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Abstract

Change and transformation in the understanding and definition of citizenship has led to the emergence of a citizen-oriented public service approach. This approach also raised a new concept in the field of public budgeting which is participatory budgets. This citizen budget seeks to ensure participation of the citizens in the budgeting process serves as a tool to ensure that the budget is shared with the public transparently and that the people take part in the budgeting processes. Citizen's budget is one of the main tools and instruments that the central and local administrations in Kenya could use to ensure greater transparency and citizenship participation. The research focused on finding out what the benefits of involving the public in the budgeting process are. It further finds out if through involvement of public, control can be achieved in terms of increasing quality of administration in public management, reinforcing accountability mechanisms, ensuring transparency in the provision of public services, involving the people and civil society groups in making policies, improving confidence in the state and making public service quality better. Ultimately, the research hopes to find out what level of participation exists in Kenya and what effect it has on budgeting process. An inductive approach was used to carry the study, where qualitative data was acquired through use of interviews. Highly specialized individuals in the budgeting process with the technical knowledge of national and county budgeting were sampled for the interview. These individuals include government officials in the budgeting department and the civil society that participate. The study found out that for effective participation to happen in Kenya and for it to serve as a control tool, certain factors have to be in place. This includes formulation of a participatory standard, civic education, capacity building for budget officials and proper monitoring, evaluation and feedback mechanisms should be in place.
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1.0 Introduction
(Galinski, 2013, p.218) Defines government budgets as “the main instrument of financial management and realizing public tasks”. Public participation is one of the major mainstays of democracy, and it inevitably influences the goals of public policy (Carreira et al., 2016). In this regard, citizens’ participation in the governance processes is globally encouraged in most democratic countries. More importantly, the participation of citizens in the fiscal processes is underscored as one of the most crucial aspects of development. This study aims to find out whether public participation in the budget process can be used as a control tool in Kenya.

Major changes in political, social, cultural and economic fields have led to significant differences in the provision of service in public and private sectors (Bilge, 2015, p.2). Citizens are becoming more educated and informed, which has led them to be proactive in the development of their countries. Information is easily accessible with the enhancements in communication technologies. This has led to citizens expecting high quality and efficient service fast. Citizen-oriented budgeting has brought about the aspect where citizens no longer want to receive insufficient and ineffective public services that do not address their needs and priorities (Bilge, 2015, p.2). They instead expect consideration of their demands and expectations in the provision of the service and flexibility by the public servants and officials in this process.

The research will focus on finding out what the benefits of involving the public in the budgeting process are. It will further find out if through involvement of public, control can be achieved in terms of increasing quality of administration in public management, reinforcing accountability mechanisms, ensuring transparency in the provision of public services, involving the people and civil society groups in the making policies, improving confidence in the state and making public service quality better.

This research will benefit a number of people. Firstly, policymakers will be made aware of what impact participation of the public in budgeting has in Kenya. Secondly, the oversight authority (office of the auditor general-Kenya) which uses the budget as a core control tool in its audit process will be able to report if public participation was duly carried out; from the formulation of the budgets through to the implementation of the publicly funded project. Thirdly, citizens of Kenya will be able to know through quality reports and audit recommendations from the office
of the Auditor General (OAG), they can contribute towards a more transparent nation and hold those in charge of dealing with public funds responsibly. Lastly, this research can also be significant to other researchers who are trying to find out whether public participation influences the efficiency and effectiveness of public expenditure in Kenya. This research is intended to add additional information on this topic and supplement other studies that have been carried out on the relationship between public participation and budgeting process in Kenya.

The research question that this study intends to answer is: **What is the role of public participation as a budgetary control system in increasing Kenya’s efficiency and controlling costs?** It is important to answer this question since there is a need for accountability and efficiency of service delivery in public organizations across Africa and in Kenya. This need puts public organizations at the forefront in the establishment of control systems. There are various indicators of a lack of financial control in Kenya. This has been evident with striking of employees because of unmet salary demands and poor working environment. Examples of such incidences reported in Kenya include the doctor’s strike in the health sector and lectures strike in the education sector (Dixon, 2011). This situation presents a worrying concern, as the problems seem to spiral among many other public organizations. It appears that many public institutions lack enough finances to facilitate adequate remuneration to workers and provide efficiency in service delivery. Another indicator of the lack of control is the ongoing increase in the number of corruption cases currently. A lot of public funds are being misused yet the public undergoes a lot of challenges like inadequate health facilities, lack of basic human needs like food, water, and electricity. Therefore, there is a need to examine the role of public participation as a budgetary control system in increasing the country’s efficiency, improving public service delivery and controlling costs.

This study has a number of research objectives. Firstly, it is going to establish whether public participation in Kenya promotes transparency and accountability in fiscal policy/ budgeting process. Secondly, it will determine if public participation in resource allocation, leads to addressing the priority concerns of the citizens in the Kenyan communities. Thirdly it will identify whether citizens in Kenya are aware they can participate in the budgeting process, and to find out if they are fully involved in determining their local needs. Lastly, it will find out the legal framework that is laws supporting public participation in Kenya.
While there has been an attempt to explore the relationship between public participation and budgeting in Kenya, there is little evidence on the outcomes of public participation in the planning and implementation of budgets. There is very little literature found on how public participation in the budget process can be used as a control tool, towards enhancing efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability on the use of public funds. The reviewed study only focused on the requirements for public participation in Kenya’s legal framework, enhancing decentralized services through public participatory projects and the effects of budget allocation on public participation. These studies did not provide empirical evidence on effects of public participation in the budgeting process. Therefore, the study will purpose to fill this gap in the literature and assess the role of public participation as a budget control system in Kenya.

This dissertation is the write up from the aforementioned study and is organized in six parts: chapter one is the foregoing introduction, chapter two reviews existing literature and theories about the subject, chapter three discusses the methodology used to come up with the data, chapter four highlights the research findings, chapter five discusses the findings and chapter six draws conclusions and recommendations from the study.
2.0 Literature review

Literature introduction

This study builds upon existing literature on public participation in budgeting process. Specifically, it looks at existing knowledge of how public participation can be used as a control tool towards enhancing transparency and accountability of public resources in Kenya. The study analyzes what public budgets are and the budget cycle in Kenya and then looks at how citizens can participate in budgeting process and how the government ensures that the public is engaged in decision-making process in the budget process. Lastly, the literature also discusses how public participation in budgeting relates to control aspect in terms of ensuring accountability and transparency in how public funds are allocated and utilized.

2.1 Budgeting

A budget is a “quantitative expression of a plan for a defined period of time: it may include planned sales volumes and revenues, resource quantities, costs and expenses, assets, liabilities and cash flows” (CIMA Official, 2005). Equivalently, (Drury, 2018, p.368) defines a budget as a plan expressed in terms of numbers and values. Budgeting, on the other hand, is “the process of expressing the predicted costs and resources for a planned course of action over a specified time period” (CIMAglobal, 2005, p.4). Similarly, (Drury, 2018, p.370) explains that budgeting is concerned with the implementation of the long-term plan for the year ahead.

Literature explains that there are three ways of creating a budget. According to (Drury, 2018, pp.386-90) the three budgeting methods are activity-based budgeting, incremental budgeting, and zero-based budgeting. **ABB – Activity Based Budgeting** is a top-down approach that aims to authorize the supply of only those resources that are needed to perform activities required to meet the budgeted production and sales volume (Drury, 2018, p.386). Cost objects are the starting point in ABB. Their budget output determines the necessary activities that are used to establish the resources that are required for the budget period. **Incremental budgeting** method is whereby the existing operations and the current budget allowance for existing activities are taken as starting point for preparing the next annual budget (Drury, 2018, p.386). (ACCA Global, 2017) “Incremental budgeting is the traditional budgeting method whereby the budget is prepared by taking the current period's budget or actual performance as a base, with incremental amounts then being added for the new budget period”. The base is then adjusted for changes for
example product mix, volumes and prices that are expected to occur during the new budget period. The reason it is called incremental budgeting is that it is concerned with increment in operations or expenditure that will occur during the new budget period for example inflation. **Zero-based budgeting** is also referred to as priority-based budgeting (Drury, 2018, p.389). “It is the budgeting process starts from a base of zero, with no reference being made to the prior period's budget or actual performance” (ACCA Global, 2017). All of the budget headings, therefore, literally start with a balance of zero, rather than under incremental budgeting, when they all start with a balance at least equal to last year's budget or spend. In relation to public sector budgeting, they are government ran activities are non-profit making in nature. Therefore, this means that the government usually adopt an incremental budgeting approach with those in charge of coming up with the budgeting figures calculating the expected costs of maintaining current ongoing activities and then adding to those costs any further developments of the services that are considered desirable (Drury, 2018, p.388).

Budget systems are a key means of operationalizing accountability in democratic systems of government: they prescribe and enforce rules for the allocation, expending, and accounting of compulsorily acquired financial resources (Michael, 2016, p.1). Mullins & Mikesell (2011, p.2) says the functions of the public budgets are: Ensure fiscal discipline, control, responsibility, and fiscal sustainability, secondly ensure that budgetary resources are directed toward the programs of greatest public return, thirdly, induce programs to make most efficient use of resources they have been allocated and provide transparent information about programs and finances to the public. Public budgeting systems serve the following important functions: setting budget priorities that are consistent with the mandate of the government, planning expenditures to pursue a long-term vision for development, exercising financial control over inputs to ensure fiscal discipline, managing operations to ensure efficiency of government operations, and providing tools for making government performance accountable to citizens (Shah, 2007, p.138). The budget also functions as a very significant statement of government policies, one in which policy objectives are reconciled and implemented in concrete terms. The budget sets forth policy priorities and levels of spending, ways of financing the spending, and a plan for managing the funds (Shah, 2007, p.138).
(Jones & Pendlebury, 2000, p.65) explains that the budget preparation for the public sector is a long and complex process that entails preparation of estimates for each individual part/department of a government entity, secondly combining the various estimates from different government institutions in order to consider the overall position. Lastly, the draft budget is submitted to the governing body for approval. In Kenya Sections 35(1) and 125 of the (PFMA) Public Financial Management Act (2012) outlines the stages in the budget process at the national and county government levels respectively in any financial year. Kenya, in a shift from the centralized system of governance that had been in place for close to five decades since attaining independence in 1963, adopted the Constitution of Kenya 2010 effectively establishing a two-tier devolved system of governance comprising of the national government and forty-seven county governments. Both levels of government are distinct but interdependent and work on a mutual ground on the basis of consultation and cooperation. Both the Executive and the Legislative arms of county governments are responsible for county revenues and the delivery of public service in the devolved units (Government of Kenya, 2010). This, therefore, means that the budgeting process in Kenya is done at two levels: the county and National levels. The budgeting process begins in August of the current financial year to December of the next financial year.

The PFMA 2012 details the budget-making in four stages namely formulation, approval, implementation, and audit. The executive arm of both the national and county government is in charge of the formulation stage. The county budgeting process commences with issuance, by the CECM-F, of initial instruction (budget circular) to guide the budget process. The CECM-F then, and in accordance with section 104 of the county government’s act 2012 as reading together with article 220 of the Kenya constitution 2010 which requires that for any public funds to be appropriated, there must be a development plan (CIDP). Subsequently, the county treasury prepares, and submits to the executive committee, for approval, a C-BROP which is a review of budget implementation and assessment of the extent of its success as well as the projections into the subsequent year(s).

After approval of the C-BROP, the county treasury prepares a County Fiscal Strategy Paper which indicates an estimate of the available financial resources. The CFSP contains broad priorities and policy goals as well as an outlook on expenditure, revenue and borrowing for the medium term. During the preparation of the CFSP, the county treasury subjects the estimates to
public participation where it seeks the views of the public and interested groups. Preparation of CFSP is followed by the consolidation and ratification of the budget by the county treasury before by the CECM-F submits it to the county assembly for approval. The County Assembly, again, subjects these estimates to citizen participation and later reviews the estimates. It may make amendments but only in line with the CFSP. Any increase in expenditure must be balanced by a reduction elsewhere, and the estimates are then incorporated in the County Appropriation Bill awaiting approval by the county assembly and later assented to by the county governor (County Government Act, 2012). Once the budget is approved by the county assembly, the law requires that it is implemented to the letter and every stakeholder’s focus now shifts to the monitoring of its implementation.

2.2 Public participation/ participatory democracy

“Many state and local governments are currently struggling with fiscal stress, in some cases, the worst they have experienced in decades” (Ebdon & Franklin, 2006, p.437). Tough decisions are required regarding spending and service reductions or tax and fee increases. It, therefore, seems to be a critical time for citizens to play a role in conjunction with the elected officials in determining the best solutions for government and the community (Ebdon & Franklin, 2006, p.437). “Public participation is defined as citizen involvement in making service delivery and management decisions” (Wang, 2001, p.324). Similarly, (Shah, 2007, p.4) defines Citizen participation refers to citizens or citizen representatives (who are not elected officials) interacting with and providing feedback to government at the policy formulation or implementation stages of governance. “Participatory budgeting (PB) is essentially a process of participation that enables ordinary citizens make decisions about budget allocations” (Krenjova & Raudla, 2013, p.18).

Existing literature shows that public/citizen participation serves a number of purposes. According to (Innes & Booher, 2004, p.423) public participation has five purposes: first, it enables decision-makers find out public preferences in order to incorporate them in their decisions. Secondly, it improves decisions by incorporating citizens’ local knowledge into the calculus. Participation is viewed as a way to inform the public about the budget, and by doing so, to enhance trust through transparency (Box et al., 2007). (Ebdon, 2002, p.274) Agrees with this statement and says that citizen participation reduces the level of distrust in government by
citizens and enlightens the public about government activities. The aim is to have citizens active in decision making and not be passive consumers of government services (Ebdon, 2002, p.274). Citizens who are informed end up being experts who can understand technical difficulties and able to see a holistic view and come up with community-wide solutions (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.56). The main goal of the citizen-based management approach is to improve efficiency in the public sector and to maximize citizens’ satisfaction (Bilge, 2015, p.3). Clientelism, patronage, and corruption can be curbed by enhanced transparency and accountability that participatory budgeting creates and hence help reduce government inefficiency (Shah, 2007, p.1). Thirdly, it promotes fairness and justice. Participatory budgeting promotes inclusive governance by ensuring that the needs and preferences particularly the least advantaged/marginalized in the society get a platform to air their concerns (Shah, 2007, p.1). According to (Lee et al., 2015, p.7) says that participation is held as a means of placing power in the hands of everyday citizens, and it’s a mechanism for creating new forms of self-governance intended to put citizens in the roles of collaborators in making major institution decisions and most importantly for braking down rigid hierarchies and entrenched inequalities state, corporate, educational, health care and other institutions in the society. Fourthly, public participation is about getting legitimacy for public decisions. If a planner can say “We held a dozen public hearings and reviewed hundreds of comments and everyone who wanted to had a chance to say his piece”, then whatever is decided is, at least in theory, democratic and legitimate” (Innes & Booher, 2004, p.424). Another view on how public participation promotes legitimacy for decision making is by (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.56) who states that administrators through regular interaction with citizens learn which policies are likely to be explosively unpopular and how to avoid such policy failures. A policy that is well-grounded in citizen preference might be implemented smoothly, and more cost-friendly as the public is more cooperative when the policy is being implemented. Lastly, public participation is done as it is a legal requirement.

There are four types of stakeholders that participate in the budget process according to (Box et al., 2007). They are (1) decision-makers who are the elected officials, (2) professional administrators responsible for preparing and implementing the budget as well as playing the advisory role to decision-maker, (3) citizens who are directly impacted by the budgetary decisions, (4) clients or their representatives who seek to influence decisions. Literature shows
that political and social stakeholder have different motivations for promoting and participating in participatory budgeting (Shah, 2007, p.3) (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.56). There are two tiers of benefits to consider (processes and outcomes) and two beneficiaries (governments and citizens) in evaluating the effectiveness of citizen participatory process (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.56). Local governments implement participatory budgeting programs in order to build a base of political support, achieve a more equitable distribution of scarce resources, foster public learning, and promote transparency in government. Citizens participate in participatory budgeting programs in order to increase access to public decision-making activities, gain access to information, and improve the quality of services provided under a participatory budgeting system. Civil society organizations (CSOs) participate in order to build broader networks of supporters and enhance their ability to influence policies (Shah, 2007, p.3). The table below summarizes the benefits of PB to both citizens and the government:

| Table 1 Advantages of Citizen Participation in Government Decision Making |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Decision process**            | **Advantages to citizen participants** | **Advantages to government** |
|                                 | Education (learn from and inform government representatives) | Education (learn from and inform citizens) |
|                                 | Persuade and enlighten government | Persuade citizens; build trust and allay anxiety or hostility |
|                                 | Gain skills for activist citizenship | Build strategic alliances |
| **Outcomes**                    | Break gridlock; achieve outcomes | Break gridlock; achieve outcomes |
|                                 | Gain some control over policy process | Avoid litigation costs |
|                                 | Better policy and implementation decisions | Better policy and implementation decisions |

**Figure 1 Summary of advantages of citizen participation**

Source: (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.56)

As much as public participation has a number of advantages illustrated above, there a number of challenges that arise while conducting it. Firstly, there is a challenge to soliciting input as the exercise is deemed costly in terms of time and effort (Box et al., 2007). “…The low end of the
per-decision cost of citizen participation group is arguably more expensive than the decision making of a single agency administrator…” (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.58). Secondly, it can further make a political process more charged by increasing the transparency of who is winning and who is losing. Another challenge faced is that meaningful participation is difficult because of the technical nature of budget presentation; many people feel intimidated by columns of numbers stated in terms that are hard to grasp (Box et al., 2007). Another challenge that may arise is by (Sounman, 2015, p.581) who says that Citizen Participation can only be beneficial to the budget process only if citizens are provided with information that enables them to reflect on the issues and values relevant to the decision at hand. Sounman argues that for successful public participation, the government has to reach out to the public and avail information so that the citizens can be aware and be able to suggest ideas with an informed background. Another challenge encountered with public participation is where the public does not see the need of participating since they elect people to represent the interests of their constituents (Box et al., 2007). Member of the public might prefer to pay taxes to hire an astute public administrator to do the decision making rather than personally allocate time to get involved in the governing process (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.59). Box further says that elections do not give guidance on specific policy issues. Participation provides a direct line of communication between the public and elected officials regarding allocation of public resources (Box et al., 2007).

Further, participatory budgeting comes with significant risks. Participatory processes can be captured by interest groups creating an opportunity to influence policy for personal gains (Shah, 2007, p.1) (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.60). This can lead to masking the undemocratic, exclusive, or elite nature of public decision making, giving the appearance of broader participation and inclusive governance while using public funds to advance the interests of powerful elites. Participatory budgeting can be used to unfairly facilitate the illegitimate and unjust exercise of power. Another drawback is that citizen participation recognizes inequality in representation (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.59). Those who speak at public hearings are generally not perceived as being representative of the population (Box et al., 2007). Since citizens who participate are not compensated for their time, the committee may be dominated by strongly partisan participants whose livelihood or values are strongly affected by the decisions being made, or those who live comfortably enough to allow them to participate frequently. In addition
to this (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.59) says that some participants like those who represent businesses and government agency interests are incentivized by some kind of payment in order for them to devote their time towards the initiative. So from this, we can see that there is some level of bias in the public participatory process as it does not take into consideration all the views of society. Literature also states another disadvantage of public participation as where citizens are misled to think that their decisions are going to be implemented, and then their decisions are ignored or merely taken under advisement, resentment will develop over time (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.59).

“Governments around the world are reforming and strengthening their systems of local government and decentralizing responsibilities and resources to sub-national levels at an unprecedented rate” (World Bank, 2000, p.57). (Ebdon, 2002, p.274) Agrees with this statement and says that “Citizen Participation has received increasing attention in the past decade”. Across many developing and middle-income countries, reforms are being undertaken to improve governance by introducing new institutional and technical systems intended to increase the transparency and accountability of governments (Schaeffer & Yilmaz, 2008, p.3). Most evident are efforts to decentralize government functions to lower tiers of government. These reforms help governments promote changes to governance structures that reshape the relationship between governments and their citizens (Schaeffer & Yilmaz, 2008, p.3). Decision making around government revenues and expenditures has historically been shrouded in mystery and secrecy (Box et al., 2007). In the traditional budgeting approach, citizens had a limited role as compared to the citizen-based approach where they play a growing role (Bilge, 2015, p.3). Decision making in the budget process was left for tax administrators, Treasury, Central Bank officials, and a few selected technocrats. Historically, Parliament’s interface with public finances was confined.

However, in recent years, interest and action with regard to public participation and accountability in fiscal decision-making have increased. Interest in public participation globally is due to the following six core factors (khagram et al., 2016): First, the escalation of good governance norms and standards that emphasize transparency, participation, and accountability in all government matters. Secondly, the world political environment has changed from the
authoritarian regime to a situation where power is separated and there is competition among different political parties. Thirdly, public financial management systems have changed for the better, and encourage public participation. Fourthly, increase in technological advancements. This has enabled the ease of spreading information and communication globally. Therefore, the public is more informed on financial matters of the country. The improvement in information technology restructures public administration which as a result has led to offer better, faster and uninterrupted services (Bilge, 2015, p.3). Lastly, decentralization and devolution of power to raise, allocate and spend public resources contributed to fiscal transparency. (Shah, 2007, p.2) is of another opinion as to why public participation is likely to be adopted. He states those factors as “strong mayoral support, a civil society willing and able to contribute to ongoing policy debates, a generally supportive political environment that insulates participatory budgeting from legislators’ attacks, and the financial resources to fund the projects selected by citizens”.

Participatory budgeting began in 1989 in the municipality of Porto Alegre, the capital of Brazil’s southernmost state, Rio Grande do Sul (Shah, 2007, p.23). Its adoption of PB reflects the nation’s efforts to construct and operate a fully democratic government after a quarter-century of military rule (Franklin et al., 2013, p.5). Proceeding from the model of Porto Alegre, several cities in Brazil and other countries in Latin America adopted PB, followed by local governments (LGs) in many other countries in the world (Krenjova & Raudla, 2013, p.19). Globally, public participation in budgeting process has become an institutional procedure, being adopted by the European Union (EU) member countries and the Asian countries as a means of promoting transparency and accountability in fiscal policy/budgeting processes (Allegretti and Carsten, 2004). In some jurisdictions, the right to public participation is enshrined in law, whereas in others it is conceived as human right, or as a manifestation of the right to freedom of association and assembly (Malena and Janmehay, 2004). Additionally, in other jurisdictions such as the Netherlands, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden, public participation has been incorporated into their legal framework and made a seamless system of information sharing (Gomez, Joel, and Isaac, 2005). In democratic societies like the US, public participation has been incorporated into their laws, including, the right to petition which was made part of the First Amendment of the US constitution since1791 (World Bank, 2003). Similar policies on public participation are evident in urban planning where participatory structures have been in place for the last thirty
years (Bay, 2011). The Constitution and the PFM Act, 2012 provide a distinct opportunity to enhance the role of citizens in public financial management processes in Kenya. Chapter Twelve of the Constitution deals with Public Finance Article 201 introduces principles of public finance, among them being, openness and accountability including public participation in financial matters. These principles, if strictly adhered to, would strengthen policy formulation and management of public resources for the improved livelihoods of many Kenyans.

Various researchers have tried to explain what constitutes effective/ authentic public participation. According to (Kin et al., 1998, p.323) shifting participatory techniques to more authentic/effective practices requires a two-sided learning process that is the administrators and the citizen need to learn. In order to move toward authentic models, all three components of public participation-the administrative structures and processes, the administrators, and the citizens-must be addressed by those working in and seeking to understand, public administration. Authenticity cannot be achieved by addressing problems in only one area. For example, citizen empowerment in the absence of administrative transformation is problematic. To develop processes that increase participation without changing the power relations between citizens and administrators is also problematic. Models of authentic participation must take a three-pronged approach, addressing all three components, seeking to (1) empower and educate community members, (2) re-educate administrators and (3) enable administrative structures and processes (Kin et al., 1998, p.323).

Empowering citizens means designing processes where citizens know that their participation has the potential to have an impact, where a representative range of citizens are included, and where there are visible outcomes (Kin et al., 1998, p.323). Re-educating administrators means changing their roles from that of expert managers toward that of cooperative participants or partners. It involves training them on interpersonal skills including communication, listening, team building, meeting facilitation and self-knowledge (Kin et al., 1998, p.324). According to (Berner & Morse, 2011, p.156) effective public participation can be defined in three dimensions depending on who the stakeholder is. The types of stake holders are political leaders, government staff and the citizens. The elected officials view of effective public participation is them being reelected to power and lack of citizen complaints. For government officials effective public participation means providing information to the public and encouraging them to act as macro-level
community advocates and thus making informed citizens a valuable resource to get other members in the community to understand tough, controversial or pressing decisions made by local officials. Citizen’s view of effective public participation is that it should include two-way communications between all the three stakeholder groups. To be effective, citizens’ input must be followed by feedback from staff or local leaders. Input cannot be merely symbolic. It is not letting the citizens say something or submit opinions or attend meetings. To be effective, the participation must initiate a reaction or response showing that the information was heard (Berner & Morse, 2011, p.151).

2.3 Budget as a control tool-transparency

McLaney and Atril (2012, P.462) define control as “…compelling event to conform to plans”. Actual outcomes of performance are compared to the planned performance that is the budget; the comparison will provide a basis of control (McLaney & Atril, 2012, p.462). Variances arising from the difference between the budgeted performance and the actual performance are highlighted in order to take the business back on track. Henry Fayol defines control as “To verify that things are done according to the plan laid out, the policies formulated and instructions given”. Budgetary control is defined as “the establishment of budgets relating the responsibilities of executives to the requirements of a policy, and the continuous comparison of actual with budgeted results, either to secure by individual action the objective of that policy or to provide a basis for its revision” (CIMAglobal, 2005). Budgetary control can be exercised by comparing budgeted results with actual results to ensure expenditure levels are not exceeded and planned activities are achieved (Jones & Pendlebury, 2000, p.23).

Several international organizations, inter-governmental groups, civil societies, and professional bodies have provided definition and official standards on budget and fiscal transparency. An example of this is by (OECD, 2017, p.10) that defines budget transparency as being fully open with people about how public money is raised and used. Budget transparency is defined as the full disclosure of all relevant fiscal information in a timely and systematic manner (OECD, 2002). Similarly, fiscal transparency is defined as openness toward the public at large about government structure and functions, fiscal policy intentions, public sector accounts, and projections (Kopits & Craig, 1998, p.8). It relates to access to information that is timely, easily
understandable, comprehensive and information that can be comparable internationally. This ensures that electorate and financial markets can accurately assess the government’s financial position and the true costs and benefits of government activities, including their present and future economic and social implications (Kopits & Craig, 1998, p.8). From the definition of budget transparency from existing literature, the study can depict budget transparency as providing fiscal/budgetary information that is clear and open and provided on time to the public.

For control to be exercised in the public sector budgets, transparency is a major factor. The public cannot provide priority preferences that are reliable and valid unless they understand the actual fiscal situation in the country that is: consequences associated with their choices, options available and the likely outcome of their choices (Dineen et al., 2004, p.84). This is to say that, participation in budgeting will not be genuine unless there is effective transparency (Justice & Dülger, 2009, p.11). Participation in budgeting process is meaningless if not well informed, and participants can only be well informed if there is effective transparency (Justice & Dülger, 2009, p.11). Although budget transparency is not a goal on its own, it is essential/ a requirement for public participation and accountability (World Bank, 2010, p.1). A proper analysis of a budget may pose a challenge if it is not transparent, accessible, and accurate. “ (Downes, 2017) agrees with World Bank and says that budget transparency is a timely and important topic, radical to questions of accountability between government and citizen. Budget transparency refers to the extent and ease with which citizens can access information and provide feedback on government revenues, allocations, and expenditures (World Bank, 2010). Similarly, (IMF, 2012) refers to budget transparency as fiscal transparency. Their definition of fiscal transparency is public reporting of the past, present and future state of public resources in a comprehensive, clear, reliable, timely, and relevant manner. Another way of describing fiscal transparency is by (Justice & Dülger, 2009, p.265) who twisted it slightly by saying that it entails the intelligibility and usability as well as availability of budget and financial information, to non-specialists (most citizens and many public officials) as well as to budget analysts and other specialists and budget-process insiders. Budget transparency is constituted by the following five (5) terms according to (OECD, 2017, p.10):

**Accountability**—Clarity about the use of public funds is necessary so that public representatives and officials can be accountable for effectiveness and efficiency.
**Integrity**—Public spending is vulnerable not only to waste and misuse but also to fraud. “Sunlight is the best policy” for preventing corruption and maintaining high standards of integrity in the use of public funds. **Inclusiveness**—Budget decisions can profoundly affect the interests and living standards of different people and groups in society; transparency involves an informed and inclusive debate about the budget policy impacts. **Trust**—An open and transparent budget process fosters trust in society that people’s views and interests are respected and that public money is used well. **Quality**—Transparent and inclusive budgeting support better fiscal outcomes and more responsive, impactful and equitable public policies.

In recent years, transparency, accountability in fiscal decision making and public participation have surged around the world (Khagram et al., 2013, p.1). The reason for valuing budget transparency in recent years is the confidence in the governments’ ability to manage public resources has diminished due to global financial crisis of 2008 (Downes, 2017). The public now has a greater appreciation of hidden risks to public finances. These dangers to public resources can be avoided in future by using a transparent approach to recognizing and managing these risks (Downes, 2017). Another reason as to why budget transparency has been of high importance lately is so that governments can respond to increasing internal and external calls to increase the level of transparency in their public budget processes and systems as a way to manage public resources more efficiently and effectively so as to better respond to the needs and priorities of their citizens (Anderson et al., 2010). (Khagram et al., 2013, p.5) agrees with this and says that there is an increased growth of the number of operational capacity of independent civil society organizations (CSOs) seeking to be informed about active participation in decision making. Other factors that have contributed to increased demand for budget transparency according to (Khagram et al., 2013, p.5) are escalation of good governance norms and standards that emphasize greater transparency, participation, and accountability. Secondly, introduction of modern public finance management systems and good practices in countries around the world and lastly, a substantial amount of decentralization of power to subnational levels of government, including the power to raise, allocate and spend public resources.

“In a representative democracy, legitimacy is based upon citizens’ trust that elected representatives and government administrators are implementing the will of the people”
Such trust is built and sustained by a complex of relations between information, transparency, accountability, and participation. Political and information theorists alike have acknowledged that democracies depend on information in order to function (Harrison & Sayogo, 2014, p.1). (Bimber, 2003, p.11) Further says that information becomes vital to democracies in multiple ways: in the processes by which citizen preferences are formed and aggregated, in the behaviors of citizens and elites, informal procedures of representation, in acts of governmental decision making, in the administration of laws and regulations, and in the mechanisms of accountability that freshen democracy and sustain its legitimacy. Budgets and the budgeting process is usually technical in nature, therefore for transparency to be achieved, the information contained in them should be simplified before being actively disseminated to citizens (World Bank, 2010, p.1). Moreover, such information must be dispersed in time to enable citizens provide feedback effectively that can influence policy formulation and resource reallocation (World Bank, 2010).

The annual budget is typically the key instrument by which a government translates its policies into action. It, however, is normally long and complex and accompanied by a number of detailed supporting documents (Ramkumar & Shapiro, 2010, p.18). Thus, even for technical experts, understanding the budget is a difficult and time-consuming task (Ramkumar & Shapiro, 2010). Therefore, it is essential that governments be proactive in helping the general public to make sense of the budget. This is part of ensuring that the budgeting process is transparent and that the citizens have full disclosure and can easily interpret what is in the actual budget. By doing this, control is enhanced as citizens are able to compare the actual outcomes of the budget visa vie the amounts stated in the budget. “Budgets should not only be available to the public they should also be accessible to the public” (Ramkumar & Shapiro, 2010, p.18).

Fiscal transparency can positively affect the economy in two key ways (Kopits & Craig, 1998). Firstly, transparency can help attract cheaper credit. Countries with higher levels of fiscal transparency have higher credit ratings and lower spreads between borrowing and lending rates, thus reducing governments borrowing costs. Secondly, transparency in fiscal matters can undermine fiscal discipline. A country’s fiscal credibility and performance can be predicted by the level of transparency in its public finance practices and systems. According to (World Bank, 2010, p.1) budget transparency has many benefits but four are key: First, it is a huge disincentive
for government officials in charge of public funds to misuse or misappropriate funds due to high scrutiny. This hence leads to less corruption. If budgets are open to the public and effective legislative scrutiny, there is less room for deviation from policy decisions and reversal of budget allocations. There are fewer distortions and the ruling elite are less likely to manipulate the budget. Secondly, budget transparency provides citizens with an opportunity to provide feedback on the quality and adequacy of the infrastructure and services provided by the government. This feedback, combined with reduced corruption, can help shine the light on leakages and improve efficiency in the use of resources (World Bank, 2010). Thirdly, budget transparency promotes better trust in government by opening up its books of account. Perceptions of poor service and infrastructure, high levels of corruption, and opaqueness of operations are the cause of citizens’ distrust of their governments. Lastly, fiscal transparency can help generate higher revenue for governments since its citizens are more inclined to pay taxes when they know that it will be put into proper use towards developing the country.
3.0 Methodology
Methodology Introduction

(Bell et al., 2019, p.45) A research method is a technique for collecting data. It “comprises of three subsections that reflect the sequence of research steps involved: Research design, data collection, and data analysis” (Bell et al., 2019, p.153). While conducting research, it is important to ensure that the method and assumption adopted meet the overall objectives/aim of the research. The purpose of the research methodology is to help in the formulation and clarify the effects of Public Participation in the budget process of Kenya, and also design the primary research by identifying which philosophy, approach and strategy best suit the nature of the research questions. This section first analysed all these factors to explain why the method of primary data collection was chosen and then provided a detailed description of how the data was collected and analysed; the criteria according to which the population was chosen; potential ethical issues and research limitations. The below discussion will also explain why a qualitative research was chosen rather than a quantitative approach.

3.1 Research Design
“A research design is a blueprint or plan for the collection, measurement, and analysis of data, created to answer your research questions (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016, p.95). Similarly (Saunders et al., 2012, p.163) further defines research design as a general plan as how you will go about answering your research question(s). It contains clear objectives derived from the research question, specify the sources from which the study will collect the data, propose how the study will collect the data, analyze this as well as discuss ethical issues and concerns that were encountered during the study.

3.2 Research Philosophy
According to (Saunders et al., 2012, p.124) research philosophy is a system of beliefs and assumptions about developing knowledge. This study will take an interpretivism philosophy, which heavily relies on the views of the participants and emphasizes the role of people as social actors. This philosophy is supported by social constructionist ontology, which holds that reality is constituted by human action and meaning-making, rather than existing objectively and externally (Bell et al., 2019, p.31). The study of the social world, therefore, requires a different logic of research that reflects the distinctiveness of humans against the natural order.
Interpretivism holds the assumption that people always try to understand their surroundings and continuously develop an individual interpretation of what they go through (Creswell, 2013). The interpretations are varied and many and this calls for open-ended questions and observations to bring out these views during data collection (Saunders et al., 2012). Interpretivist approach focuses on socioeconomic conditions, diverse cultures, and the perceptions and experiences of the actors involved (Saunders et al., 2012, p.140), which emphasizes conducting research among people rather than objects. Interpretivism is concerned with the process of how and why social acts happen (Bell et al., 2019, p.31). Interpretivists may utilize a research approach called phenomenology to study human experiences and consciousness (Joe F. Hair et al., 2016, p.297).

“Phenomenology studies examine how human being in this case the interviewer experiences certain phenomenon from their thoughts, perceptions, desires, memories, emotions and social interactions (Joe F. Hair et al., 2016, p.297). Although research has been done in this area of public participation in budgeting process, it pertains to other geographical areas; no known research had been done in Kenya. Also no published research has been found to explain how participatory budgeting can be used as a control tool in Kenya towards ensuring efficiency and effective use of public resources. It must be acknowledged that countries are unique, with different laws/financial regulations, levels of awareness, cultures, and practices. Due to the aforementioned fact, the effects of public participation in budgeting processes that have been raised elsewhere cannot be generalized to Kenya, hence the need to heavily rely on the views of Kenyan participants. The approach enabled the researcher gain deep insights into the impact of public participation in budgeting process and the level to which it creates accountability, transparency, effectiveness, efficiency of public service delivery by public sector organizations in Kenya.

3.3 Research Approach
An inductive approach is used where one first begins by collecting data to explore a phenomenon and then use it to build or generate a theory often in the form of a conceptual framework (Saunders et al., 2012, p.145). Inductive reasoning is where broad generalizations are made from specific observations: that is from observing patterns in data and then coming up with conclusions and theories from the data (Joe F. Hair et al., 2016, p.295/296). The inductive approach focuses on understanding the meanings and interpretations of ‘social actors’ and to
understand their world from their point of view, it is highly contextual and hence is not widely
generalizable (Saunders et al., 2012, p.145).

Little knowledge is known about how public participation in budgeting process in Kenya acts as
a control mechanism. This makes it difficult to formulate a hypothesis. The research approach
used to conduct this study is inductive, reason being this research aims to collect data on the
public attitude, interests, information, and participation in budgeting process and then use the
data to determine if there is a correlation between control and public participation. The data
collected will be used to indicate if there is a pattern that can be used to support a universal
theory.

3.4 Research Strategy
This research is non-numerical in nature. Data collection techniques or data analysis procedures
that generate or use non-numerical data are termed qualitative (Saunders et al., 2012, p.165).
Qualitative research is discovery-oriented where by trends in thought and opinions are under
covered and the analysts use the discovered data to generate ideas and theories (Joe F. Hair et al.,
2016, p.295). Qualitative research is associated with the analysis of individuals’ views of the
world, which are non-quantifiable. Qualitative method is used because the research aims to
explain and understand phenomena and behavior of public participation in the Budgeting
process. Also, the researcher wanted to issues that may not have been considered to emerge from
the research.

Having adopted the Interpretivism with an inductive approach, grounded theory strategy will be
used. According to (Saunders, et al., 2012, p. 594) grounded theory strategy is a systematic or
even prescriptive strategy in which the researcher forms a general theory of what is being
observed anchored on the views of the participants. Grounded theory is used to develop
theoretical explanations of social interactions and processes in a wide range context. The goal of
grounded theory research is to integrate, refine and write up theories in order to understand
particular phenomena (Joe F. Hair et al., 2016, p.296). Since the research approached chosen is
inductive, the analysis gathered arose from the participants’ views in the interviews.
3.5 Sampling-Selecting Respondents

Sampling techniques enable you to reduce the amount of data you need to collect by considering data from a representative section of the population (Saunders, et al., 2012, p. 272). Sampling methods are divided into two namely: probability sampling and non-probability sampling (Saunders et al., 2012, p.211). For this particular study, a non-probability sampling technique will be used. Non-probability sampling is where the selection is not random, therefore, only some members of the population will have an opportunity to take part in the study (Bell et al., 2019, p.197). The specific non-probability sampling technique that will be used in the research is purposive/selective sampling. The reason for using this technique is that it can provide in-depth and detailed information about the phenomenon under investigation (Saunders et al., 2012, p.212). It is highly subjective and determined by the qualitative researcher generating the qualifying criteria each participant must meet to be considered for the research study. In this research, the interviewees were subject matter expert in the budgeting field with a broad understating of the public participation in the budgeting process. These individuals include local country executive in Kenya, treasury officials, and Controller of Budgets officials. Since Kenya have 47 counties, it was difficult to interview all the 47 county officials due to the time constraint for conducting the research. The research took two angles to those it was interviewing; one of the angles was the subject matter experts who were identified as knowledgeable about participation either through their research or practice. The second group was non-governmental individual that had taken part in the participatory forums. Therefore, this research sampled six government officials with the expertise in budgeting as well as four civil society individuals who had previously participated in the budgeting process in Kenya.

3.6 Data collection

Primary data was collected using face to face in-depth individual Interviews. The person being interviewed was considered an expert specifically government officials and community figures who are involved and have experience and expertise in the participative budgeting process. The interviews were semi-structured in nature and general questions were prepared for use during the interviews. The semi-structured interview was selected as it helped create a logical flow of the interview process while trying to bring out as much information as possible. It also allowed the researcher the ability to ask follow-up questions to improve clarity and relevance of the responses. All interviews were electronically recorded to provide evidence of primary data. The
recording was also done to help correct the natural limitations of our memories and of the intuitive glosses that the researcher might place on the responses from the interviewees (Bell et al., 2019, p.445). Unexpected or exceptional occurrences during the interview process were jotted down on paper so as the non-verbal expressions of the respondents.

Appointments with the respondents were made through email. Interviews for each participant are approximated to take 30 minutes to one hour.

3.7 Data Analysis
Qualitative data is often associated with the interpretive philosophy since the research looks for meaning from reflective narrative that is socially constructed from those who take part in the research being studied (Saunders et al., 2012, p.568). Since the research carried out qualitative research interviews, the recorded interviews were transcribed as a word-processed application using actual words. Each interview transcribed was saved as a separate word-processed file. For purposes of quality control, the text were compared to the recorded data by listening while reading, to ensure that what is transcribed is the same as what is recorded. Transcription of the recording was done immediately the data had been gathered since it was fresh in the mind of the researcher and enabled accuracy. In order to retain the context of how the text was originally spoken, a copy of the transcribed script was sent to each of the interviewees to approve that there is no misrepresentation of data. Transcription of the audio recorded interview did not only involve what the interviewee said but also involved the way they said it. The researcher tried to give an indication of the respondent's tone and their non-verbal communications.

Thematic analysis will be used to analyse the data corpus. According to (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.79) thematic analysis is a method for pinpointing, analysing, examining and reporting patterns (themes) of meaning within a data. This method of analysis organizes and describes the research data in detail and interprets various aspects of the topic and that is why it was selected as an appropriate approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Qualitative data collected was categorized into themes and research specific concepts that were linked to the existing literature reviewed and the conceptual framework. This enabled easy identification of relationships between the data collected and existing literature. To aid with ease of analysis, a summary of the transcribed scripts was done, identifying the key points. This summary compressed long statements into briefer statements in which the main sense of what was observed was rephrased in a few words.
3.8 Research Ethics

Ethics in research is a moral code that guides a researcher’s behavior and conduct in relation to the rights of those who become subjects of your work or are affected by it (Saunders et al., 2012, p.239). Since the research will be an in-depth interview, traditional access will be required. While conducting this research, the following are the anticipated ethical concerns:

Maintaining the anonymity of respondents. This issue was tackled by acquiring express permission in writing and clearly explaining the final recipients of the data. While referring to comments from a respondent, codes were used to refer to them. The research assured the respondent that they will remain anonymous and this helped get more reliable information.

Wrongly transcribing recording to word during data analysis. To ensure that primary data is reported fully and accurately irrespective of whether they contradict expected outcomes, the recording was listened to while reading the transcribed word documentation to ensure they coincide.

Maintaining the confidentiality of the data collected. Organizations and individuals will remain anonymous and the data they provide will be processed to make it non-attributable.

The university code of ethics provided guidance in the conduct of this research.
4.0 Results

Introduction

In this chapter, the study shows how the interviews were analyzed and the finding from the recordings. Ten interviews were conducted. The interviewees were categorized into two. The first category was government officers and the second category was the civil society. The below table shows the demographics of the interviewees:

Table 1 Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government officials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>Five male, one female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>Two male, Two female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The government officers selected were from different offices as highlighted: one of the interviewees was a budget officer from National treasury Kenya identified as (TRES.1), 2 county executive’s from the budget section from Kajaido and Nairobi counties identified as (TRES.2) and (TRES.3) respectively, an accountant from Ministry of Road and infrastructure identified as (ACC.2), and another from Meru County identified as (ACC.1) and finally an official from the controller of budgets identified as (CoB). The other category of interviewees was the civil societies who had previously participated in the budget process in the prior years. This category had four interviewees from a civil society officer was selected and identified as CSO, a church leader was also selected and identified as PRIE, the third was a business community associates identified as Biz Com.1 and lastly professional body officer identified as Chair. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data. Various codes were formulated that eventually lead to themes. This is explained below.

4.1 Thematic Analysis

From the data corpus derived from the interviews, the study opted to use the thematic analysis to analyses the data. This analysis entailed coming up with themes and codes. According to (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.82) a theme is “something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within a data set”. While
coming up with the themes, the research read and re-read the transcripts from the interviews in order to identify important points that were seen to be raised. The study then used the researcher’s judgment to identify the themes. This study started with the six steps of conducting a thematic analysis by (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.87) as illustrated below:

**Step 1: familiarizing yourself with the data collected from the interview.**

The researcher first started by transcribing the recorded interviews into word documents. After transcribing, the word transcripts were read and checked back against the original audio recording for accuracy. After all this was done the researcher read and re-read the transcripts jotting down key points in order to generate initial ideas. The repeated reading of the transcript also helped the researcher search for meanings from the data and patterns. During this phase, the researcher took notes and started generating ideas that could possibly be codes.

**Step 2: generating initial codes from the data**

Codes are generated from the data which the researcher has familiarized themselves with. Codes are features of data that seem interesting to the researcher and can refer to the most basic segment of raw data that can be assessed in a meaningful way pertaining to a fact (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.88). In this study, coding was done manually by working systematically through the entire data set giving attention to each data item and identifying interesting aspects of the data that may form the basis of repeated patterns/themes. The identified aspects were identified by writing notes on the text being analyzed. The table below illustrates some of codes that were formulated and the data extracts from the interview that demonstrates those codes:

### Table 2 Code formulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Data Extract</th>
<th>Coded for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biz Com.1</td>
<td>“Though there is a lapse in how the government invites the public to participate in the budgeting process...”&lt;br&gt;“... usually the communication is given last minute, for instance, they invite the public through the newspaper today and the event is supposed to be the next day.”</td>
<td>Poor communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.1</td>
<td>“The purposes of this training is to create awareness to the people and providing them with the information to</td>
<td>Inadequate funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
help them identify what they need locally. It is a very expensive exercise and many at times the resources available cannot be used throughout the entire county”. “This has curtailed doing them at village levels. Most of it has been ad hoc and done for compliance purposes”. Following statutory obligations

| Tres. 1 | Another challenge that we see especially at the county level is huge amendments of the budget priorities of the people by political representatives. As I had mentioned earlier, the political leaders have to ensure that the needs of their political parties are also met | Political interference |
| CSO | “I feel that there is incoherent participation logistics. I say this because in some cases, organizers shift dates or venues for consultative meetings on short notice without consulting citizens”; “… flout procedures, fail to provide relevant information and documents, or hold meetings in inaccessible places” | Poor communication |
| CoB | At the county level, there is a strong need for an MLE( monitoring evaluation and learning) output. The MLE should show what resources have been used in which project, how far those are projects from completion, which projects are complete and the ones not yet, the reason why. This would help citizens assess outcomes and counter check whether outcomes are in line with the expected outputs. | Enhancing accountability |
| Chair | For public participation to be representative, we need a lot of people from all aspects of life. This also includes the disadvantaged groups like people with disabilities and the youth. It should be open to everyone willing to participate. | Inclusion of minority groups |
| CSO | But for the years after that, many of the public views are not put into consideration and not implemented. This has | Citizen apathy |
been very discouraging as more citizens now do not see the need to participate as their views are not put into consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC.2</th>
<th>“There are areas in kajiado county that are very remote and the literacy levels there are very low. Therefore, we are in the process of looking for a way to reach those people in a language that they understand because in as much as they cannot read English or write, there is a language that they speak. Therefore we should be able to speak to them in their language and help them participate in the process”.</th>
<th>Language barrier</th>
<th>access to information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| TRES.1 | “For sensitization to be for effective, capacity building skills are requires to government officials who will be conducting the exercise. These individual require skills like identification and mobilization, facilitating and documenting public participation, communication skills, monitoring and evaluation skills and preparation of public participation reports”. | Need for capacity building |

| CSO | “Another thing I could add here is that there is supposed to be a monitoring, evaluation and learning output paper that could help citizens track implemented projects and output achieved. I am not sure if the government actually does this because if there, it is not well published and disseminated for public consumption. So without this, the public cannot say with certainty that there is transparency in the use of public resources”. | Inadequate opportunity for public engagement. |

| TRES.2 | “I remember back in the financial year 2013/2014, especially in the rural areas where the Ma community is, women would not attend this forums. We would call for meetings and only men showed up in those forums”. | Inclusion and identification of minority groups |

| TRES.2 | “The constitution has not told you that this is the kind and number of people required to have an effective | Absence of policy/ standard or regulation |

| TRES.2 | | | |
participatory forum. It is supposed to involve all. So this is also another great challenge that we are facing. Even at the national level, as to who to call for a meeting, the number in terms of threshold and what is termed as representative is not clear”.

From the codes identified, the study came up with a map that shows a summary of how they all combine to form an effective budget participation process. The map is as illustrated below:

*Source: Chart created by researcher*

*Figure 2 Elements of effective participation*
Step 3: Searching for themes.

It involves sorting the various codes identified into potential themes, and collecting and combining all relevant coded data extracts within the identified themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.89). The aim of this step is to analyze the various code and consider how those codes can come together to form a theme. The below visual representation was used in the study to help sort the various codes into themes. Those in a rectangular shape are the various themes identified while those in an oval shape are the codes that fall under them. The arrow shows how the various themes relate.

Source: Thematic map created by researcher
Figure 3 Thematic map

It should be noted form the text size in boxes communicate the topics and subtopics and the related colors show the relationship between the topics and sub-topics. The two subtopics that relate to more than one topic can be easily identified from the gradient color fill.

Step 4: reviewing theme

After identifying five themes in step 3, the study went ahead and refined those themes. From the themes earlier identified the study discovered that the “absence of standards” did not relate with any other code and therefore separately considered as a miscellaneous theme in this study. The study also realized that the theme of transparency directly related to inadequate access to information by the public and therefore it was placed as a code.

Step 5: Defining and naming themes.

This is the ongoing analysis to define and further refine the specifics of each theme and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme. At this stage, the themes were defined, redefined and named were “Insufficient funding”, “Inadequate access to information”, “absence of standards” and “inadequate opportunity for public engagement”

Step 6: Production of a report

According to (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.93) the last step producing the report. This is where the study already has fully worked out themes and it involves the final analysis of those themes in order to generate a report. The foregoing analysis of findings is the report generated.

4.2 Detailed Findings
In this section, the research does an in-depth report that was generated from the data analyzed.

4.2.1 Background of public participation in Budgeting in Kenya and what it entails.

All the six government official respondents were asked to give a history of public participation in Kenya and what it entails. TRES.1, TRES.2 and ACC.1 explained that the promulgation of the Constitution in 2010 ushered a new era for citizen participation in Kenya by embedding public participation as a principle of governance that binds all state and public officials. And that the
law made it compulsory that citizens have to take part in the budgeting process from formulation, approval, implementation, and oversight.

What I would say about public participation in the budget-making process, it is whereby through the constitution of Kenya 2010 citizens are given an opportunity to participate in decision making and give their views into the budgeting process. (TRES.2)

Prior to the law of compulsory public participation; Kenya was largely centralized where the use of top-down approach to planning was being done. Major decision making were made by the political leaders and not much involvement was done by the public. (TRES.1)

COB and TRES.1 both explained that public participation in Kenya takes part both at the National and County level. They also mentioned that both levels of Government have guidelines on public participation and also initiated processes through which the public participate. All six government officials describe public participation as a process where individuals, governmental and non-governmental groups influence decision making in policy, legislation, service delivery, oversight, and development matters. They all said that those who participate include professionals like engineers, NGOs, civil society, business communities, and the general public.

ACC.1 mentioned that public participation process entailed five steps namely informing the public by providing information, consulting the public, involving the public in decision making, collaborating with the public and empowering the public. TRES.2 agrees with ACC.1 on what public participation entails. She says that over the years it has entailed them explaining, informing and training the public on what public participation is and what it entails. The below extracts illustrates this.

It involves informing the public by providing information to help them understand the issues, options, and solutions. Consulting with the public to obtain their feedback on alternatives or decisions. Involving the public to ensure their concerns are considered throughout the decision process, particularly in the development of decision criteria and options, collaborating with the public to develop decision criteria and alternatives and identify the preferred solution and empowering the public by placing final decision-making authority in their hands. (TRES.2)

ACC.2 and TRES.1 explain that the budget process is lengthy and starts in August of every financial year and ends in June. ACC.2, COB, and TRES.1 explained the budgeting process in
Kenya as having four stages. They said the first stage is formulation where the executive arms of both the national and county governments are in charge of the formulation stage. At this stage they say that it includes: (1) integrated development planning process which includes both long-term and medium-term planning; (2) planning and determining financial and economic policies and priorities over the medium term (3) preparing overall estimates in the form of the Budget Policy Statement (BPS) of national government revenues and expenditures, and overall estimates in the form of the County Fiscal Strategy Paper (CFSP) for the county governments; (4) preparing the budget estimates.

From the medium term plan, meetings are held from the lowest level that is the location level, then sub-county level, county level and eventually at the national level is where the key projects are identified. There are strategic projects which are identified from top to bottom but you should note that most of the Kenyan projects are bottom up. That’s what happens at the national level. Once you have the MTP (Medium term plan), which covers a period of five years, on an annual basis we extract an annual plan. The annual plan is concrete size to what we call BPS (Budget policy statement). So each ministry focuses on the key strategic areas/objectives based on vision 2030, the MTP and the annual development plan (ADP). (TRES.1)

The second stage is approval. TRES.1 says that parliament and the 47 County Assemblies are in charge of the approval stage at the national and the county level. At the approval stage, some of the key events that should take place are according to TRSE.1 are: Parliament adopting the Budget Policy Statement and the County Assemblies adopting their respective County Fiscal Strategy Paper, as a basis for future deliberations. Secondly amending and approving the budget estimates after the national or county Executive (specifically the Treasury) tables them before Parliament or the County Assembly. Thirdly enacting the Appropriation Bill and any other Bills required implementing the budgetary proposals. The third stage of the budgeting process according to TRES.1 is implementation where Executive at the national and the county level is in charge of the implementation stage. At this stage, the Executive implements the budget proposals passed by Parliament or the County Assemblies. The final stage according to TRES.1 and ACC.2 is audit and oversight where the Office of the Auditor-General audits and reports on the accounts of both the national and the county governments. TRES.3 says that the public should be able to participate during monitoring as they are on the ground and therefore should look at the audit reports and what is on the ground in order to identify gaps.
The four civil society interviewees were asked to explain what the public participatory forums entail. Their response was the same. They all said that the meeting starts with an opening prayer. After the prayers, the leaders from the government offices start with speeches followed by speeches from the politicians. After this, they present what the government did in the previous financial year. This is then followed by the public talking about their priority needs. The extract below indicates how the participatory forums are conducted:

After this, we get to the forum day where there is an opening section that starts with opening prayers and then speeches from local government officers, and political leaders. After this there is a briefing of the completed and on-going government projects. Once this is done, the floor is given to the public to provide their suggestions on what they want the government to do for them during that financial year. (Biz Com.1)

The four public participants were asked how many times they participated in the budgeting process in any financial year, and if they participated in all the four cycles of the budget process as indicated by the government officials. They all contradicted the statement by the government officials that they participate in all the four stages of the budgeting process. Three out of the four said that they only participated in the formulation stage. Biz Com.1 said that she participated in the formulation and approval stages of the budgeting cycle and did not participate in the implementation and oversight. The reason given by all the participants as to why they did not participate in the four stages of public participation was that they did not receive an invite to do the same. The extracts below illustrate the above:

Usually, there is one meeting in every financial year where we go provide our priority concerns. That is at the initial stage when the budget is being formulated. (CSO)

Most of the times I have participated in the formulation stage of budgeting. I have not participated in the other three stages. The common person actually doesn’t know that we are supposed to participate in all the four stages, leave alone the idea that they can actually participate. (PRIE)

I participated in formulation and approval. Formulation is transparent where Ngong ward communities- 5 in number identify priority projects in each community and allocated a part of 30 million ward development budget. Approval is only a rubber stamp to only accept projects identified by County assembly. (Biz Com.1)

4.2.2 How citizens are invited to the participatory forums.
All the 9 participants were asked about how the public got to know of the participatory forums. All the 5 government official said that they usually do advertisements using different media like on local radio stations, in churches, using the administration unit of the county government, the county websites, through the chief office and elders, and through public notice boards as illustrated below:

In Meru County, there are usually advertisements sent out through the local newspaper and radio advertisements in the local radio station. Announcements through the churches are also done. The county office also coordinates with the local chiefs to spread the word about the meetings. (Acc.1)

We normally use various media. This is also outlined in the public finance management Act of 2012. We normally communicate to the public through print media. The PFM requires that we give the notice in two widely circulating newspapers. So most of the time we advertise on the Daily Nation and the Standard. We also have a paper that we call county press that is widely circulated within the county that is also used to invite the public. We also use website. If you go to our website you will find the notices that we normally make. Then we also use other media through the county government structures. We have structures up to the ward level. We use our offices to mobilize the citizen, that is the administration unit of the county government. We also liaise with the National government using the chiefs. Announcements are also made through the churches and ensure that this information get to the opinion leaders. Recently, through the National government structure, we have the “nyumba kumi” strategy (Ten house initiative), so we involve those leaders that are within this linage. We normally communicate to them so that this information reaches the public. (TRES.)

The second category of interviewees which is the civil society was asked how they got to know of the participatory forums. PRIE and Biz Com got a verbal communication from the Member of County assembly. CSO stated that she got to know about the participatory forums from other citizens who talked about it. Chair stated that he got to know about the public participation forum through the local chief but there are times where he got to know about the forums while he was tending to his activities and heard people talking about it. This extract illustrates the aforementioned:

Most of the time I am usually informed by the local chief and sometimes they go round announcing that there will be a meeting tomorrow. Sometimes you might be tending to a different forum and then you hear people talking about the participatory meeting. (Chair)
The civil society also indicated that the government officials failed in this section of communicating to the public on participation forum days. CSO stated that they do not always advertise in the newspapers and when they do, it’s usually at a small section of the paper such that the citizens may miss the announcement. Biz Com stated that at times the government advertises in the newspaper but not always. PRIE stated that the reason he got the notification verbally was because of his status and he has not seen any publications done in the same. Chair stated that they usually do not advertise in print media, and even if they did not many community members picked it up.

The six government officials were then asked how early on they send the announcements inviting the citizens to the public participatory meetings. They all indicated that the PFM Act provides a guideline on the same and that this had to be done two weeks prior to the date of the forum. So they all said that they usually transmit the information two weeks prior to the meeting date. An extract from an interview illustrating this is shown below:

> Act whereby we have defined the timelines that we give to the public so that they are able to prepare and it’s normally two weeks. So the initial communication comes out two weeks before and then we continuously make announcement from then. (TRES.2)

The civil societies were asked this as well and they gave a contradicting statement indicating that information was not sent out two weeks prior to the participatory forum as stated by the government officers.

> Though there is a lapse in how the government invites the public to participate in the budgeting process. Usually, the communication is given last minute, for instance, they invite the public through the newspaper today and the event is supposed to be the next day. (Biz Com.1)

> First, those people who usually invite the public to participate in the budgeting process usually do not give us enough time. They call you on the same day when public participation forum is happening and invite you to come and take part in it. (Chair)

### 4.2.3 Rational/ purpose of carrying out public participation in the budget process

All the respondents were asked in their view what the purpose of public participation in budgeting was. A number of benefits came up and the analysis showed that the respondents did not differ much with most of them highlighting the same rationale for public participation. All of
them agree that public participation in budgeting was very important/beneficial and necessary. The reasons given as to why it was beneficial were as follow ACC.2, TRES.2 and TRES.3 stated that participatory budgeting promotes ownership of the government projects by the public. All the interviewees mentioned another benefit for participatory budgeting is that it helps the citizens identify priority concerns in their locality. All of the participants agreed that another benefit of public participation is that it fosters transparency and accountability.

Another benefit is that it promotes accountability. The accounting officers now know that the public knows the footprints on what to implement this year. The civil societies therefore move from one point to another point to ensure that whatever projects were budgeted have been implemented on the ground. So at the end of the first quarter, the controller of budget will give the public an expenditure framework i.e. this is what has been spent so the civil society will look at the expenditure against the budget and what is on the ground. Therefore, there is high level of accountability because the public is becoming more aware of their rights, they know these are their taxes they are not getting any favors from the government. (ACC.2)

Although this was agreed by all, the civil society interviewee stated that if done effectively, that could be a benefit. But they felt the participatory process was not done effectively. The below extracts support the views of civil society:

If this process is administered well it can serve a number of benefits. Yes, it is important as it would promote accountability of public resources”. (Chair)

“…further, it if is done well, we will be able to achieve a higher standard of budget implementation and proper utilization of public funds. So I feel public participation if good and it is mandatory”. (CSO)

Another purpose for public participation in the budgeting process according to TRES.2 is that it is a requirement by law and therefore a statutory obligation. Another rationale for public participation stated by ACC.1 and COB is that it eliminates social conflict by fostering cohesion.

Now, I talked about cohesion, almost all if not all counties have divisions and by divisions, I mean tribes (ethnic groups). During the division of boundaries for counties, you will find that a certain tribe exists within two to three counties. Some of the people have a deep sense of belonging to a particular tribe and feel a particular need to be in close contact with a certain county /area. However, this budget participation process can encourage such people to feel they belong to that county. So, it promotes cohesion amongst people of different dialects. (COB)
CSO and ACC.1 both agree that another attributable benefit of public participation is that it bridges the gap between the government needs and the citizens need therefore creating a situation where the government does not implement what it wants but also considers the needs of the people. This is illustrated below:

…it strengthens democracy and governance. When the public is involved in decision making process it becomes representative of the community. Another benefit is that it increases accountability by ensuring that the government is responsive to the interests of the citizens and it enhances public confidence and support of decision-making. Another benefit is it Improves process quality and results in better decisions. Public participation enables governments to understand and appreciate different opinions and concerns. (ACC.1)

4.2.4 Theme 1: Inadequate access to information by the public

One of the challenges that were identified in the analysis of data was that the public had a problem accessing budget documents, and reports. This was a factor that was stated by all the four civil society members interviewed. One factor that was talked about by all the participants pertaining to access to information was poor communication both at the national level and county level especially on how the public gets to know about participatory forum meetings. The below extract from the interviews illustrate this:

Normally they announce it through the district office or the chief’s office but mostly they do not announce them in newspapers, radios or media. You should realize at times newspaper adverts are done in areas with low literacy levels, and low access and distribution to newspapers; therefore citizens will not get this information. (Chair)

As I had mentioned earlier, public participation meetings are not communicated on time, feedback mechanisms are not in place to let the people know which projects were implemented and written down reports of the works done in the previous year are not available even on request. (Biz Com.1)

Sometimes they do advertise, but it’s usually placed at a very small corner of the newspaper such that if one is not keen, they may miss the advert. It’s not also done in advance, for example, they can place a notice in the newspaper today and the participatory meeting is scheduled for the next day. What I have seen being done most of the time is a car with a speaker is hired and it goes around saying that there will be a public participatory meeting scheduled the next day at such a place and at a certain time. How do you expect people to attend these forums with such short notice and citizens
have to go to work the next day? This just goes to show how there is poor communication about the participatory forums from the government. (CSO)

Another reason given by three of the civil society interviewees as to the reason for inadequate access to information was political interference. The civil societies believe that the political leaders only disseminate information to those people or regions that support them.

Another way political influence affects the budgeting process is, the MCA may refuse to make known when a public participation process occurs to individuals who did not support his election. This is because they feel if such individuals attend the forums, they will challenge them and they do not want to appear as if they are not doing much for the ward. (Biz Com.1)

In my view what actually happens on the ground is that those people who support the politicians are the ones invited to take part in those participatory forums. This means that most of the community members do not participate in the budgeting process. There is a strong political influence in the participatory process. (Chair)

Another factor that was associated with inadequate access to information by the public was what the civil society termed as minimum quality of engagement. The entire four civil society members said that the quality of engagement in the participatory process was very low and the reason for this was due to no-prior dissemination of budget document and budget document being technical and bulky. The civil society also mentioned that the rural areas in Kenya had some people who could not speak or understand English. They said that the budget documents were mostly in English and Kiswahili language but said it would be nice if they could translate it into the different dialects in Kenya in order to cater for the less literate in the society.

Firstly I would say that there is minimal quality engagement from the public. In my opinion, this is due to the fact that non-prior dissemination of budget documents and late communication on the dates set aside for public participation forums. (Biz Com.1)

…So going back to your question, no, information given out is not simplified and it is bulky and very difficult for the common person to understand the technical terms. (CSO)

First, those people who usually invite the public to participate in the budgeting process usually do not give us enough time. They call you on the same day when public participation forum is happening and invite you to come and take part in it. This does not give us enough time to prepare yourself and go armed to those forums with questions and ideas to enquire and pre-empt. It is usually a good idea to notify people in advance so as to have adequate time to prepare. (Chair)
The six government officers were asked on the measures taken to provide simplified budgets that were translated in the various dialects. They all were in agreement with what the civil society said; that they had not translated the budget to make it easy for the participants to understand. They said they were working on translating it and making it simplified as shown below:

Yes, so that is an issue we are trying to solve. We are thinking of putting out a Swahili version of these reports so that more people can understand. (COB)

In the previous years, we have not been simplifying the budget but in the last financial year we started working toward providing a simplified version. We call it a “mwanainchi” (local) budget that simplifies the technical aspect of that budget into an interactive language. In fact we are thinking of making it pictorial for instance if we are talking about livestock, they can be able to see. (TRES.2)

This theme summarizes some of the reasons why the civil society felt that the way the budgeting process was conducted in Kenya, transparency, and accountability remained a challenge. Government officers contradicted this as the felt transparency and accountability was a factor participatory budgeting brought about.

4.2.5 Theme 2: Inadequate opportunity for public engagement

Another challenge that was identified in Kenya limiting transparency and accountability was that there were no systems in place that allowed the citizens to interact with the government frequently. Something that all the four civil society interviewees brought to light was that there were no feedback mechanisms, to receive feedback from the public and from the government officials. Monitoring, evaluation, learning and feedback mechanisms for public participation are weak and inadequate. Supervision and documentation of programs, their content and achievements have also been weak, while citizens also complain that their inputs are not incorporated into decision making and governance processes. This can be illustrated by the following statements:

We have never had a forum that gives us feedback to the citizens. The process is not transparent and people can never know the criteria used to accept or reject the suggestions of the public. I do not know which institution within our constitution can monitor a legislating body- that will be responsible for monitoring omissions and commissions. (Biz Com.1)
After the public participation forum, there is no official communication on how allocation was done. After all, this is done, all we get to see is the budget being read out to the press by the cabinet secretary of treasury for both the county and national assembly. A number of days after this, it is passed into an appropriations bill, showing how the money is going to be used and appropriated into the various entities. (CSO)

Contrary to what the civil society said, all the government officials said that they have a feedback mechanism in place that explained to the citizens why they accepted certain projects and why they rejected others. And also that gave the public constant updates of what was happening on the ground. This is illustrated below:

The leaders also initially had the councilors but now we have the MCA’s are also informed. They have the information on how far the projects in their specific wards are. So it is easy for the public to know how far the project is doing form these leaders. In addition to that I think we exchange the contact of the person on the ground that people have chosen to represent them, so by doing this that representative is free to call us at any point and enquire on behalf of the people how far the government has reached in implementing certain projects. In addition, whenever we go to the ground to inspect a project, we call them as they are the ones who understand the locality better and are able to take us around. So if there is any question regarding what was supposed to be done, they will be able to enquire about it. (TRES 3)

It is the office of the controller of budget that is generally tasked with this responsibility. Of which, as much as we try to carry out our own public participation, we try to disseminate reporting duties to counties, universities, county executives, huduma centers, to the public but I feel the public still feels we are part of the national government. (COB)

Something else that was also identified that goes hand in hand with feedback mechanism was monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanism. One of the government officials mentioned that a challenge they face is that there is weak and inadequate monitoring and learning system that does not give room for learning from past challenges of public participation. This is illustrated below:

There is need for a proper monitoring and evaluation platform that will allow us as the government to continuously see the success achieved and learn from errors made. Now as it is not clear how lessons learned are used to improve the design for public engagement. (COB)
Another factor that was identified by two of the civil society interviewees was: that counties were yet to establish all-inclusive, multiple mechanisms that ensure the widest public participation.

There is an ineffective inclusion of special interest groups. Important segments of society, especially the special interest groups, minorities and the marginalized have not been effectively included even on issues that affect them. Some of the factors that have contributed to this gap are generalized public participation without adequate stakeholder mapping and targeting, low awareness of public participation events and limited understanding by large sections of the populace on their rights and responsibilities due to inadequate civic education and the widespread assumption that the leaders understand concerns of the marginalized groups and therefore represents their needs. (Biz Com.1)

Something else that was identified as a challenge by all the civil society interviewees was despite Constitutional and legal requirements for public participation, a number of duty bearers have a “compliance only” attitude and a “minimalist approach”, where efforts are only put to ensure compliance with the law without effectively advancing public participation.

…It is just a formality to show the floor of the house, the budget committee, national and county government officials that people participated and their views were recorded. (CSO)

4.2.6 Theme 3: Insufficient funding

Insufficient funds have limited a number of areas pertaining to public participation. The first is all the government officers mentioned that high cost of PP has curtailed doing them at village levels. Most of it has been ad hoc and done for compliance purposes. As illustrated:

Another challenge is that our county is so vast, such that if you call for a meeting and have it in one venue in a ward, some part of the ward is cut off and they are not able to participate. The reason for having one meeting is that there are inadequate funds to support more meetings in the ward. This means that there is a possibility of not having full representation in a ward. (TRES.2)

It is also very expensive, as I had told you we hold our participatory at the ward level. As a county, we would also want to go lower up to the village level. But now to finance that becomes very expensive. And also in terms of capacity building where the budget team need to be facilitated in terms of training, document planning, people skill, record keeping and how to have a member on board that speaks the 47 dialects in order to
translate is very expensive and government resources many at times are inadequate and insufficient. (TRES.3)

Another factor that has been affected by funding was sensitization. All the 10 interviewees also identified there is a need for civic education. The reason they attributed this as a challenge was that the society in Kenya has people who are not aware that they can actually participate in the budgeting process. They all said that the public needs to be sensitized more. The civic society interviewees stated that the majority of citizens lack adequate awareness of their rights and responsibilities and the few, who do, lack the requisite understanding, knowledge or skills for processing the issues at stake. These deficits require civic education that has largely been inadequate due to limitation of funds. Further, the government interviewees also stated that there are categories of citizens who did not really care much to take part in the participatory forums. All the mentioned is illustrated below:

Also, the common person is not aware that they can actually take part in decision making on policies and budgeting decisions in the country. So as I had mentioned earlier, a lot is required on sensitizing the public. (Biz Com.1)

There is still more room for sensitization. One thing I have noted is that the middle class in Kenya do not mind neither do they care about public participation, unlike the upper class and the lower class. The middle class in Kenya is like I don’t mind. Quite a number of middle class especially in Nairobi even if they are called for a participatory meeting, they usually do not attend or show up. (TRES.1)

The government officials explained that for there to be sensitization, there was need for capacity building of the government staff to equip them so as to carry out the exercise. And that the exercise required funding which was not sufficient most of the time as depicted below.

I would say that sensitization is a challenge as we do not have the relevant capacity in terms of human resources to do it. Our staff needs to be trained in order to carry out the sensitization programs. This training would ensure that there is uniformity in the management of all public bodies since public participation is a legal function in all public entities. (ACC.1)

Also, funding is an issue when it comes to public participation. Government funds are usually inadequate, unpredictable and unreliable. Since sensitizing is an expensive exercise, the government should try and put an allocation for public participation across all the 47 counties. (ACC.2)
All six government officials were asked what criteria they used to accept or reject public submissions. They all stated funding as the criteria. An illustration is done below:

Usually when we have public participation forums, the citizens have many proposals that they want done. Due to the limitation of finances, we cannot always accept all the project proposals. Therefore we usually categories them in terms of objectivity. We usually allocate funds to the pressing issue that were suggested and that can be implemented with the funds allocated to the county. (ACC.1)

Due to insufficient funding, the citizens felt that their views are not taken into consideration and therefore lead to a situation of citizen apathy as illustrated the civil society:

The citizens actually have projects that they really want done. What happens is that the forum provides them with the opportunity to air their project needs in the area. But sadly most of the time, their suggestions remain just that. Many times they are not implemented. This then beats the logic as to why citizens should then participate. (Chair)

Another challenge is where the citizens air out their views and they are not implemented in the strategy paper. This becomes demoralizing to the citizens and the feel that public participation in budgeting process has no impact. (CSO)

4.2.7 Theme 4: Absence of standards

A challenge that was identified by all the six government interviewees was that there was no standard or policy document that governed what effective participatory entails. They mentioned that the constitution was the only document available that gave guidance on public participation but it was not elaborate.

First, I think we don’t have an overarching policy to guide public participation among the counties. In 2014-2015, there was a draft bill prepared by Amos Wako (The current senator for Busia county) on public participation. However, the draft bill was not congruent with the draft policy and so the process came to a stop. You know a policy has to be developed first then eventually it is cascaded into a law. So, we don’t have an overarching policy to guide how public participation is meant to be done. (COB)

There is a legal requirement in budgeting process that you have to have public participation. However, the mechanism as to how, the platform and how and who is to do what has not been legally outlined. (TRES.3)
4.3 Conclusion

This chapter illustrated the results from the qualitative research. Four themes were found through thematic analysis, which were insufficient funding, inadequate access to information, absence of standards and inadequate opportunity for public engagement. Each theme was explored using data extracts taken from interviewees. In conclusion, public participation in the budgeting process has a number of benefits as well as limitations that will be discussed in details in the next chapter.
5.0 Discussion
The aim of this study was to understand whether public participation in the budgeting process can be used as a control mechanism on how public resources are utilized. A number of benefits of participatory budgeting were identified. On the other hand, other factors were raised that showed that as much as public participation in the budget process is beneficial, there are factors that impede it from being a control mechanism in Kenya. This section will discuss the two sides and relate them to the existing literature where applicable. The study will also try and interpret the results and finding meaning to it.

5.1 Public participation in Kenya and its benefit
The 2010 Constitution and the new Public Financial Management Law represent a unique opportunity to enhance the role of citizens in public financial management processes in Kenya as the PFM Act of 2012 states. Participation is carried out at the national level and the county level. It is embedded in the law that the public should participate in all the four stages of the budget cycle that is formulation, approval, implementation, and oversight agreeing with the (World Bank, 2010) report on participation in Kenya. Although this is the case, the four civil society members said that they do not participate in all the four stages of the budgeting cycle because they did not receive invites to do so. From the government official side, they believe the public participates in all the four stages. The study tried to understand why both sides gave conflicting information. One of the possibilities might be that announcements were made but not on time and just to a few individuals, as mentioned by the civil society. Another possibility could be some level of bias from the public official trying to show that the systems actually indeed work, as the research findings suggest. According to (OECD, 2017, p.10) budget transparency is being fully open with people about how public money is raised and used. The implication of citizens not participating in all the stages of the budget cycle as stipulated by law is transparency and accountability of the budget process is questionable, as the reason the citizens are to participate in all the stages is to create awareness and know what the government is doing with public resources.

Literature reviewed showed that public participation in the budgeting process has a number of benefits. For instance articles by (Innes & Booher, 2004, p.423; Box et al., 2007; Ebdon, 2002; Bilge, 2015; Lee et al., 2015) stipulated the benefits of public participation as it enables decision-
makers find out public preferences in order to incorporate them in their decisions. Secondly, it improves decisions by incorporating citizens’ local knowledge into the calculus. Thirdly, it promotes fairness and justice. Fourthly, “public participation is about getting legitimacy for public decisions. From the 10 respondents, it was noted that they all agreed with the literature and provided similar benefits of public participation. However this research finds that it is not automatic that once citizens participate, the benefits are yield. The four respondents from the civil society emphasized that for effective participation to occur, primary factors such as civic education, provision of reliable budget information on a timely basis by the government, feedback mechanism, monitoring and evaluation structure, simplification of the budget to common person should all be in place. This view of the civil society is in line with (Kin et al., 1998)who stipulate that effective participation requires two-sided learning process (civic education) that is both the administrators and citizens. Their views are also in agreement with (Berner & Morse, 2011) who says that effective public entails providing information to the public and encouraging them to act as macro-level community advocates and also entails communication between the three stakeholders that is government officials, citizens, and political leaders.

5.2 Factors impeding public participation from being a control tool in Kenya
From the interviews analyzed, the data gotten from it alludes to the fact that at the current moment, public participation in the budgeting process cannot be used as a strong measure of control. The factors that contribute to this are discussed below:

5.2.1 Insufficient funding
This research identifies a requirement that public participation in governance processes needs adequate budgetary allocation to finance the necessary infrastructure processes and planning for public participation, actual engagements, monitoring and evaluation, capacity building, feedback, and coordination. This was a factor that was raised by the government official and the reason they felt that it was a major hindrance to sensitization, capacity building and participation in budgeting. This is in agreement with literature whereby (Box et al., 2007; Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.58) who say that there is a challenge soliciting input in participatory budgeting as the
exercise is deemed costly in terms of time and effort. The low end of the per-decision cost of citizen participation group is arguably more expensive than the decision making of a single agency administrator (Irvin & Stansbury, 2004, p.58). Cases of participatory processes not being done in the village level due to insufficient funds implies that it is a critical factor to observe. Inadequate funding was also mentioned as the reason why there is a need for public sensitization. Without conducting sensitization of the public, and not carrying participatory process at the village level, then the results from the participatory done cannot be termed as representative of the society. Another aspect funding comes into public participatory forums is where the government resources are inadequate to cater to all the requirements by the citizens. This is counterproductive in that more citizens feel that their priority concerns are not being met and hence demotivated to participate in the forums. The potential problem of citizen’s apathy is what (Ebdon, 2002, p.274) states leads to increased levels of distrust by citizens of their government.

5.2.2 Absence of Standards

The analysis brought to light the fact that Kenya has not had clear policy objectives and standards to guide public participation. The absence of standards has resulted in lack of clarity and disagreements on important aspects of participation, including a) what constitutes adequate public participation; b) what is the nature of participation that meets the Constitutional threshold; c) what are the most effective mechanisms for public participation; d) what does public participation entail; and, e) when can it be said that public participation has effectively taken place? As much as the constitution provides a framework of when public participation should be done, there needs to be a policy/standard or regulation that acts as a guide to all government entities on what is expected of it. This can be the reason why minority groups like women, youth and the disabled are not fully considered in the participatory forums and there is no guide on adequate stakeholder mapping and targeting. Some of the issues raised by the interviewees like having four people in a participatory forum are a clear indication that a standard guide needs to be made that makes public participation uniform over all the counties and the national government. By doing this a comparability report can be done to check of counties that are performing well in the participatory forums so that they can serve as benchmarks for other counties.

5.2.3 Inadequate access to information by public
Communication relevant for effective participation and related logistics has been a challenge as stated by the 4 civil society members. Cases of organizers shifting dates or venues for consultative meetings on short notice without consulting citizens; flout procedures, fail to provide relevant information and documents or hold meetings in inaccessible places were mentioned and also last-minute notification of public participatory forums. The implication of this is slow, late, inaccurate or incomplete communication from the government that does not allow the public to fully prepare themselves and gather information necessary to take part in the participatory forums. Budget transparency refers according to (World Bank, 2010) is the extent and ease with which citizens can access information and provide feedback on government revenues, allocations, and expenditures. Further, it refers to budget transparency as fiscal transparency. Their definition of fiscal transparency is public reporting of the past, present and future state of public resources in a comprehensive, clear, reliable, timely, and relevant manner (IMF 2012). From the communication challenges seen in Kenya, the implication according to World Bank is lack of fiscal transparency.

Another aspect that the research found out was that the budget documents were not simplified for the public. This made it difficult for citizens to understand and find meaning. This finding agrees with literature that explains that even for technical experts, understanding the budget is a difficult and time-consuming task (Ramkumar & Shapiro, 2010). Therefore, it is essential that governments be proactive in helping the general public to make sense of the budget (Ramkumar & Shapiro, 2010).

5.2.4 Inadequate opportunity for public engagement

From this research monitoring, evaluation, learning, and feedback mechanism for public participation are weak and inadequate in Kenya. Supervision and documentation of programs, their content and achievements have also been weak, while citizens also complain that their inputs are not incorporated into decision making and governance processes. This goes against literature that by (Berner & Morse, 2011, p.151) that stated that effective, citizens' input must be followed by feedback from staff or local leaders. Input cannot be merely symbolic. It is not letting the citizens say something or submit opinions or attend meetings. To be effective, the participation must initiate a reaction or response showing that the information was heard (Berner & Morse, 2011, p.151). One of the reasons mentioned by the civil society as to why citizen’s
needs are not incorporated by the government was that the political leaders and government officials already have what they want budgeted for and just ask for suggestions as a statutory requirement. From the literature reviewed, we identified government budgets as being prepared through the Incremental budgeting method whereby the existing operations and the current budget allowance for existing activities are taken as starting point for preparing the next annual budget (Drury, 2018, p.386). This could be the reason why civil society believes that the government official already knows what they want budgeted for. From the responses of the civil society, the public is not usually informed on why some submissions were rejected. The study thought that if the incremental method was used, that could probably be the reason why feedback is not given back to the citizens. To enhance transparency in how the budget process is, feedback mechanisms should be put in place so that citizens can have a forum to register questions, or complaints or compliments without fear.
5.3 Conclusion and recommendations

This study has examined whether public participation in the budgeting process can be used as a control mechanism towards ensuring transparency and accountability in the use and allocation of public funds. Kenya has a good foundation to strengthen participation in both national and county governments. The space for citizen-state interaction continues to expand; the government and civil society have gained significant experience deploying participatory tools and approaches. Kenyan government, citizens and CSOs have increasing familiarity with a wide range of public participation and social accountability approaches and tools, including good examples of CSOs working hand-in-hand with local government and elected officials. These participatory approaches have demonstrated results at the local level, including improving responsiveness, project implementation, and addressing governance problems.

However, several factors have limited the scale, sustainability, and impact of public participation and social accountability initiatives, including: first, Kenya has an absence of a standard or policy that guides public participation. Secondly, there is ineffective inclusion of special interest groups. There is also incoherent participation logistics where the civil society participants informed the research that communication about public participation forums are given last minute and in some cases, organizers shift dates or venues for consultative meetings on short notice without consulting citizens; flout procedures, fail to provide relevant information and documents or hold meetings in inaccessible places. In addition, there is poor communication where citizens face difficulties accessing basic information about local development priorities, policies, budgets, expenditures, and project implementation.

Further, inadequate funding to carry out capacity building of government officers and do civic education has limited sensitization of the public. Also, insufficient funding to implement project views of citizens, leading to citizens not seeing discouraged to participate. This study also realized that the participatory attitude in Kenya is that it is done only for statutory compliance. Lastly poor learning and feedback mechanism. The results of the study shows that if effective public participation is carried out, it will foster not only improved administrative trust but also enhanced legitimacy, a well-informed public, improved decision making, increased feedback level between the public and government, reduced level of corruption, increase opportunities for the public to engage with the government and altered forms of power. The ultimate goal from all
this will be increased levels of transparency and accountability in the use of public resources and hence act as a control mechanism.

In order to ensure that the public participatory opportunity is not wasted, the study suggests the following recommendations: There is a need for more civic education and sensitization of the public on the importance of public participation and to create awareness. Secondly, capacity building for government agencies and NSAs who requires relevant skills and experience to manage and coordinate public participation. Thirdly, the county and national government should ensure that public participation forums have effective feedback mechanisms to ensure that citizens have a platform to register questions, complaints or compliments without fear of reprisal. Fourthly, to enhance interaction of budget document by the citizens, the government should create and disseminate simplified budget documents. Another recommendation is that there is need for creation of a policy or standard that gives guidelines and minimum standards on public participation for county and the national government. This standard should be based on the constitution. Lastly, civil society should build a partnership with the government to establish participatory process and coordination among providers.

5.3.1 Limitations of the study

The study has a number of limitations, one being that it examines public participation through the perceptions of six administrative experts and four civil society members. This was a small sample and could not be generalized to the whole Country and other geographical areas. Although the sample size was small, those chosen were subject matter experts who are deemed knowledgeable and therefore the information gotten can be relied upon. Secondly, Time constraint, Kenya is a large country and collecting information that can confirm with certainty the effect of public participation in Kenya, demands a lot of time. The period for conducting the research was limited. The information gotten through interviews was self-reported data, meaning they can be difficult to verify. It can also contain a lot of biases, which can limit the accuracy of the research. Lastly, little prior research was found on public participation as a control tool in Kenya. This necessitated the use of exploratory rather than explanatory research design. And this was why the literature reviewed was based on international examples.

5.3.2 Future study recommendations
This study represents a starting point for thinking about public participation in financial matters, but it is also relevant to broader discussions around public participation in decision making, such as the debate around a Public Participation law. Future studies can be conducted on the same study but choose a wider range of interviewees from all the 47 counties in Kenya. The study identified a gap in literature where there was no comparable data on any other country that compared participatory budgeting to the control aspect. Future research should be done in this area in order to provide data for comparability purposes. Public participation is not just done in budgeting; future research can be done on the effects of public participation on other processes of government.
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Appendices

Appendix 1. Proposed Interview Question Guide for national treasury officials and county executives

**Proposed Interview questions: Government Officials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In your view, what does public participation in the budgeting process in Kenya entail?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How are the citizens invited to take part in the budgeting process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In your view, what is the rationale and purpose/benefits of involving the public in the Budgeting process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do you believe that public participation in the budgeting process promotes accountability and transparency in the budgeting process and the use of public resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Since public participation is a relatively new aspect that came up with the new constitution, do you believe that the public is well sensitized on their ability to participate in the process? What steps has the government taken to promote awareness to citizens on public participation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is there a mechanism in place to monitor the number of public submissions made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>What is the criteria for accepting or rejecting the submissions by the public?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is the criteria within public knowledge?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further questions may be asked depending on the respondent's answer, for clarification.

**Proposed interview question: Civil society of Kenya, public bodies/ non-government officials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Have you participated in the public budgeting process in Kenya before? Kindly tell me about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What was the mechanism of communication about the public budgeting meeting and consultations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The budgeting cycle in Kenya is made up of 4 key cycles: that is formulation, approval, implementation, and audit. Did you participate in all these stages?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>As a member of the civil society, do you facilitate an ongoing dialogue between the citizens and the government to ensure citizen inputs are taken seriously in decision making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To facilitate engagement with budget documents, are there efforts put in place to ensure budget information is in a simplified format and using a local language where appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is there a dedicated time and feedback given to the public/ civil society after participating, to inform the citizens their inputs were considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do you feel that public participation in the budgeting process has enhanced transparency in the allocation of resources for the public and how public funds are utilized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does public participation help identify projects to be done as well as implement those projects or does it just identify them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Are there clear policies and guidelines for public participation like how many individual should be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Ethics Information form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Details</th>
</tr>
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| Population of interest: (brief description) | The research population includes key players who have in-depth knowledge and expertise in public budgeting process in Kenya. These key players include government officials in the budgeting section and the civil society members who have previously participated in the |
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<td>When will the data be destroyed:</td>
</tr>
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Student Signature: ___________________________________________ Date Signed: __________________________
Appendix 3: Information and consent sheet for Participants

PROJECT TITLE: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN BUDGETING AS A CONTROL TOOL IN KENYA

My name is Nancy Moraa Nyakegita, a postgraduate student at Dublin Business School. I am currently studying an MBA in Finance. This research will be supervised by Richard O’Callaghan lecturer at Dublin Business School.

You are being asked to take part in a research study on the effect of public participation in Budgeting process in Kenya. The research aims to establish whether public participation in Kenya promotes transparency and accountability in fiscal policy/budgeting process. It also aims at determining if public participation in resource allocation, leads to addressing the priority concerns of the citizens in the Kenyan communities. Further, the research will identify whether citizens in Kenya are aware they can participate in the budgeting process, and to find out if they are fully involved in determining their local needs. The legal framework that is laws will be reviewed to find out if it supports public participation in Kenya.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN

In this study, you will be asked to participate in an interview, which will be recorded for purposes of supporting the research work. Your expertise view on the subject of public budgeting will be required. A detailed discussion will be held with the interviewer and questions will be asked to clarify concepts. You will remain anonymous while presenting my findings to the school.

TIME COMMITMENT

The study typically takes about roughly 1-2 hours. It will be one session of face to face interview. However, in case anything comes up pertaining to the response issued during the interview that requires your input, I will contact you through email for clarification.

PARTICIPANTS’ RIGHTS

You may decide to stop being a part of the research study at any time without explanation required from you. You have the right to ask that any data you have supplied to that point be withdrawn/destroyed. You have the right to omit or refuse to answer or respond to any question that is asked of you.

You have the right to have your questions about the procedures answered (unless answering these questions would interfere with the study’s outcome. A full de-briefing will be given after
the study). If you have any questions as a result of reading this information sheet, you should ask the researcher before the study begins.

**CONFIDENTIALITY/ANONYMITY**

The data I collect does not contain any personal information about you except your expertise in the field. Information gathered will only be used for my dissertation in fulfillment of a partial requirement for attaining an MBA in Finance at Dublin Business School. Your names will not be mentioned anywhere in the research paper for confidentiality reasons.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

I or/and my Supervisor will be glad to answer your questions about this study at any time. You may contact my supervisor at the following email address: richard.ocallaghan@dbs.ie
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By signing below, you are agreeing that: (1) you have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet, (2) questions about your participation in this study have been answered satisfactorily, (3) you are aware of the potential risks (if any), and (4) you are taking part in this research study voluntarily (without coercion).
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