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ABSTRACT
Complex decision making processes require a more informed citizenry that arrives at a mutually agreed upon decision or at least one by which all parties can abide. This calls for public engagement in planning activities. The central problem of this study is the need to know the determinants of methodology used to engage the public in planning public participation in Bomet County. Studies indicated that participation in planning activities is affected by methodology used. This enthused the researcher into study of the determinants of methodology in public participation which is the purpose of this study. There are limited studies on the alternate methods of public participation and the determinants on these methods. In light of the above, the study will carry out a study on the determinants of Methods of Public Participation (MoPP) in planning for the public participation forum. The independent variables in the study are the group dynamics, space availability, legal framework and the project scope while dependent variable is the methods of public participation i.e public hearing and community workshop. The theories to be used in the study are stakeholder and agency theories. Similar studies appeared not to have been carried out in Bomet County and therefore the county was purposively selected for the study. A literature review along with field research will be undertaken to examine the available information on methodology of public participation and it’s determinants. The researcher will carry out observation with categorized note taking on three public forums to observe the proceedings of the public participation forums. Three out of five Sub-counties i.e Bomet East, Bomet Central and Sotik will be purposely sampled. A sample of 10% to 30% is appropriate for the descriptive study. Random sampling will also apply during the pilot study in which interviewees from public officers will be randomly selected in the two sub-counties not involved in the main study. The data collected will be analyzed using frequency distribution tables and cross-tabulations which will be followed by chi-square confidence and significance level tests. The data will be presented in tables, pie charts, graphs and in narrative form. After study, determinants of MoPP in Planning for public participation event will be established. This will help close the conundrum of issues affecting the methodology in planning Public Participation.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research objectives, research questions, research premises, limitations and delimitation, significance of the study. It gives a solid foundation on which the entire study is based.

1.1. Background of the study

At the end of 1960s, public participation became vital subject where citizens and academics questioned the influence of authority in the decision-making process. Participation has captured the imagination and hopes of politicians, policy makers and practitioners alike (Stewart, 2017). Across the globe - we have witnessed ‘an explosion’ of interest in participation over the past decade; this is particularly true for public participation (Bryson, Quick, Slotterback, & Crosby, 2013)

One objects of the devolution of government is to enhance the participation of the people in the exercise of the powers of the State and in making decisions affecting them (Stokes, 2012). In article 196 of the Kenyan constitution, A county assembly shall— conduct its business in an open manner, and hold its sittings and those of its committees, in public; and facilitate public participation and involvement in the legislative and other business of the assembly and its committees.; Fourth Schedule, Part 2: The functions and powers of the county are— Ensuring and coordinating the participation of communities and locations in planning at the local level and assisting communities and locations to develop the administrative capacity for the effective exercise of the functions and powers of participation in planning at the local levels (Republic of Kenya, 2010). It is therefore a responsibility of the county to ensure active participation in the county level. Many proponents of participatory planning generally assume that given the opportunity all citizens will join in these efforts. However, the empirical literature increasingly recognizes that participation may be quite low because sustained participation in these forums can be quite demanding for individuals in terms of time, resources and even effort (Lane, 2005).
New approaches are beginning to address the need to empower communities through participation in decision-making processes this is in response to the outcomes of the United Nations Summit, the General Assembly (2010) which affirms the importance of the adoption of participatory and community-led approaches in national development strategies. Planning is one such arena where public participation and consultation is brought into the decision making process. Meaningful community participation must provide a conduit for learning amongst the participants (Tummers & Knies, 2013). Involving local people in community-based planning may create an arena for conversation between community members and other stakeholders and has the potential to generate positive social change (Braun, 2010).

Planners practice public participation because it aligns with their value systems, but they rarely expect it to achieve any measurable progress (Bryson & Quick, 2013). The danger got this is that the very principles of devolution such as involvement of people in their own planning is soon becoming a pipedream (Kibur, 2014). This emphasis for citizen participation underscores the fact that the election of representatives does not contradict the need for people to continuously be involved in planning processes (Banducci, Donovan, & Karp, 2004). Residents must be able to “see through” the workings of government to know exactly what goes on when public officials transact public business (Berner, Amos, & Morse, 2011). Government that is not transparent is more prone to corruption and undue influence because there is no public oversight of decision making (Luna-Reyes & Chun, 2012).

As the sphere of government closest to the people, public participation is a vital prerequisite for the successful functioning of county government. It is also one of the key tenets of democracy (Glucker, Driessen, Kolhoff, & Runhaar, 2013). According to (IAP2 International Federation for Public Participation, 2014)), it is important that public participation in planning and service delivery becomes a reality, experienced and lived by all communities. According to Gamble (2011), an informed citizenry aware of its rights and asserting them confidently, is a vital foundation for a national integrity system.
An apathetic public that does not take part in planning provides a fertile ground for widespread corruption, fraud and maladministration (Walker, 2012). Furthermore, participation in government empowers citizens with information and the vital tools to shape their own destiny (Kibiru, 2014). The premise is that public participation is an essential component of planning, because educating the community and implementing public preferences in certain planning actions leads to successful implementations of the projects, (Axelsson, Melin, & Lindgren, 2010). If local residents are directly involved in the planning process they will be able to identify with the reasons behind planning decisions and take ownership of implementing the objectives of the plans (SCHOLL & Luna-Reyes, 2011). There is no better watchdog than the eyes and ears of an involved constituency (David, 2010).

Many governors support the idea of public involvement in planning but in practice there is a considerable amount of cynicism among planners about the payback of citizen participation (Tarus, Gichoya, & Muumbo, 2015). As a result, community participation in planning elicits mixed reviews from decision-makers with some resisting public involvement because of increased costs, time and effort (Sifuna, 1998).

While public participation requires resources such as skill, time and money, it can generate numerous advantages (Muriu, 2014). Participants can contribute to decisions through providing new information, different ways of seeing an issue and motivation to address problems (Okello, Beevers, Douven, & Leentvaar, 2009). The dynamics of public engagement in governance are multi-dimensional and mutually constitutive. The execution of participation in governance has important consequences for constituting the public and even the private sector (Ahmed & Ali, 2006). Since historical times, the relationship between governance and public participation has existed in a complex dynamic (Guarneros-Meza & Geddes, 2010). For sustainable development, it is crucial to engage the public (Marks & Davis, 2012).
1.2. Statement of the Problem

Methodology in public participation is an important aspect in effectiveness and efficiency of the public participation forum. This is because of the impact it has on the total and breath of attendance and the subsequent effect on the level of participation in these forums. Public participation is important in planning as it educate and involve the affected community in every stage of planning decisions. Studies have shown that involving the public early and often in the planning process will increase the likelihood that the resulting plans, programs and public policy will be successfully implemented. If local residents are directly involved in the planning process they will be able to identify with the reasons behind planning decisions and take ownership of implementing the objectives of the plan. However, there are limited studies on the Methodology of public participation and the reasons behind a particular method in planning. To seal the gap therefore, there is a need to study on what influences this important component which has a significant effect on the effectiveness and efficiency of public participation event. This lands the researcher into the purpose of the study which establishes the possible determinants of public participation methods in planning public participation. The effectiveness of the public participation is measured by the final resolutions which are highly influenced by the level of participation. This study is crucial as it will help the planners to make the best choice of methodology in public participation and also help to address a gap that has occurred since the explosion of literature on Arnsteins’s ladder of participation (1969).
1.2.1. Research Objectives

The study will focus on the following objectives:

I. To determine the influence of project scope on public participation methods in planning public participation (PPP).

II. To examine the influence of legal framework on the method of public participation in PPP.

III. To evaluate the impact of space availability on the method of public participation in PPP.

IV. To investigate the influence of the group dynamics on the method of public participation in PPP.

1.2.2. Research Questions

The study will be guided by the following questions:

I. How does Project scope affect method of public participation in planning public participation?

II. How does legal framework influence public participation method in PPP?

III. How does Space availability affect the method of public participation in PPP?

IV. How do group dynamics affect the method of participation in PPP?

1.3. Research premises

In the study, the research will assume that:

I. Space availability could affect the method of public participation in planning public participation exercise.

II. Group dynamics could affect the MoPP in planning PPP.

III. Legal framework can influence the MoPP in PPP.

IV. Project scope may influence the MoPP in PPP.

V. The respondents of the study will provide honest answers.
1.4. Justification and Significance of the Study

The findings of this study have both practical and theoretical implications for the future county governments and national government. Theoretically, the study will be expected to contribute to the advancement of knowledge on the methodology used in Public Participation. To enhance active participation in planning, it is important to take into account the methodology of Public participation. Active participation improves the performance, thereby creating a good name for the County Government (CG). The study is of immediate benefit to the Ministry of Planning (MoP) in the formulation of future policies and on enhancing public participation in the CGs, service delivery and ultimately quality of planning services. The study will help future researchers in identifying research gaps which can be addressed in future studies on MoPP, even in other counties in Kenya.

1.5. Delimitations and Limitations

Although there could be many possible determinants influencing Methods of Public participation in planning, the study will delimit itself to only a few selected determinants namely: space availability, legal framework, project scope and group dynamics. There are also several Methods of public participation but the research will delimit itself to public hearing and the workshops. The study will be limited to Bomet County in three sub-counties which are: Bomet East, Bomet Central and Sotik.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORITICAL/ CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Review of Related Literature

Introduction

In this chapter, literature will be reviewed on selected topics on MoPP and the possible factors affecting them. The chapter will focus on the following sub-topics: public hearing, community workshop, Genuine vs. pseudo participation, space availability, project scope, formalities, group dynamics and finally, summary of the reviewed literature.

2.2 Methods of Participation

2.2.0 Introduction

Traditional public participation methods such as public hearings that rely on government experts too often become battles among angry citizens, practitioners and elected officials (Berner et al., 2011). New perspectives suggest that “scientifically” developed knowledge by experts is not the only, or even the best, form of knowledge for public decisions (Park, Peacey, & Munafò, 2013). Many governmental agencies today see value in collaborative dialogue with the public (Szkuta, Pizzicannella, & Osimo, 2014). The following sections review participation methods that are most prevalent in planning.

2.2.1 Public hearing.

Hearings and public scoping meetings are the traditional format for public participation (Brown, Montag, & Lyon, 2012). Public hearings are non participatory (Mkinen & Kuira, 2008). Most governments worldwide expose the public to quasi-judicial decisions via a public hearing. Staff reports are available beforehand so the public can educate themselves and speak to the issues or alternatives at the hearing (Ben Jemaa et al., 2015). Public hearings are run by a public staff and are largely informative. Staff presentations are given describing the proposed project, the moderator conducts a
question and answer period with staff followed by an opportunity for public comment (David, 2010). Participants typically prepare their comments in advance (Bryson et al., 2013). The public hearing adheres to the rational planning paradigm because it is usually a quasi-judicial process (Bryson et al., 2013). Expert knowledge is dominant when it comes to interpreting plans or policies, and lay knowledge is important only as it reveals general public preferences (Kimani, Ettarh, Kyobutungi, Mberu, & Muindi, 2012). The long-term success of participatory processes of public hearings depend on institutionally embedding stakeholder participation (Piper & Zuilkowski, 2015).

2.2.2 Community workshop.

Community workshops enables members of the public to directly influence the planning process (IAP2 International Federation for Public Participation, 2014). A presentation by county officials is followed by group activities that promote discussion and interaction among community members (Muriu, 2014). The product of group activities is then presented to all workshop attendants and planners use that input to craft goals, objectives, policies, programs and plans (Bryson et al., 2013). Pioneered by Henry Sanoff, community workshops typically involve games or methods that focus on hands-on design activities like sketching development maps and determining where land uses shall be located (Sanoff, 2000). Sanoff (2000) contends that the workshop is the best forum for public participation in community design because it enables every participant to have a voice. Structured workshops with small group activities give community members a chance to get their hands on a particular development problem in a less imposing environment than the public hearing (IAP2 International Federation for Public Participation, 2014). Small breakout tables elicit debate and eventual consensus-building among four to eight stakeholders (David, 2010). Those views are then shared with the larger group and the visioning process begins to take hold. Information flow becomes a two way dialogue between residents and county government (Theunissen & Wan Noordin, 2012).
Government officials often use workshops to determine public preferences about specific questions that stem from a larger predetermined feasible framework (Theunissen & Wan Noordin, 2012). Workshop activity results are evaluated with respect to sound design and governing principles, and translated to decision-makers through policy alternatives based on workshop outcomes (Kinyua-Njuguna, Munyoki, & Kibera, 2014). Many current practitioners of public workshops contend that technologies such as interactive “clicker” voting systems, participatory games, and visioning exercises help draw a representative sample of the targeted community, which strengthens overall public participation efforts (Marres, 2016).

2.3. Genuine vs. pseudo participation

Deschler and Sock (1985) divided participation into two distinct types: genuine participation and pseudo participation. Pseudo participation is defined by two categories: domestication, which involves informing, therapy and manipulation, and assistencialism, which is placation and consultation (Poplin, 2012). Genuine participation on the other hand is defined as cooperation – partnership and delegation of power – and citizen control which means empowerment (Ostergaard, Karasti, & Simonsen, 2016). The public hearing and other participation processes that present information about what is being planned for the community are pseudo participation. Genuine participation occurs when the community is involved in the decision-making process (Ngo, Kokoyo, & Klopp, 2017). These concepts are further illustrated in Figure 1, which is Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of differing degrees of participation and the corresponding levels of communication between the agency and the community (Arnstein, 1969).
2.4. Factors influencing methods of public participation

2.4.1. Project scope

The public gets actively involved in the process when the issue at stake relates directly to them (Xie, Yang, Hu, & P.C. Chan, 2014). The scope of workshops is far-reaching topic that affects everyone in the whole community. No decision is expected, just discussion of progress, issues, resolutions, and an opportunity to pose questions early in the process. The community at-large is being informed and the officials will make decisions another day.
Hearings frequently focus on development projects where the desired outcome is a policy interpretation, entitlement or permit (Bardach, 2012). Hearings occur at the end of a planning process, with other public participation events such as workshops first (K, 2016). They are formulated to get comments about whether people hate a project, love it or want to change it for instance. Policymaking has a broad focus that should incorporate public preference on goals and objectives.

However, when a county government acts as a “police power” making a determination on a project’s compliance with adopted standards, there is limited room for discretion (Ostergaard et al., 2016). Public input is constrained to influencing official decisions and reacting to proposed development actions, and findings suggest that a formal hearing is the most effective method for gathering this type of input.

2.4.2 Legal framework

Code of conduct at Public participation governs methodology of public participation. State law requires actions be made by votes on motions in public hearing. Legal framework is legally acquired through parliamentary procedures versus locally adopted (Albrecht, 2016). There are statutory requirements for certain aspects of a hearing, such as making a motion for actions, and making decisions on majority votes. Community workshop can follow Rules of Order, which are locally adopted guidelines consistent with State law (Nyerere & Friso, 2013). Limiting the public to three minute testimony is a local decision, and the Pledge of Allegiance is a personal choice. What are legally required are public notice and the right to be heard in Community workshop. Public hearings are “business meetings” that are not a good forum for engagement (Muindi, 2011).

On the surface public hearings meet their goals, but digging deeper reveals potential conflicts as actions taken in some hearings are the opposite of the majority public sentiment expressed at the time of the decision. Actions must be taken openly, but in most cases a great deal of the work and decisions are made before the hearing begins (Maraga, Kibwage, & Oindo, 2010). The people do not “yield their
sovereignty” or give their public servants their “right to decide”, power in the public hearing is in the hands of the commission, board, council or staff. This begs the question of how much an elected official represents its residents. It is difficult to visualize the representative nature of decisions being made at a hearing when public input is clearly subordinate to official deliberations. Formalities bring about a difference between an open meeting and a public hearing (Elkin-Koren, 2013).

2.4.3. Space availability

Space availability affects the physical layout of the meeting (Okello et al., 2009). Chairs, tables, podiums and screens that are setup prior to an event can clue participants on their roles (Bandelli & Konijn, 2013). Two layouts are predominant among meetings: lecture hall and roundtable (Farkas, 2013). Lecture hall setup implies a passive role with attendants as listeners therefore partakers of information. All chairs, fixed or movable, are usually facing the same direction, with eye contact trained on a speaker or panel of officials. A screen at the front of the room can sometimes replace a speaker as the object of interest. Conversely, a roundtable setup informs attendants they are there to be active participants in a small group discussion (Brownill & Parker, 2010). Workshops rely on a roundtable setup where attendants are face-to-face in a small group discussion thereby taking a large space (Makworo & Mireri, 2011). Hearings use a lecture-hall setup with participants in fixed seats facing the same direction focused on a presenter or official body.

Eye contact is directed inward to other members of the small group in community workshop. This setup empowers individuals to contribute, however contributions can only be heard by other participants at the table. Usually, there is more than one roundtable at a meeting, and conversations happen simultaneously throughout. This type of set up requires adequate space to set up the several roundtables (Pisarski & Ashworth, 2013). The lecture hall setup is always one speaker at a time, so that everyone involved can hear what that person has to say (Mwenda, Bregt, & Ligtenberg, 2013). Degrees of power are implicit in
the physical layout of a participation event. When seats are arranged lecture hall style, power rests with the speaker. Public hearings often are lecture hall settings with a raised dais, which separates the officials from the rest of participants with a physical barrier, and amplifies the relative importance of their role in the hearing, similar to a parliamentary chamber or courtroom (Farkas, 2013). Attention is focused on the moderator or chairperson, who is placed in the center of the dais and charged with managing the proceedings of the meeting. This layout uses smaller space than community workshop.

The roundtable setup occurs most in public workshops, blurs lines of power (Registration & Registration, 2012). When individuals are seated on the same level around a table, it is difficult to infer where the power lies. Without formal introductions an individual may never know that they were seated next to a county official for instance. The focus is no longer centrally-focused on a chairperson because the moderator is integrated into the group. The moderator is noted as “recorder” on the floor plan.

It is difficult to cultivate genuine participation in a lecture hall setting. The majority of participants take a passive posture in the seats provided before the participation event even begins. Clear lines of power can be drawn from this type of space planning that suggest authoritarianism by majority instead of cooperation and control by a minority. Roundtable settings break down this hierarchy of roles by seating all on the same playing field, which creates a communal atmosphere (Bandelli & Konijn, 2013).

### 2.4.4. Group dynamics

Wates (2000) contends that “behavior and attitude are just as, if not more, important than methods” in community planning. Hearing and workshops elicit different group dynamics such as behavior and attitude based on meeting structure and roles of participants (Kim, 2013). For instance, staff and officials speak the most in public hearings. Workshops contrast from hearings because there are usually no officials, therefore more time is devoted to public opportunities for speaking. The most effective public meetings place more emphasis on speaking opportunities for residents (Alper, 2015). Varying methods
of interaction also account for differences in speaker duration (Makworo & Mireri, 2011). Most hearings and some workshops follow an oratory to listener format, with the public assuming the role of listener instead of speaker. Wates (2000) suggests that this format is the “consultation” level of community involvement on Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of participation, when authorities plan after consulting the community. The crucial level that participation should achieve is “partnership”, whereby authorities and community members have equal opportunities to speak on an issue as they jointly plan and design.

Left to our own devices, most people can make wise decisions, assuming an appropriate level of knowledge to be applied. When those same people are put in a group, where peer pressures and herd mentalities may exist, it becomes important to recognize the pitfalls a previously-wise decision-maker can fall into (Kilonzo & Nyambegera, 2014).

2.4.5 Summary of the Literature Reviewed

From the reviewed literature it is clear that methodology of public participation is an important aspect in public participation and the Studies reviewed revealed that they can be influenced by project scope, group dynamics, legal framework and space availability. MoPP can promote or inhibit public participation in planning activity.

2.5. Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

2.5.1 Theoretical Framework

The study will use agency and stakeholder theory to simplify the explanation of the reality of the study of the possible determinants of MoPP.

2.5.1.1 Agency Theory

Based on Eisenhardt, (1989) Agency theory explains the introduction of limited liability and the opening up of corporate ownership to the general public through share ownership (Eisenhardt, 1989). This has a dramatic impact on the way in which companies are controlled (Mustapha, 2014). The market system is
organized in such a way that the owners who are principally the shareholders delegate the running of the company to the company management. One of the principal assumptions of the agency theory is that the goals of the principal and agent conflict (Bosse & Phillips, 2016). In finance theory, a basic assumption is that the primary objective for companies is shareholder wealth maximization (Boučková, 2015). In practice, this is not necessarily the case. It is likely that company managers prefer to pursue their own personal objectives, such as aiming to gain the highest bonuses possible. Managers are likely to display a tendency towards ‘egoism’ (behavior that leads them to maximize their own self-interest). This can result in a tendency to focus on projects and company investments that provide high short-term profits (where managers’ pay is related to this variable), rather than the maximization of long-term shareholder wealth through investments in projects that are long-term in nature (i.e. pursuant of short-termism). The agency problem presents shareholders with a need to control company management (Eisenhardt, 1989). Based on the theory, the aim of the county government, the agent, is to drive the interest of the constituents, the principle. In reality, the county government in most cases pursues its self-interest. This calls for public participation to control the county government. If the county government officials become resistant, then the electorates can use the extreme form of control by using their voting rights to remove them from the system, county government.

2.5.1.2 Stakeholder Theory

Father of the “stakeholder Concept” changed his definition over time. In one of his latest definitions Freeman (2004) defines stakeholder as “those groups who are vital to the survival and success of the corporation”. In one of his latest publications Freeman (2004) adds a new principle, which reflects a new trend in stakeholder theory. In this principle in his opinion the consideration of the perspective of the stakeholders themselves and their activities is also very important to be taken into the management of
companies. He states “The principle of stakeholder recourse. Stakeholders may bring an action against the directors for failure to perform the required duty of care” (Freeman 2004).

A basis for stakeholder theory is that companies are so large and their impact on society so pervasive that they should discharge accountability to more sectors of society than solely their shareholders (Shoemaker, 2011). Not only are stakeholders affected by the company, but they in turn affect the company in some way. They hold a ‘stake’ rather than simply a ‘share’ in the company. Stakeholders include shareholders, customers, suppliers, creditors, employees, communities in the vicinity of the company’s operations and the general public (Freeman 2004). The most extreme proponents of stakeholder theory suggest that the environment, animal species and future generations should be included as stakeholders (Brower & Mahajan, 2013).

The stakeholder relationship has been described as one of exchange, where stakeholder groups supply companies with ‘contributions’ and expect their own interests to be satisfied via ‘inducements’ (Freeman, Wicks, & Parmar, 2004). Using this analytical framework, the general public may be viewed as corporate stakeholders because they are taxpayers, thereby providing companies with a national infrastructure in which to operate. In exchange, they expect the companies as ‘corporate citizens’ to enhance, not degrade, their quality of life (Dong, Burritt, & Qian, 2014). Linked to stakeholder theory is the idea of corporate social responsibility. Companies are being encouraged to improve their attitudes toward stakeholders and to act in a socially responsible manner (Dobele, Westberg, Steel, & Flowers, 2014). The ‘pure ethics’ view assumes that companies should behave in a socially responsible way, satisfying the interests of all (Harrison & Wicks, 2013). Based on the theory, only after meeting these moral obligations could they attend to their obligation to maximize shareholder’s wealth. Company law, however, makes a purely ethics-motivated approach to business impractical, as companies have a legal and fiduciary obligation to maximize the wealth of their shareholders. This theory explain what the
counting government strive to achieve; maximize the utilization of resources to achieve economic stability in the expense of social welfare. The electorates, are the stakeholders of the county government and that as they pay taxes to ensure the smooth running of the county government operations, they should also receive benefit from the county government through satisfaction of their interest. The county government should be able to engage the constituents to participate in planning process which will establish a relationship of exchange (Tullberg, 2013)

2.5.2 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual frame work employs the use of drawings of diagrams to explain the interrelations between variables. Some selected variables that could possibly influence MoPP in planning public participation in BCG can be illustrated diagrammatically as shown in figure 2. According to Kombo and Tromp (2011), the term "variable" refers to differences. They are attributes or qualities of the cases that we measure or record. The independent variables to be studied are: space availability, legal framework, project scope and group dynamics while dependent variables to be studied are: Public hearing and community workshop methods of public participation. There are extraneous variables that have effect on the MoPP but are not studied. In this study they are attendance and geographical location. If the outreach is vast then the participants from the general public will be many which in turn influence MoPP. Geographical location affects accessibility of the forum. The researcher will therefore carry out the study in public forums which have the same level of similar median household income and populations.
Independent variables

- Project scope
  - Sensitivity of the project
  - Time schedule
  - Availability of options and choices
  - Opportunity availability for public comment.

- Legal Framework
  - Formalities
  - Equality legislation
  - Clear protocols

- Space availability
  - Limitations
  - Space planning
  - Degrees of power
  - Convenience of the location

- Group Dynamics
  - Independent facilitator
  - Methods of interaction
  - Speaker duration
  - Communication flow
  - Stakeholder’s awareness of the proposed project

Dependent variables

- Method of public participation
  - Public hearing
  - Community workshop

**Figure 2:** Conceptual framework.

**Source:** Field researcher, 2018
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This section describes methods that will be used to carry out the study. This includes the research design, measurements of the variables, location of the study, target population, sampling technique and sample size. It also covers construction of research instruments, pilot study, data collection techniques, data analysis and finally, logistical and ethical considerations.

3.2. Research Design

This study will use the descriptive research design to collect required data. The choice of the descriptive research design is based on the fact that, the study is interested in the state of affairs already existing in the field. This design method is appropriate because it enables the researcher to gather information concerning determinants of methodology of Public participation in planning using questionnaires and observation methods.

3.3. Measurement of the variables

Scores will be obtained through numerical scales by awarding values.

- Project scope - It will be measured by assessing the sensitivity of the project, time schedule for the project, availability of options and choices and the Opportunity available for public comment. This is ascertained during observation during the public participation.

- Formalities- Will be measured through administering questionnaires to the planners of public participation who will provide their response on the influence of formalities, equality legislation and clear protocols integrated on the method of public participation in planning. The findings will be ascertained through observation during the public participation.
• Group dynamics- This will be measured by assessing the role of independent facilitator, methods of interaction, Speaker duration, Communication flow, Stakeholder’s awareness of the proposed project on the MoPP in PPP. This will be ascertained through observation.

• Space availability- This will be measured by assessing; the setting during observation, the degrees of power, convenience of the location and the effect of limitations e.g time, finances on MoPP in PPP.

3.4. Location of the Study

The study will be carried out in Bomet County. The county is situated in the former Rift Valley Province of Kenya. Its capital and largest town is Bomet. The county has a population of 730,129 (2009 census) and an area of 1,997.9 km². Bomet County is a multiracial, multi-ethnic nation with citizens of diverse socio-economic, religious and cultural backgrounds co-existing with the collective will of making things better for future generations (Otteni, Saruni, Duron, Hedges, & White, 2013). The county has five Sub-counties but the study will be carried out in three sub-counties; Bomet East, Bomet central and Sotik. The three sub-counties have a population of 421,239 (2009 census). BC is my ancestral home and is the most appropriate choice due to understanding of the local language, the social life of the people and the finance logistics.

3.5. Target Population

The study will target all the stakeholders of planning in Bomet County; Bomet East, Bomet central and Sotik sub-counties. The informants for the study will include one sub-county administrator, three ward administrators and 30 heads of departments. This will make up a total of 34 respondents.
3.6. Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

3.6.1 Sampling Techniques

Multi-stage sampling technique will be used. Wambiri and Muthee (2010) state that the technique involves selecting a sample within each selected cluster. The sample will be selected in stages. In this study; Bomet County is purposively selected out of all the 47 counties of Kenya. Bomet East, Bomet Central and Sotik Sub-counties are purposively selected because, this is where the researcher grew and is conversant with the social, cultural and geographical setting. Interviewees will then be randomly selected from the county government officials responsible for public participation strategies. Three public participation forums for observation will be purposefully sampled in Bomet East, Bomet Central and Sotik sub-counties.

3.6.2 Sample Size

Sample size is the sub-population to be studied in order to make inferences to the reference population (Boddy, 2016). A sample of 10% to 30% is appropriate for the descriptive study.

Table 1. Sampling frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Percentage (20%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-county administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward administrators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of departments</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source; Bomet County Government
3.7 Research Instruments

3.7.1. Observation

This is the firsthand observation and categorized note-taking to gather data that informs comparative analysis across all cases (Yin, 2011). Observations about general data including methodology, location, date, time, duration, attendance, weather, and number of presenters will be made for each participation event. Additional data will be collected about meeting characteristics including: meeting purpose, level of dialogue, speaker duration, visualization tools, setting, stage in the planning process, method of interaction, communication flow, degrees of power and the existence of formalities. Opportunities to participate and the sensitivity of the project will also be observed. Ratings are subjective based upon what is observed.

3.7.2. Questionnaire

Another tool of data collection for this study is questionnaire. Questionnaire according to (Kothari & Kumar 2014) is a research instrument consisting of a series of questions and other prompts for the purpose of gathering information from respondents. The questionnaire design to collect information from all the sampled stakeholders responsible for planning Public participation. The questionnaire will include both close-ended and open-ended questions about public participation and determinants of MoPP in the planning process. The researcher will train and make use of two research assistants to distribute and collect the questionnaires which will be distributed by hand.

3.7.3. Pilot Study

A pilot study is a small study conducted in advance of a planned project, specifically to test aspects of the research design and to allow necessary adjustment before final commitment to the design (Janghorban, Latifnejad Roudsari, & Taghipour, 2014). Four Interviewees from the other two Sub-counties not selected for the main study i.e Chepalungu and Konoin will randomly be selected for this
study. Piloting will ensure that the research instruments have no potential misinterpretations (Arain, Campbell, Cooper, & Lancaster, 2010).

3.7.4. Validity and reliability of the instruments.

Validity is the credibility of the research (Zohrabi, 2013). It will be done by a pre-test survey which will iron out the ambiguity. The establishment of content validity will be enlisted to ensure that the items in the instruments will be related to the study, covered all the important areas and objectives of the study and ascertained that each text item would measure only what it was intended to measure (Mohamad, Sulaiman, Sern, & Salleh, 2015). Content validity will be done by seeking expert opinions. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), reliable instruments must be consistent, stable and likely to yield same results when administered in different settings under similar circumstances. The split-half technique of measuring reliability will be used during the pilot study. Test-retest technique will be employed whereby the pilot questionnaires will be administered twice to the respondents, with a one week interval. Then the scores will be correlated using Pearson Product Moment Correlation formula to determine the reliability coefficient (Sedgwick, 2014).

3.8 Data Collection Techniques

The researcher will seek clearance from graduate school to be allowed to conduct the study. Secondly, the researcher will proceed to Bomet County to seek permission to carry out the research. Finally, the researcher will approach the sampled Interviewees to seek permission and explain the need to carry out the study. Explanations concerning the research will be made. The researcher will also attend the public forums to observe the proceedings.

3.9. Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis involves scrutinizing data with the goal of highlighting useful information as well as suggestions and conclusions (Wambiri & Muthee, 2010). The study will apply both qualitative and
quantitative descriptive methods to process and analyze the data. The data obtained will be described in
detail by use of tables and charts to show the quantitative aspect. Qualitative data will be discussed,
organized according to what was observed and presented in narrative form. Cross-tabulations to
determine the relationship between variables will be done followed by a Chi-square test for each set of
variables. It will then be possible to establish the confidence levels of the interrelationships of the
respective variables.

3.10 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

After approval by Kenyatta University, permission to collect data will be sought from the Bomet County
Government. For ethical consideration, the researcher will respect the rights, needs, values, and desires
of the informants (British Psychological Society, 2014). The purpose for the study will be explained to
each respondent and assured the information obtained during the study will not be used for any other
purpose other than the study. Sensitive information will be treated as confidential. Plagiarism is also an
ethical, professional, and even legal concern to the researcher. To mitigate this concern the researcher
will use proper referencing in accordance with the American Psychological Association (APA) reference
style. Further, the researcher will submit the project report and findings for further scrutiny by not only
the relevant academic authorities, but also other interested stakeholders.
REFERENCES:


APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

Kindly respond to the questionnaire with ultimate honest in order to facilitate this study. Your identity will be kept confidential. Thank you for taking time to support this study.

Instructions

Please place a tick in the bracket for the most appropriate response. Where explanations are required use the spaces provided.

1. Gender

Male [ ] female [ ]

2. Organization: ……………………… Department: ………………………

3. For how long have you been in the organization?

0-5 years [ ]

6-10 years [ ]

Over 10 years [ ]

Section B: Project scope

4. In your opinion does project scope influence method public participation planning public participation?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If yes explain

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
**5a.** Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement assessing the degree of project scope in respect to method of public participation in planning public participation (key 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= moderate, 4= agree 5= strongly agree.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of the opportunity for the public comment and the subsequent inclusion in making decisions at the end of the meeting determines the method of public participation in planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity of the project is considered choosing the appropriate method of public participation to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time schedule for the project and the resources available determines the method of Public participation to use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree of impact of the decisions to be made at the Public forum influences the tool of public participation in planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project availability of choices and options impacts on the method of Public participation to be applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stage of the project in the planning process has an influence on the tool to be applied in planning public participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5b. Indicate other ways through which project scope influence public participation method in Public participation planning process.

...........................................................................................................................................

Section C: Legal Framework

6. Does Legal framework influence method of public participation in planning public participation?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes please explain

...........................................................................................................................................

...........................................................................................................................................

7a. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement assessing the degree of project scope in respect to method of public participation in planning public participation (key 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= moderate, 4= agree 5= strongly agree.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formalities influence the method of Public participation in planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality legislation determines the tool of public participation in planning public participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear protocols to enable the participants to work with one another efficiently and effectively affects the MoPP in planning public participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7b. Indicate other ways through which legal framework influence public participation method in Public participation planning process.

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Section D: Space availability

8. Does Space availability influence method of public participation in planning Public participation?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes please explain

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

9a. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement assessing the degree of space availability in respect to method of public participation in planning public participation (key 1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= moderate, 4= agree 5= strongly agree.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of the location influences the choice of the method of public participation in planning public participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of power in the public participation forum is important in determining the method of public participation in planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space planning influences the tool of public participation in planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of the meeting determines the method of public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participation in planning.

Limitations e.g time constraint, finances and resources available influences the tool of public participation in planning.

9b. Indicate other ways through which space availability influence public participation method in planning Public participation.

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

Section F: Group dynamics

10. Do group dynamics influence method of public participation in planning public participation?

Yes ( ) No ( )

If yes please explain

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………

11a. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statement assessing the degree of influence of group dynamics in respect to method of public participation in planning public participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent facilitator who acts as the moderator influences method of public participation in planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of power in the public participation forum is important in determining the method of public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participation in planning.

Methods of interaction account for the methodology used in planning public participation

Speaker duration among the staff and the public determines the method of public participation in planning.

Communication flow influences the tool of public participation in planning public participation.

Awareness of the stakeholders of the proposed project determines the tool of public participation

**11b.** Indicate other ways through which group dynamics influence method of public participation in planning Public participation.

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

**12.** Based on your understanding, which among the following determinants has a great influence on the methodology of public participation in planning public participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project scope</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space availability</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group dynamics</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Others                       | [ ]    | Specify………………..

Thank you for your co-operation
APPENDIX II: OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

This Case study checklist will be used to record information on the possible factors that affect Methods of participation in planning public participation.

A. General Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late arrivals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early departures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Project scope

Observation will be made on the;

1. Availability of the opportunity for the public comment and the subsequent inclusion in making decisions at the end of the meeting.
   Adequate [ ] Inadequate [ ]

2. Sensitivity of the project
   High [ ] Low [ ]
3. The time schedule for the project and the resources available
   Adequate [ ] Inadequate [ ]

4. The degree of impact of the decisions to be made at the Public
   Immediate [ ] Later [ ]

5. The project availability of choices and options
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. The stage of the project in the planning process
   Initial [ ] Middle [ ] End [ ]

C. Legal framework

1. Formalities exist
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. Equality legislation considered
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

3. Clear procedures to enable the participants to work with one another efficiently and effectively
   affects the MoPP in planning public participation
   Yes [ ] Minimal [ ] No [ ]
D. Space availability

1. Conveniency of the location
   Accessible [ ] Inaccessible [ ]

2. Degrees of power.
   Exist [ ] Minimal [ ] Inexistent [ ]

3. Space planning
   Round table [ ] Lecture Hall [ ] Both [ ]

4. Structure of the meeting
   Free form [ ] Fixed [ ]

5. Limitations e.g time constraint, finances and resources available
   Adequate [ ] Inadequate [ ]

E. Group dynamics

1. Independent facilitator available
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

2. Degrees of power in the public participation
   High [ ] Minimal [ ] Low [ ]
3. **Methods of interaction**
   
   Oratory to Listener [ ] Conversation [ ]

4. **Speaker duration among the staff and the public**
   
   Staff > public [ ] Public < Staff [ ]

5. **Communication flow**
   
   Public to Staff [ ] Staff to Public [ ]

6. **Awareness of the stakeholders of the proposed project.**
   
   High [ ] Low [ ]

---

**Any other comments**

---

**Thank you for your co-operation**
## APPENDIX III: WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing and Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission and Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX IV: BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY/ITEM</th>
<th>AMOUNT (KSH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Transport to gather literature review</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typing services</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Fare to the Library</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Printing of questionnaires and</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Research assistants @ 5000</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Travel to and fro the Public participation forums</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone calls</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typing services</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photocopies</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>10% of the total cost</td>
<td>6900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>75,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: MAP SHOWING BOMET COUNTY

Source: Map Google, 2018