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ABSTRACT

This study examines factors that influence public participation in budget formulation in Nairobi County government. Specifically, this study was designed to address the following research questions; (a) What are the decentralization structures that influence public participation in budget formulation process? (b) How do socio-economic factors influence public participation process in budget formulation process? (c) How do behavioural factors influence public participation in the budget formulation process?

The sample population consisted of 104 participants. This sample was drawn from a population of 144 participants who took part in past (2014/2015) Nairobi County budget formulation process. The participants were drawn from seven constituencies namely Makadara, Starehe, Dagoreti, Kasarani, Embakasi, Langata, and Westlands constituencies. The sample was selected using purposive and simple random sampling. Data collection was done using a structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics were used to analyse data for frequencies and percentages distribution tables and mean. Data analysis was performed using inferential statistics mainly correlation and linear regression.

The findings of the study on what decentralization factors influence public participation revealed that both tokenism and non-participation influence public participation in budget formulation. Non-participation was represented by a significant negative association while tokenism was represented by significant positive weak association. The findings on the extent to which socio-economic factors influence public participation in the budgeting process, indicated that socio-economic factors influence public participation. However, this relationship was not significant. Findings from descriptive analysis revealed that education had the highest influence on the effectiveness of public participation in budget formulation with 69.48% of the respondents acknowledging that education level influences the effectiveness of public participation.

In determining how behavioural factors influence participation, the findings from descriptive analysis indicated that behavioural factors influence public participation and the most outstanding factor for public attitude was that people with positive attitude towards county government do participate more effectively while the most outstanding factor for the public trust was that people with higher trust on budget formulation process...
participate more effectively. However, there was no significant relationship between public participation and behavioural factors.

In conclusion, on decentralization factors that influence public participation, majority of Nairobi residents participate in budget formulation at the very basic level of non participation and tokenism. This was evidenced by a significant weak association between non participation and public participation as well as a significant positive weak association between public participation and tokenism. Equally, a linear regression indicated that 11.2% of the variation in public participation is as a result of decentralization factors adopted by the county government.

On Socio economic factors, it was revealed that social economic factors that had the most significant influence on public participation was education. Gender, age and income did not have much influence on public participation. The findings however show that there was no significant association between the social economic factors and public participation. The linear regression indicates that on 1.9% of the variation in public participation is as a result of the variation in social economic factors. On behavioural factors it was revealed that both public trust and public attitude influence public participation. However there was no significant association between the behavioural factors and public participation. The linear regression indicates that 2.5% of the variation on public participation is as result of the behavioural factors.

This study recommends that the county government of Nairobi put in place a policy framework to guide future public participation that guarantees meaningful public engagement in decision making and negotiation of trade offs in the budgeting process as way to improve decentralization factors. On social economic factors this study recommends that the county government includes people with high education level (Diploma level and above) for purposes of enriching debates on budget formulation. Additionally the county government should also offer basic trainings on budget formulation in order to equip individuals participating in budgeting process with essential skills. The county government should also ensure adequate gender representation.

On behavioral factors this study recommends that the county government should implement the views of the public that were suggested in earlier public participation forum in order to sustain public trust. Public officials should also ensure that the public resources are managed in transparent manner in order to inspire trust among the public.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

The opportunity to take part in a political process is such a fundamental tenet of any democratic society (Aulich 2009). Democratic theory suggests that public participation is undertaken to achieve different purposes and underlying goals. Public participation requires that people be at the centre of decision-making processes. Kanyinga (2010) argues that this is an important component of democracy because ‘rule by the people’ is the underlying and founding principle of any democracy. Therefore, involving people in making decisions that concern their lives is an important feature of democratic societies. This view is shared by (Muhammad et al 2010) who asserts that public participation is based on the democratic system to protect the rights of individuals and the public interest. Public participation is seen as important elements of the democratic government.

Tensions exist between views of participation as an essential element of successful democracy and participation as a means for achieving something else, be it a specific decision outcome with regard to resource sharing and utilization, a desire for more informed, accountable or legitimate decision making process, or the desire to give communities a stronger say in how they are being governed or contributing to a more educated and engaged public (Abelson & Eyles, 2004). Others argue that citizen participation facilitates dialogue in enhancing compromise, cooperation, and consideration of various policy options, as well as in increasing the legitimacy of the decision-making process (Adrain & Smith, 2006; Kim, 2010)

The challenge is to shift the paradigm arrangement of the political system from ‘experts and professional’ led model with institutional and functional separation of powers to that where citizens are fully integrated into governance. Traditional paradigm of participation call for citizen involvement through their elected representatives. According to Aulich (2009), however, this kind of participation is largely passive. Citizen participation in governance has traditionally centred on activities that enhance greater public access to information about government activities, facilitate the rights of citizens to be ‘consulted and heard’ on matters which directly affect them, and ensure that all voices can be heard equally through fair systems of representative democracy (Aulich 2009).
Participation is a fundamental human right. Since it strengthens commitment to democracy. All people, particularly young, marginalized and vulnerable groups, have a right to express their views on decisions directly affecting their lives (OECD, 2001). Participation is not a gift or a privilege bestowed from above (adults to children or Government to citizens), but the right of every person capable of expressing a view. This fundamental right can only be honoured if Government-citizen connections are further strengthened (Lukensmeyer, 2009). Lammers (1988) further asserts that Participation is not an end in itself; as a procedural right, it represents the means through which citizens may take part in and influence processes, decisions and activities.

According to OECD, (2001) public participation may be used interchangeably with the concept or practice of stakeholder engagement and popular participation. Generally public participation seeks and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision. The principle of public participation holds that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process. Lukensmeyer (2009) argues that Public participation implies that the public's contribution will influence the decision. Public participation may be regarded as a way of empowerment and as vital part of democratic governance. In the context of knowledge management the establishment of ongoing participatory processes is seen by some in the facilitator of collective intelligence and inclusiveness, shaped by the desire for the participation of the whole community or society.

OECD, (2001) asserts that Public participation is part of “people centred” or "human centric” principles, which have emerged in Western culture over the last thirty years, and has had some bearings of education, business, public policy and international relief and development programs. Public participation is advanced by the humanist movements. Public participation may be advanced as part of a “people first” paradigm shift. In this respect OECD, (2001) concludes that public participation may challenge the concept that "big is better" and the logic of centralized hierarchies, advancing alternative concepts of “more heads are better than one” and arguing that public participation can sustain productive and durable change.
According to Moseti (2010), participation serves as an instrument for closing the gap between local government, civil society, private sector and the general community by developing a common understanding about local situation, priorities and programmes. Therefore, the aim of public participation would be to promote shared understanding, transparency and accountability in governance and create ownership of development decisions, programmes and project. Tshabalala & Lombard, (2009) further argues that this process allows marginalised individuals to have voices in the implementation development initiatives. It enables for full involvement of ordinary members of the community in decision making, planning, designing, organising and executing development initiative that affect them.

Dola and Mijan (2006) list some of the importance of public participation to include promotion of consensus and stability conflict reduction and increase of consciousness and containment and bargaining. However, they also argue that an increase in participation doesn’t necessarily lead to an increase in service delivery. Over the years and during the clamour for a new constitution, Kenyans made public participation an important principle in which they seek to underpin the governance of public affairs. (Economic and Social Rights Centre, 2013) Public participation became an important theme in debates on governance in Kenya. Because of this, and in recognition of protracted struggles for democratic reforms that had taken place over the years, article 10 of Kenya’s new constitution enacted in 2010 included democracy and participation of the people among the values and principles of governance, which bind all state organs and institutions as well as state officials (Kanyinga 2014).

According to the Government of Kenya (2010) the constitution entrenches public participation as one of the fundamental privileges of the Kenyan people. Chapter 11 of the constitution, which addresses Devolved governments specifically spells out the importance of citizen participation in the affairs of government. Article 196 on public participation and county assembly powers, privileges and immunities clearly stipulate that the county government shall facilitate public participation and involvement in the legislative and other business of the county assembly and its committees(Government of Kenya 2010). Article 174 of the constitution gives the power of self- governance to the
people of Kenya and promotes the participation of the citizens in exercise of the power of the state and in making decisions on issues that affect them.

Budgeting is a fundamental activity of any government world over. Through the process, the government is able to translate the use of physical resources to meet national priorities and fulfil their promise to the electorate. Citizens on their part expect the process of budgeting to be fair, transparent, and equitable (OECD 2007). A decade ago, the thinking on budgeting among technocrats, macroeconomic policy makers and academics advocated for a process that was undertaken exclusively by technocrats in the Ministries of Finance and Ministries of Planning. The preference was to carry out a process devoid of ‘politics’ (World Bank, 2002).

Studies conducted by the Haggard and Webb (1994) argue that for this reason, politicians delegated decision making authority to technocrats who were insulated from pressure and interference from interest groups, the legislature and bureaucratic processes. Empirical findings on this matter were contrary to this argument. Studies by the World Bank (2002) found out that a more inclusive approach with key stakeholders including the public would enhance the sustainability of policies and improve their prospects for implementation success.

In the last two decades some Latin American countries have implemented participatory budgeting as a way of incorporating citizens perspectives into budget making in order to increase citizens right to participate and enhance transparency. Some of these countries include Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, El Savador, Dominican republic, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, Nicaragua, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. By the year 2007, 2,500 local governments in these countries were implementing participatory budgeting with great success (ELLA 2012).

In recent years, public participation in budgeting process is founded upon principles such as Legitimacy, Accountability and transparency in decision making, inclusivity and fairness (Economic and Social Rights Centre 2013) Kenya was among the first countries in Africa beside South Africa to make public participation in budgeting a constitutional requirement (Economic and Social Rights Centre 2013) Kenyan constitution enacted in
2010 entrenches public participation as one of the fundamental privileges of the Kenyan people. Chapter 11 on Devolved governments specifically spells out the importance of citizen participation in the affairs of government. This is outlined in appendix five. Article 196 on public participation and county assembly powers, privileges and immunities clearly stipulate that the county government shall facilitate public participation and involvement in the legislative and other business of the county assembly and its committees (Government of Kenya 2010).

Article 201 of the Kenyan constitution spells out some of the key public finance principles including the need for openness and transparency in public finance matters. The principles also emphasise that public participation shall be promoted in the decision making and budgeting process (National Taxpayers Association 2013)

The Kenya’s Public Financial Management (PFM) Act, which was signed into law by the President in July 2012, provides the legal framework for the participation of the public in budgeting and ensuring accountability in financial management. The Bill makes several references to the need to ensure public participation in different financial management processes. (Government of Kenya 2014) the Parliamentary Budget Office is expected to “observe the principle of public participation in budgetary matters” (10:2) The Treasury is required to “seek and take into account the views of the public” in preparing the Budget Policy Statement each year (25:5). Article 36:5, for example, instructs the Cabinet Secretary for Finance to draft regulations concerning public participation in the budget process at national level. This act repeatedly makes reference to the role and significance of the public participation in budgeting and financial management. The PFM act also created the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF) whose principal function is to convene public consultations on budgetary matters at the county level (Government of Kenya 2014).

The enactment of the CDF Act of 2003 and the LATF present the best effort of the Kenyan government at decentralising funds at the constituency level and promoting grassroots development planning where communities participate in the identification, design, implementation and evaluation. (Institute of Economic Affairs, 2012) in the implementation of the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) in Kenya, public participation is realised through participation in committees. Members of the public
involvement in the implementation of CDF projects has been through the Project Management Committees (PMCs) which comprise of members of the public who manage and oversee the implementation of individual CDF projects (Institute of Economic Affairs 2012).

Upon the enactment of the new constitution and the establishment of county governments, the county budgeting process was also expected to be aligned to the constitution with respect to public participation. The constitution is very clear that the County governments must involve the public in decision making, including in the budgeting process (Government of Kenya 2010). According to Economic and Social Rights Center (2013), key areas where the public involvement is expected include: the preparation of the County Integrated Development Plan; the preparation of the County Fiscal Strategy Paper and review of the budget estimates by the County Assembly. To fulfil this expectation, County governments are required to develop guidelines on public participation (Economic and Social Rights Centre 2013).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Although Kenya has put in place legal instruments and policy frameworks to foster public participation in the budgetary process at the county level, these have not been implemented fully by the county governments. The policy and legal instruments also provide broad policy statements with very little specifics with regards to how and when public participation is supposed to take place. Economic and Social Rights Centre (2013) has documented some of the challenges that affect effective citizen participation in budgeting process. These include resistance towards the politics of participation, inadequate transparency of the budget information, lack of structured mechanism for participation, an insensitive legislation to citizen demands on the budget, absence of avenues for effective remedies and inadequate citizen capacity. Because of this, a majority of the citizen and especially the poor are still not effectively participating in making budget decisions and policies that are meant to address high levels of poverty and inequality that are seen in the Kenya. This situation is common in many county governments. The Nairobi county government has not yet clearly defined and set up a definite threshold that determines how to incorporate public views in matters related to the budgeting formulation. The county has also not developed a policy to that effect. (County Government of Nairobi, 2014) This has in effect limited the effectiveness of
public participation in budgeting process. Available research indicate that public attitude toward local government might differ according to variables such as, age, income, education, occupation and sex (Kosecik & Sagbas, 2004). Other factors include lack of trust in future engagements sometimes based on the past engagement in government led initiatives (Sipilanyambe et al, 2013). These variables have considerable influence in public attitude toward their local government and consequently influence their amount of participation in local government affairs. This study seeks to examine the factors influencing public participation in Budget formulation in Nairobi County with a view of making recommendations on how the public can be involved more effectively in budgeting process. The study looks at how decentralization structure factors, socio economic and behavioural factors affect public participation in the budget formulation.

1.3 Purpose of Study
The purpose of this study is to assess the factors that influence public participation in budget formulation in Nairobi County.

1.4 Specific Research Questions
1.4.1 What are the decentralization structures that influence public participation in budget formulation process?
1.4.2 How do socio-economic factors influence public participation process in Budget formulation process?
1.4.3 How do behavioural factors influence public participation in the budget formulation process?

1.5 Significance of the Study
This study examined the factors influencing public participation in budget formulation. This information will be useful for the Nairobi county government as well as the national government to inform their policy and actions on the participation of the public in budgeting process. This will help improve future policies that will be enacted to foster public participation in budget formulation. The proposed study will also contribute to academic research in the discipline of public finance and governance specifically on issues of public participation in policy formulation, especially budgeting process.
1.6 Scope of the study
This research was carried out in seven constituencies of Nairobi County. These are Starehe, Dagoreti, Kasarani, Embakasi, Madaraka, Lanagata and Westlands. A total of 104 respondents were sampled for the study. This number was selected from the study population of 144 people who previously participated in the process of budget formulation (2014 budgeting process). This study was conducted between February and June 2015. The report was completed in June 2015.

1.7 Definition of Terms
1.7.1 Budget:
A budget is a plan for raising revenue and planning the same. The budget identifies the sources of revenue and allocates expenditure to the various sectors of the government. It is the means through which a county mobilises resources and allocates them to competing needs. (Institute of Economic Affairs, 2014)

1.7.2 Budgeting Formulation:
Budgeting formulation involves identification of budget priorities at the sector level or during the consolidation of the budget estimates (Institute of Economic Affairs, 2014).

1.7.3 Public (Citizen) Participation in budgeting:
This is the process of democratic policy making in which government invites citizen inputs during the budgeting process and allows their influence in allocations of the budget for public expenditure (Zhang and Yang 2009). It involves giving citizen some decision making power in determining allocations within budget at the constituency and county level either through consultation with the public and/or shared decision making with the public on budget formulation. (Norton & Elson 2002). This involvement can be done through departmental working group, County Budget and Economic forum organised at the Sub County and Ward levels or through public consultations during formulation of County Budget Review and Outlook paper (CBROP) (Institute of Economic Affairs 2014)
1.7.4 Decentralisation Factors
These are the levels to which the public is engaged in decision making on budget formulation process. To identify the appropriate level of public participation to which the public should be engaged the government authority should determine how much potential influence they are willing to allow to the public on decisions or actions. The three levels of public participation identified are non participation, tokenism and citizen power. (Armstein 1969)

1.7.5 Socio Economic Factors
These are demographic factors that influence public participation in budget formulation they include income levels, educational level, age and sex of the individuals who participate in budget formulation process (Akhtar 2012).

1.7.6 Behavioural Factors
These are overt actions and underlying psychological processes of an individual that influence their participation in budget formulation processes. They include trust and attitude (Mizrahi 2009).

1.8 Chapter Summary
This chapter provides a background of study that examines factors that influence public participation in budget formulation. This is followed by the statement of the problem that describes the need of the research project and the gaps this research intends to fill for the benefit of the users of the research. The purpose of the study is then highlighted and the significant of the study to the users including policy makers, and the academia is shared. The chapter outlines the scope of the study as well as definitions of key terms and concept. The following chapter present literature review of the subject under study. Chapter three explains the research methodology that was used while chapter four outlines the results and findings of the study. Finally chapter five presents a summary of the study through short discussion, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines previous literature that has been written on the various factors influencing public participation in budget formulation. The factors are based on the research questions highlighted in chapter one. These include: decentralized systems and structures, socio economic factors, and behavioural factors.

2.2 Decentralized Systems and Structures that Influence Public Participation

In sequential theory of decentralization, decentralization is defined as the process where governance responsibilities, resources, and authority is transferred from higher to lower levels of government so as to enhance public participation in the way they are governed and how resource due to them are shared and utilized (Brinkerhoff, et al., 2007). Cheema and Rondinelli (2007) describe decentralized systems as framework at the sub-national level that enable the public to engage in policy formulation, implementation and monitoring. Cheema and Rondinelli (2007) argues that public participation in budgetary enables citizens to organize themselves and participate in the budgetary planning, formulation, and implementation in regards to issues they consider of vital importance to them.

According to Van Speier (2009), Public participation in budgetary process is the act of giving a voice to citizens so as to accord them an opportunity to influence the making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of budgetary decisions that concern their socio-politico-economic wellbeing. This is also done to enhance citizen’s ability to demand accountability, and transparency from their local leadership. Brinkerhoff, et al., (2007) suggests that the benefits of public participation in budgetary formulation are optimized when both the public voice is institutionalized through systems and structures. To ensure this is done, public participation mechanisms like public hearings, town hall meetings, and direct community engagements involvement, participatory planning and budgeting should be enhanced (Esonu & Kavanamur, 2011).

There are different mechanisms through which public participation can be enhanced. According to John (2009), public participation in budgetary formulation can be directly or
indirectly. Direct participation is where the public ability and awareness on budget formulation is enhanced so as to enable the public participate individually or in various forms of self-organization. Similarly, indirect public participation is where public is a situation where local communities or citizens within decentralized units participate in budget formulation through their elected and other representatives (Robinson, 2007). The main goal of public participation is to enhance interaction of the citizens and the state in decision making, and to increase public participation and proximity to government institutions, planning and utilization of resources through budgeting (Wachira, 2010). To enhance these structures and systems for public participation in budgetary formulation, literature review for this study looks at how levels public participation enhances public participation in budgetary formulation.

2.2.1 Levels of Public Participation

According to Robinson (2007), levels of public participation is defined as the degree to which citizens of devolved units actively engage the the governance system, and decision making structures so as to influence how they are to be governanced, or how resources attributable to the citizens are accrued, planned for, and spent. According to Young (2008), public participation in budgetary formulation can only be enhanced through institutional frameworks. If the publics institutional analysis is perceived to address their social-economic and cultural issues, then the public will engage (Esonu & Kavanamur, 2011). The level to which the public engages and endorses the structures of participation is directly related to the perception of the goodness of fit of the structures and mechanisms. In retrospect, this establishes the level at which the public will engage the local or national governance in budgetary formulations and planning (Von Korff, et al., 2010).

Frey et al., (2004), and Moller et al., (2006), argue that human motivation is central tenet in establishing relationship between governance structures, systems and levels of public participation. Similarly, Deci and Ryan, (2008) contends that human beings are creatures of habit whose function is based on level of motivation. Further, they argue that for the public to engage actively in any civil, or governance process including budgetary process, they have to feel that the engagement process actually fulfils their needs. Therefore, it is
extremely essential of decentralized units to establish and link benefits of budgetary planning and formulation to public participation (Esonu & Kavanamur, 2011)

Equally important, Ostrom (2009), argues that public participation requires an environment that precipitates desire for engagement in decision making, and also an environment that guarantees the public’s inherent psychological need for procedural justice, self-determination, and fair involvement. According to Aref and Redzuan, (2009) institutional acceptance by the public determines whether they will engage with the articulated public participation process. In devolved units public participation indicates acceptance of the structures and systems (Young, 2008). However, according Ostrom (2009), structures and systems in themselves do not constitute acceptance, rather the extent to which opinion leaders inspires acceptance. Ostrom (2009), further argues once opinion leaders at a national level and elected leaders enhance the zeal of local citizens in devolved units to participate more fully in planning and implementation budget resources at the local level.

Yang (2008) contends that devolved system framework for public participation must ensure effective involvement of citizens in the local affairs. Further, Yang (2008) argues that for public participation to be effective, citizen’s participation mechanisms should be matched to the local social–ecological context to which the citizens belongs in order to establish the goodness of fit in defining what participation means. According to Deci and Ryan, (2008) the level of public participation therefore will be to the degree that the public perceives participation as goodness fit. Ostrom (2009), Aref and Redzuan, (2009), and Robinson (2007), equally argue that citizens subjective definitions of participation by local devolved units does influence the level their participation in budgeting within the units. Aref and Redzuan, (2009), contends that factors such as cultural norms on decision-making such as class, gender and education levels influence levels of public participation.

Ostrom (2009) in his institutional framework analysis of on research done on social–ecological diagnosing of participatory fit, argues that the study of public participation within decentralized units can only elevate levels of participation if social cultural, and economic tenets are synchronized to address the needs the public it is endearing for budgetary participation.
According to Arnstein’s (1969) classic on the ladder of citizen participation, educational pamphlets, attitude surveys, and public hearings do not constitute public participation. The argument behind this assertion is that attitude surveys, education pamphlets, and hearings do not provide direct citizen control over the participation process of budgetary planning, formulation and implementation. Arnstein (1969), and IAP2 (2007) research on taxonomy of self-governance argue that constitute public participation can only be executed through direct representation or delegated representation on boards, and other types or arrangements of shared decision-making.

Equally, Andrade and Rhodes (2012), argue that the true forms of public participation must give citizens more direct decision-making control, with a structural system that is fair to enhance the participation. Andrade and Rhodes (2012), equally contend that measuring high levels of participation in budgetary formulation from a psychological standpoint, does not necessarily translate into actual participation since the reliability of human motivation in public participation must be measured at different levels.

This study adopted Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of citizen participation as shown in figure 1 below:

**Table 2.1: Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of citizen participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Control</th>
<th>Citizens Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegated Power</td>
<td>}Citizens Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>}Tokenism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placation</td>
<td>}Non- Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>}Non- Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>}Non- Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>}Non- Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>}Non- Participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Arnstein’s (1969)

According to DeCaro and Stokes (2008), level 1 and 2 of public participation constitutes non – participation which has manipulation and therapy levels; Level 3, 4, and 5 are referred to as tokenism, and constitutes informing, consulting and placation. However, DeCaro and Stokes (2008), argue that tokenism levels lack to ensure actual participation
form the public, in as much as they enhance the ability of the public to hear and be heard. Ostrom (2009) argues that when budgetary participation is restricted to tokenism, the public lack the ability to follow through on actual planning, formulation and implementation of the budget. There is no actual power within the public to decide, and enforce their decision in planning.

According to Ostrom (2009), the publics’ power in decision-making clout is enhanced with levels 6 (Partnership) where the public can negotiate trade-offs with power holders; level 7 (Delegated Power) and level 8 (Citizen Control), where the public actually have acquired majority say in budgetary formulation, planning and implementation. Just like Ostrom (2009), DeCaro and Stokes (2008), and Andrade and Rhodes (2012); Stringer, et al., (2006) argues that there is a significant correlation between the degree of public participation, and levels of public participation.

2.3 Socio Economic Factors that Influence Public Participation

2.3.1 Gender and Public Participation

Concepts of ‘participation’ and ‘gender’ have been a part of emancipatory discourse and practices for the last decade. Advocates of these concepts have claimed that they allow the representation of the most marginalized groups - women and the poor (Akerkar, 2001).

The study of historical, philosophical, political texts show that "women have been kept outside the public domain of politics as most of the political thinkers and philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau, John Lock, Thomas Hobbes and Hegel considered women fit only for domestic roles in the private sphere and maintained that there was no place for women in politics because of their suitability in caring roles as mothers and wives" (Bari, 2005).

The low patronage of women in politics and public decision-making is a global phenomenon. Throughout history, men have monopolized and dominated strategic decision making positions. Despite the achievement of universal suffrage, increased education and incomes for women, and efforts to increase participation of women in
public life, women everywhere remain marginalized and under-represented in those areas of public life where important decisions and policies are made. (ADRRI)

Doopersad (2014) concludes that in order to emancipate women and ensure that they fully participate in democratization processes that it is vital to review and revise existing constitutional, political, legislative and regulatory frameworks, including electoral systems, to remove provisions that hinder women's equal participation in the decision-making processes. Studies undertaken in Africa by Baah - Ennumh, et al, Karpowitz et al (2012) Zaman (2007) Agbalajobi (2010), Ihmeje (2013) and Omodia et al (2013) argues that women participation in governance in Africa face a myriad challenges including religious and cultural beliefs, lack of economic empowerment, lack of effective means of implementing affirmative action, men dominance of political power, relatively low education levels of women, multiple roles of women in the family setup, women attitude to the process of governance, lack of confidence on the part of women and demanding nature of the work at the local assembly level. Ihmeje (2013) further argue that marginalization of women in local governance is nothing but an elongation of male dominance in virtually all political affairs. As such, historical fact of this nature is strongly associated with the attitudinal views which had often impede the chances of women to having more political representatives at the various local government.

According to Mukhopadhyay (2005), democratic decentralization is critical for women not only because of the proximity of local government to their lives but because they are often excluded from government decision-making at the national level. Contrary to views that local government is the level that women can easily break into and thus serve as springboard to national politics, the hierarchical and embedded nature of local government in local social structures make it difficult for women to break in as independent political actors. While supporting this position, Goetz (2002) argues that where women are given the opportunity to participate in local government, the terms of their inclusion determine the sustainability of their representation.

Zaman (2007) on her part argue that in order to involve women in local bodies and for their active participation in local and national decisions, they have to be mobilized and organized at various levels through the equal representation of gender in all parts of it.
For this women must also learn how to make the local government more responsive and accountable to them.

2.3.2 Age and Public Participation

This section classifies age into two categories namely Youth and Non Youth. Youth can play a very important role in any development programs. They are indeed invaluable resources to any nation, because their fresh motivation, capabilities, and innovativeness can act as a catalyst for achieving excellence goals. Opportunities to the youth to engage in governance and participate in political decision making processes depend largely on the political, socio economic and cultural contexts where social norms in many parts of the world result in multiple forms of discrimination against the youth (UNDP and IPU 2012). There is strong evidence that participation of young people in formal, institutional political processes is relatively low when compared to older citizen across the globe. This challenges the representativeness of the political system and leads to disenfranchisement of young people (UNDP 2012) Enhancing Youth political participation throughout the Electoral cycle.

In a survey conducted by UN IAN YD (2012) in 186 countries, it was highlighted that the main challenge for youth were limited opportunities for effective participation in decision making processes. With limited opportunities and exposure to meaningfully participate in inclusive decision making processes, young men and women feel excluded and marginalised in their societies and communities. The need for participatory structures and greater trust between youth and institutions were also stressed.

2.3.3 Education and Public Participation

According to Pharr & Putnam (2000), and Edwards (2005), demands for increased public participation in the affairs of government is generally influenced by a better educated, more articulate and more demanding citizenry, many of whom are the ones who express a declining level of trust in their politicians and the political institutions. This belief is usually expressed in demands for more engagement of citizens with meaningful exchanges with government beyond the traditional democratic processes of three or four year elections cycles.
According to John, (2009), education level of the citizenry has a significant correlation in the level of public participation. Education often enhances citizens awareness of governance programs and how to engage the governance system (Ahmad, et al 2005). Bratton et al, conducted a research in six Sub-Saharan countries to determine whether education levels has a correlation with the level of public participation in decentralized units. In their findings, the more a community and its citizenry became educated, the more they engaged in public participation duties like budget formulation. Similarly, Joshi and Houtzager (2012), contends that education has a high positive correlation with publics engagement in local Governance.

Pasek et al (2008) argues that level of education elevates citizens ability to participate in public functions that require a level of technical skills and ability. They contend that the reason the public doesn't have the desire to participate in forums like budget participation is that they feel inadequately informed or educated to be of value. Finkel, et al,(2012), conducted a research in South Africa and Dominican Republic to determine how engaged the public was on issues of devolved governance and budgetary processes. In their findings, education, the ability to articulate petitions, understand technical budgetary language enabled citizens to engage more actively and effectively not only in the budgetary formulation, but in other civic duties. Pasek et al, (2008), agrees with Finkel et al, (2012) findings, and further argues that positive education levels raises the public's stakes, awareness, and desire to desire the kind of future that want through governance processes like public formulation.

Higher levels of education are critical in entrenching democratic principles of public involvement in governed (KHRC. 2010). Higher public involvement triggers quest for efficiency and effectiveness in utilization of public resources. According to John, (2009). Lower levels of education in devolved units negatively correlates with public participation. KHRC(2010) report on public participation highlights the reality of education in civic process that informs public participation. The report findings argues that citizens without education, lacks ability to assimilate information, therefore, can rarely formulate interests in civic duties like budget formulation. Mboga (2009), draws the correlation to the impact levels of education have in public participation in Kenya. He argues that education expands the ability of the public to appropriate desires, interests,
and have their voice heard in logical concise and organized process like budget formulations.

Equally, Mwenda (2010) links levels of education to the public's ability to express their interests in self-determining governance of the people and by the people, but argues that lack of sufficient education -particularly in marginalized communities, hampers information dissemination, hence, low levels of participation. Oyugi and Kibua (2008) similarly argue that public citizens who sit on development and planning board for county governments on volunteer basis are all educated. Joshi and Houtzager (2012) significantly correlate education, information, and public participation. Further, they argues that the ability to coherently articulate policy issues within the budgetary planning forums favor those with higher levels of education.

Mwenda (2010) however argues that merely seating in budgetary forums, by those who are educated does not constituted participation. Oyugi and Kibua, (2008) contends that in as much as education elevated understanding, and versatile opportunities to engage in budgetary formulation, the actual is not easily articulated when you divorce self interest form actual desire to engage in public participation. In the case of participation by representation in budget formulation, the citizenry of a constituency usually engage persons with educational and engaging skills to effectively represent their views (Michels, 2012). Most people who attend public forums on county development budgetary consist largely of the educated with self aggrandizing interest, instead of that of the public Mboga (2009).

According to Michels (2012), devolution and democratization is supposed to enhance the concept of self-governance through actual participation in decision making on how the to be governed. Joshi and Houtzager, (2012), argues that to enhance public participation in budgetary formulation, then each devolved unit should consider empowering the citizenry through adequate education, and not just civic education or public forums that are reactionary. Various other researchers like Oyugi and Kibua (2008). Joshi and Houtzager, (2012), and. Mwenda (2010) argue that there exists a significant positive correlation between levels of education and public participation.
2.3.4 Income Levels and Public Participation

Brady (2003) argues that since political and civic process is also a form of participation, like economic participation which takes place in the marketplace, it seems that known models of economic participation may provide insights into the relationships between income, income inequality, and political and civic participation. Brady (2003) further observes that for labor force and marketplace participation, a change in income affect the amount of participation.

In order to provide a positive relationship between income and political activity, participation may also provide intrinsic pleasure just like a hobby. Barrels, (2003) & Verba et al. (1995) argue that the wealthy segments of society and those who are more highly educated take a greater role in public participation. This is because they have greater stakes in the affairs of government because they understand and appreciate political and social life better. The authors argue that the higher income segments are more likely to be interested and engaged in political and civic engagement activity. Bartels (2003) & Verba et al. (1995) further note that the higher segments of society are usually interested in whom to contact, and how to make their voices heard.

Weber (2000) agrees with this notion and further argues that citizen participation committees and forums are usually crowded with members of the highest socioeconomic group. The lack of low-income participants is illustrated in a developing world context by scholars such as Russell and Vidler (2000), who have argued that such citizen participants are difficult to engage in civic activities because their main priorities are to fend for and to provide basic commodities such as food for their families, and not spend time in meetings. Abel and Stephan (2000) while agreeing with this argument, further caution that although many scholars promote public participation as means of 'incorporate community values into decision making process that might otherwise be dominated by a small elite', it appears that, a non-elected small elite can dominate a participator process.

2.4 Behavioural Factors that Influence Public Participation

2.4.1 Attitude Factors and Public Participation

There is a general consensus among many scholars, about which attitude toward local government is regarded as effective factor to citizen’s participation in local government.
Some scholars generally agree that a positive attitude toward local government influences citizens’ participation in local government matters. (Kosecik & Sagbas, 2004, Suzanne et al, 2007). As local governments become increasingly significant and important in citizens’ everyday lives, the investigation of public attitude toward local government becomes vital for success of future local government programs and reforms.

Aldashev (2003) considers participation as a social behavior, while Rishi (2003) adds attitude as a central element in social behavior and argues that attitude is imperative for making change of behavior. According to Rishi (2003) people’s social actions or their personal program are directed by their attitudes. Rishi further declares that if people’s attitude toward an event or an action is positive, it is more likely, that they would divert their behavior in more meaningful ways (Rishi, 2003). Similarly, if citizen have positive attitude towards their local government, it is more likely that they would support the local government initiatives as well as participating more in local government programs.

According to Ledingham (2001) Citizens tend to participate in local government activities, when they perceive that the local government is providing some benefits for local people or acting in the best interest of local people, and/ or dedicating resources to support matters of importance to the citizens in the exchange relationship between the people and local government. Ledingham adds that citizens expect mutual interactions with local government and they seek a balance between the social costs of interaction with their local government. Ledingham & Bruning (2001) concluded that to be effective, relationships need to be seen as mutually beneficial, to the parties in question based on mutual interest. This argument presupposes therefore that people cannot be expected to demonstrate positive attitude toward local government if they do not perceive that the benefits and costs of local government is not equal.

Kosecik & Sagbas (2004) argue that there is a linear relationship between citizens’ attitude toward local government and their level of participation the affairs of local government. Stevenson (2007) equally argues that people with a positive attitude toward local government are more likely to participate in local government affairs and programs. Rishi (2003) outlines that understanding of people's attitudes is one of the central concerns in social life and is relatively crucial in influencing the desired change in the peoples’ behavior.
Citizen participation in local decision making and policy making can also be influenced by their attitude and perception on their ability to influence government decisions, and limited knowledge of, government. Studies by the World Bank (2009) in Bosnia and Herzegovina established that even though a large number of citizens were not satisfied with their representation in municipal or local authorities’ activities, a small minority were willing to participate in such activities. Their participation in local government was limited largely because citizens did not believe they can influence local decision making. As a result, public participation was more reactive than proactive.

Kosecik & Sagbas (2004) argue that a positive attitude toward local government can influence local people to be more active and eager to participate in local government activities and programs. Hickey and Seligson (2003) demonstrates that performance of local government or council affect citizen attitude toward the government. It is therefore unlikely that the performance of local government would affect citizen attitude but does not have an influence on their level of participation.

Aspden and Brich (2005) claim that there are a number of factors and issues that influence public’ attitude towards participation in local government affairs and decision-making. These consist of, citizens satisfaction for their involvement, citizen interest and understanding of local government, citizen trust of the local government and its members, and previous experience of voluntary participation. (Aspden and Brich, 2005). Lowndes, et al (2001) further argue that better understanding of citizen attitude is necessary if public officials are to address and correct the very real problems of apathy among citizens that hinder public participation, if they are to maximize the impact and effectiveness of participation (Lowndes, et.al, 2001).

According to a study conducted in Torbat, Iran on the influence of attitude on citizen participation, by Mohammadi et. al (2010), there is a linear relationship between level of participation and citizen attitude. The study concluded that it is important for government to focus on measures which are believed to positively influence citizen attitudes toward local government. These conclusions are further supported by other scholars. In a study carried out in the UK to analyse citizen’s attitude towards e government, Kolsaker and Lee – Kelley (2008) conclude that improved citizens’ perceptions of e-government and e-governance depend on whether decision-making in government is much more transparent and whether outcomes are meaningful.
Nam (2011) while conducting a study on citizen attitude toward e–government argues that if a government should care about its citizen’s attitudes, then it is crucial to identify and study what shapes citizen perceived value of government. He also argues that trust in the government influences citizen attitude towards the government and its programmes.

2.4.2 Trust Factors and Public Participation

Sociologist and political scientist Robert Putnam (1995) argues about the necessity for organisations and institutions to socialize their members by teaching them trust, solidarity and cooperation. Putnam argued that trust characterizes people’s willingness to accept and fulfil some or all of the decisions made by the state. According to Putman (1995), an individual’s involvement in political processes largely depends on the motivation to get involved and the understanding that his/her action will be profitable, beneficial, or useful otherwise.

Many scholars have acknowledged the need either to build trust towards local governance or to overcome its absence in order to influence and encourage public participation in this domain (Fordham et al., 2009; Hibbitt et al., 2001; Russell, 2008) Dasgupta (2000) on his part, believes that ‘trust is central to all transactions ‘while Giddens (1990) argues that some basic form of trust is a requirement necessary in order for us to maintain our ‘ontological security’. Generally, the diminishing amount of public trust in governments has been a problem in the last decade, which has attracted a lot of attention by public administration and social researchers world over. This explicit decrease of public trust in governments has been observed in some developed democracies such as the USA, Canada, Sweden, Great Britain, France and other EU member states. The increase of public trust is therefore an urgent question for many countries (Seimuskane & Vorslava 2013)

According to Inglehart (1999), trust ensures authorities’ legitimacy. Putnam (1995) declares that trust establishes individual’s willingness and readiness to realize and adopt decisions taken by state authority. Putnam held that political participation and activity depended on the roles and obligations an individual assumes, by taking part in a political organization. He further argues that whether an individual takes part in any processes or activity related to politics is dependent on their motivation.
Other political and social researchers studying the relationship between participation and public trust are not too optimistic. For example, Zmerli (2007) in his research concluded, that although in theoretical literature there are some evidence that a close link exists between participation and trust, this link is very weak and fragmentary, and is only evident in particular countries. XiaoHu Wang (2007) also argue that trust formation in the public sector is influenced by behavioural factors of two main behavioural characteristics of public administrators. First, participation influences trust when participation produces quality services that the public desire, and second, enhanced ethical behavior on the part of public administration is another key reason that participation leads to trust. Their conclusion is that public trust tends to increase when public officials demonstrate characters such as integrity, high moral leadership, honesty, and when ethical values are institutionalized in government processes through the process of participation.

Another relevant question to ask is how much the administrators themselves are ready to trust their citizens. Yang (2005) introduces what he calls ‘a missing link’ when he admits that large part of theories and scholarly work that explain the increase of public trust in governments are inadequate and insufficient, as they overlook condition that trust ought to be mutual and reciprocal in nature. Gilson (2003) argues that trust ‘is a relational notion and that it typically lies between people and organizations and also between people and events’. She further observes that it is important for officials to build trust in the state and its agencies so as to establish legitimacy of state action.

A study by Seimuskane & Vorslava (2011) reveal that citizens’ satisfaction with their local authority’s programs and work is an important attribute in formation of the citizens’ attitude towards the authority. At local authorities level, citizens’ satisfaction has the very strong linkage with the trust level, namely, citizens are most satisfied with the work of the local authority, when trust level levels are high. The authors however argue that, in formation of attitude against the state authority, at the national level (for instance national government or parliament) the influence of this factor was not absolute. Research demonstrated that certain local authorities recorded this influence, whereas in other local authorities, there was no interconnectedness. Seismuskane & Vorslava (2011), it can therefore be concluded that trust in institutions at the national level is formed by other factors as well.
Aitken (2012) in his comprehensive analysis of the role of trust on public participation argues that trust should be viewed as context-dependent. He contends that both the objects of trust and subjects of trust are of critical importance. He further argues that research which only considers a stakeholder's trust in a generalised 'other' and does not explore what this other is trusted to be or do is unlikely to be illuminating.

Tsang (2009) argue that for effective policy formulation and implementation, governments have to gain trust from the citizens. With reference to his research on Trust, public participation and environmental governance in Hong Kong, he summarizes three important dimensions related to the three bases of trust: cognitive, relational and behavioural and how a deliberation strategy can help to rebuild trust. The trust between stakeholders (social trust) is mainly related to the relational dimension of trust, which is based on shared values and group identification. According to Tsang (2009) factors such as government’s general lack of competence, the ability of government to fulfil its fiduciary responsibilities as well as the sense of identity derived from citizen relationship with government are usually cited as key factors that can influence the level of trust (Tsang 2009).

Uslaner & Brown (2003) look at the concept of trust within the context of inequality in society. They argue that greater equality and higher levels of trust are two pathways to participation. Inequality may suppress citizen participation, either directly or indirectly, through its effects on trust. Firstly, where inequality is higher, the poor are likely to feel powerless. They may perceive that their views and priorities are not represented in the political process and they may opt out of civic engagement. Secondly, Uslaner and Brown (2003) argue that trust in others rest on a foundation of economic equality. When resources are distributed inequitably in a society, people at the top and those at the bottom may not see each other as facing a shared fate. Therefore, they may have less reason or no reason at all to trust people of different backgrounds.

2.5 Summary
The foregoing literature review examines the factors that influence public participation in the budgeting process in Kenya and else where. The study focused on decentralisation factors, socio economic factors and behavioural factors and the extent to which these factors influence public participation in budgeting process. The examined literature shows
that there are mixed extent of application of the factors that influence public participation and some of these factors either enhance, or hinder public participation in budget formulation. The next chapter presents the methodology that was used in this study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction
This section describes the research methodology that was used to conduct the study. The chapter outlines research procedures, sampling techniques, sample size, data collection method and analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design
Given the research problem and research objectives as outlined in Chapter one, the study used a quantitative analytical approach in an attempt to empirically determine the relationship between the variables of interest by applying appropriate statistical data techniques (Hirschheim, 1985). As a result, the study will adopt a descriptive research design. A descriptive research design was a data-gathering and analysis approach in which respondents answer questions or respond to statements that were developed in advance at a point in time (Kasunic, 2005). Creswell (2003) advocates for its application in positivists research paradigms because of its ability to collect quantitative data which are analysable. Descriptive research design is flexible enough to provide opportunity for considering different aspects of the study problem (Delgado-Rodriquez & Llorca, 2004). The design was used appropriate for this study since descriptive research design produces quality statistical information about aspects of the study that may interest policy makers, industry players and academicians (Shuttleworth, 2008)

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population
Kothari (2008) describes a population as the total collection of elements about which one wishes to make inferences while the sample size is a representative of a population. The study population comprised 141 participants of the budgeting process in seven different constituencies of Nairobi County during the 2014/15 budget calendar budgeting calendar.
Table 3.1 Population Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituencies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starehe</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlands</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makadara</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langata</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagoreti</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasarani</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embakasi</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Office of Budgets, Nairobi City County Government, 2015)

3.3.2 Sampling Design
Cornell (1960) described sampling as the process by which a relatively small number of individuals, objects or events is chosen and analyzed in order to find out something about the entire population from which it was chosen.

3.3.2.3 Sample Size
According to Copper & Schindler (2006), a sample size must be large enough to be representative of the universe population. Yumane’s formula (Yumane, 1964) guided in the selection of the appropriate sample size for the budget formulation participants that were interviewed. The formula is ideal for use when it is not possible to interview all the respondents in the population which comprises of all participants. The working sample was guided by Yumane’s formula

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \]

Where

\[ n = \text{the sample size} \]
\[ N = \text{the population} \]
\[ e^2 = \text{the estimated standard error which is 5\% for 95\% confidence level} \]

\[ n = \frac{141}{1 + 141(0.05^2)} = 104 \]
The sample size of 104 was distributed proportionately to size. That is Starehe (10), Westlands (7), Makadara (9), Langata (15), Dagoretti (17), Kasarani (22), and Embakasi (24).

3.3.3 Sample Frame
A sampling frame as defined by Särndal, Swensson and Wretman (2003) is the source material or device from which a sample is drawn. It is a list of all those within a population who can be sampled, and may include individuals, households or institutions. The sample frame of this study consisted a list of all participants of the budgeting process in the 2014/15 financial years from the 7 constituencies in Nairobi County. The list was obtained from the County government budget office, Nairobi.

3.3.4 Sampling Technique
The study used two steps sampling approaches. These are Purposive sampling and simple random sampling. Purposive sampling is a non-probability technique that involves the conscious selection by the researcher of certain people to include in the study. The participants are selected because they have particular characteristics that are of interest to the researcher. Simple random sampling technique allows each potential respondent the probability of being selected, thereby ensuring a high degree of representativeness.

3.4 Data Collection Methods
Primary data was obtained and utilized for purposes of addressing the research objectives. The main primary data collection instrument was the structured survey questionnaire (see Appendix I). Telephone interviews was used to facilitate the data collection using the respondents’ telephone contacts provided by the Nairobi County budget office.

3.5 Research Procedures
A tailor-made structured questionnaire and interview guide was developed by the researcher, specifically for this study. The data collection method that was used is a structured questionnaire and more specifically, a telephone-administered structured questionnaire. The data collection instrument (structured questionnaire) was pilot tested with 10% of the respondents representing who represent similar characteristics as study respondents (Gill & Johnson, 2010). After pilot testing of the data collection instrument necessary adjustments was made to the questionnaire before administering it on the whole
study sample. During the pilot test, the validity and reliability of data collection instruments was tested. After revision of the data collection instrument, the whole study sample was subjected to the data collection instrument. To improve returns (response rate), the researcher explained the purpose of the research adequately.

3.6 Data Analysis Method
Once the data was captured from the completed survey instruments, the process of analysis of the data commenced. The purpose of data analysis was to reduce accumulated data to a manageable size, develop summaries, look for patterns, and apply statistical techniques (Cooper and Schindler 2011). Descriptive analysis was used to determine the proportions and frequency of the variables. The data collected from the closed-ended items of the questionnaire was assigned numerical values (coded), checked for any errors and finally analysed by use of a computer package, STATA. Qualitative data was organised and analysed through themes. Other statistical testing processes considered were correlation analysis and linear regression analysis. The results were presented in form of tables and graphs.

3.7 Chapter Summary
This chapter presents the research methodology that was used in the analysis of the research questions. The study population consisted of 141 participants in 2014/15 budget process. The sample size for this study was 104 respondents. The study relied entirely on primary data which was collected from the respondents who participated in the budgetary formulation process in 2014/2015 county budgeting using structured questionnaires. The structured questionnaire was pilot tested on 10% of respondents representing various categories of the sample size. Descriptive analysis, correlation and linear regression analysis was used to analyse the results of the study. The following chapter presents analysis and findings of the study.
4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings carried out on the factors that influence Public participation in Budget formulation process in Nairobi County. In section one; the chapter presents descriptive analysis of the demographic data from the respondents. The other sections in the chapter are organized according to the research questions. The first section relate to decentralization related factors that influence public participation. The second section analyzes the influence of socio economic factors on public participation. Findings on behavioral factors that influence public participation are presented in section three of this chapter.

4.2 Response Rate

Out of the 104 questionnaires distributed to respondents who participated in Nairobi County budget for the year 2012, the study collected 95 filled questionnaires. This represented a response rate of 90%. This is illustrated in figure 4.1
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Figure 4.1 Response Rate
4.3 Characteristics of the Respondents
In section I of the questionnaire, the researcher asked the respondents some of the basic information. The results are presented below

4.3.1 Classification of Respondents by Gender
The data in table 4.1 shows the number of responses by gender. From the table shown, 50.53% of the respondents were female while 49.47% were male an indication that gender bias is not an issue in public participation in budget formulation process.

Table 4.1 Classification of respondents by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Gender, N=95</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Classification of Respondents by Age
The information in figure 4.2 shows the number of responses by age. From the figure shown, most of the respondents were aged between 26-35 years and 36-45 years which accounted for 30.53% in both cases of the total respondents. This finding indicates that majority of the respondent 61% are between 26 years to 45 years.

Figure 4.2 Classification of the respondents by ages
4.3.3 Classification of Respondents by Level of Education

The result in figure 4.3 shows the number of responses by levels of education. From the findings shown, most of the respondents held college diploma which accounted for 36.84% of the total respondents. This was followed by secondary school certificates which accounted for 25.26%. This indicates that the majority of the respondents either understand or a competent enough to address or provide credible information related to the research questions by virtue of their education level.

Figure 4.3 Classification of the respondents by levels of education

4.3.4 Classification of Respondents by Monthly Income

The respondents were expected to indicate their monthly incomes to establish the respondents’ monthly incomes. The result in table 4.2 shows the number of responses by monthly income. From the findings 44.21% of the respondents were earning between Ksh 25,001 and Ksh. 50,000 per month.
Table 4.2 Classification of respondents by monthly income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income (Kshs), N=95</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25,000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 – 50,000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 – 100,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5 Classification of the Respondents by Employment Status

The respondents were expected to indicate their employment status to establish the respondents’ employment status. The result in figure 4.4 shows the number of responses by the levels of education. From the findings 49.47% were employed.

Figure 4.4 Classification of the respondents by levels of education

4.3.5 Classification of the Respondents by Constituency

The respondents were expected to indicate their employment status to establish the respondents’ employment status. The result in table 4.3 shows the number of responses by the constituency where they reside. From the findings 22.11% of the respondents were from the Kasarani constituency. This represents the highest number of the respondents.
The difference however is not large compared to other constituencies an indication that the findings applies to Nairobi county residence irrespective of their constituency of residence.

Table 4.2 Classification of respondents by constituency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency, N=95</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makadara</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagoreti</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starehe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langata</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langata</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embakasi</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasarani</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Descriptive Analysis of the Study Variables

This section presents the descriptive analysis of the four public participation dimensions of interest namely decentralisation related factors, socio economic factors and behavioural factors.

4.4.1 Public Participation in Budget Formulation

To determining the indicators of public participation in budget formulation, the respondents were asked to rank the public participation in budget formulation measures according to their level of knowledge of the public participation in budget formulation on a scale of 1 to 5. The scale respectively represent: Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree (A) and Strongly Agree (SA). The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics -frequencies and percentages and the findings are shown in Table 4.4
Table 4.3 Aspects of public participation in budget formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of public participation in budget formulation</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You understand the concept of public participation in budget formulation</td>
<td>7 (7.37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last two years, you have participated in budget formulation at your constituency level</td>
<td>5 (5.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The constitution provides for mechanisms for public participation in budget formulation</td>
<td>1 (1.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given a chance, I would participate (again) in budget formulation at my constituency</td>
<td>6 (6.32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

Most respondents acknowledged that the constitution provided for mechanisms for public participation in budget formulation. This was the highest attributes of the respondents’ understanding of public participation in budgeting process accounting for 85.26%. This was followed by respondents acknowledging that they participated in the budget formulation in the constituency in the last two years. This represented 80% of the respondents agreeing. 71% of the respondents also agreed that they understood the concept of public participation while 69.47% agreed that given a chance, they would participate again in budget formulation at their constituency.

Table 4.5 Rating Public participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of public participation in budget formulation</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate public participation in your constituency</td>
<td>7 (7.37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: VB=Very Bad, B=Bad, DK=Don’t Know, G=Good, VG=Very Good
Despite having recorded high number of responses to questions on respondents understanding of Public participation and their willingness to participate in future budget formulation forums, most respondent rated public participation in their constituency as bad. This stood at 49.47%. Another 7.37% rated the process as very bad. This was largely due to the fact that most of the respondents who rated it as bad said that they were just invited as a formality and that their input did not add value to the budgeting process since the county government already had come up with their budget lines and priorities. However, 37.89% of the respondents rated the process as good.

4.4.2 Decentralization Structures Influencing Public Participation in Budget Formulation Process

In determining the indicators of decentralization structures influencing public participation in budget formulation, the respondents were asked to rank their participation level (decentralization structures measures) according to their level of knowledge on how the decentralization structures influenced the public participation in budget formulation on a scale of 1 to 5. The scale respectively represent: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics - frequencies and percentages and the findings are shown in Table 4.6

Table 4.6 Aspects of decentralization structures influencing public participation in budget formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of decentralization structures</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My participation in budget formulation at my constituency is just a formality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.47%)</td>
<td>(23.16%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
<td>(29.47%)</td>
<td>(32.63%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tokenism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am usually given an opportunity to air my views in Budget formulation forums</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25.26%)</td>
<td>(28.42%)</td>
<td>(9.47%)</td>
<td>(29.47%)</td>
<td>(7.37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen power</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I normally negotiate tradeoffs with budget officials on items to be included in budget formulation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44.21%)</td>
<td>(50.53%)</td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td>(2.11%)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree
Participation in budgeting process as a formality (Non participation) stood to be the most outstanding decentralization indicator influencing public participation in budgeting process (62.1% of the respondents agreed), followed by respondents acknowledging that they are usually given the opportunity to air their views (tokenism) which was represented by 36.84% of the respondents. About 94.74% of the respondents disagreed that they normally negotiate tradeoffs with budget officials on items to be included in the budget formulation process (citizen power) as a decentralization factor that influences public participation in budgeting process.

4.4.3 Socio Economic Factors Influencing Public Participation in Budget Formulation Process

In determining the indicators of socio economic factors influencing public participation in budget formulation, the respondents were asked to rank the socio economic measures according to their level of knowledge on how the socio economic factors would influence the public participation in budget formulation on a scale of 1 to 5. The scale respectively represent: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics -frequencies and percentages and the findings are shown in Table 4.7
## Table 4.7 Aspects of social factors influencing public participation in budget formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of social factors</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in budget formulation because I am a woman/ man.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31.58%)</td>
<td>(43.16%)</td>
<td>(6.32%)</td>
<td>(14.74%)</td>
<td>(4.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a woman/ Man influenced my choice of participating in public budget forums</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(32.63%)</td>
<td>(36.84%)</td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td>(16.84%)</td>
<td>(10.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/ men have equal opportunities to participate in budget formulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.21%)</td>
<td>(23.16%)</td>
<td>(7.37%)</td>
<td>(35.79%)</td>
<td>(29.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a man enables one to participate better</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34.74%)</td>
<td>(36.84%)</td>
<td>(8.42%)</td>
<td>(14.74%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a Woman enables one to participate better</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34.74%)</td>
<td>(47.37%)</td>
<td>(6.32%)</td>
<td>(6.32%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My age influences my ability to effectively participate in the Budget formulation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.89%)</td>
<td>(43.16%)</td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td>(18.95%)</td>
<td>(16.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My age does not influence how effectively I participate in the budget formulation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.42%)</td>
<td>(37.89%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
<td>(32.63%)</td>
<td>(15.79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger (the youth) people participate more effectively</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14.74%)</td>
<td>(25.26%)</td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td>(37.89%)</td>
<td>(18.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people participate more effectively</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.05%)</td>
<td>(54.74%)</td>
<td>(9.47%)</td>
<td>(13.68%)</td>
<td>(1.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My education level influences the degree to which I participate in budget formulation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.37%)</td>
<td>(36.84%)</td>
<td>(7.37%)</td>
<td>(25.26%)</td>
<td>(23.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My education level does not influence the degree to which I participate in public formulation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23.16%)</td>
<td>(37.89%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
<td>(25.26%)</td>
<td>(8.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who have higher educated level participate more effectively</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.37%)</td>
<td>(20.00%)</td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td>(43.16%)</td>
<td>(26.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who have lower education level participate more effectively</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(32.63%)</td>
<td>(55.79%)</td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td>(5.26%)</td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

The findings indicate that the most outstanding variable for gender was women and men have equal opportunities to participate in budget formulation. This was acknowledged by 65.26% of the respondents.
The most outstanding variables for age was younger (youth) people participating more effectively in budget formulation. This was acknowledged by 56.84%. The most outstanding variables for education levels was people with higher education levels participate more effectively. This was represented by 69.48% of the respondents. However, 58% of the respondents disagreed that their education level influenced their participation in budget formulation. Being a man or a woman (gender) least influences the quality of public participation in budget formulation as represented by 68% and 78% of the respondents respectively.

Table 4.8 Aspects of economic factors influencing public participation in budget formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of economic factors</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My income level influences my level of participation in budget formulation.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My income level does not influences my level of participation in budget formulation.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of higher income level participate more effectively.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of lower income levels participate more effectively</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree

These findings show that the most outstanding attributes in socio economic factors was that the income level does not influence participant’s level of participation in budget formulation. This is represented by 72% of the respondents. An indication that participation was undertaken irrespective of respondents income level.
4.4.4 Behavioral Factors Influencing Public Participation in Budget Formulation Process

In determining the indicators of behavioral factors influencing public participation in budget formulation, the respondents were asked to rank the behavioral measures according to their level of knowledge on how the behavioral factors would influence the public participation in budget formulation on a scale of 1 to 5. The scale respectively represent: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly Agree. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics -frequencies and percentages and the findings are shown in Table 4.9

Table 4.9 Aspects of social factors influencing public participation in budget formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of behavioral factors</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, I have a positive attitude towards participation in budget formulation.</td>
<td>5 (5.26%)</td>
<td>17 (17.89%)</td>
<td>3 (3.16%)</td>
<td>49 (51.58%)</td>
<td>21 (22.11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, I have a negative attitude towards participation in budget formulation.</td>
<td>24 (25.26%)</td>
<td>51 (53.68%)</td>
<td>6 (6.32%)</td>
<td>8 (8.42%)</td>
<td>6 (6.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with positive attitude towards the county government participate more effectively.</td>
<td>4 (4.21%)</td>
<td>7 (7.37%)</td>
<td>6 (6.32%)</td>
<td>43 (45.26%)</td>
<td>35 (36.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with negative attitude towards the county government participate more effectively.</td>
<td>32 (33.68%)</td>
<td>57 (60.00%)</td>
<td>5 (5.26%)</td>
<td>1 (1.05%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have trust in the budget formulation process</td>
<td>12 (12.63%)</td>
<td>29 (30.53%)</td>
<td>4 (4.21%)</td>
<td>28 (29.47%)</td>
<td>22 (23.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have trust in the budget formulation process</td>
<td>20 (21.05%)</td>
<td>31 (32.63%)</td>
<td>3 (3.16%)</td>
<td>25 (26.32%)</td>
<td>16 (16.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with higher trust on the budget formulation process participate more effectively.</td>
<td>1 (1.05%)</td>
<td>8 (8.42%)</td>
<td>2 (2.11%)</td>
<td>56 (58.95%)</td>
<td>28 (29.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with lower trust on the budget formulation process participate more effectively.</td>
<td>32 (33.68%)</td>
<td>55 (57.89%)</td>
<td>7 (7.37%)</td>
<td>1 (1.05%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Agree
The findings indicate that the most outstanding factor for public attitude was that people with positive attitude towards county government do participate more effectively (82.10%). The most outstanding factor for the public trust was that people with higher trust on budget formulation process participate more effectively (88.42%). It is worth noting that 74% of the study respondents acknowledged that they have a positive attitude towards public participation in budget formulation while only 50% of the respondents trusted the public participation in budget formulation process.

4.5 Inferential Statistics
This section presents correlation analysis results.

4.5.1 Correlation Analysis
Correlation analysis was done to ascertain the most related attributes.
**Table 4.10 Correlation Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>public_part</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>non_part</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-2.72**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tokenism</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>-.716**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>citizen_power</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.438**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>educ_level</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.215*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.243*</td>
<td>.210*</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>public_attitude</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.202*</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>public_trust</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.246*</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
There was a significant negative association between public participation and non-participation ($r = -0.272$, $p\text{-value} = 0.008$).

There was a significant positive weak association between public participation and tokenism ($r = 0.330$, $p\text{-value} = 0.01$). This implies that tokenism is significant $\alpha = 0.10$ and not 0.05. The remaining factors were not significantly associated with public participation process.

**4.5.2 Regression Analysis**

Regression analysis was done to determine the significant factors affecting public participation in budget process.

**4.5.2.1 Decentralization Factors Influencing Public Participation**

A regression analysis was done with public participation being the dependent variable while citizen power, tokenism and non-participation being the dependent variable to determine the decentralization factors affecting public budget formulation.

The coefficient table below shows the value of R-squared to be 0.112, this shows that the amount of variation accounted for by the citizen power, tokenisms and non-participation is 11.2%. Therefore, 11.2% of the variation in Public participation is as a result of the variation in decentralization structure adopted by the county government. This indicate that there is a significant relationship between public participation and the decentralization structure (represented by citizen power, tokenisms and non-participation).

**Table 4.11: Decentralization Factors Regression Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non_part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tokenism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizen_power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R = 0.335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The values of non-participation, tokenism and citizen power are all not statistically significant \((p>0.05)\). The regression model explaining the results in the above table is given by:

\[
\text{Publicparticipation} = 3.4 - 0.04 \times \text{Non-participation} + 0.133 \times \text{Tokenism} - 0.028 \times \text{Citizenpower}
\]

The model shows that tokenism positively and significantly affects the public participation in budget formulation, i.e. holding other factors constant, an increase in mean index tokenism increases the public participation in budget formulation by a positive unit mean index value of 0.133.

Non-participation and citizen power reduces participation in budget formulation by 0.04 and 0.028 respectively.

### 4.5.2.2 Socio Economic Factors Influencing Public Participation

A regression analysis was done with public participation being the dependent variable while socio-economic factors (income, education level, age and gender) being the independent variable to determine the socio economic factors affecting public participation in budget formulation. The table in appendix three shows the value of R-squared to be 0.019. This indicates that the amount of variation accounted for by the Socio economic factors (education level, age and gender) is 1.9%. Therefore, 1.9% of the variation in Public participation is as a result of the variation in socio economic status. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between public participation and Socio economic factors (income, education levels, age and gender)

As per appendix three, the values of gender, age, education levels and income are all not statistically significant \((p = 0.782 >0.05)\). The regression model explaining the results in the above table is given by:

\[
\text{Publicparticipation} = 3.384 + 0.132 \times \text{Gender} + 0.002 \times \text{Age} + 0.027 \times \text{EducationLevels} - 0.095 \times \text{Income}
\]
The model shows that gender, age and education levels positively affect the public participation in budget formulation, i.e. holding other factors constant, an increase in mean index of gender, age and education levels increases the public participation in budget formulation by a positive unit mean index value of 0.132, 0.002 and 0.027 respectively. However, income levels reduces participation in budget formulation by 0.095

4.5.2.3 Behavioral Factors Influencing Public Budget Participation

A regression analysis was done with public participation being the dependent variable while behavioral factors (public trust and public attitude) being the independent variable to determine the behavioral factors affecting public participation in budget formulation.

The coefficient table in appendix four shows that the value of $R^2$ to be 0.025. This indicates that the amount of variation accounted for in the model by the public trust and public attitude is 2.5 %. Therefore, 2.5% of the variation in public participation is as a result of the variation in behavioral factors. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between public participation and behavioral factors (public trust and public attitude).

The values of public attitude and public trust are all not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). The regression model explaining the results in the above table is given by:

$$Publicparticipation = 2.67 + 0.288 \times PublicAttitude + 0.041 \times PublicTrust$$

The model shows that public attitude and public trust positively affect the public participation in budget formulation, i.e. holding other factors constant, an increase in mean index of public attitude and public trust increases the public participation in budget formulation by a positive unit mean index value of 0.288 and 0.041 respectively.

4.6 Chapter Summary

A total of the respondents completed the study representing 90% of the response rate. The gender distribution for the study was 50.53 % female, and 49.47 % male respondents. From the findings shown, most of the respondents were aged between 26-35 years and 36-45 years which accounted for 30.53% in both cases of the total respondents. Most of the respondents also held college diploma which accounted for 36.84% of the total
respondents. This was followed by secondary school certificates which accounted for 25.26%. Most respondents acknowledged that the constitution provided for mechanisms for public participation in budget formulation. This was the highest variable of respondents understanding of public participation in budgeting process accounting for 85.26%.
CHAPTER FIVE
5.0 DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to discuss the findings reported in chapter 4 with a view of making conclusions about the research and finally recommendations on how public participation in budget formulation can be improved in Kenya. This section consists of four sections namely summary, discussions, conclusions and recommendations. The first section provides a summary of the important elements of the study which include the research objectives, methodology and findings. The second section discusses the major findings in light of the specific objectives (research questions). The third section discusses the conclusions based on the specific objectives and results obtained in chapter four of this study.

5.2 Summary
The general objective of the study was to establish the factors which influence public participation in budget formulation in Kenya. The specific objectives were to determine the decentralization structures that influence public participation in budget formulation, to determine how socio economic factors influence public participation in budget formulation and to determine how behavioural factors influence public participation in budget formulation. The research design employed a case study of Nairobi County in which a structured questionnaire was used to collect data from past participants of public budgeting forums. The total population of the participants was 141. A sample size of 104 was selected. A total of 95 questionnaires were returned which represented 90% return rate. A fact sheet was used to summarize the data before it was cleaned, coded and edited for completeness and accuracy. Data was analysed using STATA software to obtain descriptive statistics. The data collected was analysed using descriptive statistics namely frequencies and measures of central tendencies such as means. Inferential statistics techniques such as correlation and regression analysis were also used. Data was presented in tables, pie charts and graphs.

In determining what decentralization structure influences public participation in budget formulation, the study established that there is a significant relationship between public participation and the decentralization structure (represented by citizen power, tokenisms
Among the different levels of Public participation, participation in budgeting process as a formality (Non participation) stood to be the most outstanding decentralization indicator that influences public participation represented by 62.1% of the respondents. However, there was a significant negative association between public participation and non-participation ($r=-0.272$, $p$-value=0.008). There was also a significant positive weak association between public participation and tokenism ($r=0.330$, $p$-value=0.01). Citizen power was not significantly associated with public participation in budgeting process. This implies that although decentralization factors influence public participation, only non-participation has a significant association. Tokenism positively affects the public participation in budget formulation, i.e. holding other factors constant, an increase in mean index tokenism increases the public participation in budget formulation by a positive unit mean index value of 0.133. Non-participation and citizen power reduces participation in budget formulation by 0.04 and 0.028 respectively but these attributes effects on public participation were not significant.

In establishing how the Socio economic factors have positive influence on public participation in the budgeting process, it was established that socio economic factors influence public participation. However there is no significant association between socio economic factors and public participation as illustrated by ($F$-value=0.437, $p$-value=0.782$>$0.05). Findings from descriptive analysis indicates that women and men have equal opportunities to participate in budget formulation. This was acknowledged by 65.26% of the respondents. The most outstanding variables for age was younger (youth) people participating more effectively in budget formulation. This was acknowledged by 56.84%. The most outstanding variables for education levels was people with higher education levels participate more effectively. This was represented by 69.48% of the respondents. However, 58% of the respondents disagreed that their education level influenced their participation in budget formulation.

In determining how behavioral factors influence participation, the findings from descriptive analysis indicated that behavioral factors influence public participation and the most outstanding factor for public attitude was that people with positive attitude towards county government do participate more effectively representing 82.10% while
the most outstanding factor for the public trust was that people with higher trust on budget formulation process participate more effectively representing 88.42%. However, there was no significant relationship between public participation and behavioral factors (public trust and public attitude) as illustrated by F-value=1.200; p-value=0.306>0.05).

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Decentralization Factors and Public Participation

The study revealed that decentralization factors influence public participation in Nairobi County. This was evidenced by a positive significant relationship between decentralization factors and public participation. Non participation, (in which the public acknowledge that ‘my participation in budget formulation in my constituency is just a formality) was identified by 62% of respondents as the decentralization level that they participate identify with. There was a positive significant relationship between non participation as a decentralization factor and public participation. These findings are consistent with a number of studies. Ostrom (2009), DeCaro and Stokes (2008) and Andrade and Rhodes (2012); Stringer, et al.,(2006) all of whom argue that there is a significant association between the level of public participation and the degree of citizen participation. This finding affirms that indeed the county government has not entrenched effective and meaningful participation mechanisms at the county level. At best, citizens only participate to fulfill a legal and constitutional requirement. Another study by Economic and Social Rights Center (2013) examined public participation in Kenya and established that effective citizen participation in budgeting is faced by a myriad challenges including inadequate transparency of budget information and a lack of structured mechanism for participation.

A huge majority, 94.74% of the respondents disagreed that they normally negotiate trade-offs with budget officials on items to be included in the budget formulation process (citizen power) as a decentralization factor that influences public participation in budgeting process. This demonstrates that meaningful participation that empowers the public and allows them to have a voice, influence budget allocation and contribute to the identification of priorities and negotiate trade-offs is largely non-existent. This finding is consistent with other studies on public participation in the devolved funds such as the Constituency Development fund and Local Authorities Devolved Fund that have been
conducted in Kenya in the past. According to Institute of Economic affairs, (2012) although the funds have presented the best effort at public participation so far, the actual participation of the public in the management of the funds is piece meal and falls short of the requirement. National Tax payers Association (2013) also highlight glaring limitations of public participation in the budgeting process. According to the institution, effective public participation is yet to fully take root in Kenya. These concerns are further confirmed by County Government of Nairobi (2013) which affirms that the County government has not yet developed a definite threshold and policy for public participation in the budget process. It would be therefore premature to expect effective and meaningful participation just a year after the enactment of the constitution and the creation of the county governments.

Although public participation in budget formulation seems to be at the lowest level in Nairobi as shown by 62% of the respondents who chose non participation, and 56.84% rated the public participation in budgeting in their constituency as either bad or very bad, a majority of the respondents, 69.47% still demonstrated their interest at participating in future budget processes. This means that there is still public good will and that the public hopes that the process will improve by allowing them more decision making power.

5.3.2 Socio Economic Factors and Public Participation
On the socio economic factors, findings from the study revealed that education had the highest influence on citizen participation relative to other socio economic factors with 69.48% of the respondents acknowledging this. The findings however showed that there was no significant association between socio economic factors and public participation. Mwenda (2010) links education to the publics’ ability to express their interest in self-determining governance of the people by the people and argues that lack of sufficient educational attainment hampers information dissemination hence lower the quality of public participation. Mboga (2009), draws a correlation that higher education attainment has on public participation in Kenya. He argues that education expands the ability of citizens to appropriate their desires and interests and have their voices heard in a logical and organised manner.

Indeed other studies conducted by other scholars have concluded that a unit increase in the number of years in school leads to increased public participation. This also applies to
other civil engagement activities that citizen participate in such as voting. According to Milligana, Morreti & Oreopoulosc (2004) an extra year in schooling in the UK had small but significant influence on probability of voting. According to them, for registered voters who finished attending school at the age of 18 years or later, the voting rate is 88% against 87%, 83% and 85% for those who finished school at age of 17, 16 and 15 respectively. Additionally, related findings from studies conducted in the US by Dee (2004) found that college education attainment was associated with up to 22% point increase in voter participation. Results from study suggested that educational attainment has high and statistically significant association on voter participation by 17% to 22%. The report also established that additional schooling appear to increase the quality of public participation and civic knowledge.

Apparent contradictions to this argument have been noted especially in some of the countries in the industrialised West where higher educational attainment has actually led to a reduction in citizen participation in civic engagement such as budget process or electoral process. This has been noted in the United States and other countries (Franklin, 2004).

According to the findings of this study, another dimension of Socio economic factors influencing public participation was that men and women have equal opportunity in participating in budgeting forums. This was indicated by 68% and 78% of the respondents respectively. This shows that the process of selecting participants to participate in the budget formulation process was fair and representative for both genders. This contradicts arguments that women have largely been left out in civil engagement and political processes. Akerkar (2001), ADRII (2014), Ihemeje (2013).

Income levels were found to have minimal influence on participation in budget formulation as represented by 72% of the respondents. This finding seems to contradict other studies conducted by Verba et al. (1995), who argues that richer people tend to have more stakes in the political process because they understand political and social life better. Bartels (2003), argue that wealthier people are usually interested in their voices being heard while Weber (2010) and Russell & Vidler (2000) who argue that the wealthier members of the public tend to participate more effectively because lower
income segments are usually concerned especially in the developing world are more concerned about other priorities such as fending for their families.

5.3.3 Behavioral Factors and Public Participation

Findings from the study revealed that behavioral factors namely trust and attitude influence public participation. This was indicated by 88.42% and 82.1% of the respondents respectively. However it was revealed that there is no significant association between behavioral factors and public participation. The findings from the descriptive statistics are in line with those of Rishi (2003) and Hiskey & Seligson (2003) who established that citizens’ social behavior such as attitude towards the local government influences their level of participation in local government affairs. According to Rishi (2003) since peoples social actions or their personal programs are directed by their attitudes, if their attitude is positive toward an event or an action, it is more likely that they would divert their behavior towards such action in more meaningful way.

Studies by Mohammadi, Norazizan & Ahmad (2010) conducted in Malaysia concluded that indeed citizen attitudes influence public participation in the activities of government. However, these studies also concluded that there was a significant positive association between public attitude and public participation. The findings, which sought to establish how attitude is influenced by the level of participation revealed that two level of ladder participation (Tokenism and Citizen-power) have positive and significant relationship with attitude, while Non-participation level of ladder has negative significant relationship with attitude. It is important to note that the sample size in this study was 400. This may also have had an influence on the results of the study.

Kosecik & Sagbas (2004) and Stevenson (2007) also argue that there is a linear relationship between citizen attitude toward local government and their participation in the affairs of government. However, studies carried out in Bosnia and Herzegovina by the World Bank (2009) suggest that there are instances where people still participate in local government affairs despite their low trust and negative attitude towards the local government and when they know that they have a lower likelihood of influencing the government decisions. These studies however indicated that in such cases, the participation of the public was more of a reactive participation as opposed to proactive one. The most outstanding factor for the public trust was that people with higher trust on
budget formulation process participate more effectively (88.42%). However, trust as a factor influencing public participation was not significant.

The argument that trust influences the degree and quality of public participation is supported by several scholars. Tsang (2009), Gilson (2003), Putman (1995) and Inglehart (1999) all argue that trust is an important factor that influences public participation. However, scholars like Xiao Wang (2007) contend that trust formation is largely influenced by whether participation produces the quality that the public desires. Seismuskane & Vorslava (2011) differentiate the level of public participation where trust seems to have an influence. They argue that at the local level, citizen participation has a very strong link to trust. They however argue that at the national level, the influence of trust in participation is not absolute. They therefore concluded that participation in at the national level is also influenced by other factors as well and not largely by trust. Aitken (2012) in his comprehensive analysis of the role of trust in public participation argue that any research on the role of trust in public participation need to consider both the object of trust and the subject of trust. He argues that research which only considers stakeholders’ (such as the public) trust without looking that of the object (such as state officials) the role of trust in influencing public participation is likely to be inconclusive.

5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Decentralization Factors and Public participation

The study concludes that a majority of citizen in Nairobi County participate in budget formulation at the very basic level of non-participation which had a significant and positive correlation $\alpha=0.05$ and tokenism which had a positive and significant correlation at $\alpha=0.10$. This is evidenced by a positive significant relationship that exists between non participation and public participation. From the responses, it appears that public participation is just a formality meant to fulfil a legal and constitutional requirement with minimal meaningful participation on the part of the public. This conclusion is further strengthened by a huge majority of respondents (94.74%) who disagreed that their participation in budget formulation allows them to negotiate trade-offs with budget officials and 56.84% who rated the public participation process as either bad or very bad. This is partly as a result of a lack of effective participation modalities and policy that
defines the framework within which participation of the public in budget formulation is to be done.

5.4.2 Socio Economic Factors and Public Participation
The study concludes that education attainment is the social factor that has the highest influence on the effectiveness of public participation. This is however inconclusive since there was no significant association between education and participation. This may be due to the sample size of 104 respondents that this research used. The study also concludes that age and gender have no influence to public participation in budget formulation.

5.4.3 Behavioural Factors and Public Participation
Finally, the study concludes that indeed behavioural factors (attitude and trust) influence public participation in budget formulation. Citizens who have a high level of trust and a positive attitude toward the government are likely to participate more effectively. However, this is inconclusive as there was no significant association between behavioural factors and public participation. This is likely to be the case due to the sample size used or the fact that the study focussed on the government at the national level as opposed to the local level which they interact with more frequently.

5.5 Recommendations
5.5.1 Recommendations for Improvement
5.5.1.1 Decentralization Factors and Public Participation
The study recommends that the County Government in Nairobi puts in a place policy under framework that will guide future public participation forum with view to ensure that the public is meaningfully engaged and contributes effectively to the process of budget formulation. It is important to ensure that the public is meaningfully involved in identifying budget priorities based on their felt needs. This can be done by allowing public needs to make decisions and negotiate trade offs in the budgeting process. This will address their concerns that there are just being used as rubber stamp to the process or to provide information that is not necessarily used by decision makers.

5.5.1.2 Socio Economic Factors and Public Participation
Based on the results of this study we recommend that the county government considers including people with diploma level of education and above for purposes of enriching the
debates on budget formulation. For those who do not have this level of education, it is our suggestion that county government provides basic training on budget formulation process so that the individual acquire basic skills that are necessary to contribute meaningfully to the budgeting process. It is also our considered view that the county government needs to ensure adequate gender representation in future budgeting processes.

5.5.1.3 Behavioural Factors and Public Participation
Based on the results of this study we recommend that the county government should implement the views of the public that were shared in previous budgeting process in order to sustain public trust. County officials should also ensure that county resources are managed in transparent manner.

5.5.2 Recommendation for Further Study
The researcher acknowledges the fact that the study was limited to a case study in Nairobi and not the entire country it is therefore recommended that further studies be conducted to establish the factors that influence public participation in other counties. Further studies should also be conducted on other factors that influence public participation beyond decentralisation factors, socio economic factors and behavioural factors. Future research, should consider a bigger sample size.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX ONE: Introduction Letter

Edwin Siala
Email: siala2014.es@gmail.com

5th June 2015

Dear Respondent,

I am conducting a survey on Budget Formulation with the objective of exploring how best how best to improve public participation in budget formulation in Nairobi County. The study is titled “Factors Influencing Public Participation in Budget Formulation: The Case of Nairobi County”

You have been selected as a respondent because of your past participation in budget formulation. The survey takes approximately 5 minutes to complete; your experiences and observations are very important to me.

Your feedback will be treated with utmost confidentiality and used for research purposes only.

Regards,
Edwin Siala

EMOD Graduate Student

United States International University - Africa
APPENDIX TWO: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire

FACTORS INFLUENCING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN BUDGET FORMULATION: THE CASE OF NAIROBI COUNTY

QUESTIONNAIRE TO PAST PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS IN BUDGET FORMULATION PROCESS

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION

Please respond to the questions below by ticking in the boxes provided

1. Gender: Male □
   Female □

2. Age: 18 – 25 Years □
   26 – 35 Years □
   36 – 45 Years □
   46 – 55 Years □
   Over 56 Years □

3. Level of Education: Primary Certificate □
   Secondary Certificate □
   College Diploma □
   University Degree □
4. Monthly Income (Kshs): Under 25,000 □
   25,001 – 50,000 □
   50,001 – 100,000 □
   Over 101,000 □

5. Employment Status
   Employed □
   Unemployed □
   Self-Employed □

6. Which constituency do you reside in?
   Makadara □
   Dagoreti □
   Starehe □
   Kamukunji □
   Langata □
   Westlands - □
   Embakasi - □

SECTION B: RESEARCH TOPIC

FACTORS INFLUENCING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN BUDGET FORMULATION

To what extend do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please indicate your response by putting an X to each item using the scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree.
### PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN BUDGET FORMULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. You understand the concept of public participation in budget formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In the last two years, you have participated in budget formulation at your constituency level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The constitution provides for mechanisms for public participation in budget formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Given a chance, I would participate (again) in budget formulation at my constituency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Bad</th>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11(a). How would you rate public participation in your constituency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11(b). Please provide any other additional information with regard to your understanding of public participation in budget formulation

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Decentralization structures that influence Public Participation in Budget formulation.

Tick only ONE statement that best describes your level of participation

Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Participation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) My participation in budget formulation at my constituency is just a formality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tokenism

| 13). I am usually given an opportunity to air my views in Budget formulation forums |                   |          |         |       |               |

Citizen Power

| 15(a) I normally negotiate tradeoffs with budget officials on items to be included in budget formulation |                   |          |         |       |               |

15(b). Please provide any other additional information with regard to decentralization structures

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Socio economic Factors Influencing Public participation in Budget formulation

Social Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A) Gender</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16) I participate in budget formulation because I am a woman/ man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Being a woman/ Man influenced my choice of participating in public budget forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Women/ Men have equal opportunities to participate in budget formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Being a man enables one to participate better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Being a Woman enables one to participate better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A) Age</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21) My age influences my ability to effectively participate in the Budget formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) My age does not influence how effectively I participate in the budget formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Younger (the youth) people participate more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Older people participate more effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C) Education Level</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25) My education level influences the degree to which I participate in budget formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) My education level does not influence the degree to which I participate in public formulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) People who have higher educated level participate more effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) People who have lower education level participate more effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Economic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Income Level</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29) My income level influences my level of participation in budget formulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) My income level does not influences my level of participation in budget formulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) People of higher income level participate more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32(a) People of lower income levels participate more effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32(b). Please provide any other additional information with regard to socio economic factors

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

### Behavioral Factors Influencing Public participation in budget formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A)Public Attitude</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33) Generally, I have a positive attitude towards participation in budget formulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Generally, I have a negative attitude towards participation in budget formulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) People with positive attitude towards the county government participate more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) People with negative attitude towards the county government participate more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C) Public Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37) I have trust in the budget formulation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) I don’t have trust in the budget formulation process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) People with higher trust on the budget formulation process participate more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40(a) People with lower trust on the budget formulation process participate more effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40(b). Please provide any other additional information with regard to behavioural factors

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

*Thank you very much for taking your time to fill in the form and to take part in this research.*
APPENDIX THREE: COEFFICIENT SOCIO ECONOMIC FACTORS

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>6.351</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>1.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ_level</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.138  R² = 0.019  Adjusted R² = -0.025
## APPENDIX FOUR: COEFFICIENT BEHAVIOURAL FACTORS

Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.607</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 public attitudes</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>1.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public trust</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R = 0.159  R\(^2\) = 0.025  Adjusted R\(^2\) = 0.004
APPENDIX FIVE: COUNTY BUDGET CALENDAR

Table 2. Below outlines the County Budget calendar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline (Deadline)</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30th August</td>
<td>County Executive member for Finance (CEMF) issues budget circulars to all county entities and spending units (s.128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st September</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plan submitted to County Assembly for approval by County Executive Member for Planning (s.126(3) and 125(1)(a))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st October</td>
<td>County Budget Review and Outlook Paper (CBROP) is tabled in Assembly (s.118(4)(a)) and published as soon as practicable (s.118(4)(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Treasury prepares County Fiscal Strategy Paper (CFSP) taking into account the views of CRA, the public, interested persons and any form established by legislation. Must be aligned to policy objectives in the national BPS. CFSP is submitted to the County Executive Committee for approval (s.117(1) – (4))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th February</td>
<td>County Fiscal Strategy paper (CFSP) is submitted to the County Assembly (s. 117 (1)-(2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th March (within 14 days after CFSP being submitted)</td>
<td>County Assembly adopts CFSP with or without amendments (s.117 (8))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th April</td>
<td>CEMF submits budget estimates. Must be in line with Assembly resolutions on the CFSP (s. 129(2)). Budget documents to include detailed list of entities that will receive appropriated money, shown by economic classification and vote. Should also include a summary, statement of how the estimates comply with fiscal responsibility principles and financial objectives, and how CFSP resolutions had been taken into account (s. 130(6). It must be in a form that is clear and understood by the public (s.131(6). County Assembly Clerk submits estimates for County Assembly (i.e, its running costs) to Assembly, with copy to the CEMF (s.129(3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As soon as practicable after presentation to the Assembly</td>
<td>County Executive Member of Finance (CEMF) publishes and publicizes estimates (s. 129(6))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEFM submits comments on the estimates to the County Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant County Assembly Committee meets to consider the estimates and make recommendations to the County Assembly. It must take into account the views of the CEMF (s. 131 (2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Assembly considers estimates and approves with or without amendment, in sufficient time for the county appropriation law to be passed By 30th June (s. 131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Assembly may amend estimates only if any proposed increase is balanced with a reduction in another appropriation, and any proposed reduction is used to fund the deficit (s. 131(3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After estimates are approved, CEMF submits County Appropriation Bill to the County Assembly (s.129(7))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th June</td>
<td>County government must submit annual cash flow projections to the Controller of Budget (s.127(1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th June</td>
<td>Appropriation Bill must be passed by the County Assembly (s.131(1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEMF makes a public announcement of the proposed revenue measures (s.132(1). Finance Bill is tabled in the County Assembly at the same time (s. 132(2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assembly committee considers the Finance Bill and may amend, provided total revenue is consistent with the Fiscal Framework and County Allocation of Revenue Act and taking into account recommendations of the CEMF (s.132 (3)&amp;(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 days after Appropriation Law is passed</td>
<td>County Assembly considers the Finance Bill and approves with or without amendments(s.133)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>