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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRA</td>
<td>Commission for Revenue Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>County Development Indices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>Elgeyo Marakwet County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>International Development Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNBS</td>
<td>Kenya National Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVDA</td>
<td>Kerio Valley Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASDAP</td>
<td>Local Authorities Service Delivery Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOSTI</td>
<td>National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG-CDF</td>
<td>National Government Constituency Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>Participative Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SE)</td>
<td>Social Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>Social Exchange Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Environmental factors:** Conditions surrounding implementation and participation which are rules and regulation, laws, peace or war, that could influence, affect or moderate the relationship between participation and policy implementation.

**Lead agency:** Implementing agent or organization in charge of operationalizing a project or a Programme on behalf of the Government.

**New public management:** is an approach to run public service in government that can be used in public Administration to implement government policies

**Policy failure:** inability of a policy to achieve its objective, targets, leading to poor implementation, stalling or total collapse.

**Poverty:** is defined as lack of shelter, being sick and not being able to see a doctor, having no access to school and not knowing how to read and write, not having a job, having fear for fear for future, and living on one dollar a day or less

**Public policy implementation:** is actualization of government plans and programmes as solutions to existing societal problems.

**Public policy:** is a bottom-up approach in which the public deliberate, discuss, debate and decide on solutions to problems that are affecting them, which the government transforms to policies

**Social exchange theory:** is a socio-psychological and sociological paradigm that posits that human beings in a society or organization are constantly involved in a series of interactions that generate obligations

**Stakeholder participation:** means range of practices in which organizations takes structured approach in connecting with stakeholders.
**Stakeholder:** is any individual, group or party that can affect or be affected by implementation or participation in policy actualization.
ABSTRACT

Policy implementation is actualization of governments’ plans and programs as an answer to societal problems. It is a reaction by the government to the socio-economic problems affecting the residents of Elgeyo Marakwet county which is a semi-arid region in North Rift at the floor of rift valley of Kenya. The research was a case study done at Kabiemit ward that exhibits general population character of Elgeyo Marakwet county. In emulation to other researches done by development agents the researcher sought to determine effects of participation on policy implementation in effort to address the root cause of socio – economic problem mooted by poverty in the region. Policy implementation is successful if sufficient and effective participation by stakeholders is done in a free and secure environment. It’s focused on general policy implementation. The researcher investigated how participation affects implementation and then use the findings to improve on policy implementation. Two variables, policy implementation which was dependent variable and participation the independent variable with environment as the moderating variables have been used. Objectives were; to find out the effects of representation on policy implementation, to examine the effects of information exchange on policy implementation, to find out the effect of stakeholder interaction on policy implementation and to find out the effects of environmental moderation on relationship between participation and policy implementation. H01: suggested that there is no relationship between participation and policy implementation while H02: Information exchange has no significant effect on policy implementation and the third hypothesis H03, Suggested that stakeholder interaction has no effect on implementation. Research questions sought to answer or confirm the hypothesis above. The researcher preferred to use both research questions and hypothesis in this study. Most of government projects fail at early stages. The study sought to unravel the root cause of project failure and use the knowledge acquired to reverse under development in the area. The researcher used two theories to explain the situation, the Social Exchange theory as lead theory and the New Public Management theory. Conceptual framework showed the interaction between the variable and their indicators. The study used cross -sectional research design and descriptive statistics to explain the phenomenon. The target population was 410 adult residents of Kabiemit ward that attend public participation in the past as per past records in attendance registers of past sessions. A 10% of this was the study sample selected through simple random sampling. Questionnaires were used to get data that was analyzed using (SPSS) statistical package for social sciences version 23 and Spearman’s coefficient to illustrate relationship between the variables and present the findings for easy interpretation. The findings can used in improving policy implementation in future and inform the government of what to do to correct already stalled policies in the area. From the findings, majority of the respondents (65.9%) reported that there is a policy implementation within the community while only 34.1% disagreed that policy implementation within the community is not evident. There are factors that inhibit policy implementation which include existence of competition among different stakeholders, conflict of interest, mistrust among stakeholders and poor management. The study therefore recommends that the government makes use of more platforms when informing the public on the date, time, venue and topic of discussion and also on the relevance of the topic to the local people. It also recommends that proper monitoring and evaluation mechanisms be implemented with sufficient resources to ensure that policy implementation is successful. Regression result showed that increase in presentation by one unit would have a corresponding unit in policy representation equivalent to 0.463 units.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Public policy implementation is actualization of government plans and solutions to existing societal problems. Public organizations or private organizations are charged with implementing policies that address problems affecting the citizens so as to bridge development gaps, address poverty and in essence legitimize existence of governments (Holzer, Gabrielyan & Yang, 2018). According to Lipsky (2010), street bureaucrats are important implementers of government or organizational policies in the ground for they are in direct contact with the public that is affected by these policy decisions.

Ojha, Ghimire, Nightingale, Khatri and Dhungana (2016) argue that policy implementations is either bottom up approach in which the public deliberate, discuss, debate and decide on solutions to problems that are affecting them, or top – bottom in which the elite deliberate and formulate policies from the top and then through civil service they implement it on the ground without much input from the public.

Perry and Christensen (2015) postulate that to enhance development in developing countries, particularly in Africa governments need to involve people in problem solving strategies. Implementation of public policy is done by public administrators, project officers or development agencies on the ground, commonly referred to as street bureaucrats. The purpose of these policies is to solve societal problems and enhance service delivery. Researchers, administrators and other development experts seek the best ways to improve policy implementation and improve satisfaction of their citizens (Henry, 2017). Therefore the major question is how to improve implementation, what hampers successful implementation and what is the standard guide to successful policy implementation. This study seeks to unravel the cause
of policy failure in the target population and how to use knowledge gained from this study to improve policy implementation which in turn will improve of life of the citizens. Public participation is based on the belief that those affected by the decisions have a right to be involved in the decision-making process. Therefore, the organization or the implementer consults with the interested or affected individuals, organizations and government entities before deciding. It’s a two-way communication and collaborative problem-solving tool that aims at achieving better and more acceptable decisions. (International association for public Participation: (2009). This study will focus on general participation effects on policy implementation without bias to environment or climate. The researcher will investigate effects of participation on policy implementation and use the results in improving policy implementation in regard to Elgeyo Marakwet County. Major objective is to uncover the causes of policy failure in this region. Policy failure is inability of a policy to achieve its goals, targets hence not responsive to the societal problems which it was intended to solve.

Stakeholder participation means range of practices in which organizations takes structured approach in connecting with stakeholders (Beach 2009). Participation in policy implementation, hence aims at enhancing information exchange through consultation, deliberations, debates and dialogue among participants which in the end achieves change in attitudes, perceptions, understanding for the benefit of the policy and host community. Gamedia and Stagl observed that to make good scientific decisions, to provide or obtain useful input, scientists must interact with the society (Gamedia and Stagl, 2010).

It is worth pointing out that for effective and efficient participation and policy implementation to occur, a favorable moderating environment is vital. Legal framework, rules and regulations, social, political and economic factors must create conducive environment for citizen or
stakeholder participation and policy implementation both in public organizations or private for
development to occur. Hence, both participation and implementation depend on environment as a
moderating variable as confirmed by many organizational research studies. It’s therefore widely
acceptable that performance of both participation and policy implementation is affected by the
environment that they are actualized. Challenges posed to both therefore could include
economic, social, cultural, political, ecological and technological challenges (Mburu, 2011).

The exposure to raw conflicts over cattle, poverty and high level of underdevelopment while
working as an administrator in Elgeyo Marakwet, made me to seek solutions to the problem the
locals were facing. I resolved to study the cause of this problem, “policy failure” which was the
origin of most societal vices in the area, I thought if I ascertain the causes of policy failure, it will
be easy for administrators and development agents to address the problem and avoid failure of
the past.

The study as indicated above focuses on general participation and implementation regardless of
sectoral bias although citations that touch on environment and climate are meant to emphasize
the importance of public participation and adoption by international institutions. Kenya being a
modern democracy and with new devolution supported by constitution 2010 ascribes to Rio de
Jenairo declaration on environment and development that resolved the environmental issues are
best handled with participation of all concerned citizen at relevant levels (UNFAO 2000). “The
way policy options are presented can significantly impact the preferences and behavior of the
people” (Emir, 2016). Behavioral scientist has found that policy implementation as well as any
public programme can be improved by engaging various tools to change human behavior, to a
positive one, right attitudes etc. which reduces conflicts, increase acceptance and quality of
decisions made.
1.1.1 Elgeyo Marakwet County

Elgeyo Marakwet County is in Kenya in the North Rift in the Floor of Kerio Valley about 400km North of Nairobi. It has four (4) Sub Counties which are; Keiyo South Sub County, Keiyo North, Marakwet East and Marakwet West Sub counties. The study area is Kabiemit ward that is inhabited by all sub tribes of Elgeyo Marakwet and with uniform culture and a common identity. Elgeyo Marakwet County (EMC) had 369,988 people in 2009 census and has an area of over 3049.7km$^2$. Its headquarters is at Iten town, the area of study was Kabiemit ward with 8756 registered adults per IEBC reports of 2017. (KNBS-National population census, 2009).

This study aimed to reveal the cause of poor policy implementation and underdevelopment leading to poverty among Elgeyo Marakwet people. Kabiemit ward covering Tumeiyo, Maoi and Kabiemit locations occupied by Marakwets and the Keiyo sub tribes is a perfect representation of the entire Elguyo Marakwet county.

Poverty is defined as lack of shelter, being sick and not being able to see a doctor, having no access to school and not knowing how to read and write, not having a job, having fear for future, and living on one dollar a day or less. (World Bank Organization).

Poverty is thence a multifaceted phenomenon that is mainly defined by inadequacy of everything in life leading to material destitution, illiteracy, ill health, poor diet or total lack of the same, high mortality rates and generally poor living standards and low quality of life. In Kenya, Commission for Revenue Allocation defines poverty as living on or below one dollar a day (CRA working paper No.2012/1).

CRA is mandated by Kenya constitution 2010 to develop county development index to act as a guide for distributing resources.
The 2012 CRA report categorized Elgeiyo Marakwet County as poor and lagging behind in development. Hypothetically the root cause of poverty in development among the Keiyo’s and general Elgeiyo Marakwet residents to a significant extent is wrong behavior and attitudes that tend to oppose every policy leading to high policy failure in the region and exposing residents to water shortage, food scarcity, perennial cattle rustling which are just symptoms of the core problem which is policy failure. This study is to examine the cause of such behavior and attitudes and then address the same, (Emir 2016).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The overall research problem addressed in this study is the high levels of poverty among the residents of Elgeyo Marakwet that has been occasioned policy failure. This has exposed the community to a myriad of symptomatic problems leading to poverty, conflicts particularly cattle rustling, water shortage and food shortage affecting women and children mostly because of their social roles.

Most of water projects are initiated by the Ministry of Water and CDF. Massive collapse of water projects emanates from general failure of policies due to disagreements, abandonment, lack of support and finally end up stalling or getting vacated all together. The core problem is policy failure. Though the highlands are blessed with large water reservoirs in Kipkabus forest complex and many other riparian areas, though backed by sound policies, efforts to actualize these policies into tangible water projects to provide clean tapped water for domestic and agricultural use, wrangles and disputes hitched in clannism, bad politics and other selfish interest have in many instances undermined government policies. This has led to rampant poverty, food insecurity, youth idleness, domestic violence, homicides, suicides, juvenile delinquencies, defilements and excess indulgence in into illicit brew menace. According to National Police
Service brief on crime profiles between 2010 and 2016, shows that women and children are the most affected by this situation. (Kenya National Police Service Report 2010 to 2016).

The Kerio Valley covers Keiyo South and Keiyo North, Marakwet East and West that are climatically semi-arid though the Kimwarer and Arror dams that are being implemented by Kerio Valley Development Authority (KVDA) is intended to address the problem by introducing irrigation and zero grazing in future. Kimwarer dam is also facing serious resistance from the community. The Kenya Fluorspar Mines which is the only Company in the area closed the doors in 2014 following disagreements and conflicts by the host community over land worsening the problem of unemployment.

1.3. Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to examine the effects of participation on policy implementation and use the findings to improve policy implementation and participation to realize development objectives in Elgeyo Marakwet County.

1.4. Objectives of the study

i. To find out the effects of representation of stakeholders in decision making on policy implementation.

ii. To examine the effects of information exchange on policy implementation.

iii. To establish the effects of stakeholder interaction on policy implementation.

Each objective had indicators that measure performance as to when each objective has been achieved these are representation, information exchange, stakeholder interaction, consensus, support and acceptance.
1.5. Research Questions

i. How does public representation through participation affect policy implementation?

ii. What is the effect of information exchange on policy implementation?

iii. What is the effect of stakeholder interaction on policy implementation?

1.6 Study Hypotheses

\( H_{01} \): There is no relationship between Representation and policy implementation

\( H_{02} \): Information Exchange has no significant effect on policy implementation

\( H_{03} \): Stakeholder does not affect policy implementation

1.7 Justification and significance of the study

The study enabled the public and stakeholders an opportunity to input on matters affecting them. Kenya as a country can as well be able to successfully implement her development policies successfully. Policy implementers gained knowledge and important information useful in policy implementation.

1.7.1 The Government of Kenya

Public administrators, policy implementers, government agencies decision makers and lead agencies in projects will use the findings to enhance consultation, collaboration, engagement and empowerment of the participants.

1.7.2 Host Community and Beneficiaries

The residents and the beneficiaries will get a chance to exchange information and knowledge on government policy implementation and understand the cost benefit analysis of public projects.
1.7.3 County Government

Through engagement, the County Government will be able to get citizens inputs and feedback on policy decisions thereby improving acceptance, legitimacy and success rates of projects. This in the long run will be supportive to development initiatives and eradicate poverty.

1.7.4 Researchers and Academicians

They were able to re-evaluate the relevance and applicability of social exchange theory which is the basic theory in this research. The study will be able to cement the significance of public participation on the success of public policy. In this study we shall be able to re-evaluate the importance of both new public management (NPM) and bottom-up theories in implementing policies.

1.8 Scope and Limitations of the Study

This research examined the effects of public participation on policy implementation in Elgeyo Marakwet County.

The limitations anticipated in this study were the following: -

Respondent failure to co-operate in answering the questionnaires were addressed by honest briefing and explanation on the reasons and importance of the study and an assurance that any information given will be kept confidential and were not be used subversively in future.

Language barrier would be addressed by recruiting research assistant who understand the local language and explain the entire project to the locals in their mother tongue.

Failure to volunteer information due to the official secret act where appropriate were addressed by presenting the introduction letter obtained from the faculty to enable the respondents to supply as much information as the study sought.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Empirical Literature

2.1.1 Policy Implementation

A study by Neera, et al. (2017) observed that policy implementation at local level in Yunnan province in China between 2009 and 2010 was below the expectation of the public. The study employed a qualitative method to study the explanatory nature of his research. The research design was a field survey between 2013 and 2015 at Luliyang. The critique provided here is that the environmental conditions in Yunnan province of China may be unique to the other areas of the world and may affect the results.

Li et al (2013), Chen et al (2014) are in agreement that questions still remain unanswered on how to increase adaptive capacity of local communities on ongoing changes and extreme events that are either programs or public policies initiated by government (Chen et al 2014). Feng Li, Zhuo Chen, Shaojun, in 2017 worked on research dealing with empirical investigation of an Equity Trading Strategy published in the management science journal of April 8th 2017. The research was done in Shanghai. The method employed was quantitative analysis. Critique appropriate here is that the study is on finance and of science in nature and therefore may not be very useful to explain a social phenomenon. (Li et al 2013).

Mugwagwa J, et al (2015), while assessing the implementation and influence that supports research and innovation systems for health sector in Tanzania, Mozambique and Senegal found that the rate of implementation is generally poor. He attributed this to environmental challenges like lack of enforcement laws, lack of accountability mechanisms, inadequate financing and policy incoherency thereby emphasizing the importance of environment on policy implementation. (Mugwagwa 2015). Method used in this study was review of past government
documents like various reports and in-depth interviews. Mugwagwa (2015) employed case study in the above areas to show the status of policy implementation for research and implementation. The knowledge gap here is that not many researchers have sought to know how policy implementation can be impacted by public participation.

In policy implementation, clear objectives must be identified by the lead agencies and same information passed to the host communities to improve their understanding on the entire policy. Enkark and Mbula (2017) observe that absence of objectivity and “verifiable standards” makes the entire policy a mere judgmental work prone to subjectivity. This weakens the study and the outcome is not credible as well as eliciting more conflicts among the stakeholders. This increases the chances of failure in policy implementation. To avoid the above scenario appropriate criteria and logical weighting of issues in any policy or research is essential, (Ofir et al, and 2016).

Yule (2010) while working on Research Excellence in Canada with the International development Research Centre (IDRC), observed that range of research quality dimensions have to include utility, accessibility of the quality and end user. It’s therefore logical to conclude that policy implementation should also embrace research excellence element so as to benefit the users who are service consumers (Yule, 2010). In their study on research excellence in Africa: Policies, perception and performance, the method used was online surveys that dealt with 106 online respondents in different places of Africa. About 80% respondents provided a myriad of responses. The concern on this works is excellence on research techniques and not effects of public participation on policy implementation creating a knowledge gap that this research intends to cover.

Michael Hill and Frederic Varone (2016) imputes public policy as a tool of solving societal problems which is complex and therefore a multifaceted approach is needed to fully comprehend
and implement it in the most apt way to reap maximum benefits from it. He goes further to state that no single framework that offers a comprehensive explanation of public policy.

Konyango, O. T. et al (2018) conducted a study on influence of public participation on policy implementation in Kenya where they used descriptive correlation design and questionnaire on 20 Ministries and 153 Parastatals to confirm if the gap between policy and practice is a governance gap. The study found that public participation had influence on successful policy implementation and therefore a determinant of policy implementation in Kenya.

Nda, (2010) observed that policy implementation is important in the life of a people of any country to a point that it shapes their daily lives and might lead to war or peace as cited by Konyango O et al (2018).

L Hooghe, et al, (2009) in a British Journal of Political Science posits that consensus is achieved when groups or individuals with dissenting views reach a common ground where their ideas and views agree. It’s generally a creative and dynamic way of reaching an agreement in opinions of all members of a group.

Z. Master, et al, (2013) in his study on Science and Engineering Ethics observed that to gain public support and acceptance on any policy, public trust is fundamental.

Beach (2009) notes that stakeholder participation refers to a range of practices in which organizations take structured approach in connecting with stakeholders. Organizations engage stakeholders for purposes like acquitting them with organizational accountability and responsibility, stakeholder contribution to the organization, risk control, positive organizational image construction and establishment of managerial control.
Mikiko Nishimura (2017) posits that community participation in school management has great potential in removing mistrust and closing distance between community and school thereby nurturing transparency of information, culture of mutual respect and joint goals of improving the school.

Gladys Kibera (2013) in her works of assessing stakeholder participation in implementing of ICT software in Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology observed that acknowledging the significance of beneficiaries of a project or policy is crucial to that particular project or policy. Researcher also noted that more weight has to be put on stakeholder participation so as to build awareness, set realistic expectations, raise support, minimize resistance, and ensure successful implementation and adoption. Gladys Kibera (2013).

The research employed qualitative and quantitative approaches in collecting and analyzing data that led to the conclusion that right from identification to project implementation, organizations must involve the stakeholders. Given that the study was done in university an environment with high literacy rates, respondents unlike in rural setting the results are only applicable to similar situations and more research that covers general public participation on common citizenry needs to be done.

P. Akoth Oloo and Bula (2016) researched on influence of junior employee participation in decision making in Nairobi Uchumi supermarket chain and found that in today’s ever changing and competitive business environment firms must involve the work force in decision making to improve their capacity to generate more competitive ideas, reduce conflict of interests and change employee behavior. While using stratified and random sampling with aid of structured questionnaires, the researcher analyzed data using descriptive and inferential statistics to
emphasize the importance of employee participation in decision making for organizations to improve their performance.

A. Gyau, M. Mbugua and J. Oduol (2016) analyzed determinants of participation and intensity of participation in collective action on production and marketing of Avocado in Kenya whereby the use of binary choice decision models was analyzed with logit models to find out that age, education, gender, perceptions on knowledge and improved technology influenced farmers decision making to participate in group activities.

The research covered a limited field that is business like and could be influenced by other motives like anticipated prices, profits, taxes, competition and government regulations yet these components do not feature. A need to examine the influence of participation in policies that don’t have direct personal benefits is crucial to shed more light on general participation.

Goffrey N. Kwena (2012) researched on factors affecting community participation in management of development projects under Local Authorities Service Delivery Action Plan (LASDAP) in Kilgoris, Narok County, and using qualitative approach gathered data through past document analysis and field interviews to find out that governments must create an enabling environment free of institutional obstacles to realize success of development projects. The study covered a small local government sector under LASDAP exploring local government projects under that program leaving out general government policy realm which is implemented on the general population.

Odhiambo and Taifa (2009) further posits that participation is important because it helps to inculcate a sense of ownership, reduce resistance to new ideas, strengthen local capacities and afford a voice to poor and marginalized as well as providing the much-needed checks and balances to civil servants with the excess powers of discretion.

Amolo, O. A. (2010) in her paper “Citizen Participation in devolved governance in Kenya” published by institute of social change identified thematic areas crucial to any participation. This are citizen awareness, capacity building, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, feedback and reporting mechanisms. She further observed that participation occurs in two forms either indirectly or directly whereby the people can themselves be involved in implementation or participation process or by use of elected representatives.

2.1.2 Representation and policy implementation

Representation is rooted in believe that one acts as an agent to the other though criticism is contrary to this believe in most cases representatives act and push for their own conscience (Lowery, D, 2013).

Christian Strohal (2011) posits that key to effective political representation and meaningful participation in a democracy is to engage all citizens so that they feel they are part of the society and its institutions. He further stresses that representation increases responsiveness, responsibility, belongingness, and improved decisions and generally promote trust. All these close the gap between stake holders and the organizations. (Christian S. 2011).

In a research that sought to examine the quality of stake holder engagement (SE) in sustainability reporting (SR) analysis it was found that Stakeholder Management Approach (SMA) is the most applied in majority of cases than SE approach. A critique on this is that SE needs be improved
from being a simple means of influencing stakeholders to an effective instrument for engaging
stakeholders in company decision making process. (Lawrence, R & Bateman, N 2013).

Mokoena (2011) in a qualitative study, investigated the extent to which South African rural
schools, understood, perceived and implemented participative decision making (PDM) in
management of rural schools. While highlighting achievements and challenges in
implementation of PDM, the research found that there was need for management to create space
for stakeholders to debate and participate actively in school management Boards or other
governing bodies.

Robinson et al (2010) examined vision for public participation in management of water
resources as enshrined in the Kenya constitution water Act 2002, focusing on pastoralist
communities. The act envisions that responsibility of managing water resources among the
pastoralists be bestowed upon local community bodies. Applying qualitative study that
interviewed the Gabra, who were actively involved in meetings and discussion groups he found
that a deliberative method was better than “institutional model” that was being employed through
formations like Water Resource user Association (WRUA) which proved to be a problem to
nomadic pastoralists that were ever on the move. Important findings by other studies stressed the
need to incorporate host communities and surrounding stakeholders in decision making process
and implementation of policies to contain and address complaints from the public. This is well
captured by Abiero (2010) in works that centred on Sondu Miriu hydroelectric project in Kenya
that established stakeholder challenges in management of projects that could also replicate on
policy implementation.

Another study to determine effects of stakeholder’s participation on performance of road projects
by KenHA in which user involvement, technology for management support, or resources in
stakeholder’s involvement were enlisted as variables. The study employed descriptive research design and both qualitative and quantitative methods. The study found that awareness, feasibility, conferences and seminars in user involvement had a great positive influence on road performance: (Oloo 2016).

The critique is that the study does not reveal, whether similar effects or influence would be experienced on policy implementation. Further research to determine influences or effects of the same on public policy implementation. Could other research designs and methods yield similar results to policy implementation? (Oloo 2016).

2.1.3 Information Exchange and policy implementation

Information exchange between stakeholders is crucial for the success of any policy implementation and therefore a vital requirement in public participation. It is through information exchange that good qualitative decisions are made and important inputs from the stakeholders are obtained by the organization. Gamedia and Stagl (2010).

Reeds (2008) posits that all positive relationships that mobilize the organizational synergies, visions and objectives are supported by stakeholders only if there is trust as a foundation of the organization. Stakeholders support the management of an organization or the government if they trust them. With trust, stakeholders cooperate more, challenge less, are easy to retain, interact with and agree with organizational objectives. (P. Muthoni. M. (2014.)

R. Bandeira-de-Mello (2011) found that stakeholder’s interaction and information exchange has a positive impact on performance during his research on effect of stakeholder’s interaction on organizational performance which could be extended to mean positive effects on policy implementation.
Tiankai Wang, (2012) conducted a study to examine adoption and utilization of Electronic health records systems (EHR) in long term facilities (LTF) in Texas and found that data sharing between various Health care facilities, departments, laboratories and physicians improved surveillance practice and improved preparedness to counter epidemics.

The study employed mixed design methods that embedded qualitative methods within quantitative techniques. He used quantitative data to report rates, timeliness, report completeness and accuracy.

Further he noted there was a reduction in costs, improved patient safety, and easy efficient access to more timely interventions, and availability of surveillance data for public health organization. Important conclusion by this study is that health information transmitted electronically contributed largely to the successful implementation of electronic health information record systems in Texas. (Tiankai W. 2012).

Richard Elmore and Mike Solomon (2015) did a study that confirmed Tiankai’s findings where the researcher did a systematic review of future needs of health information exchange by use of ICT. In this study whose basic idea was to detect challenges and examine outcome of health information exchange systems, identified and reviewed 34 past studies on H.I.E done between January 1990, and February 2015, with an objective of systematically reviewing, available research on H.I.E outcomes and analyze future research needs.

The researchers used dual review technique to extract data on clinical information from citations selected from data bases in pacific North West evidence-based practice center, Oregon, University of Portland and the United States of America where there were disagreements, the researchers used adjudication to harmonize the same.
Electronic Health information exchange between diverse public health players enhanced interaction of an important health cadre of stakeholders resulting to improvement of health care policy in a variety of score cards, namely cost effectiveness, surveillance, safety and policy implementation rating which reflected positive effects of participation on policy implementation (Richard Elmore and Mike Solomon 2015).

Critique: The study dealt with scientific health research citations, and corroborated data obtained electronically that originated from medical professionals. Further research on effects of stakeholder’s information exchange on social policy implementation, in environments that involves the public that is not educated to the level of professionals like health workers need to be researched on and documented.

2.1.4 Stakeholder Interaction in policy implementation

The beneficiaries who are mostly from the host community have to interact with implementing agencies, financiers, experts, and government officials etc. to create the understanding and teamwork necessary for the successful implementation of policies.

Miriam et al (2011) researched on improving cross agency collaboration in New Zealand and found that interaction between stakeholders acted as “enablers” by removing barriers between the stakeholders.

Community liaison officers have been found to play a critical role in developing and maintaining good relationships with communities around the sites of projects and in explaining and demystifying Public policies to ease the work of implementing agencies and reduce resistance.

Policy implementation is a complex change process that transforms government decisions into programmes, procedures regulations or practices aimed at social improvements. Amy DeGroff, and Margaret Cargo (2009) Evaluated policy frameworks to determine challenges facing policy implementation, and the study explored network governance, social political context, democratic turn, and new public management. The study employed exploratory design to evaluate various policy frameworks putting into consideration the political environment around each framework and found out that policy implementation, being a complex change process that involved many players at multiple levels in unstable environment that changed regularly, interaction between and amongst stake holders was fundamentally essential. In this case, the host community, implementing agency (lead agency), the financiers, regulators and government officials must interact at all stages for successful policy implementation.

Further conclusion, is that meaningful dialogues, debates and negotiations among diverse parties in a democratic secure environment, improved policy implementation by encouraging knowledge transfer, utilization, diffusion and actualization of policies. (Degroff, Margret 2009)

2.2 Theoretical Literature Review

2.2.1 Social exchange theory:

Social exchange theory (SET) is a socio-psychological and sociological paradigm that posits that human beings in a society or organization are constantly involved in a series of interactions that generate obligations. Emerson, (1976). These interactions are interdependent and contingent on the actions of another person. Blau (1964). SET therefore emphasis that these interdependent transactions have the potential to generate quality relationships though on certain circumstances. George Homans (1961): Social behavior as exchange defined social exchange as an activity
tangible or intangible that is more or less rewarding or costly between at least two persons or parties.

The relevance of social exchange theory (SET) to this study is on the premise that people or society make decisions on any government program or policy based on the anticipated benefits of the activity in question. The society employs SET as framework to make a judgment on the economic and social viability of a policy which informs the type of reaction to the policy. Richard Emerson (1976).

Social exchange perspective posits that people calculate the overall worth of a particular relationship by deducting its costs from the rewards it provides.

Due to theoretical ambiguities of this model its application is dependent on an incomplete and unspecified set of ideas yet social exchange theory remains most influential theory in explaining social and organizational interactions.

This theoretical ambiguity with SET has led to multiple interpretations and also has not fully defined ideas that form its core tenets leading to systemic inadequacies. This has created the gap for further research e.g. in what specific societal or organizational setting do we expect social interactions to elicit the anticipated behavioral actions? And is it in all situations? Conditions that reinforces them and are they specific to specific people? All these forms the knowledge gaps to be researched further.

For the propose of this study, SETs model explains how participation of stake holders in policy implementation can affect social exchange behavior, improve communication, information and knowledge exchange through active and objective structured engagement of stakeholders by way of debates, deliberations concessionary tradeoffs, dialogues, consultations etc. so as to forge the
synergy needed to push a policy implementation process to success. The rule of reciprocity guides the society in a “give and take “transaction, where the society accepts to cede some benefits (valuables) in exchange of bigger or more valuable gains. Gouldner (1960). When the anticipated benefits equal the foregone values then equilibrium is reached and consent is given, though in many occasions, the society must understand the gains they stand to reap from a policy being implemented supersedes the benefits ceded. Cook and Emerson (1978) noted that at times “negotiated rules” demands that goods and valuables being traded must be clearly explained and understood explicitly in quid pro quo, than on reciprocal exchanges.

Meeker (1971) posits that guiding rules to differentiate personal from group decisions must be established guided by principles of rationality, Altruism, (a rule that one person seeks to benefit another person) group gain, (“common pot for all) rank equilibrium or status consist where the allocation is based on one’s station or position in the social group and lastly the principle of competition which is diametrically opposite of Altruism. However as noted by Linden et al (1997) the process of social exchange is not well known and hence referred to as the “black box” of social exchange theory.

In participation rules to guide debates, decisions and the entire policy implementation must be spelt by the lead agency. The values of transparency, accountability, equality and equity, mutual respect, recognition of every ones’ contributions and all values of good governance must be embraced and practiced. The importance of mediating roles played by regulations and policies in such an undertaking is sacrosanct to the success of any policy implementation. UN, department of Economics (2011).


2.2.2 New Public Management Theory (NPM)

New management theory was born out of contention that actual management might be affecting performance of both public and private entities. The relevance of this theory to study of participations effects on policy implementation is to find out whether boardroom private sector management techniques that views stakeholders as customers could be replicated into public undertaking where governments could view stakeholders as clients/customers and seek to satisfy their need for service. Research has for many years tried to estimate the effect of public management on public program performance Akkerman, Torenvield (2011).

Boyne and Walker (2006), Boyne and Brewer (2010), among others have found that though the management style impacts on performance results of both public and private entities several aspects also do have weighty influence on the results. Factors like resources, environment, technology and work-related problems also lead to success or failure of programs. It’s all about “context” affecting performance. Simply put is how the management boards/governments execute their work, may be impacting on the overall results. “Context” in this case refers to the situational opportunities and constraints that affect the occurrence and meaning of organizational behavior and functional relationship between variables. (Johns 2006:386).

The focus in this theory for purposes of this particular study is to find out how employment of new management techniques in managing public programs can build the support and catalyze synergy needed in pulling societal efforts to policy implementation by injecting the needed support and minimizing resistance.

This in the long run is hoped to mitigate against poverty and inject development in the target population.
New public management is an approach to run public service in government that can be used in public Administration to implement government policies. The approach originates from the UK and Australia in 1980’s as efforts to make public service more “business-like” and improve its performance by use of private sector management techniques. In 1990’s the NPM was generally accepted as “gold standard for administrative reform”. New public management managers have a greater discretion and freedom to decide on how to best achieve their organizational goals, unlike old public management administration model that was rigid and decision making was dictated by laws, regulations and organizational traditions. Old administration model, disregarded customer service needs, tastes and preferences and denied mangers an opportunity to use their entrepreneurial and innovational capability for the benefit of the organization. Faraznad, Ali (2006).

Sahlin- Anderson (2001) and Smullan (2007) did a detailed investigation on this theory as applied in various EU health systems and found that due to diverse intellectual roots associated with the theory interpretation and implementation varied from one country to another. (Daniel Siomonet 2011).

Reschenthaler GB. (1996) argued that no single theory of public management, whether positive or normative, that is good for all time or all circumstances. NPM was necessitated by citizens’ dependence on service which were provided by government under monopolies thereof due to lack of competitors’ government began to take citizens for granted (Osborne 1993). NPM has been ignited by two forces one of the needs for sociopolitical and economic changes in the world and the ever-increasing demand for state services and complexity of the society. The need to provide social equity service delivery and good governance forms the main reason for researchers, administrations and policy makers to look for new effective management approaches

Kabolian (1998) identifies main drivers of NPM as increased efficiency, Decentralization, increased accountability, improved resource management and marketization. This replaced rigid hierarchical organizational structures with flexible more dynamic networks of zonal organizational units (Pollit and Bonchaert (2004), cited in Paliulis and Chlivickas (2004). This approach replaced Authoritarian top –down decision making with bottom-up approach that is more consensual, which facilitate participation of as many stakeholders as possible, especially ordinary citizens. (Pollit and Bouchaert, (2004) as cited in Paliulis and Chlvidias (2004).

2.3 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework shows relationship between variables. Policy implementation is the dependent variable while public participation is the independent variable. Environment is the moderating factor. To achieve maximum benefit of stakeholder participation policy implementers must have high quality stakeholder’s engagements by ensuring intensive and extensive publicity and correct constitution of participation session forms the standard practice in public engagements or stakeholder’s involvement. The environment in which participation and policy implementation occurs has to be enabling and facilitative for better results.

By conducting intensive and investigative data mining in past records of participation sessions the researcher will determine how participation would affect policy implementation. Extensive and effective publicity of every meeting to ensure a wide range of stakeholders is informed, and actually invited to every public engagement is necessary to ensure the overall effect on support, information exchange, and general acceptance of the policy is achieved.
During the interaction of the two variables, a moderating factor is the environment. The environment of any public engagement needs to be peaceful, conducive, free and constant. The lead agency here needs to create a conducive environment for a free frank debate and information exchange to occur; Information exchange is key in any public participation to improve decisions made. Earlier studies have stressed the importance of participation in decision making particularly by those who are to be affected by the decisions being made. Hence the importance of information access by the public. (UN 1992) Rio de Janeiro declaration on environment and development.

In preparation for any public engagement, analyzing the environment for any threats or opportunities to be seized to benefit the engagement is important. It’s always essential to scan the environment in order to mitigate against any negative traits that may interfere or deter the success of the participation at the same time seize opportunities available or identify risks and threats in the environment for proper management and mitigation. Ming Yang, Faisal Khan, Rehan Padig (2011).
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Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

Source: Researcher (2018)
2.4 Research Gap Summary

Research on policy implementation and participation is scanty particularly one dealing with effects of participation on policy implementation. Studies on performance, decision making, health information exchange systems in medical institution settings, representation in courts and ICT linkage with participation in medical set up or field has been sufficiently covered. More research on policy implementation and participation of general public as an important stakeholder in government policy need to be done.

Abiero (2010) study sought to establish challenge of stakeholder management in implementation of Sondu Mirui hydroelectric project, but how involvement of stakeholders in policy implementation in other areas involving general populace in a broader spectrum, is yet to be researched.

Robin, Sinclair and Spalino (2010) examined vision of public participation in respect to Kenya water Act, among the pastoralists, (Gabra) with focus on institutional management Visa Vis other deliberative processes. This does not highlight or delve on effects of participation to other government policy implementation that do not touch on public utilities. Hence the need to find out the effects that participation would impute on other general public policy implementation and among non-pastoralists. The study should establish other factors that would have affected policy implementation, instead of participation in general.

Studies on stakeholder participation on performance (Oloo, 2016) on project implementation, like road projects by KenHA have to be replicated on policy implementation to quantify effects of participation on policy implementation. Projects being products of policies, can succeed only if the mother policy succeeds.

Amy DeGroff and Margret (2009) worked on policy framework to determine challenges facing policy implementation in a complex social political setting with focus on governance, democratic turn and new public management leaving out a gap on effects that would be experienced on policy implementation if we had scientific way of measuring participation impacts on implementation. Research on health information exchange (HIE) in a public health system has been sufficiently documented unlike literature on ICT contribution to public participation and
policy implementation. How to use ICT in enhancing participation and how this would affect policy implementation is a grey area, for further research.

Abdala S. (2012) explored ICT use in information and knowledge sharing in United Arab Emirates health systems and found positive effect of knowledge sharing between departments, hospitals and health personnel that led to reduction of costs, improved surveillance, improved patient safety, timely conclusions and completion of health policy implementation within United Arab Emirates. Stakeholder participation on project implementation would reap similar benefits if properly implemented. Research on how ICT could be tapped to improve on policy implementation and gauge effects of participation of stakeholders on general government public policies needs to be further researched. Research on how to improve the quality of participation and measure effects of participation on policy implementation needs to be further researched and documented.

Participation effects on policy implementation is yet to be quantitatively measured and further research to develop tools that can quantitatively measure the magnitude of gain or loss to policy implementation instead of general indicators.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter largely dealt with research design, study area, study population and sample size, data collection instruments, validity and their reliability, data collection procedures, data analysis and, Ethical considerations in respect to the study.

3.1 Research Design
The study used descriptive design. This design is most apt because it provides a complete and true picture of the population and phenomenon of the study. Njoroge, Muathe and Bula (2015) observed that descriptive research design offers a clarification as to how and why there is a relationship between various aspects of a phenomenon or a situation. Both descriptive and cross sectional approach are most apt for the study since it’s the best in information collection, response to questions, and can investigate and explain the underlying issues on various variables that lead to phenomenal behavior in question as well as describe and explain relationship between variables.

3.2 The Area of Study
The area of study was Kabiemit of Elgeiyo Marakwet, county. The county is in North Rift valley and borders Pokot County on the West, Baringo County on the East, Uasin Gishu on the South and Trans Nzoia on the North west. It has a population of 36998 people and it is 3049.7km² in size. Kabiemit ward is made of Tumeiyo, Kbiemit and Maoi locations, occupied by both the Keiyos and Marakwets. They both share a common culture language and climatic conditions and a way of life. Kabiemit ward has 8756 adults as registered by IEBC 2017. (The National Census of Kenya 2009, and IEBC 2017).
3.3 Target population

Population refers to a group of person or elements that exhibit similar characteristics. It refers to an entire aggregate of people who share common culture, beliefs, geographical area, environment, identity etc. In this case, the people of Elgeiyo Marakwet, who inhibit Kabiemit ward are Marakwets and Keiyos. The study target 410 people who have been participating and managing past participation sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sampling Percentage</th>
<th>Population Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tumeiyo location</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maoi location</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabiemit location</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>410</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Past records of Baraza and meetings attendance in three locations as per records in chiefs offices of three locations.

3.4 Sampling Techniques and sample size.

Simple random sampling was used to select the population of 410 people who frequently attend participation sessions and 10% of this people will be used as respondents to questionnaires. Simple random sampling was suitable because it is a non-probability technique in which any respondent who meet a defined criterion would participate in the exercise. The criteria in this case was availability, accessibility, geographical proximity and willingness to participate. (Ilker Etikam et al 2016).
3.5 Data collection instruments

Questionnaires are convenient tools that are used in collecting information from respondents. The instrument is most apt for this study because of its simplicity, clarity, easy to compare and analyze the data.

The questionnaire posed closed and open-ended questions with some sections having structured questions that are framed to address each thematic area and a table of questions aligned to each objective. In international journal of medical Education (2011), researcher M Tavakol and R Dennick noted the import of questionnaire as a research instrument.

3.6 Primary Data

Primary data was collected by use of questionnaires answered by respondents identified randomly but resourceful.

3.7 Secondary Data

Secondary data was collected by mining data from past records of public participation sessions and meetings like barazas sourced from county Government and National government administrators, NG-CDF offices, Education offices and implementing partners specifically KVDA. The engagement sessions will be categorized as administrative barazas, consultative meetings, education meetings, and profession or occupation consultations exemplified as chiefs barazas, parents school meetings, county Government/NG-CDF, consultative meetings and farmers/Sacco meetings.

Malewa L.Netal (2014) ICT integration in Higher learning found while evaluating ICT Based Education and student’s behavior in Arusha, Tanzania, its only Questioners that could be used to
collect data needed, hence questionnaire items are the most reliable. For easy analysis a linkert scale with weighted rating will be employed particularly in Yes or No questions.

3.6 Reliability and Validity

3.6.1 Reliability

Reliability refers to a measure of consistency of results in many repeated trials. Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), John Orodho (2003) and Shale (2014) noted that reliability is concerned with dependability, or stability of a test, according to Nachamias and Nachamias (1996). It’s about consistency of results.

Hence, the consistency in which respondents reply to questionnaire items or individual scores remain relatively the same. In (1951) Cronbach Alfa test, which was used to provide measures of internal consistency of the tests conducted, where values were expressed as a number between 0 and I (0.1……………1.0).

In computation of Cronbach’s Alpha technique, the Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 23 was used and as Tavakal (2011) observed reliability coefficients equal to or higher than 0.7 are acceptable as indication of reliability as also used by Gathima & Njoroge (2017).
Table 3.2: Reliability Test Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Policy Implementation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.9222</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8586</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Information exchange</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7526</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Stakeholder Interaction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8268</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.84</strong></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pilot data (2018)

Table 3.2 above shows all the variables attained the acceptable and recommended level of alpha 0.7. The overall research instrument was therefore highly reliable, with Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.84.

3.6.2 Validity.

Validity deals with relevance of questionnaire issues, in relation to objectives of the study.

Validity refers to how well the idea in theoretical construct is represented in the questionnaire, which in this case is the operational measure. (Kembe, and Leung, 2008)

Establishing the validity and the reliability of evaluating questionnaires. The questionnaire should be free from systematic, face, and content errors (Tavakol 2011). There are various forms of validity that should be ascertained and assured for an instrument to be valid.

Content validity affirms whether actually the instrument accurately measures what it was intended to measure. The researcher conducted a pilot study to test and a panel of experts to test the validity of the study instrument.
3.7 Data collection.

The researcher obtained all appropriate permits and authority to carry out the data collection. The researcher also sought permission from various authorities and in this case they were; Elgeiyo Marakwet county, NGCDF, Keiyo South, Kerio Valley Development Authority (KVDA) and Kenyatta University and NACOSTI.

3.8 Data Analysis.

The researcher categorized the sample population into males and females, professional’s level of education and occupation so as to analyze the number of males and females that attend public participation per month, types and quality of attendees. The researcher analyzed quality of participation by determining the education level, occupation or social status of attendees. The study also analyzed the number of respondents that support most of issues in the study. Analysis also sought to explain some situations for instance it was found that more men than women attended public barazas in Tumeiyo unlike in Kabiemit where more attended barazas than men. Analysis will also seek to explain challenges faced by participants that may hamper effective participation e.g. distance, ignorance, indifference, lack of facilitation, age or gender issues. Analysis of the data will also answer question whether stakeholder’s resolutions are included in implementation of policies.

After receiving well filled questionnaire, the researcher coded and edited them to ensure they were complete and consistent. The researcher reorganized and reviewed responses to correct any errors and then allocated quantitative values using the likert scale. The researcher used SPSS version 23 to process the data and used spearman coefficient to explain the relationship between participation and policy implementation. The researcher used graphical illustrations to present and interprets results.
Quantitative values in accordance to Likert scale were attached to each response and their totals, means, modes and other statistical tools used to analyze the data and have a credible conclusive finding.

The following regression equation was used as a model to explain the relationship:

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1 E_1 + \beta_2 E_2 + \beta_3 E_3 + \beta_4 E_4 + \varepsilon \]

Where,

\( Y = \) policy implementation

\( \alpha = \) constant

\( \beta_1 \ldots \beta_4 = \) beta for the four variables

\( E_1 \ldots E_4 = \) represent any four indicators

\( E_1 = \) elected representatives

\( E_2 = \) filed Liaison officers

\( E_3 = \) debates

\( E_4 = \) environmental moderators

3.9 Ethical considerations and management

As mentioned above, the researcher got the relevant permit from the authorities as indicated below.

Introduction letter from NACCOSTI, Kenyatta University, permit from Elgeiyo Marakwet County, KNBS, NG-CDF Keiyo South Constituency, KVDA.
The researcher held formal discussion with local administration and give the relevant guarantees and assurances, address confidentiality of information and give the names of research assistants to the community and the leadership.
CHAPTER FOUR: EMPIRICAL RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study and is organized as follows: First, descriptive statistics showing the respondents profiles and characteristics are presented to show the degree to which data represents the population of interest. Secondly, pre-estimation diagnostic tests are presented and, finally, testing of hypotheses is presented thematically, based on the objectives.

4.2 Reliability of Research Instrument

The coefficient of internal consistency was used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire used in this study. It was tested using Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient. According to Wuang and Su (2009), a Cronbach’s alpha value equal or greater than 0.7 is regarded to be a good internal consistency.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics

4.3.1 Response Rate

A total of forty one questionnaires were administered and all of them were correctly filled and returned. This represented a response rate of 100 percent. The results are shown in the table below.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Respondents</th>
<th>Successful Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) and Saunders, et al., (2007), a response rate of 50 percent is adequate, 60 percent is good, and 70 percent is very good. Therefore, the response rate
of 100 percent was excellent and hence acceptable for drawing conclusions from the study findings.

4.3.2 Gender of Respondents

The study sought to determine the gender of respondents and find out the distribution of each gender in the managerial positions. The results are shown in the table below.

Table 4.2: Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018

Table 4.2 shows that about 63 percent of the respondents were male and 37 percent were female. This shows that men are more involved in decision making than women.

4.3.3 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

This section presented the demographic characteristics of respondents, based on age, level of education and occupation. The results are as shown in the table below.
Table 4.3: Age, Education and occupation of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>20-30 years</th>
<th>31-40 years</th>
<th>41-50 years</th>
<th>51-60 years</th>
<th>61+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Polytechnic</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Medical officer</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Social worker</th>
<th>Farmer</th>
<th>Business person</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Activist/political</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018

4.3.3.1 Age of Respondents

The results in the table above shows that a majority of the respondents, 29.3% of the respondents were aged between 31-40 years followed closely by age group 41-50 years at (24.4%). About
20% were aged between 20 – 30 years, 17% were aged between 51 and 60 years and nearly 10% were above 60 years. From these findings, it is clear that the most active age brackets are between 31 and 50 years which constituted about three quarters of the participants in public affairs.

4.3.3.2 Education Level of Respondents

The results in table 4.4 above shows that 53.7% of the respondents completed studies at the secondary level while only 7.3% made it to the university. About 20% had primary education and 19% had tertiary education. This shows that the respondents have the capacity to understand and participate in governance matters and also had the capacity to understand the questionnaires and give valid responses.

4.3.3.3 Occupation of Respondents

The results in table 4.4 above shows that the participants came from diverse occupational backgrounds which included teaching, health, engineering and civil. This implies that public participation in Elgeyo Marakwet County is diverse and inclusive.

4.4 Policy Implementation

Policy implementation was assessed using policy characteristics, implementing agency and factors affecting policy implementation. The results are shown in table 4.5 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you meet to discuss and learn more about participation in policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation in your ward?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is information exchange among stakeholders important for policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you periodically updated on policy implementation progress in your area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you discuss progress, challenges and solutions facing policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation in your area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What difficulties do you face during information exchange sections in your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of information materials</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge gap</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B, and C.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you like to be included in the information agenda?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current calendar for meetings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose, objectives and venue for meetings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing information to the public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What facilitation would you like to be provided to participants to enhance information exchange?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informing the public of ongoing activities through publications</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting with the public on specific issues through workshops</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing and distributing reports to assist public in evaluating follow-up</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018

The results in table 4.5 above shows that 65.9% of the respondents meet to discuss and learn more about participation in policy implementation in their wards. Another 73.2% agreed that information exchange among stakeholders important for policy implementation while 36.8% disagreed. On whether the participants are periodically updated on policy implementation progress in their areas, 61% of the respondents disagreed while 39% affirmed that there is periodical update on policy implementation progress in their areas. The study also sought to identify what difficulties the participants face during information exchange sections in their area and a majority of them (63%) identified knowledge gap as the major difficult they face while 31.7 identified shortage of information materials and 5% identified language barrier. The results further shows that a majority (56%) would you like current calendar for meetings included in the information agenda while 36.6 preferred purpose, objectives and venue for meetings. On what facilitation they like to be provided to participants to enhance information exchange, majority identified informing the public of ongoing activities through publications, about one third preferred consulting with the public on specific issues through workshops and a similar number identified preparing and distributing reports to assist public in evaluating.
4.5 Representation and Policy Implementation

The effect of Representation on Policy Implementation was assessed using five indicators and results presented in the table below.

**Table 4.5: Representation and Policy Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders represented in decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10 (24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15 (36.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders attend most of participation functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24 (58.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative articulate issues affecting stakeholders including special interest groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12 (29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative views are accepted and included in policy decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>15 (36.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5 (12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder contributions are reflected in final policy implementation plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10 (24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16 (39.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018
The likert results were presented in the raw form to indicate the strength of the choices made. It shows that a majority of the respondents agreed that stakeholders are represented in decision making, they strongly agreed that stakeholders attend most of participation functions and agreed that representatives articulate issues affecting stakeholders including special interest groups. The results further indicated that the respondents strongly agreed that the views of representatives are accepted and included in policy decision. The respondents also agreed that stakeholder contributions are reflected in final policy implementation plans. Overall, the results showed that stakeholders are well represented in decision making and that representatives are allowed to articulate issues affecting stakeholders including special interest groups within the community.

The result confirms similar findings by Robin, Sinclar and Spalino (2010), Reeds (2008), Amolo O.A. (2010) and other scholars who confirmed that participation enhances chances of successful policy implementation and the wider participation the easier implementation becomes.

### 4.6 Information Exchange and Policy Implementation

The relationship between Information exchange and policy implementation was assessed Five items and results presented in table 4.7 below.

**Table 4.6: Table 4.7: Information exchange and Policy Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of information amongst stakeholders enhance policy implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16(39.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10(24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10(24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different stakeholders do compare notes and exchange ideas during consultative meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>23(56.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6(14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3(7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5(12.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information exchange ease tensions, create consensus, understanding and acceptance of implementation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8(19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15(36.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13(31.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5(12.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information materials is regularly given to stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8(19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9(22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13(31.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Free open and democratic information exchange take place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10(24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15(36.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5(12.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018

The results in table 4.7 shows that a majority of the respondents (39.0%) strongly agreed that exchange of information amongst stakeholders enhance policy implementation another 24.4%
agreed. Another 24.4% of the respondents disagreed and 9.8% strongly disagreed that exchange of information amongst stakeholders enhance policy implementation. The results further showed that more than half of the respondents strongly agreed that different stakeholders do compare notes and exchange ideas during consultative meetings, 14.6% agreed, 7.3% were neutral, 12.2% disagreed while 9.8% strongly disagreed. The results further showed that majority of the respondents agreed that information exchange ease tensions, create consensus, understanding and acceptance of implementation process. About 20% strongly agreed while about one third disagreed and 13% strongly disagreed. Overall, the results showed that Information exchange promotes policy implementation in Elgeyo Marakwet County. Just as R. Bandeira-de-Mello (2011) and Clare Bebington, et al (2017) found that community and implementing agency interaction improved information sharing majority of the respondents agreed that Vital information is shared through interaction as well as improved relationship between the players

4.7 Stakeholder interaction in policy implementation

The study assessed Stakeholder interaction in policy implementation using five items and results presented in the table below.

Table 4. 7: Stakeholder interaction in Policy Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community do interact with implementing agency regularly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10 (24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>10 (24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community lead Agency relation improve after each interaction session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17(41.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3(7.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda for interaction is jointly developed by the stakeholder</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12(29.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10(24.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5(12.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes and resolutions are recorded and taken by implementing Agency after each session for future reference</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24(58.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8(19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6(14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3(7.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Agency make use of minutes and resolutions to improve on policy implementation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7(17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8(19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14(34.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8(19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018

The findings in table 4.8 showed that 24% disagreed and another 24% strongly disagreed that the community do interact with implementing agency regularly. Nearly 15% strongly agreed and 20% agreed. The results also showed that majority (41%) of the respondents disagreed that Community lead Agency relation improve after each interaction session and about developing agenda for interaction, 29% strongly agreed that developing agenda for interaction is jointly developed by the stakeholder. The majority of the respondents (58.5%) strongly agreed that minutes and resolutions are recorded and taken by implementing agency after each session for future reference. About 20% agreed, 14.6% disagreed and 7.3% disagreed. The results further
indicated majority of respondents (34%) were neutral about the Agency making use of minutes and resolutions to improve on policy implementation. Nearly 20% disagreed and another 19.5% agreed while 17.1% strongly agreed. Generally, the findings showed a high interaction between stakeholder interaction and policy implementation.

4.8 Regression Analysis

In this study, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to test the effects of public participation on policy implementation. However, before the tests were carried out, it was necessary to test the significance of the model. The study used statistical package for social sciences (SPSS V 20.0) to code, enter and compute the measurements of the multiple regressions. The regression results are shown in Table 4.9 below

**Table 4.8: Usefulness of the Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.2467</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 2018

Adjusted R Square is coefficient of determination which informs us of the variation in the dependent variable due to changes in the independent variable. From the findings in Table 1 the value of adjusted R² was 0.653, an indication that there was variation of 65.3% on policy implementation due to changes in public participation at 95% confidence level. The adjusted R-squared is 65.3%, means that the independent variables jointly account for approximately 65.3% of variations in the dependent variable, while the remaining 34.7% is explained by other variables not included in the model. Therefore, the model can reliably be used to test the influence of public participation on policy implementation.
Table 4. 9: ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>74.507</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.309</td>
<td>17.919</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>109.113</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183.62</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher, 20118

ANOVA table (test using alpha = 0.05)

The overall model was significant F (3,112) = 17.919, P < 0.05, R² = 0.653

P-value (Sig.) = .000 which is less than .05 therefore R-square is significantly greater than zero.

The independent variables account for a significant amount of variance in dependent variable, thus the regression model is significant.

Table 4. 10: Regression Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.824</td>
<td>13.495</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>2.422</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Exchange</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>3.546</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>6.350</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2018)

The regression model below was computed using regression results in the table above.

Y = 9.824 + 0.463X₁ + 0.396X₂ + 0.768X₃ + ε
Where:

\[ Y = \text{the Dependent Variable (Policy implementation)} \]

\[ X_1 = \text{Representation} \]

\[ X_2 = \text{Information Exchange} \]

\[ X_3 = \text{Stakeholder} \]

\[ \varepsilon = \text{Error term} \]

4.9 Testing of Hypotheses

The study used the regression results above to test three null hypotheses.

\( H_{01} \): There is no relationship between Representation and policy implementation

The coefficient of representation is positive and significant at 0.463 and \( P \) value = 0.001 < 0.05. At five percent level of significance, the study rejected the null hypothesis. The regression results further indicated that increase in representation by one unit would have a corresponding increase in policy implementation by 0.463 unit. Similar findings were reported by Mokoena (2011) who found that there was need for management to create space for stakeholders to debate and participate actively in school management Boards or other governing bodies. Similarly Robinson et al (2010) found that a deliberative method was better than “institutional model” that was being employed through formations like Water Resource user Association (WRUA) which proved to be a problem to nomadic pastoralists that were ever on the move. Abiero (2010) stressed the need to incorporate host communities and surrounding stakeholders in decision making process and implementation of policies to contain and address complaints from the public.

Regression result for each objective starting with representation with a real coefficient of 0.463 and information exchange with a real 0.396 and community lead agency interaction with 0.768
shows increase in each coefficient affects implementation in a measure equivalent to indicated coefficients.

**H$_{02}$: Information Exchange has no significant effect on policy implementation**

The coefficient of Information Exchange is positive and significant at 0.396 and P value = 0.013 < 0.05. At five percent level of significance, the study rejected the null hypothesis. The regression results further indicated that increase in representation by one unit would have a corresponding increase in policy implementation by 0.396 unit. Similar findings were reported by Reeds (2008) that all positive relationships that mobilize the organizational synergies, visions and objectives are supported by stakeholders only if there is trust as a foundation of the organization. Stakeholders support the management of an organization or the government if they trust them. With trust, stakeholders cooperate more, challenge less, are easy to retain, interact with and agree with organizational objectives. Bandeira-de-Mello (2011) found that stakeholder’s interaction and information exchange has a positive impact on performance during his research on effect of stakeholder’s interaction on organizational performance which could be extended to mean positive effects on policy implementation.

**H$_{03}$: Stakeholder does not affect policy implementation**

The coefficient of Stakeholder is positive and significant at 0.768 and P value = 0.017 < 0.05. At five percent level of significance, the study rejected the null hypothesis. The regression results further indicated that increase in Stakeholder by one unit would have a corresponding increase in policy implementation by 0.768 unit. These findings are supported by Tiankai (2012) who noted there was a reduction in costs, improved patient safety, and easy efficient access to more timely interventions, and availability of surveillance data for public health organization. Important conclusion by this study is that health information transmitted electronically contributed largely
to the successful implementation of electronic health information record systems in Texas. Similar findings were reported by DeGroff, and Cargo (2009) found out that policy implementation, being a complex change process that involved many players at multiple levels in unstable environment that changed regularly, interaction between and amongst stake holders was fundamentally essential. In this case, the host community, implementing agency (lead agency), the financiers, regulators and government officials must interact at all stages for successful policy implementation.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of the major findings from the study based on the research objectives, conclusions from the findings and recommendations derived from the conclusions. The study sought to find out the effects of public participation on policy implementation in Elgeyo Marakwet County. This was guided by the following specific objectives; To find out the effects of representation of stakeholders in decision making on policy implementation; To examine the effects of information exchange on policy implementation; To establish the effects of stakeholder interaction on policy implementation.

A total of 41 participants took part in the research where 26 were males and 15 were females. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics with the aid of SPSS version 23 for Windows and also Spearman coefficient was used to explain the relationship between participation and policy implementation.

5.2 Summary

The socio-cultural factors influencing public participation included: poor distribution of resources, poverty, illiteracy, age barriers, public awareness, lack of time to participate, corruption or inefficiency among some stakeholders, political biasness and improper coordination, evaluation and monitoring of activities. Other factors included: unaccountable leadership, inaccessibility to leaders when faced with challenges, selfish leaders who only cheer politicking not performing, women not allowed to participate by husbands, illiteracy, language barrier, too much clannism and nepotism hindering participation, poor health, insecurity,
poverty, gender imbalance in the representation in forums, insufficient number of NGOs standing in the gap for the public, pursuing own interest by leaders and unemployment.

The study concluded that resource adequacy influences policy implementation. The resource adequacy factors include; resources sufficiency, disbursement, red tape in receiving finance, resource allocation and trained staff on financial management.

It was also revealed that stakeholders’ involvement influenced community participation in county policy implementation. For example, 15 (36.6%) of the local members indicated that they were involved in the operations and policy implementation programs. It was also revealed that stakeholders attend most of the functions and made decisions about implementation of policies projects as indicated by majority 24(58.5%).

The study established that the significance of information is considered to a very great extent when deciding which mode of information exchange to use. Also, the study established that the value of the information is considered to a great extent when deciding which mode of information exchange to use. In addition, the study established that the magnitudes of the information and time accuracy of the information are considered to a moderate extent when deciding which mode of information exchange to use.

5.3 Conclusions

Inadequate democratic networks with stakeholders or lead agencies in designing public participation program(s) and gender analysis techniques to help prospects for sustainable development although County Government identified individuals, resources, organizations, and contractors needed to conduct various facets of public participation.
Timely, well-planned, and well implemented public involvement programmes have contributed to the successful design, implementation, operation, and management of projects and policies. The study also ascertained that, community members, when given an opportunity to be informed and involved in the revitalization process, are/can be a critical factor to a policy’s success. Leaders did not articulate policy issues adequately or pass adequate information to address community problems which signify that public participation in Elgeyo Marakwet County does not bring about a significant improvement in service delivery due to political competition. Half of the population under study in Elgeyo Marakwet County indicated inadequate accountability in terms of governance hence limited public participation in budget allocations in consultations with all the stakeholders and exchange of material flows by productive entities which were inefficient and full of loopholes.

In general, Elgeyo Marakwet County leadership demonstrates weak decision process involving public participation, inadequate communication of detailed information and insufficient systematic gathering of information and analysis of community issues in order to influence development agenda and policy implementation.

5.4 Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Based on the conclusions drawn above, the study makes the following recommendations:
The government should conduct intensive and extensive civic education. This is because a number of the respondents were ignorant of the fact that public participation is their right as enshrined in the constitution of Kenya;

The County leadership should demonstrate effective training; strengthen good communication in public engagement and enhance sufficient systematic gathering of information and analysis of community issues in order to influence development agenda and policy implementation.
There is need for the youth to take up an active role in the sensitization and creation of awareness to the old who do not seem to appreciate the need for public participation;

Those conducting public participation should consider using the local language during public participation forums or making use of interpreters in addition to providing materials in a language that the locals understand.

It is important that the government makes use of more platforms when informing the public on the date, time, venue and topic of discussion and also on the relevance of the topic to the local people. This can be done through use of social media and key personalities in the community like local pastors, priests, chiefs and other influential persons in the community. This will ensure that the locals attend these fora and gives that they air their views so that the projects implemented meet their needs.

It is prudent that the county governments consider facilitating those who attend public participation fora by either refunding their fare or providing them with lunch during the day. This is because most of those available to attend such fora are casual laborers who earn minimum wage and making such sacrifice ought to be rewarded; it is also important that prior to the public participation, the relevant documents are availed to the public so that they know what will be discussed during the forum.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Study

The study proposes further research in the following areas; this study needs to be replicated in other conflict affected counties throughout the country in order to compare the results. Further study should also be carried out on effect of public participation in other processes of
governance, a study should be carried out to investigate the impact of public participation on democracy and the economic development of a nation.

The study also revealed a gap on studies on the other factors that influence the policy implementation process and factors influencing citizen participation not only on policy implementation but also in other processes of governance.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION ONE: PART I

1. What age group are you in?

(Tick where applicable)

(20-30)   (31-40)   (41-50)   
(51-60)   (61 and above)

2. Gender:

Male   
Female

3. Highest level of education.

Primary   Secondary   Polytechnic   
College   University   Other, please specify

Occupation

Teacher   Medical officer   Engineer   
Social worker   Farmer   Business person   
Unemployed   Activist/ political   Others
Part II QUESTIONS

Do you attend public participation functions in your ward?
Yes ............ No ............

Are you informed by the authorities over policy matters in your area?
Yes ............ No ............

Are you free to participate on policy discussions, planning, decision making and implementation?
Yes .......... No ..........

Are your views always included in organization decisions or plans?
Yes .......... No ..........

What would you like to be done to improve participation and implementation?
   a) Broaden stakeholder participation by inviting more stakeholders
   b) Introduce sufficient facilitation
   c) None of the above
   d) A and B

What improvement would you like to be done on public participation?

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

What mode of communication would you recommend to be used to announce public participation events in your area?

..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
.
PART III

Do you meet to discuss and learn more about participation in policy implementation in your ward?

Yes……. No……

Is information exchange among stakeholders important for policy implementation?

Yes…………….. No……….

Are you periodically updated on policy implementation progress in your area?

Yes………No……

Do you discuss progress, challenges and solutions facing policy implementation in your area?

Yes……….. No…………

What difficulties do you face during information exchange sections in your area?

   a) Language barrier
   b) Shortage of information materials
   c) Knowledge gap
   d) None of the above
   e) A, B and C.

What would you like to be included in the information agenda?

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

What facilitation would you like to be provided to participants to enhance information exchange?

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
PART IV

Do you think your interaction with implementing Agency is important?

Yes………… No………..

Do you oftenly meet with lead Agency to discuss about ongoing policy implementation progress?

Yes………… No………..

Do you agree with the need to have stakeholders interaction?

Yes………… No………..

Does interaction between you and government official benefit your relation with the government or lead Agency?

Yes………… No………..

Who develops the agenda for discussion during interaction session?

a) Lead Agency
b) Government
c) Community
d) All of the above in joint consultation

How would you like interaction between stakeholders interactions be enriched?

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

Why do you recommend interaction between the stakeholders?

...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
PART V

Do you think the environment affects the way participation and policy implementation relates to each other?

Yes……………No…………

Does insecurity and inter clan rivalry affects policy implementation in your area?

Yes…………. No…………

Do you feel the environment of policy implementation and participation in Kabiemit ward is conducive and secure?

Yes…………. No…………

Do you think the surrounding affect the way policy is implemented?

Yes…………. No…………

What do you think is the biggest threat to policy implementation in Kabiemit ward?

a) Poor management  
b) Competition among stakeholders  
c) Conflicting interest  
d) Mistrust among stakeholders  
e) Lack of sufficient information on policy progress

What other reasons apart from ones given above, do you think affects policy implementation?

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

What measures would you recommend to improve public participation and policy implementation?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
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SECTION TWO: TABULATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 1: Representation in policy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders represented in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders attend most of participation functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative articulate issues affecting stakeholders including special interest groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative views are accepted and included in policy decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder contributions are reflected in final policy implementation plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Information exchange and policy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of information amongst stakeholders enhance policy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different stakeholders do compare notes and exchange ideas during consultative meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information exchange ease tensions, create consensus, understanding and acceptance of implementation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information materials is regularly given to stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free open and democratic information exchange take place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Stakeholder interaction in policy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community do interact with implementing agency regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community lead Agency relation improve after each interaction session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda for interaction is jointly developed by the stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes and resolutions are recorded and taken by implementing Agency after each session for future reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Agency make use of minutes and resolutions to improve on policy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment moderates’ relationship between participation and policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and safety of participants in implementation process is vital for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the success for policy implementation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws, rules and regulations affects policy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental factors can negatively or positively affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly, calm and secure environment enhances policy implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II. Map of Elgeyo Marakwet County

Source: Elgeyo Marakwet county website
APPENDIX III: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Respondent,

RE: REQUEST TO COLLECT DATA FOR MPPA RESEARCH PROJECT

I am a student at the Kenyatta University pursuing Master of Public Policy and Administration degree. Part of the requirement of attainment of this degree is to carry out a research project. The research I am carrying out is on the effect of stakeholder’s participation on policy implementation, a case of Elgeyo Marakwet County in Kenya.

I am kindly requesting you to answer the simple questions in the attached questionnaire so as to enable me to accomplish the project. All information given is for the purpose of the research project only and shall be treated with strict confidentiality and shall not be used subversively.

I look forward for your humble assistance.

Yours faithfully,

NAME: NTOMBURA .E. MIONKI

REG. NO: C153/OL/CTY/26884/2015
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MR. NTOMBURA EUNIAS MIONKI
of KENYATTA UNIVERSITY, 320-60600
MAUA, has been permitted to conduct
research in Elgeyo-Marakwet County

on the topic: EFFECTS OF PUBLIC
PARTICIPATION ON POLICY
IMPLEMENTATION: THE CASE OF ELGEYO
MARAKWET COUNTY, KENYA

for the period ending:
17th August, 2019

Permit No: NACOSTI/P/18/72871/24606
Date Of Issue: 24th August, 2018
Fee Recieved: Ksh 1000

Applicant’s
Signature

Director General
National Commission for Science,
Technology & Innovation
RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION – NTOMBURA EUNIAS MIONKI

Following the authorization by the National Commission for Science, Technology And Innovation (NACOSTI) to carry out research in Elgeyo Marakwet County Vide Authority letter Ref. No. NACOSTI/P/18/72871/24606 dated 24th August, 2018 you are hereby formally granted authority by this office to proceed with your study on “Effects of public participation: the case of Elgeyo Marakwet County, Kenya,” for a period ending, 17th August, 2019.

You are further required to report to all Sub-County Directors of Education –Elgeyo marakwet County before you embark on your research.

By copy of this letter, the Sub-County Directors of Education are requested to accord you the necessary assistance.

Copy to:
1. The Sub-County Directors of Education –Elgeyo marakwet County
2. The Director General/CEO -NACOSTI
3. County Director of Health Services
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION
NTOMBURA EUNIAS MONKI

This is to confirm that the above named has been authorized to carry out a research on “Effects of public participation on policy implementation”. The research will be undertaken in Elgeyo Marakwet for the period ending 14th December, 2018.

Please accord him necessary assistance.

K. O. MIFWONI
FOR: COUNTY COMMISSIONER
ELGEYO MARAKWET

c.c. Deputy County Commissioners
Elgeyo Marakwet County