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ABSTRACT

Participatory budgeting has been supported in the legislative framework in Kenya, however, the process faces challenges characterized by low participation rates. This study therefore interrogated the influence of citizen’s perceptions, information availability and citizen’s knowledge on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. A descriptive survey design was adopted and the target population was the 5 Sub County Administrators, 25 members of the county assembly, 25 Ward Administrators, 9 County executive committee members and 227762 adult citizens of Kiminini Sub-county. In this study, multistage sampling was adopted where while the citizens were sampled through simple random sampling method, the other category was conveniently sampled. Through Fisher formula, a sample size of 448 was determined. A semi-structured questionnaire was used to obtain both qualitative and quantitative data from the citizens because there was a need to capture in-depth information on the subject matter. The qualitative data was analyzed through qualitative analysis methods and presented in a narrative form. On the other hand, the quantitative data was analyzed through descriptive as well as inferential statistics and presented in form of tables and figures. A binary logit regression model was suitable to establish the relationship between the study variables. The study findings indicated that there is a low public awareness regarding Public Participation in the county in the tune of 29%. It was also established that the level of public participation in budget making process in the county was low at 7%. Additionally, the study established that majority of the citizens have a negative attitude towards participatory budgeting arguing that it was not adding any value to the development of the county. An improvement in the level of Citizen’s positive Perception can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process significantly. It was also established that the county government was not open in availing information regarding participatory budgeting and that access to reliable and relevant information was only achievable to a moderate extent. However, an improvement in information availability can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process significant. The findings further showed that more than two thirds of the citizens are not informed about participatory budgeting implying low awareness and knowledge on the same. Additionally, an improvement in the level of Citizen’s knowledge can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process significant. The study recommends the county government to run campaigns and create awareness in order to reverse the negative attitude and public relations they face from the citizens. There is also a need to show political goodwill in implementing some of the relevant suggestions from citizen’s contributions. The county government should also avail relevant information to the citizens beforehand. This can be done through road shows, print media, local Community Based Organizations, Non-governmental organizations, Chief’s Barazas, local radio stations and televisions. Programmes can be established to sensitize citizens about public budgeting procedures, public participation requirements, public financial management practices as well as social audit of the public sector in order to encourage boost their confidence to contribute on such matters.
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## OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen’s Knowledge</td>
<td>is defined as the ability of the citizens to understand matters regarding participatory budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen’s Perceptions</td>
<td>is defined as the views, beliefs and attitudes of the citizens towards participatory decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Availability</td>
<td>is defined as the ease of accessing reliable, comprehensive and timely information regarding participatory budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>is defined as a decision-making process that involves the citizens in deliberation, dialogues, mutual learning as well as collaborative planning and public management with the county government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baraza</td>
<td>it is a Swahili word that describes the semi-formal and mostly regular public (open air) meetings convened by a local chief for purposes of addressing local issues and facilitating the percolation of state agenda and policy to the grassroots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

There has been shrinking trust of the public in their governments throughout the world (Edelman, 2012) attributed to a number of factors but not limited to ever increasing political scandals, corruption, cuts in public expenditure, individualism, and unreasonable expectations (Lorsuwannarat, 2017). This has led to increased public apathy and low turnout at elections. Bovaird and Loffler (2015) added that as a result of decreasing trust in public financial management and the inability to convert public wishes into actions has pushed up the desire of the citizens for participatory budgeting (Peters, 2010; Sintomer, Herzberg & Rocke, 2008).

Rios, Benito and Bastida (2017) called for the urgency in improving the relationship between citizens and their governments. This is because it highly encourages the citizens to air out their desires for inclusion. Public participation is a process whereby governmental groups, individuals and not for profit groups participate majorly in influencing the process of making decision on legislations, policies and service delivery (Xie, Xia, Hu, Shan, Le & Chan, 2017). It is a crucial component of policy and legislative government functions. The participation applies to the process of enacting legislatures, financial planning and management and managing performance (Magani, 2018).

Public participation is a concept that dates back to Brazil in the year 1989 in the town of Porto Alegre. It was needful as a result of the need for improved services by the council.
After the first stage, the process spread to other towns of Brazil, more than 130 towns, between the year 1997 and 2000 in what is termed as the second wave.

Since then, participatory budgeting has spread to other parts of the world. In the UK, it is manifested in community grants which have realized significant improvements in the community, high confidence in the government as well as citizen’s control of the resources allocated (Rocke, 2014). According to Neshkova and Guo (2012), most cities because of democracy, have set aside bureaucracies and embraced participatory processes. In Florida for instance, Yahong and Kaifeng (2009) argued that citizens have gone for participatory budgeting based on the citizen’s perceptions of the political environment as well as how professional the facilitators of such meetings are.

Participatory governments are more effective and equitable without being less efficient. Compared to Latin America, participatory budget making in Asian countries is low. Yang and Wang (2008) indicated that in China, the level public interactions greatly determined administration of the devolved units of governance. It was also established that public training and contribution also determined to a great extent how the units of governance were administered. However, there is still a low level of public participation in China. Participatory budgeting in Bangladesh is however limited (Rahman, 2005). There lack formal channels for that and hence some elected leaders have opted for informal mechanisms of ensuring its implementation in collaborations with not for profits organizations.

making it work.
In Asia, Uddin, Mori and Adhikari (2019) admitted that at the national stage, the process faces setbacks in Japan. However, at the local stage, local leaders and mayors ensure that lobbyists and citizens take part in it. On the contrary, Mishra (2014) postulated that the entire exercise of budget-making in India remains shrouded in complete secrecy till the budget is presented in the parliament. Only then, the general public gets relief from the vague guesswork of media. The process is so strict and cryptic that it pushes away citizens.

Compared to the developed economies, participatory budget making process in Africa is low. However, among the African countries, participatory budget making process is more advanced in South Africa owing to the well-developed legal framework (Finkel et al., 2012). Nonetheless, the process still faces challenges where racial discrimination in engaging citizens in decision-making still exists as shown by discrimination of the whites. In as much as Nylen (2014) supported participatory budgeting in Mozambique, the process has been reserved for those with strong political connections and financial ability.

In Nigeria, efforts at participatory governance have never received the full backing of the ruling class in Nigeria since the return of democratic rule in in 1999, because the ruling class see it as a threat to their collective interest. Thus, opportunities for citizens' participation in governance in Nigeria have always been limited. Budgeting in Nigeria is seen as an exclusive preserve of the executive arm of government, especially as it concerns budget preparation and implementation, with the legislature participating during the approval and audit stages. The only opportunity given to citizens to participate in the
process is at the approval stage, during public hearings at the National Assembly (Iloh & Nwokedi, 2016).

In Zimbabwean context, Chikerema (2013) posited that there has been public participation in Zimbabwe for the last 20 years as a result of the enabling legal framework. Yet, citizen’s participation doesn’t bring much change since they are allowed to participate after decisions have already been made. In Tanzania, Kihongo and Lubuva (2010) described the contemporary resource management structure as inefficient and lacking transparency. Resource allocation has been efficient for a few Districts such as Singida and Ilala which have encompassed public participation. On the contrary, even though there has been immense progress in the rapport between the citizens and the government in Uganda in recent times, it is marred by suspicion and in most cases, the government invites the citizens to participate after the meetings have already been conducted. Their contribution is therefore worthless.

The relationship between the council and citizens in Uganda has improved greatly, but suspicion between the two still exists. Invitation letters are reportedly sent to some civic groups after meetings have been held. Some councils still deliberately exclude civic groups from council meetings. In Zambia, Claassens (2005) indicated that even though the citizens know their right of participation, they don’t dare since they don’t have confidence in the government.

In Kenya, a report by Kenya Human Rights Commission (KHRC, 2010) indicated that high education levels and information accessibility determine to a large extent how the
public is involved in governance. Citizens with low education levels get limited information insufficient for formulating interests in public activities such as budget formulation and implementation. Muriu (2013) agreed that citizen’s participation in resource allocation meetings in Kenya is low and its effect on service delivery is negligible. Mugambi and Theuri (2014) added that even though the process is well documented in Kilifi county, political interference was an obstruction.

According to Kenya school of Government (2015) allowing citizens to participate in the government activities can result in greater understanding of responsibilities, breaks down barriers between citizens and government, empowers the people through education and also unlocks resource potential. This process has been provided for in the constitution under Article 10 where both the national and county government are obligated to facilitate it (Asingwa, 2019). Under section Art.174(c), the county government has been mandated to facilitate, create awareness and ensure that there is public participation. They are also supposed to build capacity on the public to be incorporated in the governance. Participatory budgeting is therefore well covered and supported by the constitution of Kenya.

A budget is a summary of expenditures projected for a specific time and the proposal on how to finance it. Additionally, a budget expresses a plan quantitatively expressed for a period of time and incorporates expenditure and revenues for a specific organization over a specific timeframe (Asingwa, 2019). The process controlled by the finance County Executive Member (CEC), starts with issuing of circulars in the initial stage of formulation. Based on it, a County Development Plan is prepared and tabled in the
County Assembly for debate after which, 7 days after, it is made public and the public are invited to have their input. The public member views are used to prepare the County Budget Review which again is sent to the assembly for debate. From here, the public are also invited to present their proposals between April and June before the final budget is presented.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Participatory budgeting has been touted as a promoter of efficiency, transparency and reduced corruption in the public sector (Government, 2015). It is an inexpensive exercise that can unlock resource potential. Despite its importance, the link between public participation and budget implementation is missing in Kenya since counties have inconsistencies in budget implementation (Jason, 2013). Wanyoike (2012) also postulate that despite its support in the legislative framework in Kenya, the process faces challenges characterized by low participation rates. Similarly, Wandaka, Mungai and Odindo (2014) supported the claim that participatory budgeting has been a struggle and the whole process is seen as just symbolic.

The existing research gaps in the previous works also inspire this interrogation. Some of the previous studies focused on other economies thus presenting a contextual research gap. For instance, Mohammadi, Norazizan and Nikkhah (2018) in Iran, Waheduzzaman (2010) in Bangladesh, Hayrapetyan (2019) in Armenia, Juliana (2014) in Brazil and Herian (2011) in United States of America. Locally, the study by Imbo and Kiruthu (2019) focused on Kenya National Assembly while Moi (2019) focused on governance of
projects presenting contextual and conceptual research gaps respectively. Other studies for instance, Mbithi, Ndambuki and Juma (2019) and Marine (2018) used secondary data thus presenting methodological research gap. To fill the gaps, this study used a mixed method.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

i. To determine the influence of citizen’s perceptions on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya

ii. To establish the influence of information availability on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya

iii. To establish the influence of citizen’s knowledge on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya

1.4 Research Questions

i. What is the influence of citizen’s perceptions on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya?

ii. How does information availability influence public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya?

iii. To what extent does citizen’s knowledge influence public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya?
1.5 Justification and Significance of the Study

The budgeting process in Kenya is often incremental and is characterized by lobbying by the mighty. The whims of the budget makers are therefore highly depended on at the expense of public participation. In doing that, the benefit of public participation is missed in this process thus a need for this interrogation. The question of participatory budgeting in Trans Nzoia County is a matter of mixed feelings. This is reflected in massive public funds mismanagement as reflected in the Auditor general’s report of the year ended June 2018.

The report quizzed expenditures on stalled projects in the county whereby up to 73 percent of the projects initiated had stalled whereas payments worth Kshs. 2 Billion had already been paid (Auditor General Report, 2018). Inconsistencies were also indicated in the payments and receipts statements whereas while the county reports indicated a value of Kshs.5.8 B, IFMIS report showed Kshs. 3.8 B and the variance of Kshs. 2 B was not accounted for. The report also cited other inconsistencies in the public financial management practices of the county which would otherwise not have happened had the due process of participatory budgeting been followed. As a result, the focus on this county is justified for this study.

The study has made policy recommendations geared towards improving public participation in budgetary process which can lead to the realization of the benefits of a quality public participation process. Quality public participation can lead to increased accountability and transparency in management of the scarce resources, there will be
meaningful utilization of resources. Development and investment can thus be realized from this new development.

The study findings can also benefit both the national and county governments in shaping policies that can improve public participation. The study findings are also expected to open up more discussions by academicians and scholars. Based on the recommendations for improvement, other studies can be able to build more on the topic.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The conceptual focus of the study was to determine the influence of citizen’s perceptions on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya, establish the influence of information availability on public participation in budget making process Trans Nzoia County, Kenya, and the influence of citizen’s knowledge on public participation in budget making process Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. Contextually, the study was conducted in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. The study targeted the Sub County Administrators of Trans Nzoia, Members of the County Assembly (MCAs), Ward Administrators and the County executive committee members (CECs). The study also targeted the citizens of Trans Nzoia County from Kiminini Sub-County.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The data collection process was marred by various limitations which mostly ranged from bureaucracy in the county government, low participation rates since most of the citizens were busy as well as the COVID-19 pandemic which hindered physical meetups. However, the health practices such as wearing masks, washing hands, sanitizing and
social distancing were observed during data collection. Additionally, the citizens were assured that this is just an academic process and the information being collected would not hurt them in any way. Anonymity was considered and confidentiality maintained.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

The chapter gave a review of other scholarly works on participatory budgeting. The chapter also provided a discussion of theories related to the study theme and finally presented a figure showing how the variables relate in the conceptual framework. Theories as well as empirical review were presented and discussed.

2.1.1 Citizen’s Perceptions and Public Participation

Mohammadi, Norazizan and Nikkhah (2018) through a qualitative focus, established the perceptions of the Iran people on participation in government activities. The methodology adopted by the study was a qualitative approach that mainly made use of interviews to obtain qualitative data which was thematically analyzed. From the content analysis, it was revealed that their perception was centered on their need for participation.

In a study by McComas (2003) to get the views of the citizens regarding public meetings in New York, semi-structured interviews and questionnaires were used. The findings showed that there was low turnout because of the belief that the meetings were not credible and neither did they have high expectations.

Aboelnaga (2017) conducted a study focusing on public participation in planning in the Egyptian context. Through a qualitative interrogation, the study established that the citizen’s opinion has a great effect on the implementation of projects leading to the development of the country. However, the most important problem was in the stage in
which the decision maker takes into account the opinion of the public and thus most people felt that their opinion was not valued thus had a poor attitude towards public participation in such meetings.

In a study by Kasozi-Mulindwa (2013) in Uganda to find out the feelings of the citizens on participation in local government initiatives, KII were adopted. It was demonstrated that public participation was hampered by lack of information as well as poor attitude based on the belief that it could not yield any substantial outcomes.

In Kenya, Moi (2019) interrogated whether citizen’s perception played a role in governance of projects in Two counties, Elgeyo Marakwet and Nandi. Through multinominal regression, it was demonstrated that citizen’s expectations guided their participation in governance of the projects. On the other hand, Imbo and Kiruthu (2019) investigated whether publication participation affected legislations at the National Assembly. It was realized that its influence is not impactful.

2.1.2 Information Availability and Public Participation

Msofe (2016) established the factors affecting citizen participation in village assembly in Akeri and Patandi villages in Meru District Council of Tanzania. The study used interviews as well as questionnaires. Descriptive analysis was used to analyze the collected data and the study findings revealed that citizen participation in the area is poor due to lack of government responsiveness and transparency in information dissemination, unclear time table for participation as well as low awareness and knowledge among the citizens.
Ebdon and Franklin (2006) analyzed the involvement of the citizens in local government decisions in Kenya and Uganda. The study demonstrated that the defining factors were vibrant civil organizations, information availability and the nature of leadership. It was also indicated that the process was a guided affair of a few. In Kenya, Mugambi and Theuri (2014) investigated the challenges which the county government of Kilifi faces in ensuring public participation and showed that the rate of public participation was low attributed to information in availability and low awareness.

Muriu (2014) cross examined whether services delivery was affected by the extent of public participation in in regard to the delivery of Local Authority Service Delivery Action Plan (LASDAP). Using secondary data, it was shown that the process was minute and its effect was negligible. On the other hand, a study by Mbithi, Ndambuki and Juma (2019) to find out the determining factors for public participation in county governments in Kenya adopted a Probit model and showed that lack of information about county budgets and projects, greatly hampered the process. In a similar study but focusing on a case study of Busia County, Kenya, Papa (2016) through a mixed methods study, it was revealed that there was lack of proper institutional frameworks to facilitate information dissemination for the process, hence it was lowly achieved.

2.1.3 Citizen’s Knowledge and Public Participation

A study was conducted in Bangladesh by Waheduzzaman (2010) to investigate the effect of public participation in good governance. Among other objectives of the focus was to examine the setbacks to public participation in governance. The interrogation made use
of a qualitative approach where interviews were conducted in order to come up with more in-depth interrogation. The results demonstrated that multiple setbacks such as lack of awareness and low level of knowledge defined poor public participation.

In the context of Armenia, Hayrapetyan (2019) adopted a quantitative analysis to establish the factors affecting participation narrowing down to the case of Yerevan. The study mainly made use of quantitative data which was analyzed by binary logistic regression models. From the results, it was ascertained that citizen’s perception and attitude towards their government is critical in their decision to participate in decisions.

It was also established that citizen’s level of awareness and knowledge played a key role in their decision to participate in public process. In Ghana, Ahenkan, Bawole and Domfeh (2013) established the practices aimed at improving public participation in the Wiawso Municipality. Capacity building to enhance an understanding of budget making process in the public sector was recommended.

In a comparative analysis of Kenya and Uganda, Devas and Grant (2003) showed that due to pressure from civil organizations, Kenyan government was involving its citizens in decisions. However, in Uganda, even though the centralized system encouraged participation, there still lacked transparency of the process and lack of information. In Nyandarua county Kenya, Wacera (2016) through a mixed method indicated that even though the citizens were willing to participate, they were weary of their low levels of education and knowledge which could hamper their understanding and contributions.
2.2 Summary of Literature and Research Gaps

The chapter highlighted past studies on public participation. Regarding the empirical review of literature, it presented research gaps namely; conceptual, methodological and contextual research gaps which need to be filled. Some of the reviewed studies did not focused on Kenya but on other economies thus presenting a contextual research gap. Some of the studies were Mohammadi, Norazizan and Nikkhah (2018) in Iran, Waheduzzaman (2010) in Bangladesh, Hayrapetyan (2019) in Armenia, Juliana (2014) in Brazil and Herian (2011) in United States of America. The contribution of these studies to the field of study was important, however, the findings from such economies could not be generalized to the Kenyan setting due to legislative and institutional differences regarding participatory budgeting. As a result, it was important to conduct this study and compare the findings.

Of the local studies, the focus didn’t narrow down to county governments such as a study by Imbo and Kiruthu (2019) which focused on the National assembly of Kenya. Other studies presented methodological research gaps by simply reviewing secondary information and not conducting a survey based on primary data for instance Mbithi, Ndambuki and Juma (2019) and Marine (2018) which focused on PB in the constitutional transition period 2010-2016. Those studies such as Moi (2019) which focused on county governments, did not necessarily limit to participatory budgeting but on governance of projects thus presenting a conceptual research gap.
2.3 Theoretical Framework

Anfara and Mertz (2014) defined a theoretical framework as a collection of related ideas that provides a guide in research that makes the researcher determine what to measure and what deductions to look for. Theories provide analytical tools that help the researcher in explaining, understanding and predicting a specific subject matter. Different scholars have formulated theories that try to explain public participation and reasons thereof.

However, this study will narrow down to Three main theories namely the Cognitive Engagement Theory by Meece, Blumenfeld and Hoyle (1988), Stakeholder Theory by Freeman (1984) and Social Capital Theory by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu in 1972. The discussion and contribution of the theories have been presented in the subsections below.

2.3.1 The Cognitive Engagement Theory

The theory proposed by Meece, Blumenfeld and Hoyle (1988) argue that an interactive process and public participation is reliant on availability of information. It also depends on the willingness of the citizens to use the information in a logical way to make a change. The level of literacy increases the chances of gaining and interpreting larger pieces of information. Therefore, the cognitive ability of the people depends on their level of education to trigger sharp information processing powers and make judgements.

The theory therefore links public participation to the citizen’s knowledge and level of education. In simple terms, the theory states that those with higher level of education and cognitive abilities, are likely to participate in public proceedings. The notion has nonetheless faced criticism with the argument that it is not obvious that educated people
would utilize the information in an educated manner to add value. Other factors, such as motivation can play a center stage. A town can have people who are highly educated and well informed but with no interests in political affairs.

2.3.2 Stakeholder Theory

Freeman (1984) advocated the theory in order to acknowledge the role of a stakeholder (Any person or a group which can affect or be affected by the actions of an organization) in holding an organization accountable. In the setting of a county government such as Trans Nzoia, the main stakeholders for those responsible in budgeting are the citizens of the county who demand better service delivery. Others can be the suppliers to the county as well as contractors and other groups who are directly affected by the decisions of the budget allocation committee.

Unlike the Agency model which emphasizes principal-agent relationship where the agents are mandated to fulfill the interests of the principals, this theory (Stakeholder theory), demonstrates that other interested parties (stakeholders) should be considered and consulted when organizations are deciding on relevant matters. The school of thought of the proponent is that by involvement of stakeholders, such as citizens in participatory budgeting, the results yield equity and social efficiency. The bottom-line of the theory is that the outcome may not just rely on the choice of one group, but also the strategies and opinions by other participating parties and hence in line with this study, the theory supports participatory budgeting regardless of the existing barriers.
2.3.3 Social Capital Theory

Before being used in the year 1972 by Pierre Bourdieu, the concept of Social Capital had been silent in the 1890s. Afterwards, it was popularized by other scholars. It implies social relationships which can result to benefits. Social relationships can result into development of social capital which can be trust, networks and identity. Such capital can define collective actions and collaborations. Through mutual bonds of trust and norms, the people in the society can easily coordinate actions (Portes, 1998).

Social capital can be developed by being members in interpersonal networks, and can further be developed into other forms of capital for their benefits (Dubos, 2017). Membership in these associations improve the chances of people reducing poverty. Additionally, those with higher social capital can agitate for better services for the society. Continuous interactions in the society between the government and the people can develop a mutual understanding of what is best for both parties (Siisiainen, 2003).

2.4 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework hypothetically reveals the link between study variables (Anfara & Mertz, 2014). In this study, it linked participatory budgeting to its determinants as shown in Figure 2.1.
Independent Variables

Citizen’s Perceptions
- Belief in the value of their input
- Trust on county leadership
- Political motivation

Information Availability
- Availability of public accounts reports
- Information on public participation dates
- Availability of county development plans

Citizen’s Knowledge
- On public budgeting procedures
- On public participation requirements
- On public financial management

Participatory Budgeting
- Efficient funds utilization
- Manageable fiscal deficits
- Reduced public funds embezzlement

Figure 2.1 Conceptual Framework
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The chapter highlighted the methodological underpinnings to answer the research questions. From the design, population, data collection, analysis and ethical values, the chapter was decisive in developing a working methodology based on the objectives of the study.

3.1 Research Design

There exist various research designs that can be adopted for a survey. This study embraced the descriptive survey design. A descriptive survey design, as argued by Mackey and Gass (2015) is not only suitable in description of state of affairs, but also the best design in answering “What” research questions. It also supported the adoption of questionnaires in data collection.

The general research question of this interrogation was what were the determinants of public participation in budget making process in devolved governments in Kenya were and to answer this question, there was a need to adopt a research design that supported description of state of affairs surrounding participatory budget making though mixed methods. Hence, a descriptive research design fitted the bill.
3.2 Category / Variable of Analysis

Pursuant to this interrogation, this study had two main variables grouped into Predictor variables which are citizen’s perceptions, information availability and citizen’s knowledge and the dependent variable which was public participation in budget making process in devolved governments in Kenya. Analysis was limited to the two sets of variables.

3.3 Site of Study

The study focused on Trans Nzoia County located in Kenyan Rift Valley approximately 380 KMs from the country’s capital of Nairobi and neighboured by Bungoma, Uasin Gishu and Kakamega, Elgeyo Marakwet and Pokot counties as well as Uganda to the Northwest. The county is cosmopolitan with inhabitants from across the tribes in Kenya in the tune of 15%.

The county is largely agricultural and has been referred to as the basket of Kenya for its role in food production. After devolution, just like other counties in Kenya, the county has made efforts to ensure participatory processes. However, challenges in fully ensuring public participation exist and that motivated this interrogation.

The study specifically focused on Kiminini Sub-County which was one of the 5 Sub-Counties of the county. The other Sub-Counties were Cherangany, Endebess, Kwanza and Saboti. The focus on Kiminini was because it had the largest population of over 18 citizens compared to the others. Another reason was because the Sub-County is the host of the county administrative offices and its easier for its citizens to participate in the
budget making process because of its proximity. To rule out lack of participation because of distance or extra transport costs, this study chose to focus on this sub county. Additionally, the Sub County possess both rural and urban characteristics which are suitable to avoid geographical bias.

3.4 Study Population

For this study, the focus was on the Sub County Administrators of the 5 sub counties of Trans Nzoia, Ward Administrators of the 25 wards, 25 Members of the County Assembly (MCAs) of Trans Nzoia, the County executive committee members (CECs) who total to 9 according to the CIDP, 2018-2022 and the citizens from Kiminini Sub-County. According to Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS, 2019) population census, Kiminini Sub-County has a total of 222,762 citizens aged above 18 years. The distribution of the target population was indicated in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Study Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub County Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Administrators</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive Committee Members (CECs)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAs</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Population (18 Years and above) Kiminini Sub-County</td>
<td>222,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>222,826</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CIDP, 2018-2022 for Trans Nzoia county as well as KNBS (2019)

3.5 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The study adopted two stage sampling methodology. First, the focus on Sub-County Administrators, MCAs, Ward Administrators and County Executive Committee Members
was conveniently done. Non-probabilistic sampling technique of convenience sampling was adopted and the same has been suggested by Barlett, Kotrlik and Higgins (2011).

This is because these groups have the information required concerning public participation in the county. The justification for this method was based on the argument by Bresler and Stake (2017) that a study can opt for Non-probabilistic purposive / convenient sampling when the researcher feels that a certain unit has the desired information.

The second method adopted was in selection of the citizens to participate in the study. In this approach, a simple random sampling method was adopted. Before sampling, the sample size was determined since the target population of the citizens was very big. In that case, various formulas such as Krejci and Morgan, Fisher, Cochran and Yamane have been seconded by researches such as Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), Kumar (2019) and Fletcher (2017).

Every formula has its own strengths but, in this case, the best formula to use was the Fisher formula suggested by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) in a scenario where the target population is greater than 10,000. Which was the case in this study. The formula was as indicated below:

\[
n = \frac{Z^2 p(1-p)}{\varepsilon^2} \]

(1)
Where:

\[ n = \text{the desired sample size when the target population is greater than 10,000 as is the case for this study} \]

\[ P = \text{The proportion in the target population estimated to have characteristics being measured. This is placed at 50\% (0.5) as suggested by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003).} \]

\[ q = (1-P) \]

\[ e = \text{margin of error set at 5\%} \]

\[ Z = \text{the standard normal deviation at the required confidence level of 95\% which is 1.96} \]

Substituting the values gives the values below:

\[ n = \frac{(1.96)^2 (0.5)(0.5)}{(0.05)^2} \]

\[ = 384 \]

A sample of 384 citizens from that of the Sub-County were randomly sampled. The sample size of the study was as shown in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2 Sample Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub County Administrators</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Administrators</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive Committee Members (CECs)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAs</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen (18 Years and above)- Kiminini Sub-County</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>448</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Research Instruments

A questionnaire was used to collect primary data. It facilitated collection of quantitative data from the citizens because there was a need to capture their perceptions, knowledge as well as opinion on information availability. The questionnaire was also administered to Ward Administrators and MCAs.

The most suitable type was a semi-structured one to measure both qualitative and quantitative data (Ledford & Gast, 2018). The study also adopted an interview guide in collecting qualitative data from the leaders in the county government. An interview was scheduled with randomly selected Sub County Administrators and County Executive Committee Members (CECs) in order to obtain in-depth analysis of the participatory budgeting in the county.

3.7 Pilot study

A pretest was conducted on 20 respondents, (5 percent of the survey sample) to determine the instruments’ reliability and validity. This sample size was in line with Quinlan, Babin, Carr and Griffin (2019) and Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) who argued that a pilot size should be between 1 percent and 10 percent of the survey sample.

Piloting of the research instrument was done in Saboti Sub-County which just like Kiminini, shares proximity to the county head offices and has both rural and urban characteristics. The Sub-County was also justified in order to reduce sampling bias since the main survey was conducted in Kiminini, there was a need to conduct the pilot in a different Sub-County but the same county.
Another choice of Saboti was that it is within Trans Nzoia county where the main survey was done hence there was an insignificant difference in the demographics. The 20 respondents were sampled through simple random methods which gave each of the citizens an equal chance of selection.

3.8 Validity and Reliability

Fletcher (2017) implies that a questionnaire should be valid. Validity means the ability of the instrument to capture meaningful data which it had purported to capture. To establish content validity of the research instrument in this study, the research instrument was scrutinized by the supervisor thoroughly in order to establish any flaws, ambiguity or errors. The researcher also aligned the questionnaire to public policy issues as well as literature to ensure that it didn’t go out of context.

Reliability on the other hand implies the consistency or repeatability in capturing similar opinions in repeated trials. Reliability shows that the questionnaire is well understood and that the respondents are likely to capture the same information in repeated trials (Fletcher, 2017). Cronbach’s (α) Alpha was adopted at a threshold of 0.7 as recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003).

3.9 Data Collection Procedure

After defence of the proposal, a letter was obtained from the university to aide in introduction during data collection. With the letter, the researcher applied for National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) research authorization permit which together with the university introduction letter, were also used to make
formal introductions to Trans Nzoia county. After permission was granted, data collection process commenced and the researcher together with recruited assistants collected data.

3.10 Data Analysis and Presentation

Since both qualitative and quantitative data were collected, then the methods for analysis of the two sets of data were used.

3.10.1 Qualitative Data Analysis and Presentation

Qualitative data from the interviews as well as open ended questions in the questionnaire, were analyzed through qualitative analysis methods. The data was transcribed and then analyzed through thematic methods. Mackey and Gass (2015) argues that this method is best in categorizing the main themes that emerge from the opinions. The study findings in this analysis were presented in a narrative format and summarized in Tables.

3.10.2 Quantitative Data Analysis and Presentation

Descriptive (Percentages, Means, Standard deviations) and inferential statistics (regression analysis) were conducted through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24. The regression defined the effect of each determinant on participatory budgeting. The study findings were presented using tables and figures.

To establish the determinants of public participation in budget making process in devolved governments in Kenya, the study will adopt a binary logit regression model. This regression model was suitable because the dependent variable (public participation
in budget making process) was a binary variable, that is, participated (Yes) or not participated (No).

The model was also suitable regardless of whether the independent variables were real, binary or categorical. In this case, the independent variables were captured using a Likert scale of 1 to 5 hence they were categorical. The binary logit model was therefore suitable to establish whether the citizens participated (or not) in budget making process in the county government given various factors that is, their perceptions, information availability and knowledge.

The binary logit model was of the general form:

\[ p(y_i = 1 | x_i) = x_i^T \beta + \mu \]

… (2)

Where \( p \) represented the probability odds, \( y_i \) is a binary variable representing 1 if the respondents participated in budget making process, and 0 otherwise, \( x_i \) represents the vector of determinants that determine the likelihood of participating in budget making process in this case (Citizen Perceptions, Information Availability and Citizen Knowledge), \( \beta \) was a vector of parameters that was estimated, and \( \mu_i \) was the disturbance term, which has a symmetric distribution that is either normal or logistic.

Overall, the following binary logit regression model was used:
\[
\frac{Pr(y_i = 0)}{Pr(y_i = 1)} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \mu
\]

…………………………………………………… (3)

Where:

\( y_i \) – dependent variable defined by \( y = 1 \) if the respondents participated in budget making process, and \( y = 0 \) otherwise

\( x_1 \) – Citizen’s Perceptions

\( x_2 \) – Information Availability

\( x_3 \) – Citizen’s Knowledge

\( \mu \) – is the error term which represents other determinants other than the three

\( \beta \) – Beta Parameters to be estimated.

3.11 Data Management and Ethical Considerations

The process remained confidential and the respondents were required to consent to the process, before participation. A permit from NACOSTI as well as university letter were presented to seek permission. The right of the respondents to withdraw was also respected. After consenting, the respondents were not required to give their names nor reveal their identity. The analysis was not shared with other parties other than for the purpose of academic research
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The study results are presented and discussed in the chapter. Both the qualitative and quantitative results are presented. The first section presents the response rate followed by demographic characteristics, then descriptive findings and lastly inferential statistics. The findings are also compared with that of other studies in different contexts.

4.2 Response Rate

The study targeted 5 Sub County Administrators, 25 Members of the County Assembly (MCAs) and 9 County executive committee members (CECs) to participate in the interview. Additionally, 25 Ward Administrators and Citizen (18 Years and above) were targeted to respond to the questionnaire. Therefore, a total of 409 respondents were targeted to respond to the questionnaire and 39 were targeted for the interviews.

Out of the 409 questionnaires issued, a response of 256 (63%) was obtained while out of the 39 interviews scheduled, 22 were successful giving a response rate of 56%. Overall, a response rate of 62% was recorded. According to Smith (2015), a response rate above 50% is satisfactory. Therefore, the response rate of 62% was considered satisfactory especially since the data collection process was faced with challenges that ranged from COVID-19 and bureaucracy. The high response rate was achieved through persistence.
Table 4.1 Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>KII</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>256 (63%)</td>
<td>22  (56%)</td>
<td>278 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Response</td>
<td>153 (37%)</td>
<td>17  (44%)</td>
<td>170 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>409 (100%)</td>
<td>39  (100%)</td>
<td>448 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data,(2021)

4.3 Demographics Analysis

The study described the respondent’s demographic profile and established whether there was a significant relationship between the described characteristics and participatory budgeting. The section presents the results.

4.3.1 Description of the Respondent’s Demographics Profile

Respondent’s gender, age bracket, designation and level of education were established and presented in Table 4.2. It was indicated that majority of the respondents, 174 (68%), who participated in the study were male. Additionally, most of them, 183 (71.5%) were aged above 45 years. Since the study targeted ward administrators and the citizens to respond to the questionnaire, the results demonstrated that no respondent out of the category were interviewed.

Majority of the respondents, 240 (93.8%), were citizens. It was also shown that there was high illiteracy level in the county since majority of the respondents had secondary level of education and below whereby, 112 (43.8%) had secondary education, 40 (15.6%) had primary education and 12 (4.7%) had no formal level of education. These findings are consistent with the demographic profile of the county as indicated in the County
Integrated Development Plan (2018). It was indicated that majority of the citizens are semi-literate.

**Table 4.2 Demographics Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Factor</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Age Bracket</td>
<td>Between 18 – 30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 30 -45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 45</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Designation</td>
<td>Ward Administrator</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident of Trans Nzoia</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Education</td>
<td>No Formal Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Survey Data, (2021)*

**4.3.2 Relationship between Demographic Factors and Participatory Budgeting**

In addition to description of the demographic profile, the study established whether respondent’s gender, age bracket, designation and level of education had a relationship with participation in the budgeting process at the county. Adopting Chi-Square analysis, the results in Table 4.3 established that respondent’s gender and designation don’t significantly influence the decision to participate in the budget making process (P-value > 0.05).

This implies that the decision of the citizens of the county to participate in the budget making process is not influenced by being male, female, a citizen or a ward.
representative. On the contrary, Mohammadi et al. (2018) established that gender had a significant influence on public participation activities whereby, more male than female participated. Quite the reverse, it was established that age bracket and level of education significantly influenced the decision to participate in the budget making process (P-value < 0.05).

Specifically, the findings imply that age played a significant role in the decision to participate in the county budget making process. Besides, level of education also played a significant role given that information access, understanding of the process and contribution in debates required literacy. In agreement, Msofe (2016) similarly indicated that level of education was a key determinant of the citizen’s public participation in Meru District Council of Tanzania.

**Table 4.3 Relationship between Demographic Factors and Participatory Budgeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Factor</th>
<th>Chi-Square test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Gender</td>
<td>($\chi^2 = 0.553, P = 0.289$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Age Bracket</td>
<td>($\chi^2 = 4.697, P = 0.005$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Designation</td>
<td>($\chi^2 = 0.029, P = 0.541$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Education</td>
<td>($\chi^2 = 15.777, P = 0.003$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data,(2021)
4.3 Descriptive Statistics

Mean, standard deviations, frequency and percentages were used to describe the responses for various statements under each variable. This section gives the summary of the results.

4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics of Participation in Budget Making Process

The respondents were asked to indicate whether the county government had participatory budgeting sessions as required by law since the year 2013. The results presented in Figure 4.1 demonstrated that 71% of the respondents were aware of such sessions while 29% were not aware. This is so considering that there was high illiteracy level in the county to understand the budget making process at the county level. Ebdon and Franklin (2006) also established low awareness of the need for public participation in the local municipalities in Uganda.
Figure 4.1 Awareness on the Existence of Participatory Budgeting Sessions since 2013

Source: Survey Data,(2021)

Asked what measures the county government has put in place to ensure that the turnout for participatory budgeting is high, the interviewees indicated that there is public awareness where the citizens are notified through local administration and leaders about upcoming dates on budget making. One of the interviewees noted the following:

‘‘...among the programmes we are running to ensure accommodative PB is creation of awareness where through the local administration, Chiefs barazas we sensitize the citizens on the importance of their turnup. We also publish dates on relevant platforms such as the county websites...’’

Other interviewees indicated that the participants are encouraged to participate and are facilitated to do so. As a result, it has improved the turnout significantly. One of the interviewees noted the following:
‘‘...the county has mandated to take care of the logistics for the participants as a way of encouraging more turnout to give views on the process and priorities...’’

The respondents further rated the impact of participatory budgeting on improving public financial management. The results in Figure 4.2 indicate that 43% of the respondents felt that it improved Public Financial Management (PFM) to a moderate extent and 48.8% stated that it only improves it to a low extent. Only 8.2% felt that it does to a high extent. In a similar study, Papa (2016) indicated that participatory decision making in the public sector does not yield any significant outcomes in Busia County, Kenya as a result of weak or lack of good will.

![Figure 4.2 Impact of Participatory Budgeting in improving PFM](chart)

**Source:** Survey Data,(2021)
The participation rate was further established. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they had ever participated in PB in the county. The results presented in Figure 4.3 indicated that only 17% of the respondents had participated in the budget making process in the county. Consequently, the majority, 83%, had never taken part. The rate of PB in the county was thus rated as low at 17% similar to Kilifi County (Mugambi & Theuri, 2014) and Busia county (Papa (2016) which was lower than 20%. The need for this study in interrogating the determining factors for this low rate was thus justified.

![Figure 4.3 Participation in the Budgeting Process](image)

**Figure 4.3 Participation in the Budgeting Process**

**Source: Survey Data,(2021)**

The findings are consistent with the results from the KII. Asked whether the citizens are informed on participatory budgeting, the interviewees acknowledged that there was still low awareness despite efforts to create more awareness. They further indicated that the
citizens had a negative attitude towards the whole process and felt that their opinion won’t be counted nevertheless. Some of the interviewees noted the following:

‘‘...despite the efforts to create awareness on the importance of PB as required by law, most citizens don’t buy the idea and feel they have no incentive to contribute...’’

‘‘...some of the citizens see the county government as corrupt and feel that even though they give their opinion, there is no goodwill to incorporate them thus they opt not to waste their time...’’

Those who had indicated that they had participated in the budget making process were asked to state the frequency. The results in Figure 4.4 demonstrated that majority had participated more than 2 times. The findings may imply that those who participate in the process are the same people. Study by Wandaka et al. (2014) claimed that participatory budgeting process in Kenya was a preserve of the few and was just symbolic with no true intentions. In most cases, same people were called to justify the legal requirement.
Figure 4.4 Frequency of Participation in the Budgeting Process

Source: Survey Data,(2021)

On the contrary, those who had not participated were asked whether they could consider participating in the budget making process in future given a chance. The results in Figure 4.5 indicated that 41% of them agreed that they could participate but still a larger percentage, 38.3%, stated that they could not participate even when given a chance.
Figure 4.5 Decision to Participate if given a Chance

Source: Survey Data,(2021)

As asked to explain the citizen’s perceptions on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia county, the interviewees felt that the citizens had a negative attitude towards the process. They stated that the citizens were unwilling to participate in budget making process citing reasons among them corruption and lack of political goodwill. In Nyandarua county Kenya, Wacera (2016) also indicated negative perceptions on Participatory Budgeting (PB) among the citizens. Some of the interviewees noted the following:

‘‘...most citizens are not reactive to the news of PB feeling that it was a waste of time...’’

‘‘...some citizens indicated that PB is for those close to the governor and so no need of indulging in fruitless activities ...’’
4.3.2 Descriptive Statistics of Citizen’s Perceptions

The first objective of the study was to determine the influence of citizen’s perceptions on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. The study sought to establish whether the respondent’s attitude towards participatory budgeting. The results presented in Figure 4.6 indicated that only 46.5% of the respondents had a positive attitude regarding PB stating that it helps them to air their development priorities. However, majority had mixed feelings as well as negative attitude towards the process arguing that it was not adding any value to the development of the county. In Nyandarua county Kenya, Wacera (2016) also indicated negative perceptions on PB among the citizens.

![Figure 4.6](image.png)

**Figure 4.6** Respondent’s attitude towards Participatory Budgeting

**Source:** Survey Data,(2021)
The respondents further rated statements on their perception regarding participatory budgeting. A perception index of 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree was adopted. The results are presented in Table 4.4 indicated that majority of the respondents disagreed that the county government takes their contribution seriously (M = 1.88 ; SD = 0.92), agreed that they can participate in budget making process since they trust the county leadership adherence to the rule of law (M = 3.51 ; SD = 0.50) and neither agreed nor disagreed that they can participate in budget making process since they believe in the county government leadership’s transparency (M = 2.73 ; SD = 1.11).

Majority also disagreed that they can participate in budget making process since they believe in the county government leadership’s accountability (M = 2.22; SD = 0.97) but agreed that their desire to make change drives their willingness to participate in budget making process (M = 4.53; SD = 0.50). Additionally, majority of the respondents felt that their desire to influence policies drives their willingness to participate in budget making process (M = 4.57; SD = 0.50). On average though, the citizen’s perception on PB is ambivalent. Related results were established by Aboelnaga (2017) who established that most Egyptians had mixed feeling about public participation given that they felt their opinion was not valued.
Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics of Citizen’s Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the county government takes my contribution seriously</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in budget making process since I trust the county leadership adherence to the rule of law</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in budget making process since I believe in the county government leadership’s transparency</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in budget making process since I believe in the county government leadership’s accountability</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My desire to make change drives my willingness to participate in budget making process</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My desire to influence policies drives my willingness to participate in budget making process</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.24</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data,(2021)

4.3.3 Descriptive Statistics of Information Availability

The second objective of the study was to establish the influence of information availability on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. The respondents were asked to indicate their thought on whether the county government is open in availing information on its activities.

The results as presented in Figure 4.7 indicated that the county government was not open in availing information regarding PB so that they can participate. This can perhaps be one of the reasons for low rates of participation. The findings are consistent with that of Ebdon and Franklin (2006) who indicated that in Uganda, the citizens felt that public
participation was a guided affair of a few and no relevant information was shared to the public.

![Figure 4.7 Whether the County Government availing information on its activities](image)

**Figure 4.7 Whether the County Government availing information on its activities**

**Source: Survey Data,(2021)**

The respondents further rated the extent of accessibility to reliable and comprehensive information on public finance. The results presented in Figure 4.8 stated that majority of the respondents, 66.8%, indicated that access to reliable and relevant information to a moderate extent while 25.8% stated that they have never accessed the information at all. Mbithi *et al.* (2019) similarly agreed that lack of information about county budgets and projects, greatly hampered the PB process.
The respondents further rated statements on information availability through a perception index of 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. The results are presented in Table 4.5. It was established that majority of the respondents disagreed on whether the county government readily avails information on public accounts (M = 2.41; SD = 1.18), they also disagreed on whether the county readily avails information showing its track record and the development plans (M = 2.21; SD = 1.00), disagreed on whether the information available to the public is comprehensive (M = 2.23; SD = 1.10) as well as whether the information available to the public is reliable.
(M = 2.21; SD = 1.06) and on whether the county government is timely in releasing information (M = 2.20; SD = 1.04).

The respondents however agreed that the county government conducts public awareness on participatory budgeting (M = 4.52; SD = 0.50) and neither agreed nor agreed on whether the county government readily avails information regarding the public participation dates (M = 3.45; SD = 1.32). On average, it was established that information availability on PB was to a low extent in the county. The findings are consistent with that of Papa (2016) who indicated that there was low public participation in Busia County as a result of lack of proper institutional frameworks to facilitate information dissemination for the process.

**Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics of Information Availability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The county government readily avails information on public accounts</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county government conducts public awareness on participatory budgeting</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county government readily avails information regarding the public participation dates</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county readily avails information showing its track record and the development plans</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information available to the public is comprehensive</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information available to the public is reliable</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county government is timely in releasing information</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.03</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Survey Data, (2021)
4.3.4 Descriptive Statistics of Citizen’s Knowledge

The third objective of the study was to establish the influence of citizen’s knowledge on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. The respondents rated their level of knowledge regarding participatory budgeting. Their ratings are summarized in Figure 4.9. It was established that up to 62.9% of the respondents are not informed about PB. Those who indicated that they are highly informed were only 14.8%.

The findings implied that there was low awareness and knowledge about PB in the county government. Ahenkan et al. (2013) also established that in Ghana, despite their willingness to participate in PB, majority of the citizens were less informed regarding matters to do with the budget making process in the public sector.

![Figure 4.9 Level of knowledge regarding Participatory Budgeting](image)

**Figure 4.9 Level of knowledge regarding Participatory Budgeting**

**Source:** Survey Data,(2021)
The respondents further rated statements on citizen’s knowledge through a perception index of 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. The results are presented in Table 4.6. It was established that majority of the citizens are not informed on matters regarding public budgeting procedures (M = 2.44; SD = 1.35), public participation requirements (M = 2.34; SD = 1.35), public financial management practices (M = 2.45; SD = 1.31) as well as social audit of the public sector (M = 2.45; SD = 1.37).

The results also indicated that majority of the citizens are not informed on matters regarding promotion of interest of minorities (M = 2.44; SD = 1.42) as well as matters regarding their rights as citizens (M = 2.46; SD = 1.33). Overall, it was established that the citizens had low knowledge on matters surrounding PB. Waheduzzaman (2010) similarly indicated that in Bangladesh, one of the critical hindrances to PB was lack of awareness and low level of knowledge.

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics of Citizen’s Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding public budgeting procedures</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding public participation requirements</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding public financial management practices</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding social audit of the public sector</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding promotion of interest of minorities</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding my rights as a citizen</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, (2021)
4.4 Determinants of Public Participation in Budget Making Process

To establish the determinants of public participation in budget making process in devolved governments in Kenya, the study adopted a binary logit regression model since the public participation in budget making process was a binary variable.

The results in Table 4.7 indicated that the three predictor variables, that is, citizen’s perception, information availability and citizen’s perception account for up to 40.1% of the variation in participatory budgeting in the county (Cox & Snell R Square = 0.401). This implies that the three factors are important in explaining PB in the county. Other factors other than the three account for the remaining variation (59.9%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-2 Log likelihood</th>
<th>Cox &amp; Snell R Square</th>
<th>Nagelkerke R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.538</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimation terminated at iteration number 8 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Source: Survey Data, (2021)

Unlike ANOVA and adjusted R-square in ordinary Least Square, a binary logistic regression model fitness is tested using Hosmer-Lemeshow statistic. In this method, the model is said to be significant if the Sig < 0.05 (Smith, 2015). As indicated in table 4.8, the binary logistic regression model predicting the determinants of participatory budgeting was a good fit (Sig < 0.05) implying that it was closer to the actual model hence a good predictor.
Table 4.8 Hosmer-Lemeshow statistic test of Binomial Logistic Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fitness</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>131.392</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data,(2021)

The regression model coefficients were also established as shown in Table 4.9. From the Table, it can be demonstrated that the predictor three variables, that is Citizen’s Perception, Information Availability and Citizen’s Knowledge had a positive relationship with participatory budgeting ($\beta > 0$). Additionally, the influence on participatory budgeting was significant (P-value < 0.05) at 5% level of significance.

Specifically, the results indicated that an improvement in the level of Citizen’s positive Perception can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process by 71.337 times (Odds Ratio = 71.337). The study findings are consistent with that of a study by Aboelnaga (2017) who indicated that the moment the citizens felt that their opinion was valued, it increased their public participation rate.

The results also established that an increase in information availability can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process by 2.812 times (Odds Ratio = 2.812). Mugambi and Theuri (2014) also established that the citizens are likely to increase their publication participation rate given availability of information and high awareness.
Similarly, it was established that an increase in the level of Citizen’s Knowledge can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process by 7.484 times (Odds Ratio = 7.484). The findings are consistent with that of a study by Hayrapetyan (2019) which indicated that in Armenia, citizen’s level of awareness and knowledge increased the chances of public participation.

In order of strength, the most important factors were citizen’s perception, followed by knowledge and then information availability.

**Table 4.9 Binomial Logistic Regression Model Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen’s Perception</td>
<td>4.267</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>16.325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>71.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Availability</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>4.246</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>2.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen’s Knowledge</td>
<td>2.013</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>25.265</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>7.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-25.502</td>
<td>4.233</td>
<td>36.304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable(s) entered on step 1: Citizen’s Perception, Information Availability, Citizen’s Knowledge

**Source:** Survey Data,(2021)
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The chapter summarises the research findings, provides the conclusion build-up and also the recommendations. The chapter also highlights areas for further research on the study theme based on the gaps identified.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The study determined the influence of citizen’s perceptions on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya, established the influence of information availability on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya as well as the influence of citizen’s knowledge on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya.

A mixed methodology was adopted to achieve these objectives. This section presents a summary of both the qualitative and quantitative findings per objective. Generally, it was established that there is a low public awareness regarding PB in the county in the tune of 29%. The study also established that in the county, there is high illiteracy level. Additionally, the level of public participation in budget making process in the county was low at 17%. The other findings are presented er objective.
5.2.1 Citizen’s Perceptions

The first objective was to determine the influence of citizen’s perceptions on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. It was established that majority of the citizens in the county had a negative attitude towards participatory budgeting arguing that it was not adding any value to the development of the county.

Additionally, it was established that the citizen felt that the county government does not take their contribution seriously, doesn’t adhere to the rule of law, is not transparency and accountable. Inferential statistics indicated that an improvement in the level of Citizen’s positive Perception increased the chances of participating in the budget making process significantly.

5.2.2 Information Availability

The second objective of the study was to establish the influence of information availability on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. The study findings indicated that the county government was not open in availing information. Besides, access to reliable and relevant information was only achievable to a moderate extent. The findings also indicated that the county government does not readily avail information on public accounts and track record and the development plans.

The existing information was not reliable and comprehensive. However, it was established that the county government has put in efforts to conduct public awareness on the importance of participatory budgeting. Inferential statistics indicated that an
improvement in information availability increased the chances of participating in the budget making process significantly.

5.2.3 Citizen’s Knowledge

The third objective of the study was to establish the influence of citizen’s knowledge on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia County, Kenya. The findings revealed that more than two thirds of the citizens are not informed about PB implying low awareness and knowledge about PB in the county government.

Specifically, majority of the citizens are not informed on matters regarding public budgeting procedures, public participation requirements, public financial management practices, social audit of the public sector, promotion of interest of minorities as well as their rights as citizens. Inferential statistics indicated that an improvement in the level of Citizen’s knowledge increased the chances of participating in the budget making process significantly.

5.3 Conclusion

The study concluded that there is a low public awareness regarding PB in the county in the tune of 29%. The study also concluded that in the county, there is high illiteracy level. Another conclusion is that the level of public participation in budget making process in the county was low at 7%. The study also concluded that majority of the citizens in the county had a negative attitude towards participatory budgeting arguing that it was not adding any value to the development of the county. However, an improvement in the
level of Citizen’s positive Perception can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process significantly.

It was also concluded that the county government was not open in availing information regarding PB and that access to reliable and relevant information was only achievable to a moderate extent. However, an improvement in information availability can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process significantly.

Another conclusion is that more than two thirds of the citizens are not informed about PB implying low awareness and knowledge about PB in the county government in regard to public budgeting procedures, public participation requirements, public financial management practices, social audit of the public sector, promotion of interest of minorities as well as their rights as citizens. However, an improvement in the level of Citizen’s knowledge can increase the chances of participating in the budget making process significantly.

5.4 Recommendations for Policy Implications

There is a need for the county government to run campaigns and create awareness in order to reverse the negative attitude and public relations they face from the citizens. The county government needs to relook at its image and public relations and improve where necessary and at the same time, sensitizing the citizens on the importance of participatory budgeting.

The county government also needs to show political goodwill in implementing some of the relevant suggestions from citizen’s contributions. Furthermore, there is a need for the
county government to win the trust of its citizens through promoting transparency and accountability in management of the public resources in an effective, efficient and economical manner.

Since majority of the citizens have low literacy level with secondary education and below, the county government needs to rethink its education policy in order to ensure that access to education, which is a human right, is advanced. The county government can implement programmes that aim to promote adult education since education was established to be a significant determinant of PB.

Given that the county government was not open in availing comprehensive and reliable information regarding PB, the study recommends the county government to ensure that they avail relevant information to the citizens beforehand. This can be done through road shows, print media, local CBOs, NGOs, Chief’s Barazas, local radio stations and televisions. In doing so, it increases turnout rates.

Given that majority of the citizens are not informed about PB, the county government can enhance the efforts and programmes aimed at creating awareness in order to increase the chances of PB. Programmes can be established to sensitize citizens about public budgeting procedures, public participation requirements, public financial management practices as well as social audit of the public sector in order to encourage boost their confidence to contribute on such matters.
5.5 **Recommendations for Further Study**

The study narrowed down to one county even though the problem of low public participation cuts across the country. Other researchers can thus widen the scope to other counties to find out whether citizen’s perception, information availability and citizen’s perception determine PB.

It was also established that the three variables account for up to 40.1% of the variation in participatory budgeting in the county implying that other factors other than the three explain the remaining variation. Therefore, other research can seek to establish the other factors which are critical in driving PB at the county government level.

The study assumed a direct relationship between the study variables without moderators and intervening variables. There is a need for future research to consider moderating variables since the relationship is not necessarily a direct one. Some of the moderating variables can be funds availability, socio-economic activities of the citizens and political goodwill.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Introduction Letter

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROJECT

I am currently pursuing a master’s programme at Kenyatta University, Kenya. One of the requirements for the award of the degree is to write a thesis in my area of study. The title of my research is **DETERMINANTS OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN BUDGET MAKING PROCESS IN DEVOLVED GOVERNMENTS IN KENYA: A CASE OF TRANS NZOIA COUNTY**. I am in the process of gathering data and I have identified you as one of the respondents in this study. I kindly ask you to take some time to respond to the attached questionnaire. The information you give will be treated with utmost confidentiality and at no time will your name be referred to directly. The information given will only be used for academic research purpose.

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Yours Sincerely,

**OSCAR KITUYI**

Research Student
Appendix II: Questionnaire

SECTION A: Demographic Information

1. What is your gender
   a. Female { }
   b. Male { }

2. What is your Age Bracket?
   a. Between 18 – 30 { }
   b. Between 30 – 45 { }
   c. Above 45 { }

3. Kindly indicate your designation
   a. Ward Administrator { }
   b. Resident of Trans Nzoia { }

4. Kindly indicate your highest level of education
   a. No Formal education { }
   b. Primary { }
   c. Secondary { }
   d. College { }
   e. Degree { }
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SECTION B: Citizen’s Perceptions

1. What is your attitude towards participatory budgeting?
   Positive  { }  
   Negative  { }  
   Ambivalent (Mixed feelings)  { }  

2. Kindly respond to the questions on citizen’s perception (Kindly tick the relevant box for each). Use a scale of 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the county government takes my contribution seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in budget making process since I trust the county leadership adherence to the rule of law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in budget making process since I believe in the county government leadership’s transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in budget making process since I believe in the county government leadership’s accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My desire to make change drives my willingness to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in budget making process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My desire to influence policies drives my willingness to participate in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget making process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: Information Availability

1. Do you think the county government is open in availing information on its activities?
   
   Yes { }  
   No { }  
   Explain  
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………..  
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………..  
   …………………  

2. Rate the extent of accessibility to reliable and comprehensive information on public finance?
   
   Not at all { }  
   Low extent { }  
   High Extent { }  

3. Kindly respond to the questions on information availability (Kindly tick the relevant box for each). Use a scale of 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The county government readily avails information on public accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county government conducts public awareness on participatory budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county government readily avails information regarding the public participation dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county readily avails information showing its track record and the development plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information available to the public is comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information available to the public is reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county government is timely in releasing information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D: Citizen’s Knowledge**

1. Rate your level of knowledge regarding participatory budgeting?

   Not Informed at all                   { }  
   Informed to a low extent              { }  
   Highly Informed                      { }  
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2. Kindly respond to the questions on citizen’s knowledge (Kindly tick the relevant box for each). Use a scale of 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding public budgeting procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding public participation requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding public financial management practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding social audit of the public sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding promotion of interest of minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am informed on matters regarding my rights as a citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION F: Participation in Budget Making Process

1. Since 2013, has the county government had participatory budgeting sessions as required by law?
   
   Yes { }  
   
   No { }  

2. Rate the impact of participatory budgeting on improving public financial management?
Low extent { } 
Moderate extent { } 
High extent { } 

3. Since 2013, have you ever participated in budget making process in your county? Yes { } 
No { } 

4. If you have (question 3 above) how many times?
   Less than 2 times { } 
   More than 2 times { } 

5. If you have not (question 3 above) would you participate given a chance? 
   Yes { } 
   No { }
Appendix III: Interview Guide

i. What measures has the county government put in place to ensure that the turnout for participatory budgeting is high

ii. Explain the citizen’s perceptions on public participation in budget making process in Trans Nzoia county

iii. How available is information to aide in participatory budgeting? Explain.

iv. Are the citizens informed on participatory budgeting? Explain.

v. What challenges are faced in promoting participatory budgeting in county governments? Explain the remedies.
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