



PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND THE BUDGETING PROCESS WITHIN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF NANDI, KENYA

Elias Kipyego¹,

Joshua Wanjare²

¹University of Nairobi, Kenya

²Dr., University of Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract:

Citizen participation is one of the national values in Kenya and is also a principle of public service. This study examined the key factors affecting public participation in budgeting process in the County Government of Nandi in Kenya. The study also sought to identify the key socio-cultural factors affecting public participation in the budgeting process in Nandi County. The study adopted a descriptive survey design targeting Community Based Organizations' (CBOs) members who are residents of Nandi County, CBO officials and officials from the Treasury and Economic Planning department in the County Government of Nandi. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select members of Community Based Organizations who were administered with structured questionnaires. The study found out that public participation enhances the quality of the budgeting process. The study also found out that stakeholders' involvement in budgeting process enhances accountability and transparency. Pearson correlation test found that there was a statistically significant positive relationship ($R = 0.513$) between stakeholder's involvement and budgeting process since $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.014$). It was also found that socio-cultural factors could also affect public participation in the budgeting process and using Pearson correlation test to determine the effect of socio-cultural factors on participatory budgeting process, the study found a weak positive relationship ($R = 0.203$) between Socio-cultural factors and budgeting process since $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.203$).

Keywords: public participation; budgeting process; public finance; accountability and transparency; Nandi County

JEL: H41, H61, H70

1. Introduction

Public participation and accountability in public finance in Kenya can be traced back to Kenya's decentralization initiatives. These initiatives included the District Focus for Rural development in 1980s, and the proliferation of decentralized funds in Kenya in the late 1990s (Oyugi and Kibua, 2006). The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) Act (2003) provided for participation of communities through project identification at the locational and constituency levels. The CDF Act (2003) has since been amended to align its mandate to the Constitution of Kenya (CoK) (2010). Article 10 of the CoK (2010) made citizen participation a central part of Kenya's governance system. Additionally, Article 174(c) of the Constitution of Kenya (2010) provides that the object of devolution is to; enhance the participation of people in the exercise of the powers of the State and in making decisions affecting them.

With the promulgation of the CoK (2010), the government continued to uphold the principal of public participation by anchoring the following legislative framework on public involvement in the governance process; the County Government Act (CGA) (2012), the Urban Areas and Cities Act (2011) and the Public Finance Management Act (2012). The provisions of these legislations empower the public to participate in planning and decision making processes in their respective local governments. Despite the provisions of these three legislations, most of the county governments and more specifically Nandi county has failed to effectively uphold the principle of public participation in the fiscal planning and in particular in the budgetary process (Kenya National Audit Report for the financial year 2014/2015). Similar complaints were also raised by the Civil Society Organization (CBO) through its petition dated 6th August 2015 to the Senate. This study therefore sought to identify the factors affecting public participation in the budgeting process in Nandi County. It sought to do so by examining the budgeting process with a view to identifying inherent weaknesses in the public participation process.

Public participation is a process through which citizens voice their input in public policy decisions (Malanilo, 2014; Roberts, 2002). Even though public participation and citizen involvement are used interchangeably, they are a means to ensure that citizens have a direct voice in public decisions (Irvin *et al.*, 2004; Russell, 1982). Globally, public participation in budgeting process has become an institutional procedure, being adopted by the European Union (EU) member countries and the Asian countries as a means of promoting transparency and accountability in fiscal policy/budgeting processes (Allegretti and Carsten, 2004). According to the results of the latest Open Budget Survey (OBS) conducted by the International Budget

Partnership (IBP) (2003), it was found out that, out of one hundred countries surveyed, Korea emerged the best as the country “*that provides extensive opportunities for public engagement*” (Gomez, Joel, & Isaac 2005). In the year 2003, president Moo Hyun Roh took office and his emphasis was on fiscal transparency and public participation (Gomez, Joel, & Isaac 2005). His administration introduced significant public financial management (PFM) mechanisms, including a medium term expenditure framework (MTEF), performance-based budgeting and integrated financial management information system (IFMIS) (Ackerman, 2005).

In some jurisdictions, the right to public participation is enshrined in law, whereas in others it is conceived as human right, or as a manifestation of the right to freedom of association and assembly (Malena and Janmehay, 2004). Additionally, in other jurisdictions such as the Netherlands, Germany, Denmark and Sweden, public participation have been incorporated into their legal framework and made a seamless system of information sharing (Gomez, Joel and Isaac, 2005). In democratic societies like the US, public participation have been incorporated into their laws, including, the right to petition which was made part of the first Amendment of the US constitution since 1791 (World Bank, 2003). Similar policies on public participation are evident in the urban planning where participatory structures have been in place for the last thirty years (Bay, (2011). More recently in the New Zealand, numerous laws (e.g. health, local government, environmental management) require government officials to “consult” those affected by a matter and take their views into consideration when making decisions (World Bank (2005). In the republic of South Africa, public participation is being managed around one principal philosophy of modernization, which proposed a top-down approach to development (Bekink, 2006). The Constitution of South Africa (1996) stresses the need for accessible services, promotion of sustainable economic growth, and equity in citizen participation in development initiatives. The republic of South Africa introduced the principle of “*Batho-pele*” through the Municipal Financial Management Act (2003), which was aimed at putting the interest of the citizens before everything else. The South African Constitution (1996) further requires local authorities to encourage citizen participation in policy-making and other local government activities, such as budgeting.

Public participation and accountability in public finance in Kenya can be traced back to Kenya’s decentralization initiatives (Oyugi and Kibua 2006). With the promulgation of the CoK (2010), the government continued to uphold the principal of public participation by anchoring the County Government Act (2012), the Urban and Cities Act (2011) and PFM Act 2012) to its Governance process (CoK, 2012). Participatory budgeting in Kenya predates the establishment of county governments

(CGA, 2012). The adoption of the Constitution of Kenya (2010) yielded a devolved system of governance, comprised of the national government and 47 county governments. This revived the hope for meaningful public participation (Muriu, 2014). For the first time in Kenya's history, public participation was enshrined in the constitution and was infused into all aspects of public administration. For example, Article 201 (a) requires that *"there be openness and accountability, including public participation in financial matters."* Article 196 (2) of the constitution requires that the county assembly *"facilitate public participation and involvement in the legislative and other business of the assembly and its committees"* (CoK, 2010).

The constitutional and legislative provisions avail various platforms for citizen participation in devolved governance (Muriu, 2014). According to Hongo (2010), public participation provides opportunities for citizens to be involved in a number of ways and at different levels viz: consultative meetings, consensus meetings, project committees and monitoring and implementation. At the initial level of consultative meeting, information on the budget process, resource availability, operational and institutional requirements are shared (Wampler, 2000; Souza, 2001 & Navarro, 2001; O'Toole and Marshall, 1988). The right to participation may also be advanced in the context of equality and group rights, which is meant to ensure equal and full participation of a designated group in society (Pickaver *et al.*, 2011; O'Toole and Marshall, 1988). According to Lakin, (2013), public participation is based on the assumption that open, participative processes lead to better decisions. He further argues that where the planner engages directly with stakeholders, an institution is likely to gain support, build consensus, identify acceptable solutions, and secure implementation.

At the second level of consensus meetings, the public discuss the programmes based on the community's demands (Wampler *et al.*, 2000; Walsh and Richard, 2007). The projects and programs identified are subjected to discussion with the guidance of technocrats (Avritzer, 1999). The degree of success in interactive planning is measured by the extent to which balance can be achieved among competing interests and the nature of consensus agreed amongst the participants (Lakin, 2013).

At the project committee level, the citizens elect their representatives whose role will be to steer the implementation of the projects/programmes in collaboration with the authorities (Souza 2001 and Heimans, 2002). The implementation will be through the guidance of technocrats (Rubin, 1990). Such efforts may also serve the long-term goal of enhancing governmental accountability and responsiveness (Adams, 2004). In addition to enhancing accountability, the project committees will help the government augment

a range of participatory activities in their fiscal planning process (Baer and Jaros, 1974; United Nations Development Programme, 2006).

The fourth stage of monitoring and evaluation is meant to help generate a feedback on the effectiveness and sustainability of the programmes (Hongo, 2010). While public participation efforts may not yield immediate victories for citizens in the budgetary process, they may however serve to enhance communication and trust between government officials and citizens (Cole, 1975). The enhanced communication and trust will lead to reinvigorated levels of popular participation (Adams, 2004).

Public participation in local budgeting generally falls within one or more of the following activities; public outreach and education, public surveys, budget advisory committees, budget workshops and forums for public/stakeholder deliberations (Avritzer, 2002). Other budgeting approaches include; consensus conference, citizens' jury and advisory committees (Creighton, 1993). According to Creighton (1993), these budgetary approaches resonate well on both acceptance and process criteria. Other mechanisms used to elicit public input in the budgeting process include; surveys, focus groups, interviews, comment (or point of service) cards, public meetings and use of interactive priority setting tools (Pickaver and Kreiken, 2011).

When participatory budgeting emerged in Brazil in the 1980s, the country was transitioning from dictatorship to democracy, and was characterized by one of the greatest income gaps in the world (Avritzer, 2002). The new constitution adopted in 1988 was very progressive and open to citizen participation, but the political system remained characterized by corruption and clientelism (Navarro, (2001).

In Africa, a series of political reforms in the late 1990s drove attention to a wide range of management tools that could open the way for participatory democracy (Olowu, 2003). Participatory budgeting experiments are often 'catalysts' supporting and even accelerating the effectiveness of decentralization reforms and associated principles of transparency and responsiveness (Sintomer *et al.*, 2010). In Anglophone Africa, participatory budgeting has merged with other tools, whose main objectives are to 'demystify budgeting', as the 'traceability of investments' and the 'consensual development planning' (Heller, 2001). According to Olowu (2003), the hybrid nature of African participatory budgets could play a positive role by opening new possibilities for poverty alleviation strategies and consolidating decentralization.

Participatory budgeting leads to a reorientation of public investments towards the most disadvantaged districts, at least those investments decided within the participatory process (Indeche and Ayuma, 2015). According to Muriu (2014), participatory budgeting in Kenya is a two way process where government provides opportunities for citizens' involvement in governance and the citizens choose whether

or not to utilize these opportunities. These opportunities are supported by constitutional, legislative and regulatory provisions (County Government Act, 2012). On the other hand, public participation with regard to the formulation of the County Fiscal Strategy Papers (CFSP), County Budget Estimates (CBE) and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDP) is guaranteed through the PFM Act (2012). According to the Kenya constitution (2010), public participation and governance processes at both National and County governments are mandatory and emphasized by the constitution and the subsequent laws on devolution (CoK, 2010). Article 10 (2)(a) of the Constitution of Kenya (2010), states that “*participation by the people*” is one of the values and principles of governance in Kenya (CoK, 2010). Article 232 (1) (d) of the CoK (2010) highlights one of the values and principles of public service as “*involvement of the people in the process of policy formulation*”.

Participatory budgeting in Kenya predates the establishment of county governments (Lakin, 2013). In 2001, Local Authorities (LAs) established a formal mechanism for public participation called the Local Authorities Service Delivery Action Plan (LASDAP) (Hongo, 2010). In order to access transfers from national government under the Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF), LAs were required to give citizens an opportunity to participate directly in planning and budgeting for a certain fixed portion of the available resources, with a focus on development projects (Kibua and Mwabu, 2008). Thus in order for LAs to access funding to pay for key services and manage their debts they were required to adopt the doctrine of participatory budgeting (Oyugi and Kibua, 2006).

According to the County Government Act (2012), various bodies are tasked with the facilitation and coordination of citizen participation. These bodies include the sub-county, ward, village administrators and village councils. These bodies are given responsibility for encouraging public participation in governance (Muriu, 2014). Nonetheless, there is only one structure in the law that is explicitly tasked with fomenting participation in the budget, and that is the County Budget and Economic Forums (PMF Act, 2012). The County Government Act (2012), further sets the primary mechanism for encouraging citizen participation in planning and budgeting, with specific reference to key formulation and implementation documents (Fiscal Strategy Paper, Budget Review and Outlook Paper). The Act however provides minimal legal guidance on how County Budget Estimates Forums (CBEFs) should function. According to Lakin (2013), there is however the need for a much more elaborate procedure of encouraging participation in budgeting. He concludes by stating that there is lack of clear law on how the CBEFs will address the challenges that were faced by

LASDAP in the past and hence in order to conceptualize on how best CBEFs can actually work, there is a need to move beyond the PFM Act (2012)

Section 137 of the Public Finance Management Act (2012) provides for the establishment of a County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF) in each County. According to the PFM Act (2012), the CBEFs are intended to provide a platform for the County Government and the public to consult on areas such as preparation of a County Fiscal Strategy Paper, preparation of the County Budget Review and Outlook Paper (BROP) and other matters relating to budgeting process and other fiscal policies. The CBEF is specifically designed to ensure public participation in the county's budgetary process. Despite provisions of the County Government Act (2012), the Urban Areas and Cities Act (2011) and the Public Finance Management Act (2012), most of the County Governments including the County Government of Nandi have failed to satisfactorily uphold the principle of public participation in the fiscal planning and in particular the budgeting process. Failure by the County Government of Nandi to uphold the concept of public participation has led to failure of projects/programmes to take off thereby denying the citizens the right to effective service delivery and efficient utilization of resources (KENAO reports, May 2016). This study therefore sought to establish the factors that affect the quality of public participation in the budgeting process.

2. Literature Review

In democratic societies, individual have the right to be informed and consulted so they can express their views on matters which affect them (Thomas, 1995). Public involvement in decision-making, is not a mere consultation process upon a preferred decision that supports both institutional legitimacy but a "bottom-up" approach to decision-making ((Smith and Thomas, 2004). This allows those with a weak voice to exert influence on decision outcomes (Halachmi and Holzer, 2010).

A study by Wu and Tzeng (2014) described the functions of participatory budgeting in Taiwan and analyzed the primary political effects of participatory budgeting. The study found that the development of participatory budgeting was facing several impediments because of potential political factors, including the concern of power relations between citizens and local governments in budget policy, political oriented budget process, the conflict of budget decision-making model between top-down approach and bottom-up approach, political thoughts and motives to budget policy, and potential budget actors. However, this study did not provide empirical information on how public participation forums, stakeholders' involvements and socio-cultural factors influence the quality of participatory budgeting process. Participatory

budgeting is a democratic procedure for drawing up a budget in which citizens without a political mandate take part in the process of planning (Souza, 2001). In this form of public participation, the focus is on local financial policy (Allegretti & Carsten, 2004). According to Hongo (2010), allocating public funds is a key Instrument of economic policy, with which the distribution of resources and thus the power Structure are determined. Participation by ordinary citizens in drawing up the budget makes this central sector of public administration more transparent, and is directed toward structuring public expenditure to achieve social justice and meet actual needs through enhanced accountability (DeSario and Langton, 1987). Apart from this, the process of negotiating the allocation of funds on the basis of consensus strengthens people's awareness of the meaning of democracy and boosts their willingness to play an active part in civil society (Lakin, 2013).

According to Muriu (2013), it is the responsibility of government agents to develop avenues for public engagements. These avenues provides platforms through which authorities enables the public to know the resources at its disposal. It is through such forums that citizens' desires and proposals can be incorporated into the budget (Hongo, 2010). This enhances service delivery because government programs are drawn public priorities (Oyugi & Kibua, 2006). Public participation in governance in turn enhances effective/good public governance through efficient resource allocation (Zhang and Yang, 2009). According to the theory of public participation, for there to be effective governance, there must be maximum citizen participation in governance (Pateman, 1970). Ebdon and Franklin, (2004) note that effective use of resources is measured by the extent to which the services delivered matches the preferences of the citizens. It is assessed by the extent to which citizen needs expressed in proposals are reflected in the decisions and final services provided. It is therefore expected that through participation by citizens, local governments have better knowledge of the preferences and hence can vary services to suit demands. Allocative efficiency is measured as the degree to which services provided match citizen preferences and the satisfaction level of citizens with it (Hongo, 2010; Kantai, 2010).

According to Franklin, Ho and Ebdon (2009), citizens should be able to access accurate and timely information about operation plans, disposable resources, budgeting requirements, accounts management and other financial indicators. The degree of reliability to access county information is determined by availability of venues/channels at the discretion of the citizens (Fisher, 1993). Such avenues include; public outreach and education, public surveys, budget advisory committees, budget workshops and forums for public/stakeholder deliberations. Latendresse, (1999) observes that for any meaningful public participation in governance process, the citizens' should be literate in

order for them to engage bureaucrats and advance their proposed priorities. Omolo (2011) supports this assertion by stating that the success of meaningful public participation in budgeting process largely depends on the literacy level of the citizens. Accordingly, literacy becomes a determining factor in public participation because illiterate people hardly understand the practical issues of governance. Transparency International (TI) (2014) observes that public participation in budgeting can only be effective if the local authority develops policies which allow citizens to access accurate and timely information for decision making. Such information will allow citizens to be involved in all fiscal planning besides monitoring implementation of the programmes (Kenya School of Government, 2015). Commonly used mechanisms include public outreach and education, surveys, budget advisory committee and budget workshops among others (Kahn, 1997). According to Hongo (2010), such public participation forums can be effectively conducted in town hall meetings, public hearings, hotlines, direct community involvement, participatory planning and budgeting, and monitoring and evaluation.

Citizen participation is a means to effective decentralization which in turn improves service delivery by affecting key determinants including allocative efficiency based on citizens' priorities (Kahn, 1997). The mechanism of citizen participation can largely be categorized into vote and voice (Key Jr., 1940). The levels of participation requires institutionalization of both vote and voice mechanisms in decentralized systems, so that the public can have unrestricted access to timely and accurate information, have the freedom of choice to be incorporated into membership of various forums and to be incorporated into advisory committees among others (Kahn, 1997). According to Olum, (2000), citizens' involvement can be undertaken through the following groups or persons; citizen advisory groups, interested individuals, professional bodies and the general business community.

Socio-cultural factors can play significant role in shaping both participation and participatory outcomes in the budgeting process. Social exclusionary practices like gender stereotyping, inequality and religious factors among others may undermine participation of certain groups particularly the women in decision-making (Moliehi, 2009).

Public participation in budgeting process can be effective if participants have the capacity to participate and engage authorities (Muchunu, 2015; Kantai, 2010). The capacity can be enhanced through acquisition of set skills, knowledge and operational capability. The same sentiments were echoed by Hongo, (2010) who asserts that, awareness without knowledge will not be of much benefit to the public participation process in budgeting. If anything, it hinders the ability of citizens to effectively

participate in governance. Citizens' awareness is one of the driving forces in participation of public governance (Cleveland, 1915). For citizens to actively take part in matters of public governance, they must be politically conscious and have access to information (Thomas and Germano, 2008). This means that they must not only be aware of their rights and responsibilities but also know the channels through which they can exercise them (Hongo, 2010).

In South Africa, Moliehi (2009) sought to assess the extent of citizen participation in local government decision-making, with focus on the local government budgeting processes. A framework of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil was used to assess participation in budgeting in the Mantsopa Local Municipality in the Free State Province with a view to drawing appropriate lessons for South Africa as a whole. The research found out that the political and administrative elites are still holding on to power that should be in the hands of citizens. Civil society groups are still being neglected in local government decision-making. Citizens are also not being encouraged and mobilised to take part in the budget process.

Malanilo (2014) analyzed the participation of citizens in budgeting process in local government in Tanzania. The study was conducted in the Ngara District Council in Kagera region. The findings from the research indicated that 92% of all respondents did not know how the budget process of the village as well as local government is prepared and 86% had never participated in budget formulation at village level. The findings indicated that there is a diversion from the process proposed by the guiding documents including the guidelines from the ministry of finance and the actual process done by the local government officials which exclude direct citizens' participation in the budgeting process for local government in Tanzania. The study also found that factors that hinder citizens' participation in budgetary process included formation of TUKI committee made by people between 4 to 6, which have confiscated citizens constitutional rights to participate directly in the budget formulation at village level. Another reason was the limited resources in the local government which makes it difficult to pay allowance for the days facilitators are in the process of formulating the budget for the village.

In Kenya, The County Budget and Economic Forum provide a platform for public participation in county planning and budgeting. Nonetheless, according to CIC Report (2015), devolution has suffered from lack of conceptual precision on the feedback mechanisms on the effectiveness of public participation in budgeting process. According to the CGA (2012), the county government shall facilitate the establishment of structures for citizen participation including budget preparation and validation (Section 91, County Government Act). Some of the formal mechanisms for public

participation include Pre-budget public sector consultative forums, County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF), Sector Working Groups (SWGs), and Budget and Appropriations Committee hearings among others. Most County governments have, however, not established effective structures reportedly due to lack of staff capacity (CIC, 2015).

To ensure that the public views are included in budgeting process, Section 115 of the County Government Act (2012), requires county governments to facilitate public participation in the county planning processes. Public facilitation can be done through; planning for town hall meetings where citizens meet at a dedicated venue in a central place and have conversations on the governance of their counties, it may also include creation of forums for Budget preparation, validation and platforms where citizens participate in managing the project. Additionally, county governments are encouraged to embracing Information communication technology based platforms for example; websites, blogs, social media sites, e-conferences, chat rooms, text message services and call centres as a means of promoting social accountability. According to the CGA (2012), county government shall facilitate the establishment of structures for citizen participation including budget preparation and validation (Section 91, County Government Act). Some of the formal mechanisms for public participation include Pre-budget public sector consultative forums, County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF), Sector Working Groups (SWGs), and Budget and Appropriations Committee hearings among others. Most County governments have not established effective structures reportedly due to lack of staff capacity (CIC, 2015).

Indeche and Ayuma (2015) investigated the effects of citizen participation on the budget preparation process in Mombasa County. The study adopted a descriptive research design with quantitative and qualitative data. The target population was the 4000 employees of Mombasa County Government. The study sampled 400 employees who were drawn from all cadres of staff. The study established that allocative efficiency affects the budgetary allocation in Mombasa County to a great extent. The reviewed study only focused on the effects of budget allocation on public participation but did not provide empirical evidence on effects of public participation on budgeting process. The present study therefore filled this gap in the literature.

Zhang and Yang (2009) conducted a review in literature on Citizen Participation in the Budget Process: The Effect of City Managers. The study focused on city managers and was conducted in Florida in United States of America. The study adopted a survey where questionnaires were sent to mayors and city managers forming a sample of 141 city managers. Statistical t –test was used to compare the means. The study found that managers' professionalism, perceived political environment, and attitude toward

citizen input are important factors explaining local governments' adoption of participatory budgeting (Zhang and Yang, 2009). The study by Zhang and Yang (2009) focused on city managers as facilitators of participatory budgeting process. It did not, however, consider the effect of other stakeholders such as citizens, CBOs and other government institutions on the budgeting process.

Muchunu (2015) conducted a study on the influence of stakeholders' participation in the budgetary process implementation of Government funded projects in Isiolo, Kenya. The study focused on civil society organizations, individual citizens, community group participation and funding agencies and donors as the stakeholders. The study adopted descriptive survey design using stratified sampling to access 579 respondents with data collected using questionnaires and interview schedules. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze quantitative data while thematic content analysis was used to analyze qualitative data. The study found that citizens did not have knowledge about the county budgeting process although a sizeable number attended county budget forums. The study did not, however, investigate the influence of the stakeholders' involvement in budgetary process.

3. Research Methodology

The research was conducted through a descriptive survey design. This method according to Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008, allows the researcher to have first-hand information on the dynamics and complexities of public participation in local governance. The researcher administered semi-structured questionnaires to the targeted respondents in Nandi County.

The design also used random stratified sampling to cluster the population in order to facilitate collection of quantitative and qualitative data from the selected sample population. The research was conducted through a survey, which according to Shamoo and Rensik, (2003) is a frequently used method for collecting information about people's attitude, opinions, or habits. The list of respondents in the study was obtained from the Ministry of Social Services offices in Nandi County. The participants in the study were drawn from representatives of 75 Community Based Organizations in Nandi County. The researcher used randomly administered semi-structured questionnaires to the stratified respondents and interview schedules to key informants. Key informant interviews were used to gather qualitative information (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008). The key informants were purposively selected because they are knowledgeable about matters of public participation and budgeting process. The interview schedules were designed to capture the themes of the objectives of the study.

The study used semi-structured questionnaires to collect the data. According to Shamoo and Rensik, (2003), questionnaires are used extensively in social research to collect data about phenomena that are not directly observable, inner experiences, opinions, values, and interests. Before administering the questionnaires, the researcher familiarized himself with the area of study in order to identify possible challenges and develop a mitigation strategy. Thereafter, interviewers administered questionnaires at the convenience of the respondents. The researcher later collected the questionnaires from the respondents. The data was coded using key words and then organized into themes for ease of interpretation. The analyzed data was presented in form of tables, charts and graphs. Pearson Moment correlation was used as the inferential statistics to establish the relationship between factors affecting public participation and budgeting process.

4. Data Analysis, Presentation and Interpretation

A total of 75 questionnaires were issued out and were all collected back. The high return rate was achieved due to concerted efforts by the researcher which involved administering the questionnaires by himself as well as making call backs to ensure the participants fully participated. The gender of the respondents was then analyzed as shown in table 1 below.

Table 1: Gender of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage %
Male	45	60
Female	30	40
Total	75	100

Source: Field data, 2017

From the table 1 above, it was established that 60% of the respondents were male and 40% were female. This shows that most of the officials and members of the registered community based organizations are male. However, the female gender is also reasonably represented.

The researcher also sought to establish the level of education of the respondents. This was important in gauging their awareness levels which consequently influences their involvement in the budgeting process. The results are shown in table 2.

Table 2: Education Level

Education	Frequency	Percentage%
Secondary level	12	16
Diploma	12	16
Degree	33	44
Masters	15	20
Doctorate	3	4
Total	75	100

The study found that majority of the study participants (44%) were first degree holders with another 20% being holders of post graduate degrees. This shows that most of the participants had adequate knowledge to understand their role in budgeting process.

The main aim of the study was to investigate factors affecting public participation in budgeting process in Nandi County. Thus, participatory budgeting process was the dependent variable measured in terms of perceived level of importance. To achieve this, the researcher designed a five item 5-point LIKERT scale where the study participants were expected to indicate their perceived level of importance on various aspects of participatory budgeting. The rate was given on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 = strongly disagree (SD), 2 = disagree (D), 3 = undecided (U), 4 = agree (A) and 5 = strongly agree (SA). The data was analyzed to show responses in terms of frequencies and percentages. Ultimately, the average (mean) score of each item was computed to determine the overall participants' perception regarding the particular statement as detailed in table 3.

Table 3: Perceived importance of Participatory Budgeting Process

Response	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total	Mean
Public participation in budgeting enhanced accountability.	36 48%	33 44%	0 0%	6 8%	0 0%	75 100%	4.32
Public participation in budgeting improves service delivery.	33 44%	39 52%	0 0%	3 4%	0 0%	75 100%	4.36
Public participation in the budgeting process enhances efficient allocation of resources.	39 52%	21 28%	0 0%	6 8%	9 12%	75 100%	4.00
Public participation in the budgeting process reduces corruption.	33 44%	21 28%	0 0%	18 24%	3 4%	75 100%	3.84
Public participation in the budgeting process ensures equitable development	48 64%	18 24%	0 0%	3 4%	6 8%	75 100%	4.32

The participants generally agreed that public participation in budgeting enhances accountability (Mean = 4.32) where majority (48%) strongly while another 44% agree. This shows that nearly all the respondents understood that public participation in

budgeting process enhances accountability. This finding is contrary to KIPPRA (2006) report which noted that both the community members and fund managers had a low awareness level of their roles and responsibilities.

Similarly, the study participants agreed that public participation in budgeting improves service delivery (Mean = 4.36) with majority (52%) agreeing while 44% strongly agreed. This was also found to be true regarding the statement that public participation in the budgeting process enhances efficient allocation of resources (Mean = 4.00) where majority (52%) strongly agreed with the statement and another 28% agreed. Thus, the found that public participation in budgetary process ensures equitable distribution of resources and thus improved service delivery. The findings are consistent with that of Souza, (2001) who noted that participation is perceived as a way of receiving information about issues, needs and attitudes, and which provides affected communities the opportunity to express their views before policy decisions are taken; it promotes equality, fairness and reasonableness in the allocation and distribution of public resources. On corruption, the study found that the respondents slightly agreed, with the decision tending towards neutral (Mean = 3.84), that public participation in the budgeting process reduces corruption. Although majority (44%) strongly agrees with another 28% agreeing with the statement, there is a significant 24% who disagree that public participation reduces corruption, further, 4% strongly disagreed. This shows that public participation in budgeting process in Nandi County has not been very effective in reducing corruption as noted by a significant proportion of the respondents.

With regard to public participation forums, the researcher developed a four item 5-point LIKERT scale which was administered to 75 respondents who are members of CBOs. The items were scored on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly disagree (SD), 2 = disagree (D), 3 = undecided (U), 4 = agree (A) and 5 = strongly agree (SA). Frequencies and percentages of each response calculated for each item was used to present the data and summarize the findings. Mean for the score on each item for all respondents was computed to make deductions on the specific items. Detailed findings regarding public forums and its effect on budgetary process are shown in table 4.

Table 4: Public participation forums

Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD	Total	Mean
Public outreach and education enhances the budgeting process and thus affects the quality of public participation.	21 28%	45 60%	3 4%	6 8%	0 0%	75 100%	4.08
Surveys are used to collect public views regarding the budgeting process and thus affect the quality of public participation.	24 32%	21 28%	0 0%	27 36%	3 4%	75 100%	3.48

Elias Kipyego, Joshua Wanjare
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND THE BUDGETING PROCESS WITHIN THE
COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF NANDI, KENYA

Budget workshops are used to collect public views regarding the budgeting process	30	24	0	21	0	75	3.84
	40%	32%	0%	28%	0%	100%	
Budget workshops are used to collect public views regarding the budgeting process and thus affect the quality of public participation.	30	15	6	24	8	75	3.79
	40%	20%	8%	32%	11%	100%	

The findings indicate that public outreach and education, surveys, committees and workshops are used to collect public views. Specifically, the respondents agreed that public outreach and education enhances the budgeting process and thus affects the quality of public participation (Mean = 4.08). This was found to be true as majority of the participants (60%) agreed with the statement while 28% strongly agreed. The finding shows that community members understand the significant influence of public outreach and education on budgeting process. In agreement with these findings, Hongo (2010) noted that public participation provides opportunities for citizens to be involved in a number of ways and at different levels viz: consultative meetings, consensus meetings, project committees and monitoring and implementation.

Similarly, the respondents agreed that budget workshops are used to collect public views regarding the budgeting process (Mean = 3.84). This was found to be true to a low extent as although a majority (40%) strongly agreed while 32% agreed with the statement, a significant 28% out rightly disagreed. Similarly, Allegretti & Carsten (2004) observed that public participation in budgeting process has become an institutional procedure, being adopted by the European Union (EU) member countries and the Asian countries as a means of promoting transparency and accountability in fiscal policy/budgeting processes.

However, regarding the view that surveys are used to collect public views regarding the budgeting process and thus affect the quality of public participation, this was found to be to a low extent as the study found a mean of 3.48. Specifically, majority of the respondents (36%) disagreed that surveys are used to collect information on budgetary process despite a cumulative majority of 60% agreeing (32% strongly agree, 28% agree). This finding corroborates the finding by CIC (2015) report that most County governments have not established effective structures reportedly due to lack of staff capacity.

In order to determine the effect of public participation forum on participatory budgeting process, Pearson moment correlation was used. The summated scores of the participants on the public participation forums and participatory budgeting process scales were used as the measure of the two variables. Correlation output is presented in table 5.

Table 5: Relationship between public participation forums and budgeting process

		Public participation forums	Budgeting process
Public participation forums	Pearson Correlation	1	.283
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.048
	N	75	75
Budgeting process	Pearson Correlation	.283	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.048	
	N	75	75

The study found weak but statistically significant positive relationship ($R = 0.283$) between public participation forums and budgeting process since $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.048$). This shows that increasing the public participation forums enhances the budgeting process in Nandi County. This finding is in agreement with Sabela and Reddy (1996) who concluded that increased public participation forums ensure sustainable service provision, accountability to tax-payers, promotion of social and economic development, as well as citizen participation in budgetary process.

In order to establish whether stakeholders' involvement affects the budgeting process in Nandi County, the researcher developed a four item 5-point LIKERT scale which was administered to 75 respondents who members of CBOs. The items were scored on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly disagree (SD), 2 = disagree (D), 3 = undecided (U), 4 = agree (A) and 5 = strongly agree (SA). Frequencies and percentages of each response calculated for each item was used to present the data and summarize the findings. Mean for the score on each item for all respondents was computed to make deductions on the specific items. Detailed findings regarding stakeholder's involvement and its effect on budgetary process are shown in table 6.

Table 6: Stakeholder's involvement

Response	SA	A	N	D	SD	Total	Mean
Stakeholders involvement in budgeting process enhance accountability and transparency	42 56%	18 24%	12 16%	0 0%	3 4%	75 100%	4.28
Citizen's advisory group enhances the budgeting process and therefore affects the quality of public participation.	24 32%	39 52%	6 8%	6 8%	0 0%	75 100%	4.08
Inputs of interested individuals in the budgeting process affect the quality of public participation.	24 32%	21 28%	27 36%	3 4%	0 0%	75 100%	3.56
Professional involvement in the budgeting process affects the quality of public participation.	42 56%	9 12%	18 24%	6 8%	0 0%	75 100%	4.00
Inputs by the business community and entrepreneurs enhance the budgeting process and thus affect the quality of public participation.	33 44%	30 40%	3 4%	9 12%	0 0%	75 100%	4.16

Table 6 reveals that majority of the respondents (80%) cumulatively supported the statement that stakeholders involvement in budgeting process enhance accountability and transparency, while (16%) remained neutral on the statement. Only (4%) disputed the statement cumulatively. A computed mean of 4.28 signifies that generally the respondents agreed with the statement, implying that stakeholders should be highly involved in the budgeting process because they promote and enhance accountability and transparency in the whole process. Similarly, an interview with the community based organization representative also reiterated that stakeholders' involvement in the process of budgeting is considered to be one of the means of increasing and enhancing service delivery as it promotes accountability efficiency and effectiveness.

The study also found that majority of the respondents at 84% agreed with the statement that citizen's advisory group enhances the budgeting process and therefore affects the quality of public participation. Only 8% disagreed with the statement as another 8% remained neutral. This shows that quality of budgeting process was also a dependent of level of involvement and participation of citizen's advisory group and public participation and this was also justified for the mean calculated as 4.08. Majority of the respondents at two thirds, 60%, also agreed with the statement that inputs of interested individuals in the budgeting process affect the quality of public participation, while 36% were neutral on the statement. Only 4% disputed the statement.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether Professional involvement in the budgeting process affects the quality of public participation. Over three quarters of the respondents at 78% supported the statement, 24% were undecided, while 8% cumulatively refuted that professional involvement affect quality of budgeting process. With a mean of 4.00, it can be generally inferred that professional involvement in the budgeting process affects the quality of public participation. The study also found that 84% were positive with the statement that inputs by the business community and entrepreneurs enhance the budgeting process and thus affect the quality of public participation, while only 12% indicated otherwise. This shows that involving professionals and business community in budgeting process promotes the quality and effectiveness of the budget.

In order to determine the effect of stakeholder's involvement on participatory budgeting process, Pearson moment correlation was used. The summated scores of the participants on the stakeholder's involvement and participatory budgeting process scales were used as the measure of the two variables. Correlation output is presented in table 7.

Table 7: Relationship between Stakeholder’s involvement and budgeting process

		Stakeholder’s involvement	Budgeting process
Stakeholder’s involvement	Pearson Correlation	1	.513
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.014
	N	75	75
Budgeting process	Pearson Correlation	.513	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	
	N	75	75

The study found an average statistically significant positive relationship ($R = 0.513$) between stakeholder’s involvement and budgeting process since $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.014$). This shows that increasing the stakeholder’s involvement enhances quality budgeting process in Nandi County.

One of the objectives of the study was to establish whether socio-cultural factors affect public participation in the budgeting process in Nandi County. Aspects of socio-cultural determinants were investigated using a LIKERT scaled questionnaire. The 5-point LIKERT scale was administered to the respondents who were members of CBOs. The items were scored on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly disagree (SD), 2 = disagree (D), 3 = undecided (U), 4 = agree (A) and 5 = strongly agree (SA). Frequencies and percentages of each response calculated for each item was used to present the data and summarize the findings. Mean for the score on each item for all respondents was computed to make deductions on the specific items. Detailed findings regarding Socio-cultural factors and its effect on budgetary process are shown in table 8.

Table 8: Socio-cultural factors in budgeting process

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean
Gender stereotyping affects the quality of public participation in the budgeting process.	33	18	12	9	3	3.92
	44%	24%	16%	12%	4%	
Beliefs interfere with the budgeting process and thus affect the quality of public participation	21	30	12	9	3	3.76
	28%	40%	16%	12%	4%	
Religious biasness affects the quality of public participation in the budgeting process	36	24	9	6	0	4.20
	48%	32%	12%	8%	0%	
Literacy levels of the citizens affect the quality of public participation in the budgeting process	33	21	6	9	6	3.88
	44%	28%	8%	12%	8%	

The study found that gender stereotyping affects the quality of public participation in the budgeting process as indicated by majority of the respondents at 68% who agreed

with the statement, while 16% indicated otherwise as 16% remained neutral on the statement. On this statement, the calculated mean of 3.92 implies that generally, gender typecasting may be detrimental to quality budgeting process especially when the stereotype is of negative kind. When asked on whether certain beliefs could interfere with the budgeting process and hence its quality, more than two thirds at 68% agreed with the statement, while 16% cumulatively indicated otherwise as another 16% remained neutral. This implies that certain beliefs such as corruption culture with the conviction that we have to fight for our share of limited resources or the need to make wealth out of the budget, may cripple the goals of the budget. The study also found that most of the respondents at 80% cumulatively agreed that religious biasness affects the quality of public participation in the budgeting process, while only 8% indicated otherwise.

Based on literacy factor, the study found that majority of the respondents at 72% agreed that literacy levels of the citizens affect the quality of public participation in the budgeting process, while 20% indicated otherwise as 8%.

In order to determine the effect of socio-cultural factors on participatory budgeting process, Pearson moment correlation was used. The summated scores of the participants on the socio-cultural factors and participatory budgeting process scales were used as the measure of the two variables. Correlation output is presented in table 9.

Table 9: Relationship between Socio-cultural factors and budgeting process

		Socio-cultural factors	Budgeting process
Socio-cultural factors	Pearson Correlation	1	.203
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.047
	N	75	75
Budgeting process	Pearson Correlation	.203	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.047	
	N	75	75

The study found a weak statistically significant positive relationship ($R = 0.203$) between Socio-cultural factors and budgeting process since $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.203$). This shows that increase in Socio-cultural factors influence the budgeting process in Nandi County albeit to a lesser extent.

5. Conclusions

This study sought to investigate factors affecting public participation in the budgeting process within the county government of Nandi, Kenya. The researcher sought to determine whether public participation forums affect budgeting process in Nandi County. Major findings drawn from these findings were that; most of the respondents agreed that public outreach and education enhances the budgeting process and thus affects the quality of public participation (Mean = 4.08). This was found to be true as majority of the participants (60%) agreed with the statement while 28% strongly agreed, implying that the community members understood the significant influence of public outreach and education on budgeting process. It was also found that the budget workshops were vital in collecting public views regarding the budgeting process (Mean = 3.84). This was found to be true to a low extent although a majority (40%) strongly agreed while 32% agreed with the statement, a significant 28% out rightly disagreed. However, regarding the view that surveys are used to collect public views regarding the budgeting process and thus affect the quality of public participation, this was found to be relatively lower since the study found a mean of 3.48. Specifically, majority of the respondents (36%) disagreed that surveys were used to collect information on budgetary process despite a cumulative majority of 60% agreeing (32% strongly agree, 28% agree). In testing the effect of public participation forum on participatory budgeting process, Pearson moment correlation was used and the study found weak but statistically significant positive relationship ($R = 0.283$) between public participation forums and budgeting process since $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.048$). This shows that increasing the public participation forums enhances the budgeting process in Nandi County.

The study also sought to investigate whether stakeholders' involvement affects the budgeting process in Nandi County. The study mainly found that majority of the respondents at 80% cumulatively supported the statement that stakeholders' involvement in budgeting process enhances accountability and transparency, while 16% remained neutral on the statement. Only 4% disputed the statement cumulatively. A computed mean of 4.28 signifies that generally the respondents agreed with the statement, implying that stakeholders should be highly involved in the budgeting process because they promote and enhance accountability and transparency in the whole process.

The study also established that majority of the respondents at 84% agreed with the statement that citizen's advisory group enhances the budgeting process and therefore affects the quality of public participation. Only 8% disagreed with the statement as another 8% remained neutral. This shows that the quality of budgeting

process also depends on the level of involvement and participation of citizen's advisory groups and public participation. This was also justified by the mean calculated being 4.08. Majority of the respondents at 60% also agreed with the statement that inputs of interested individuals in the budgeting process affect the quality of public participation, while 36% were neutral on the statement. Only 4% disputed the statement

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether professional involvement in the budgeting process affects the quality of public participation. Out of the 75 respondents that were polled, over three quarters of the respondents at 78% supported the statement, while 8% cumulatively refuted that professional involvement affect quality of budgeting process. With a mean of 4.00, it can be generally inferred that professional involvement in the budgeting process affects the quality of public participation. The study also found that 84% were positive with the statement that inputs by the business community and entrepreneurs enhance the budgeting process and thus affect the quality of public participation, while only 12% indicated otherwise. Using Pearson correlation test to determine the effect of Stakeholders' involvement on participatory budgeting process, the study found an average statistically significant positive relationship ($R = 0.513$) between stakeholder's involvement and budgeting process since $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.014$). This shows that increasing the stakeholder's involvement enhances quality budgeting process in Nandi County.

The study also sought to investigate the effect of socio-cultural factors on public participation in the budgeting process in Nandi County. The study found that gender stereotyping affects the quality of public participation in the budgeting process as indicated by majority of the respondents at 68% who agreed with the statement, while 16% indicated otherwise as 16% remained neutral on the statement. On this statement, the calculated mean of 3.92 implies that generally, gender typecasting may be detrimental to quality budgeting process especially when the stereotype is of negative kind. When asked on whether certain beliefs could interfere with the budgeting process and hence its quality, more than two thirds at 68% agreed with the statement. This implies that certain beliefs such as corruption culture with the conviction that citizens have to fight for their share of limited resources or the need to make wealth out of the budget, may cripple the goals of the budget. The study also found that most of the respondents at 80% cumulatively agreed that religious biasness affects the quality of public participation in the budgeting process. Based on literacy factor, the study found that majority of the respondents at 72% agreed that literacy levels of the citizens affect the quality of public participation in the budgeting process. Using Pearson correlation test to determine the effect of Socio-cultural factors on participatory budgeting process, the study found a weak statistically significant positive relationship ($R = 0.203$) between

Socio-cultural factors and budgeting process since $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.203$). This shows that increase in Socio-cultural factors influence the budgeting process in Nandi County albeit to a lesser extent.

References

1. Ackerman, J. M. (2005). "Social accountability in the public sector, a conceptual discussion", social development papers, participation and civic engagement paper No. 82, March, World Bank, Washington DC.
2. Adams, B. (2004). Public meetings and the democratic process. *PAR*, 64(1), pp. 43-54.
3. Allegretti, G. and Carsten, H. (2004). Participatory budgets in Europe: Between efficiency and growing local democracy: Transnational institute, Amsterdam.
4. Avritzer, L. (1999). Public deliberation at the local level: Participatory budgeting in Brazil paper delivered at the experiments for deliberative democracy conference, Wisconsin January, 2000.
5. Baer, M. A., & Jaros, D. (1974). Participation as instrument and expression: Some evidence from the states. *AJPS*, 18(2), pp. 365-383.
6. Bay, K. E., (2011). Does participatory governance deliver? Citizen participation and social service delivery in Nicaragua. PhD dissertation, at Brown University, <http://repository.library.brown.edu:8080/> [Accessed August 01, 2017].
7. Bekink, B. (2006). Principles of South African local government law. Cape Town: Lexis Nexis Butterworths.
8. Cleveland, F. A. (1915). Evolution of budget Idea in the United States: The annals of the American academy of political science.
9. Cole, R. L. (1975). Citizen participation in municipal politics. *AJPS*, 19(4), pp. 761-781.
10. Creighton, J. (1993). Guidelines for establishing citizens' advisory groups. Washington, D.C.: department of energy.
11. DeSario and Langton (1987). Citizen participation in public decision making: Explore the role of technology in public policy decisions.
12. Ebdon, C., and Franklin, A. (2004). Searching for a role for citizens in the budget process. *Public budgeting and finance* 24: 32-49.
13. Fisher, F. (1993). Citizen participation and the democratization of policy expertise: From theoretical inquiry to practical cases. *Policy sciences*, 26(3), 165-187.

14. Franklin, A. L., Ho, A. T., & Ebdon, C. (2009). Participatory budgeting in midwestern states: Democratic connection or citizen disconnection? *Public budgeting & finance*, 29 (3), 52–73.
15. Gomez, P., Joel, F., and Isaac S. (2005). Opening budgets to public understanding and debate: results from 36 countries. *OECD journal on budgeting*, 5:1, pp. 7-35.
16. Government of Kenya (2003). *Constituency Development Fund Act, 2003*. Government printer. Nairobi, Kenya.
17. Government of Kenya (2010). *The Constitution of Kenya, 2010*. The government printer. Nairobi.
18. Government of Kenya (2012). *County Government Act, 2012*. The government printer. Nairobi.
19. Government of Kenya (2012). *Public Finance Management Act, 2012*. The government printer. Nairobi.
20. Government of Kenya (2015). *Constitution Implementation Committee, 2015. An assessment of implementation of the transferred functions to the county governments*: The government printer. Nairobi.
21. Government of Kenya (2015). Kenya School of Government (2015). *Building public participation in Kenya's devolved government*. Kenya school of government working paper series 1.
22. Halachmi, A., & Holzer, M. (2010). Citizen participation and performance measurement: Operationalizing democracy through better accountability. *Public administration quarterly*, 34(3), 378–399.
23. Heimans, J. (2002). *Strengthening participation in public expenditure management: Policy recommendations for key stakeholders* OECD development centre, Paris.
24. Heller, P. (2001). "Moving the state: The politics of democratic decentralization in Kerala, South Africa, and Porto Alegre," *politics & society*, 29, no. 1 (March): 131-163.
25. Hongo, A. (2010). Promoting regulatory reform at local government level in Kenya. Paper presented at the network for regulatory reformers conference, Kampala, 20 January 2010. [Online] Available at <https://www.wbginvestmentclimate.org/advisory>.
26. Indeché A. and Ayuma C., (2015). Effects Of Citizen Participation On The Budget Preparation Process-A Case Study Of Mombasa County, *International Journal Of Social Sciences Management And Entrepreneurship* 2(1):107-122
27. Irvin, R. A., and Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen participation in decision making: Is it worth the effort? *PAR*, 64(1): 55-65.

28. Kahn, J. (1997). *Budgeting Democracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University press.
29. Kantai, W. (2010). *Lessons for devolution: A country comparative study in devolution in Kenya, prospects, challenges and the future*. Mwenda (ed). IEA research paper No. 24. Nairobi.
30. Kenya Institute of Public Policy Analysis and Research (KIPPRA). (2006), *Baseline Survey report on decentralized funds in Kenya*. Nairobi: KIPPRA
31. Key Jr. V. O. (1940). *American political science review*.
32. Kibua T.N., and Mwabu, G. (2008). *Decentralization and devolution in Kenya: New approaches*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi press. Nairobi.
33. Lakin, J. (2013). *Toward public participation in the county budget process in Kenya: Principles and lessons from the former local action service delivery*. Washington DC.
34. Latendresse, A. (1999). *The Porto Alegre participatory budget, An innovative experiment in urban governance*.
35. Malanilo J. S. (2014). *An Analysis of The Participation Of Citizens In Budgeting Process In Local Government In Tanzania: The Case Of Ngara District Council*, Unpublished Thesis, Mzumbe University
36. Malena, C. R., and Janmehay, S. (2004). "Social accountability: An introduction to the concept and emerging practice", participation and civic engagement paper No. 76, December, World Bank, Washington DC.
37. Moliehi, I. (2009). *Participatory budgeting in the South African local government context: the case of the Mantsopa local municipality, Free State province*, unpublished thesis, Stellenbosch University
38. Muchunu, H. N. (2015). *Influence of stakeholders' participation in the budgetary process on the implementation of Government funded projects: the case of Isiolo County, Kenya (Unpublished Thesis) University of Nairobi, Kenya*.
39. Mugenda, O. M. and Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods, quantitative and qualitative approaches: Centre for technology studies*. ACTS press Nairobi.
40. Muriu, A. (2014). *How does citizen participation impact decentralized service delivery?* <http://internationalbudget.org/wp>
41. Navarro, Z. (2001). *Decentralization, participation and social control of public resources: In Porto Alegre (Brazil) development*, 41(3).
42. O'Toole, D. E., & Marshall, J. (1988). *Citizen participation through budgeting. The bureaucrat* 17 (2).
43. Olowu, D. (2003). "Local democracy, taxation and multi-level governance in Africa" (paper prepared for Norwegian association for development research (NFU) annual conference on politics and poverty, Oslo, October 23-24.

44. Olum, Y. A. A. (2000). The political economy of decentralisation in africa, The case of Uganda, paper presented at a conference on challenges to the social sciences in africa in the twenty-first century, held at the international conference centre, Kampala on the 25th–27th October, 2000.
45. Omolo, A. (2011). Policy proposals on citizen participation in devolved governance in Kenya, Nairobi: The institute for social accountability (TISA).
46. Oyugi, L.N. & Kibua, T.N. (2006). Planning and budgeting at the grassroots level: The case of local authority service delivery action plans. New approaches. Nairobi: University of Nairobi press.
47. Pateman, C. (1970). Participation and democratic theory. Cambridge university press. Cambridge.
48. Pickaver, A. and Kreiken, W. (2011). Public participation legislation: Available from http://www.coastalwiki.org/wiki/Public_participation_legislation [accessed on 20-10-2016].
49. Republic of South Africa (1996). Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Notice 108 of 1996). Available online at: <http://www.info.gov.za> (Accessed 01 April 2008).
50. Republic of South Africa (2003). Municipal Finance Management Act (Notice 56 of 2003). Cape Town: Government printers.
51. Roberts, N. (2002). Keeping public officials accountable through dialogue: Resolving the accountability paradox. *Public administration review*, 62(6), 658–669.
52. Rubin I. S. (1990). Budget theory and budget practice: How good the fit: *Public administration review*, 50:179-189.
53. Russell H. (1982). *Collective action*: Johns Hopkins university press.
54. Sabela, T. and Reddy, P. S. (1996). The philosophy of local government in developing countries with particular reference to South Africa. In reddy, P.S. (Ed). *Reading in local government and development: A South African perspective*. Kenwyn: Juta.
55. Shamoo, A.E. and Rensik, B.R. (2003). *Responsible conduct of research*. Oxford University press.
56. Sintomer, et al., (2010). *Learning from the south: Participatory budgeting worldwide- an invitation to global cooperation* (Bonn: GIZ).
57. Smith R. W. and Thomas D. L. (2004). *Public budgeting in America*. 5th Ed., Pearson; Upper saddle river, New Jersey.

58. Souza, C. (2001). Participatory budgeting in brazilian cities: Limits and possibilities in building democratic institutions environment & urbanization Vol. 13 No 1 April 2001.
59. Thomas J.C., (1995). Public participation in public decisions: San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.
60. Thomas N.K. and Germano M., (2008). Decentralization and devolution in Kenya: Nairobi, University of Nairobi press.
61. Transparency International. (2014). Low public awareness and participation undermining devolution. Transparency International Kenya.
62. UNEP. Rio declaration- Rio declaration on environment and development- United Nations environment programme. Retrieved 2012-08-06.
63. United Nations Development Programme (2006). Participatory budgeting: Increasing citizen involvement in municipal development strategy formulation: A case from the south Porto Alegre, Brazil.
64. Walsh M.W. and Richard A. M. (2007). Theories of public finance; New York times.
65. Wampler, B. (2000). A Guide to participatory budgeting retrieved 10 June 2006 at <http://www.internationalbudget.org/resources/library/GPB.pdf>.
66. World Bank (2003), "Case Study 2 – Porto Alegre, Brazil: Participatory approaches in budgeting and public expenditure management", social development notes No. 71, March, World Bank, Washington DC.
67. World Bank (2005). Stocktaking of social accountability initiatives in the Asia and Pacific region, 2005, World Bank, Washington DC.
68. Wu, W., and Tzeng, W. (2014). Challenges in the Adoption of Participatory Budgeting in Taiwan: A Perspective of Budgetary Politics, Unpublished Thesis, University of North Texas
69. Zhang, Y., and Yang, K. (2009). Citizen Participation in the Budget Process: The Effect of City Managers. *J. of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 21 (2), 289

Elias Kipyego, Joshua Wanjare
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND THE BUDGETING PROCESS WITHIN THE
COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF NANDI, KENYA

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain copyright to their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Management and Marketing Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).