more persons. In an average, service receivers' were accompanied with 2.48 persons. We further explored the reasons for accompany. Around 57 percent had a requirement for receiving service, 41 percent said they did not have enough information about services, 27 percent came with others supposing it would be easier to receive service and 13 percent sought accompany for gaining confidence to interact with service providers (Table 6).

3.2.3 Attempts made to receive service

We asked respondents how many attempts they made to receive services. Little more than 6 in 10 respondents received services in first attempt while around 32 percent had to make 2 to 4 attempts and four percent made more than five attempts. In an average, service recipients were required to make 1.71 attempts with 21 attempts as a maximum (Table 7).

Table 7: Attempts made to receive service

Attempts	N	%
Single attempt	882	64.2
2 to 4 attempts	438	31.9
More than 4 attempts	54	3.9
Mean attempt	1.71	
Highest attempt	21	
Total	1374	100.0
Reasons for multiple attempts (N=492)*		
Inadequate document	264	55.7
Insufficient time	136	28.7
Lack of information	96	20.3
Absence of service provider	90	19.0
Large number of service receiver	59	12.4
No electricity or other utilities	34	7.2
Service provider did not want	31	6.5
Missing records in the office	31	6.5
Inadequate service fee	21	4.4

Source: Field Survey, 2016.

*Percentage total may exceed 100 due to multiple responses.

Reasons for making multiple attempts were further explored. Majority (55.7%) reported inadequate documents was the major reason, followed by insufficient time (28.7%), lack of information (20.3%), absence of service provider (19.50%) and large number of service recipient (12.4%). Other reasons reported were lack of utilities (7.2%), reluctance of service providers (6.5%), missing records (6.5%) and inadequate service fee (4.4%) (Table 7). This shows still there is plenty room to improve service delivery system.

3.2.4 Perception towards service process

Often there is public dissatisfaction about processes of public services. It is criticized for being complicated, process oriented and non-performing. We asked the respondents about their experience on service processes. Around 36 percent respondents felt the service process was difficult or complicated indicating that public perception about public services may be improving but not satisfying.

Table 8: Perception towards service process

Experience	N	%
Satisfied	876	63.8
Dissatisfied	498	36.2
Total	1374	100.0
Reasons for dissatisfaction (N=497)*		
Lengthy process	190	38.2
No information about process	186	37.4
Unable furnish required documents	150	30.2
Unsystematic service process	137	27.6
Large number of service receiver	92	18.5
Service providers did not support	75	15.1
Did not know whom to ask	66	13.3

*Percentage total may exceed 100 due to multiple responses.

As a reason for dissatisfaction, around 38 percent reported lengthy process, 37 percent were dissatisfied because they could not get enough information about process; 30 percent could not furnish required documents; 28 percent were dissatisfied for unsystematic service process; 19 percent felt difficulty because of crowd, 15 percent reported service providers were unsupportive and 13 percent did not have idea whom to ask (Table 8).

3.2.5 Source of information

Communication is important tool of public service delivery. State is responsible for providing quality information to its citizens. We asked to respondents how did they know about services. The most common sources of information were service provider (45.1%) and previous service users (43.4%) who have experiences about services. Around a quarter received information from intermediary or professionals and around 3 in 20 respondents reported to get information from citizen charter.

Table 9: Sources of information about service

Sources of information* (N=1374)	N	%
Service provider	606	45.1
Previous service receiver	583	43.4
Intermediary or professionals	296	22.0
Citizen charter	202	15.0

*Percentage total may exceed 100 due to multiple responses.

Table 9 is evident that citizen still believe on manual communication. There could several reasons for such tendency. The service organizations have improve their communication standards.

3.2.6 Assistance to receive services

Do citizens need support to receive public services? It may have multiple answers. Four in 10 respondents received service on their own. Nearly 3 in 10 required assistance from service provider, 22 percent from relatives or known person, 21 percent from intermediary and less than five percent from political party members and social workers.

Table 10: Assistance to receive service

Assistance to receive service* (N=1374)	N	%
Self	539	40.0
Service provider	388	28.8
Relative or known person	290	21.5
Intermediary	286	21.2
Political party	40	3.0
Social worker	33	2.4

*Percentage total may exceed 100 due to multiple responses.

In a county where there are critics about governance systems, it is often regarded that a relationship with the service provider would be the most convenient way of receiving service. A further question was asked that whether the respondents knew any service provider and they had any benefits of having

such relation. Around one-fifth had closely known one of service providers. Of those who knew, 67 percent said to have benefits of the relationship. This indicates relationship with service provider could be one important factor to determine quality of services.

Table 11: Relationship with service provider

Relationship with service provider	N	%
Yes	299	21.8
No	1075	78.2
Total	1374	100.0
Benefit of relationship		
Yes	201	67.1
No	98	32.8
Total	299	100.0

3.3 Cost of service

This sub-section highlights cost that citizens pay for receiving services. We use proxy indicators like distance between home and service institutions; service fee; secondary cost as foods, lodging, travel cost; days spent; payment for intermediary or bribery.

3.3.1 Distance to service organization

Around half of the respondents travelled less than 10 kilometers for receiving service while around a quarter travelled 11 to 25 kilometers, 18 percent 26 to 50 kilometers and around 7 percent travelled more than 51 kilometers. In an average, a respondent travelled 24 kilometers with 0.1 kilometer the lowest and 550 kilometers as the highest. We further asked them time consumed to travel. Around one-third respondents

spent 30 minutes or less to reach to service organization while 30 percent spent 31 to 90 minutes and 38 percent spent more than 91 minutes. In an average, it took 115 minutes to reach service organization, with one minute the lowest and 990 minutes the highest (Table 12). The distance and time are one-way only. Adding return travel increases the cost of the services.

Table 12 further shows that almost half of the respondent used public transportation, followed by private vehicles (22.8%). Around 23 percent respondents travelled on foot and 3.6 percent in Rickshaw. Of those who came with someone else, 54 percent respondents paid travel cost of all accompanying persons, for 42 percent respondents, the accompanying person paid the travel cost. A few managed travel cost from organization and collectively.

Table 12: Distance to service organization

Distance travelled (in kilometers)	N	%
Less than 10	594	43.2
11 – 25	343	25.0
26-50	303	22.1
51 and more	134	9.8
Mean	24.45	
Minimum	0.1	
Maximum	550	
Time spent in travel (in minutes)		
Less than 30	450	32.8
31 – 90	407	29.6
91 and more	517	37.6
Mean	115.37	
Minimum	1.0	
Maximum	990.0	
Means of transportation		
Public transportation	700	50.9
Private vehicle	313	22.8
On foot	312	22.7
Rickshaw	49	3.6
Total	1374	100.0
Who paid for travel*		
Self	458	54.3
Accompanying person	354	42.0
Organization	27	3.2
Collective	4	0.5
Total	843	100.0

*Asked only for those who came with someone else.

3.3.2 Service fee

Service fee generally depends on the types of services. It requires caution to analyze and standardize and may not be directly comparable. Our objective is to provide a general estimation for gaining an insight on direct service fee. Around 6 in 10 respondents reported to have paid service fee. An equal

proportion of respondents (28.7%) paid service fee less than NRs 100 and 101 to 500 respectively. Around 11 percent paid NRs 501 to 1000 and proportion of paying more than NRs 1001 was 31.3 percent. The average service fee paid was around NRs 3000, with the lowest NRs 2 and the highest NRs 48000 (Table 13). There could influence of extreme values in inflating the service fee.

Table 13: Service fee

Service fee (in NRs)	N	%
Less 100	189	22.8
101 – 500	247	29.8
501-1000	97	11.7
1001 and more	295	35.6
Mean	2658.82	
Minimum	3.0	
Maximum	99000	
Std deviation	7658.82	
Total	828	100.0

3.3.3 Additional expenses

Generally, there is contradiction in interpretation cost of public services. User fee does not necessarily explain the expenditure of citizens to receive services. We have estimated the expenses apart from the service fee mainly in five indicators – travel cost, lodging, foods, payment to intermediary and additional payment. First, we analyze cost associated with travel, lodging and

foods. Around 78 percent respondents had additional expenses in cash. This proportion is 18 percent points higher than the proportion of paying service fee. In average, respondents spent NRs 853 in addition to service fee. Of which, 60 percent respondents had additional expenses less than NRs 500, around 16 percent spent NRs 501-1000, 22 percent spent NRs 1001-5000 and two percent spent more than NRs 5001. The expenses varied from NRs 10 as the lowest to NRs 16200 as the highest.

¹As per Central Bank of Nepal 10 Feb 2017 foreign exchange, \$1 is equivalent to 106.89 NRs.

²Intermediary is a term used for those who facilitate service process and take charge from service recipients. This practice is unregulated and considered as a source of bribing in Nepal.

Table 14: Additional expenses

Additional expenses (in NRs) ¹	N	%
Less 500	656	60.4
501 – 1000	176	16.2
1001-5000	236	21.7
5001 and more	18	1.7
Mean	853.36	
Minimum	10.0	
Maximum	16200	
Std deviation	1379.00	
Total	1086	100.0

The value climbs by 36 percent to NRs 1160 when payment to intermediary² is added to additional expenses for receiving services.

The trend of expenses shifts to upper side indicating increase in the cost of the services (Table 15).

Table 15: Additional expense with payment for intermediary

Additional expenses (in NRs)	N	%
Less 500	555	48.2
501 – 1000	196	17.0
1001-5000	368	31.9
5001 and more	33	2.9
Mean	1160.48	
Minimum	10.0	
Maximum	24200	
Std deviation	1708.61	
Total	1152	100.0

3.3.4 Time spent to receive service

Time factor is important but neglected element in cost estimation of service. We have estimated time cost in two aspects. First, respondents were asked to report number of days they spent to receive service. Second,

they were asked to report time they spent to receive service after first reporting to the service organization. In an average, citizens spent 1.99 days to receive a service. The variation ranges between half-a-day to as high as 20 days. Sixty-one percent respondents received services within a day whereas 30

¹As per Central Bank of Nepal 10 Feb 2017 foreign exchange, \$1 is equivalent to 106.89 NRs.

²Intermediary is a term used for those who facilitate service process and take charge from service recipients. This practice is unregulated and considered as a source of bribing in Nepal.

percent spent 2 to 3 days to receive service. About 9 percent respondents spent more than 4 days to receive a service (Table 16). With the increase in number of days, the cost of service varies with significantly. If we convert this into monetary values, the cost escalates. The days reported here are for one person. The number of persons accompanying together should multiply it to get total cost. This makes services even costlier. Unless there is special reasons, there is plenty of room to reduce the time cost.

When derived persons-days as product of persons accompanied and days spent to receive service, the conclusion made in previous analysis needs revision. It indicates that citizens are spending more person-days while accessing the services. Nearly 6 in 10 respondents spent 2-5 person days, followed by 1 or less person-days (24.3%) and 6 and more (16.9%). The average person-days spent to access service reaches to 3.92 with 80 person-days the highest value.

Table 16: Days to receive services

Additional expenses (in days)	N	%
1 or less	837	60.9
2-3	413	30.1
4 and more	124	9.0
Mean	1.99	
Minimum	0.5	
Maximum	20	
Total	1374	100.0
Person days (number of persons*days spent)		
1 or less	334	24.3
2-5	808	58.8
6 and more	232	16.9
Mean	3.92	
Minimum	1	
Maximum	80	
Total	1374	100.0

It is also worthwhile to examine exact time spent to receive a service as the citizens reported to office. It is useful to analyze the actual administrative time required to access the services. The results revealed that in average a citizen receives service in around 207 minutes. Nevertheless, there is also evidence of receiving service within ten minutes to as

long as 2880 minutes. The highest proportion (34.6%) of respondents got service between 91 to 180 minutes. For 33 percent, it took more than 181 minutes to the highest time-period. Around one fifth received service within 31-90 minutes. At least 13 percent respondents received service within 30 minutes (Table 17).

Table 17: Time spent to receive after reporting to office

Time spent (in minutes)	N	%
Less than 30	172	12.5
31-90	279	20.3
91-180	475	34.6
181 and more	448	32.6
Mean	207.42	
Minimum	10.00	
Maximum	2880.00	
Std deviation	265.47	
Total	216	100.0

3.4.5 Service from intermediary

Presence of intermediary is common in most of the public services. Many services by default require support from professionals. However, in some organizations, it has been a major problem, which has increased cost of

public services and has, therefore, created a gap between service receivers and providers. A question was asked whether respondents required support from intermediary or professionals. If yes, did they pay for the services of intermediary or professionals?

Table 18: Support from intermediary

Support received from intermediary	N	%
Yes	416	30.3
No	958	69.7
Total	1374	100.0
Payment to service intermediary (in NRs)*		
Less 500	161	38.7
501 – 1500	105	25.2
1501 and 2000	88	21.2
2001 and more	36	8.7
Do not want to say	26	1.9
Total	416	100.0
Mean	1056.35	
Minimum	20.00	
Maximum	8000.00	
Std deviation	1000.73	

* All those who took service from intermediary did not report to pay for them.

Around 30 percent service recipients required to take help of intermediary. As expected, the presence was highest in land administration. In an average, respondents paid NRs 1056 to intermediary. Intermediary levied as low as NRs 20 to as high as NRs 8000. Nearly 4 in 10 respondents paid NRs 500 or less, while a quarter paid NRs 501-1500. Slightly higher than one-fifth paid between NRs 1501 to 2000 and 9 percent paid NRs 2001 or more. A few (1.9%) did not disclose the amount they have paid for the intermediaries (Table 18).

In addition to the payment for intermediary, a further question was asked whether the respondents paid anything extra for receiving services. Most of them were reluctant to answer the question. However, less than 10 percent reported to have paid in addition to all other payment. Although, we did not term this a bribery, we suspect this

could be a bribe paid for receiving services. We were fully aware that it would be superficial to ask a direct question on bribing practices, we put a caution to derive conclusion on it. Another point is we have referenced to general services that do not involve a huge transaction. Although, a remarkable size of respondents provided 'verbatim' to inform about the malpractices involved in service delivery, we escape to derive conclusion leaving rooms for further focused research.

3.4.6 Follow-up visit

In order to gain sense whether the respondents received a complete service, a question on follow-up visit was asked. Visiting service centre several times definitely would increase service cost. Slight higher than one-fifth respondents would require a follow-up visit for accessing the services. This provides a possibility of increasing the estimated cost by noticeable trend.

Table 19: Follow-up visit

Follow-up visit	N	%
Yes	300	21.8
No	1074	78.2
Total	1374	100.0

3.5 Satisfaction on services

Perceived service quality can be defined as the sum of expectation minus actual experience. Respondents were asked to report their level of satisfaction. Table 20 shows that around 70 percent respondents were either completely or partially satisfied with the service quality. Of which 44 percent were completely satisfied and 27 percent were partially satisfied. Around 30 percent respondents were either partially or completely dissatisfied.

Satisfied customers apprehended convenient service (45.9%), service as expected (38.5%), good behaviour of service provider (37.2%), low cost (22.6%), systematic service (19.4%) and prompt service (6.7%). Those dissatisfied with the services blamed for unsystematic service (44.8%), costly service (44.8%), service not as expected (37.8%), delay in service (31.6%), inconvenient or complicated service (30.6%) and unfriendly behaviour of service provider (27.6%).

Table 20: Satisfaction with services

Satisfied with services	N	%
Completely satisfied	598	43.5
Partially satisfied	365	26.6
Partially dissatisfied	225	16.4
Completely dissatisfied	186	13.5
Total	1374	100.0
Reasons for satisfaction (N=963)*		
Convenient service	426	45.9
Good behavior of service provider	346	37.2
Service as expected	358	38.5
Systematic service process	180	19.4
Low cost to receive service	210	22.6
Prompt service	62	6.7
Reasons for dissatisfaction (N=411)*		
Unsystematic service process	180	44.8
Costly to receive service	180	44.8
Unfriendly behavior of service provider	111	27.6
Service not as expected	152	37.8
Inconvenient service	123	30.6
Delay in service	127	31.6

*Percentage total may exceed 100 due to multiple responses.

Certain cautions are required to explain the results on citizen's satisfaction. During the interview several citizens expressed satisfaction just only because they were able access service after several attempts. One of the respondents (37-year male receiving development administration service) said 'Although I made several attempts, finally I got it. It is more than enough. I do not have any other complaints'. Likewise, those who took support of intermediary also found satisfied with the service process. Another (48-year female receiving land administration

service) respondent remarked 'I am quite happy with the service because I took support of intermediary and they made work easy. Otherwise, I would have faced complication.' Both of these statements have positive ends but may have something important theoretical framework that remained to explore. If we take quality of public service as a 'closer correspondence between perceptions of actual and desired standards of public services' (Boyne, 2002), service recipients might have reduced their expectation to only getting their things done.

On a positive note, people appreciate for improvements in service delivery over the periods. A 53-year male citizen in a Municipality compared his experience in over five years as “I found quality of public service has increased largely. Five years back I had very negative impression as I had to face lot of hassle in receiving service. This time I found service process less complicated and the service providers more cooperative. I wish it will sustain”. Public service in Nepal is not free

from criticism. A 38-year female who travelled a long way to receive service in Land Revenue Office expressed her experience as “I travelled whole day to arrive here with an expectation to get service next day. It has been three days, neither they do my work nor say any reason. Just say ‘being done’. I do not know what to do.” These all testimonies offer grounds that public service in Nepal is undergoing through transition, which requires holistic improvement plan.

CHAPTER 4

Discussion and Conclusion

Public sector reform in developing countries is under pressure as there are increasing public awareness and expectations promoted by civic education, social media and technological advancement. Citizens are empowered to claim their entitlements. Characteristics of public service is transforming from citizens being a passive recipient to co-producer of service (Alford, 2009) which demands active involvement of citizens in design and delivery of public services. However, a critical question is to what extent the existing public service delivery process of Nepal allows citizen's participation in service design and delivery. We have limited the scope of this study to comprehend user's experience on service, which may be a proxy to interpret the extent of citizen's participation in the service process. At the time, Nepal is opting for transforming governance system and service delivery processes, this study can be considered as relevant to shed lights on public experiences about the service delivery practices and system.

Public sector efficiency has been a buzzword for public sector reforms (Ayeni, 2002; The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, 2008). The current arguments of efficiency proposes to reduce public sector expenses with an objective to reduce cost of service delivery and thereby bring efficiency (Weaver, 2008). This principle ignores concern much about the

impact of such reforms initiatives on people. Our argument is any reform on public service should ensure to reduce cost while accessing the public services. If reforms would not make significant differences in quality of services from the recipients' perspective, the reform interventions are not sufficient.

Public service of Nepal is not insulated to criticisms. Criticisms are organized around different themes, mainly on process, cost, time and citizen orientation. In terms of process, it is criticized for red-tapism (National Planning Commission [NPC], 2007), bureaucratic hassles and complications (Upreti, 2010). Nevertheless, how friendly are service delivery processes to the citizens? Do such rules apply equally to all? Respondents in this study criticized process orientation as a major reason for their dissatisfaction.

Major findings of the study suggest some appreciating improvements but equally disappointing practices. Amidst trust deficit towards public institutions, people are skeptical to find reliable reasons to believe the public sector reform initiatives. For many people, public services have been a burden and necessary evil. People neither can avoid nor get it without any trouble. For example, despite increasing public awareness and civic education, still large portions of people do not have confidence that they can access public service alone. As expected, the proportion is significantly higher for women. They require

some company to talk with service provider, access information and put their problems. This reminds women still doubt on their agency. Four in ten customers are required to make more than one attempt to receive a service. Most of them who were required to make multiple attempts were unable to furnish required documents, as they did not have adequate information about service processes and other basic elements of services. However, being a female is advantageous to receive service faster. It is evidence of transformation in public service being sensitive towards women.

Despite welcome efforts to put citizen charter in public institutions, its user rate is considerably low, less than 10 percent. People believe on manual communication especially from previous service users. It may be because citizen charter and other forms of information are available only at the service centres. This would not address the information requirements for preparation of required documents. Citizens may have to visit service centre for collecting information, which would make impractical solution. Obtaining information from an experienced person is the only viable option available in the community. Hence, the perception of informant would guide the perception of followers. Service providers have been another reliable source of information, as a quarter reported to have received information from them. Relationship with service provider is instrumental to access service conveniently. Having relationship with a service provider proved to be fortunate for easy access to service.

Distance to reach the service centre appeared as another concern. More than half people travelled higher than 10 kilometers to reach service centre. Around 70 percent spend

more than 90 minutes to reach service centre. With the increase in travel distance and time, the cost of the services may escalate.

Generally, there is no trend of accounting expenses in travel, lodging, foods and time as the costs incurred to access services. For many instances, neither citizens nor the service providers are aware of the indirect costs associated. It demands a careful philosophical and political interpretation and understanding of reorienting the calculation of cost of public service. There could be discrepancies in interpretation of the service cost between service providers and recipients. Providers may claim to have levied low user fee while the users might be paying high costs. In many cases, such costs may not be visible in the design and delivery of services. On contrary, users may not have realization about the expenses they are making while receiving the services. It is also possible that citizens take it naturally as part of service process and do not think necessary to speak out.

The costs may further increase at any time the customers encounter intermediary. For many services, processes by default complicated for a citizen. It makes systemic compulsion for them to get help of intermediary or professionals. On the other hand, for many cases, citizen choose to take help of intermediary than to involve themselves in the complicated services process. Frustration with the complicated service process and lack of self-confidence would take citizens to the intermediary for which they have to pay additional cost. Involving intermediary was common in services related to land administration. We have also observed that citizens feel convenient to deal with intermediary than service providers.

In conclusion, Nepal's public service is progressing amidst critical interaction with changing political environment, bureaucratic values and practices, people's level of awareness and expectations, social environment and advancement in communication technology. However, this leaves a doubt whether people

at the grassroots away from mainstream are benefiting these changes. The fate of public service depends on to what extent public organizations can reach to these people by improving public sector efficiency and thereby reducing the cost of public services.

References

- Administration Reform Recommendation Committee [ADRRRC]. (2014 [2070 BS]). *Report of Administration Reform Recommendation Committee*. Kathmandu: Ministry of General Administration. Retrieved Nov 10, 2014, from <http://moga.gov.np/ckfinder/userfiles/files/PARTIBEDAN%202070.pdf>
- Adnrews, R., & Entwistle, T. (2014). *Public Service Efficiency: Reframing the Debate*. London: Routledge.
- Afonso, A., Schuknecht, L., & Tanzi, V. (2005). Public Sector Efficiency: An International Comparison. *Public Choice*, 321-347.
- Alford, J. (2009). *Engaging Public Sector Clients: From Service-Delivery to Co-production*. London: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.
- Alford, J., & O'Flynn, J. (2012). *Rethinking Public Service Delivery: Managing with External Providers*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baral, L. R. (2000). *The Regional Paradox: Essays in Nepali and South Asian Affairs*. New Delhi: Adroit Publishers.
- Bhattarai, P. (2014, Nov 10). *Public Service Delivery: Role of Local Governments*. Retrieved from Gorkhapatraonline.com: <http://trn.gorkhapatraonline.com/index.php/op-ed/8808-public-service-delivery-role-of-local-governments-pranav-bhattarai.html>
- Borge, L.-E., Falch, T., & Tovmo, P. (2008). Public Sector Efficiency: The Roles of Political and Budgetary Institutions, Fiscal Capacity, and Democratic Participation. *Public Choice*, 136(3/4), 475-495.
- Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and Private Management: What's the Difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(1), 97-122.
- Butler, M., & Williams, H. P. (2002). Fairness versus Efficiency in Charging for the Use of Common Facilities. *The Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 53(12), 1324-1329.
- Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2007). *The New Public Service*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Doherty, T. L., Horne, T., & Wootton, S. (2014). *Managing Public Services- Implementing Changes: A Thoughtful Approach to the Practice of Management*. London: Routledge.
- Dunn, S., & Morgan, V. (2001). *Barriers to Access to Essential Services*. Officer of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister. Retrieved Nov 9, 2014, from <http://www.ofmdfmni.gov.uk/barriers.pdf>
- Forester, J. (1993). *Critical Theory, Public Policy and Planning Practice: Toward a Critical Pragmatism*. Albany: State University of Newark Press.
- Grabosky, P. N. (1995). Using Non-governmental Resources to Foster Regulatory Compliance. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 8(4), 527-550.
- Grand, J. L. (2007). *The Other Invisible Hand: Delivering Public Services through Choice and Competition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Haque, M. S. (2001). The diminishing publicness of public service under the current mode of governance. *Public Administration Review*, 61(1), 65-82.
- Högström, C., Davoudi, S., Löfgren, M., & Johnson, M. (2014). Relevant and Preferred Public Service: A Study of User Experiences and Value Creation in Public Transit. *Public Management Review*. doi:10.1080/14719037.2014.957343
- Jones, A., & Morris, k. (2010). *Managing Change: Responding to Reduced Public Expenditure in Yorkshire and Humber*. London: The Work Foundation. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from http://www.theworkfoundation.com/downloadpublication/report/249_public_expenditure140710.pdf
- Lawoti, M. (2007). *Contentious politics and democratization in Nepal*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications India.
- Madrick, J. (2009). *The Case for Big Government*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Mathis, K. (2009). *Efficiency Instead of Justice?: Searching for the Philosophical Foundations of the Economic Analysis of Law*. London: Springer Science & Business Media.
- May, E. R. (1997). The Evolving Scope of Government. In J. S. Nye, P. Zelikow, & D. C. Kind (Eds.), *Why People Don't Trust Government* (pp. 21-54). London: Harvard University Press.
- National Planning Commission [NPC]. (2007). *Three Year Interim Plan 2007/08-2009/10*. Kathmandu: National Planning Commission, Government of Nepal.
- Nelson, B. R. (2006). *The Making of Modern State: A Theoretical Evolution*. New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.
- OECD. (2013). *Government at a Glance 2013*. OECD Publishing. Doi:10.1787/gov_glance-2013-52-en
- Paul, S., Balkrishnan, S., Thampi, G. K., Sekhar, S., & Vivekananda, M. (2006). *Who Benefits from India's Public Services? A People's Audit of Five Basic Services*. New Delhi: Academic Foundation.
- Pierson, C. (2004). *The Modern State*. London: Routledge.
- Prottas, J. M. (1981). The Cost of Free Services: Organizational Impediments to Access to Public Services. *Public Administration Review*, 41(5), 526-534.
- Recanatini, F. (2008). *How Does Bribery Affect Public Service Delivery?* Washington DC: World Bank Publications.
- Regmi, J. C. (1978). *Political History of Ancient Nepal [Prachin Nepal Ko Rajnitik Itihas]*. Kathmandu: Nepal Academy.
- Regmi, M. C. (1979). *Readings in Nepali Economic History*. Vanarasi: Kishor Vidhya Niketan.
- Rousseau, J.-J. (2008). *The Social Contract*. (G. H. Cole, Trans.) New York: Cosimo, Inc.
- Saunders, P. (1990). *Social Class and Stratification*. London: Routledge.
- Schachter, H. L. (2007). Does Frederick Taylor's Ghost Still Haunt the Halls of Government? A Look at the Concept of Governmental Efficiency in Our Time. *Public Administration Review*, 67(5), 800-810.

- Stanley, D. T. (1999). Excellence in Public Service: How Do You Really Know? In R. C. Kearney, & E. M. Berman (Eds.), *Public Sector Performance: Management, Motivation and Measurement* (pp. 265-272). Colorado, the United States of America: Westview Press.
- Titumir, R. A., & Hossain, J. (2004). Barriers to Access to Public Services for the Urban Poor: An Enquiry into Dhaka Slums. *Journal of the Institute of Bangladesh Studies*, 27-46. Retrieved Nov 9, 2014, from http://www.unnayan.org/documents/International_Economic_Relations/Barriers_to_Public%20Services.pdf
- Upreti, B. C. (2010). Nepal: *Transition to Democratic Republican State*. Kathmandu: Gyan Publishing House.
- Weaver, C. (2008). *Hypocrisy Trap: The World Bank and The Poverty of Reform*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Whelpton, J. (2005). *A History of Nepal*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Annex 1: Sample distribution

Offices					
District	District Administration Office	District Development Committee	Land Revenue Office	Municipality	Total
Baglung	10	12	10	0	32
Banke	9	11	11	10	41
Bara	20	19	21	9	69
Bardiya	0	0	0	10	10
Chitawan	10	3	16	11	40
Dadeldhura	11	10	10	9	40
Dailekh	10	8	10	10	38
Dang	10	10	10	10	40
Dhading	11	10	10	10	41
Dhankuta	0	10	10	10	30
Dolakha	13	8	10	5	36
Gorkha	10	10	10	10	40
Illam	10	0	10	7	27
Jhapa	4	10	7	5	26
Kailali	10	11	9	10	40
Kanchanpur	11	10	9	10	40
Kapilvastu	9	0	10	10	29
Kaski	9	11	9	10	39
Lamjung	10	10	9	11	40
Makawanpur	10	10	15	5	40
Morang	0	10	9	0	19
Myagdi	10	10	10	10	40
Nawalparasi	10	6	16	8	40
Nuwakot	10	5	9	10	34
Palpa	9	10	10	9	38
Parsa	10	10	13	10	43
Pyuthan	10	11	0	10	31
Rautahat	10	12	9	10	41
Rolpa	10	0	8	4	22

Contd.

Rukum	8	10	9	17	44
Rupandehi	14	11	9	6	40
Salyan	10	10	10	10	40
Saptari	10	7	11	9	37
Sindhupalchowk	0	0	3	4	7
Siraha	10	10	10	10	40
Sunsari	10	11	10	10	41
Surkhet	10	10	11	7	38
Udaypur	10	11	10	10	41
Total	348	327	373	326	1374

Annex 2: Survey questionnaire

Quality of Public Service Survey 2016

Survey Questionnaire

Section 1: Background				
QN	Questions	Options	Code	Skip
101	Survey district	Select one from list		
102	Name of organization visited for services	District Administration Office District Development Committee Land Revenue Office Municipality	1 2 3 4	
103	Name of respondent (optional)		
104	Sex of respondents	Male Female Others	1 2 3	
105	Caste/ethnicity of respondents	Brahmin/Chettri Hill Janajaties Dalits Madehsi/Terai Origin Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5	
106	Age of respondents		
107	Highest completed education qualification of respondents	Illiterate Literate only Primary level Lower secondary level Secondary level Higher education Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
108	Current residence of respondents	District: Municipality:		
109	Current occupation/profession/usual activities	Agriculture Business Service (government or public sector) Service (NGOs or private) Daily wages Unemployed Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6 6 8	

Contd.

Section 2: Experience while accessing services				
201	Which service have you received from this [the visited] organization?	Citizenship related Passport related Relationship verification Land transfer Land revenue Business registration Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
202	For whom are you accessing services?	For my self For family members For others	1 2 3	
203	Are you alone or accompanied with someone else to receive this service?	Alone Someone else	1 2	207
204	If accompanied with someone else, with whom?	Family member Neighbour Friend Members of political parties Members of social organization Intermediary Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
205	Why did you accompany someone else for accessing the service? (Multiple response)	Necessary for receiving service No information about services For convenience of receiving services For convenience to interact with service providers Others (Specify)	! @ # \$	
206	Who pays the cost including transportation for person accompanying you?	I paid Individual	1 2	
207	How many attempts did you make to access this service?		Single attempt to go 209

Contd.

208	If made multiple attempt, what was the reasons for making multiple attempts? (Multiple response)	Lack of information about service Inadequate documents Absence of staff Insufficient money for service fee No electricity and other utilities Crowding of service recipients Work not completed on time Reluctance of staff Missing records Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	
209	How did you feel about while accessing the service?	It was convenient It was inconvenient/complicated	1 2	211
210	What was the reason for feeling inconvenient while accessing service? (Multiple response)	Lack of knowledge about service process No idea whom to ask about Lengthy process Inability to furnish required documents No cooperation from staff Unsystematic service process Crowd of clients Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	
211	How did you know about the service process? (Multiple response)	Own experience Citizen charter From person who have received previously From staff Intermediary or professional Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6	
212	Whose support did you take to receive service?	Self Relatives or known person Staff Intermediary Political parties Social organization Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6	
213	Do you have any personal introduction (relationship) with any staff in this organization?	Yes No	1 2	301

Contd.

214	Do you have any advantage of that relationship in accessing service?	Yes No	1 2	
Section 3: Time and cost for accessing service				
301	What is the distance (in KM) from your current residence and this service organization? (If cannot say in KM, ask walking time and convert into KM)		
302	How many hours does it take to reach here from your current residence? (Include time used in vehicle and walking)		
303	How did you reach here from your current residence? (Multiple response)	On foot Public transportation Private vehicle Rickshaw Others	1 2 3 4 5	
304	What amount of service fee did you pay for accessing this service? (Write '00' if not paid)		
305	How much did you spent on the following topic while accessing this service?	(Add cost for all persons who accompanied to receive service. Write '00' if not paid)		
	Cost of transportation		
	Lodging		
	Lunch and refreshment		
	Others (Specify)		
306	How many days did you spend to access this service? (Write in days)		
307	How many hours did you spend to access this service after reporting to office? (Write in hours)		
308	Do you have visit this office again for this service?	Yes No	1 2	
309	Did you take support of any intermediary to access this service?	Yes No	1 2	311
310	If yes, how much did you pay to intermediary? (Write "00" not paid)		

Contd.

311	Did you pay anything else than stated above for accessing service?	Yes No	1 2	401
312	If paid, how much did you pay?		
Section 4: Quality and Satisfaction about service				
401	To what extent are you satisfied with the service you have received?	Fully satisfied Partially satisfied Partially dissatisfied Fully dissatisfied	1 2 3 4	402 403
402	If satisfied, what were the reasons? (Multiple response)	Convenient service Service as expected Good behaviour of staff Systematic service Low cost Service in less time Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
403	If dissatisfied, what were the reasons? (Multiple response)	Inconvenient service Service not as expected Not good behavior of staff Unsystematic service process Expensive service Lengthy process Others (Specify)	1 2 3 4 5 6	



NEPAL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COLLEGE

Jawalakhel, Lalitpur

Phone: +977-1-5522160, 5523517, 552002

Fax: +977-1-5524906

URL: www.nasc.org.np

Email: rcsd@nasc.org.np

