

American Journal of
Public Policy and Administration
(AJPPA)



**EFFECTS OF COUNTY BUDGETING FORUMS ON
SERVICE DELIVERY IN KENYA: THE CASE OF
KAJIADO COUNTY**

Joshua Saiyanka Richard and Dr. Wilson Muna



EFFECTS OF COUNTY BUDGETING FORUMS ON SERVICE DELIVERY IN KENYA: THE CASE OF KAJIADO COUNTY

Joshua Saiyanka Richard

Kenyatta University Student

Email address; jsaiyanka.js@gmail.com

Dr. Wilson Muna (PhD), Lecturer

Department of Public Policy and Administration Kenyatta University

Email address; muna.wilson@ku.ac.ke

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of county budgeting forums on service delivery in Kenya: the case of Kajiado County government. The objectives of this study were: to analyze the effect of Sector Working Groups on delivery of services in Kajiado County; to establish the effect of County Budget and Economic Forum on service delivery in Kajiado County; to determine the effect of Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum on service delivery in Kajiado County; to determine the effect of Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings on delivery of services in Kajiado County. The target population for this study was those members of the public and employees who had participated in county budgeting for the past three financial years from which the sample size will be selected. The study used stratified and random sampling techniques to select a sample size of 107 individuals representing 12% of the accessible population of 889 persons. The study used interview schedules and self-administered questionnaires with both structured and unstructured questions to collect primary data. This study also used secondary data that was obtained through document review of government documents and reports. Quantitative data from the questionnaires was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Qualitative data collected through interviews was analyzed using thematic analysis. The results showed that the respondents were extremely dissatisfied with accessibility, efficiency, accountability, inclusivity, responsiveness and quality of the services delivered to them by the county government of Kajiado. The findings further indicated that Sector Working Groups did not have a significant effect on service delivery in Kajiado County while County Budget and Economic Forum, Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum and Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings had a positive effect on delivery of services in Kajiado County. The study recommended that county officials should provide adequate budget information to the public and enhance their participation in the budget making and policy formulation as well as induct members on their roles and mandate in matters related to public participation in budgeting forums.

Keywords: *Budgeting forums, service delivery, Sector Working Groups, Economic Forum*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Throughout the world, the issue of poor public services is widely pronounced and needs to be addressed. According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2010), Policymakers and public leaders in many countries, developing countries in particular are increasingly faced with the challenge of how to effectively provide public services like education, healthcare, sanitation, safety, transportation and utilities to satisfy the growing populations and the pressing needs of the poor. Khalid (2010) supports this view when he found from his study that local councils in Malaysia continually face pressure to improve their service delivery. He found that the increased level of education of the population led to a more vocal and more discerning public that expects better services and accountability from its local government.

Successive Auditor General's reports have been revealing massive improprieties in the county governments' spending. The reports show that a huge chunk of public monies are paid to ghost workers, ghost projects or fictitious firms (Auditor General's Report, 2017). These findings are consistent with the findings contained in the report by Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC) which identified County public procurement, County Financial Management, Planning and Management of county projects and County legislative duties as the High Corruption Risk Areas (HCRA) in County Governments (EACC, 2014).

The Constitution of Kenya (CoK) 2010, the Public Finance Management (PFM) 2012 Act and County Government Act 2012, all emphasize on public participation in financial matters to promote social and economic development and the provision of proximate, easily accessible services throughout Kenya. A survey by the International Budget Partnership (2014) showed that Taita Taveta, Machakos, and Kajiado had established budgeting forums as platforms for public participation in county budgeting. However little is known as to what extent these budgeting forums have promoted openness, efficiency, accountability and prudent use of public funds in service delivery in Kajiado County; this study was aims to fill this knowledge gap.

The purpose of this study was to assess the effects of public participation in county budgeting on public services delivery in Kenya using the case of Kajiado County government.

1.2 Study Hypotheses

- H₀₁:** Sector Working Groups have no effect on delivery of services in Kajiado County
- H₀₂:** County Budget and Economic Forum has no effect on service delivery in Kajiado County
- H₀₃:** There is no relationship between Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum and Service Delivery in Kajiado County
- H₀₄:** There is no effect of Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings on Delivery of Services in Kajiado County

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 County Budgeting forums and Delivery of Public Services

A budget is a plan of raising revenue and spending the same. As part of public finance, the budget allocation process is key to the government's roles of sharing and redistribution of income. With devolved system of governance in Kenya, government functions have been divided between the national government and forty seven County Governments (IEA, 2014).

Public participation in financial matters is a key requirement in the budget making process. It's anchored in the Constitution of Kenya, 2010, Public Finance Management Act, 2012 and the County Government Act, 2012. Roberts and Nancy (2015) noted that Public Participation in budget making services has steadily widened over recent decades. Their study further indicated that dialogue between publics and administrators was a useful mechanism for aligning budgetary decisions with actual public priorities and values, better public services, brings services closer to its publics, produce more transparent public policies and decisions, and help the publics to hold leaders more accountable in contested areas. For a democratic government to function properly, publics need to participate actively in decision making, policy formation and service delivery (Adesopo, 2011).

Formal mechanisms for public participation in budget making include: the Sector Working Groups (SWGs), County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF), Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum, and Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings.

2.2 Sector Working Groups and Service Delivery

The Sector Working Group (SWG) are made up of many different actors, including representatives from the Ministries of Finance, Planning and National Development, and Health among others. Additionally, each SWG includes representatives from development partners, civil society and the private sector. The role of the SWG is to prepare the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) sector reports that synthesize ministerial expenditure requirements to implement policy goals in reference to a Treasury Call Circular. The SWG identifies and ranks sector priorities, and analyzes the costs of the different proposed policies, programmes and activities. The departments within the sectors are expected to review their budgetary priorities and needs, taking into consideration the national priorities as set out in the guidelines; on-going activities and projects; and the financial plans of the sectors. Once the review has been accomplished, the reports are expected to contain cost of programs which are ranked in order of priority on a three-year rolling plan together with a criteria for allocation of resources among competing needs.

A qualitative study by Odiwuor (2013) investigated the factors that influence women's participation in cooperative leadership and development programs. The findings showed that education, socio-cultural beliefs and Government Policies all had a positive significant effect on Women Participation in Leadership Positions.

Oduor (2014) found that the County government of Uasin Gishu organized stakeholder meetings with farmers, religious leaders, women and youth leaders. Stakeholder meetings were also held with professionals drawn from various sectors including health, education, water, the association of manufacturers among others. These were organized as separate forum to ensure that each

group was accorded the opportunity to articulate their priorities. Additionally, public engagement was achieved through public forum conducted in the sub-counties.

2.3 County Budget and Economic Forum and Service Delivery

County governments are required to set up a County Budget and Economic Forum. The forum provide a means for consultation by the county government on the preparation of county plans, the County Fiscal Strategy Paper, and the Budget Review and Outlook Paper for the county; and matters relating to budgeting, the economy and financial management at the county level (Republic of Kenya, 2012).

Wacera (2016) investigated the effect of Public Participation on Budget Implementation in Kenyan Counties with a special focus on Nyandarua County. The study used descriptive research design and a sample size of 400 participants that was distributed across the entire county. The research findings showed that most of the residents that attended public participation fora came from the headquarters, Ol'Kalou. The study further revealed that the publics were dissatisfied with the way public participation was being conducted, citing that their views were hardly ever taken into consideration.

The Institute of Economic Affairs (2015) utilized a derivative of the Open Budget Survey (OBS) to assess progress of counties in terms of budget transparency. The Open Budget Survey measured the extent to which county governments provided timely, useful and accessible budget information throughout the budget process as provided for in the law. In addition, this survey also assessed the degree of overall public engagement in budget making at the sub-national level, and also whether information on public procurement and on the services offered by counties were made public. This survey showed that Taita Taveta, Machakos, and Kajiado had established County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEFs) as a formalized platform for public consultations on matters of county budget making. However, these CBEFs are not functional and majority of civil society felt the process of constituting them was not transparent and integral. The findings further indicated that counties provide scant budget information to the public.

2.4 Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum and Service Delivery

The Public Finance Management Act 2012 requires both the county and national government to engage the public in the budget process. One way of effecting this requirement is to conduct Pre-budget public sector consultative forum where the public are invited to deliberate on the inputs for the new financial year's budget. In such fora, public are usually encouraged to either make oral submissions on the material day or present a memo clearly specifying their policy projects addressed to the county treasury. Submissions can be made by individual members of public, civil societies, private sector representatives or members of any organized groups.

Darma and Ali (2014) examined the quality of service offered by the Nigerian public service in the six local councils of Nigeria's federal capital Abuja. Using tools of Gap Analysis for the period of five years beginning from 2007 to 2011 they measured and quantified the gap between the expected level of service delivery and the actual quality of service delivered to the public. The study found a very noticeable difference between what was officially expected of the public service and the perception of the quality of service actually delivered. The study also found a

noticeable difference in perceptions of the efficiency of public service delivery relative to services provided by private agents.

The findings further showed a significant gap between government budgetary allocations/expenditure for the provision of public services and the actual performance in terms of tangible deliveries. In terms of the availability, access and quality of public service provision, there was a gap between the urban and the rural areas in all parts. The Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) were engaged in the advocacy for the provision of these public services, but not in the monitoring of the implementation of these public services especially in the rural areas. The implementation of the national budgets particularly the capital budget has been less than satisfactory at below 50 percent. The study recommended for the government to adopt a popular and public oriented participatory process in needs articulation at all tiers of government as part of the planning and budget making

2.5 Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings and Service Delivery

The County Assembly has a Budget and Appropriation Committee whose mandate is to examine the County Fiscal Strategy Paper and evaluate tax estimates, economic and budgetary policies and programmes with direct budget outlays. The committee is expected to invite submissions from members of the public in addition to the Chairpersons of all Departmental Committees to make presentations during the pre-budget public consultations and also during consideration of the budget estimates. Such submissions can either be made orally or through written memoranda. The notice for public invitation to the committee hearings must be communicated in good time for the public to attend. This committee invites public input for both the pre-budget and post budget deliberations.

Oduor, Wanjiru and Kisamwa (2015) in their study on Public Participation in County Governance and County Information Dissemination Frameworks, case study of Isiolo, Kisumu, Makueni and Turkana counties reviewed provisions in the Constitution and existing legislation on public participation. The findings in the study showed that the target counties had put in place a number of processes and platforms for effective public participation at Ward and Sub-County levels to enable the publics to attend public forum on development projects.

A report submitted the Nairobi City County Budget and Economic Forum Nairobi City County Government pointed some challenges and other financial issues hampering the successful implementation of Nairobi's budget. The report called on the Governor and the County Executive Committee Members to implement the recommendations of the Office of the Controller of Budget and the Office of the Auditor General in regards to those challenges.

The report showed that the Nairobi City County government had violated Article 207 of the Constitution and section 109 of the PFM Act by spending an average of Kenya shillings 8 billion at source without any supporting legislation despite repeated warnings and recommendations by the Office of the Controller of Budget, the Office of the Auditor General, the Nairobi County Budget Appropriations and Finance Committee and the Nairobi County Public Accounts Committee. But as to how this intervention affected service delivery is not known and this is the gap that the proposed study intends to fill. (The Nairobi City County Budget and Economic Forum, 2016).

2.6 Theoretical Review

This study was anchored on four theories: Public Choice theory, New Public Management Model, Agency theory and Stakeholder theory. The four theories complement each other.

2.6.1 Public Choice Theory

Public Choice Theory is a body of theory developed by James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock to try to explain how public decisions are made. It involves the interaction of the voting public, the politicians, the bureaucracy and political action committees. This theory views local government as an industry where there are buyers and sellers in the market for local services.

A precursor of modern public choice theory was the work of Knut Wicksell (1896). In this context the buyers are local households and businesses who locate in particular areas and pay for services through local taxes. The sellers are politicians and bureaucrats who either procure or provide direct services to the public (Boyne, 1998: 15-16). However, the way in which local governments procure or provide services is based on the demands made by the market. For example, if a residential area is made up of a majority in the middle and upper income bracket they may demand for services which residents in the lower income bracket cannot afford (ibid.). One major problem identified with the theory of public choice pertains to the issue of sustainability as result of market failure (ibid.). Market failure results because of non-payment for services by some residents due to various socio-political and economic reasons. They are often referred to as free-riders.

The other option is for those who cannot afford to pay for services within a particular locality to relocate into an area within their affordable means. This according to the public choice theorists creates a free market as local publics are provided with a choice within a variety of localities in keeping with their level of income affordability. It is therefore argued that the public choice theory creates competition among local governments, with differing types and extent of services in keeping with prevailing consumer demands (Engel, 1999).

3.0 METHODOLOGY

A descriptive research design was used in this study. According to Orodho (2017), the purpose of descriptive research, is to determine and report the way things are. This type of research attempts to describe things as possible behavior, attitudes, values and characteristics as they exist. This design was appropriate because this study seeks to describe the effects of public participation in county budgeting on public service delivery in Kajiado County without any manipulation. The study was conducted in Kajiado County. Kajiado County was appropriate for this study because previous studies have revealed that Kajiado County Government has put in place the necessary platform for conducting budgeting forums. The target population for this study include all the publics and employees of Kajiado County government. The accessible population are those residents and employees of Kajiado County who have participated in county budgeting forum for at least three fiscal years since the implementation of devolved government.

The study used stratified and random sampling techniques to select the required sample size of 107 individuals. A total of hundred and seven responded were select and questionnaires were administered to them. The sample size was determine by following Gay as quoted by Mugenda

and Mugenda 2003 who suggests that for descriptive studies, at least 10% of the accessible population is enough (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Data was collected using interview schedules and questionnaires. The questionnaires was contain both structured and unstructured questions. The questionnaires was self-administered. This study also use secondary data that was obtained through document review, government documents and reports.

The researcher used pilot testing and Cronbach's alpha methods to address validity and reliability of the study instrument. Questionnaires were administered using self-administered method. Every questionnaire was accompanied by a transmittal letter which contained a brief about the research. The researcher engaged two assistants to hand deliver the questionnaires to the respondents using a drop-and-pick method and collected after two weeks. The researcher also conducted interviews with the key informants at their workplace. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics was used to describe and summarize the data. Descriptive statistics of mean, mode, median and standard deviation computed to make it possible to interpret the information. Inferential statistics was carried out using multiple linear regression.

The study was guarantee of privacy, confidentiality and anonymity in carrying out the research. The data collected from the field was scrutinized and processed in order to ensure proper data management. There was a written form for guaranteeing privacy, confidentiality and anonymity, where the respondents was sign to confirm.

4.0 DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Response Rate and Reliability

The sample size on which the questionnaires were administered was 107 individuals out of the 107 questionnaires that were distributed, 85 were correctly filled and returned while 22 questionnaires were not received even after follow-up. This represented a response rate of 79 percent. The coefficient of internal consistency was used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire used in this study. It was tested using Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient. To ensure content validity, a pilot test was carried out with nine respondents where the results were used to make adjustment where necessary to ensure the instrument measures what it was supposed to measure

Table 4.1: Reliability Test of Research Instrument

Variable	No of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability
Service Delivery	6	0.85	Reliable
Pre-budget public sector consultative forum	6	0.75	Reliable
County Budget and Economic Forum	7	0.72	Reliable
Sector Working Groups	7	0.84	Reliable
Budget and Appropriations Committee hearings	8	0.83	Reliable
Aggregate		0.80	Reliable

Table 4.1 above shows the overall research instrument was therefore highly reliable, with Cronbach's alpha value of 0.80.

4.2 Service Delivery in Kajiado County

The study sought the views of the respondents on their satisfaction of services provided by the county government of Kajiado. Their opinions were sought on accessibility, efficiency, accountability, inclusivity, responsiveness and service quality. The results were measured using likert scale of 1 – 5 where;

Satisfied = 2, Extremely Satisfied = 1, Dissatisfied = 3, Extremely Dissatisfied = 4 and Neutral = 5

Table 4.2: Service Delivery in Kajiado County

Response Rate Scale of 1 – 5							
Statement	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Mean	SD
Accessibility	7%	6%	19%	45%	24%	3.72	1.11
Efficiency	1%	6%	15%	51%	27%	3.96	0.88
Accountability	4%	9%	22%	47%	18%	3.66	0.99
Inclusivity	1%	7%	22%	48%	21%	3.81	0.89
Responsiveness	2%	8%	19%	47%	24%	3.81	0.97
Service quality	4%	5%	16%	45%	31%	3.94	0.99
Aggregate						3.81	0.99

The aggregate mean score and SD are 3.81 and 0.99 respectively implying that the respondents are extremely dissatisfied with services provided by the county government of Kajiado. About half of the respondents said they are extremely dissatisfied with accessibility, efficiency, accountability, inclusivity, responsiveness and quality of the services delivered to them. Similar views were raised in the interviews where the interviewees pointed out poor garbage collection in urban centers, lack of clean drinking water for both human and animals, distant Pre-primary education centers, lack of animal and crop disease control; lack of drugs in the health facilities and ambulance services, poor street lighting, as the services they are greatly dissatisfied with.

These findings are similar to those of Darma and Ali (2014) in Nigerian public service where the study found a very noticeable difference between citizens' expectations of the public services and the quality of services actually delivered. The study also found a significant difference in perceptions of the efficiency of public service delivery relative to services provided by private agents. Gomes and Yasin (2013) also had similar findings in Mauritian, the study found a significant shortfall in meeting customer expectations in terms of service quality, availability and transparency.

These findings are well anchored in the New Public Management Model (NPM) that was used to guide this study. NPM focuses chiefly on change and Administrative Responsiveness. NPM suggests the inclusion of rationality of the people too in the process of policy formulation. NPM emphasizes that public officials have to advocate the interests of the disadvantaged people. NPM emphasizes the centrality of the public or customer, accountability for results, choice and voice to service user and promoting efficiency in public service delivery. NPM places emphasis on

serving individual customers. The organization should focus on what the population (customers) want, not what administration thinks they need. To improve efficiency, productivity and integrity in the public service, efforts should be primarily focused on creating a culture of commitment to identifying and meeting customer requirements throughout organizations and within available resources.

4.3 Sector Working Groups and Service Delivery in Kajiado County

The effect of Sector Working Groups on Service Delivery in Kajiado County was examined using six indicators and measured using likert scale of 1 – 5 where

Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree =4, Strongly Agree =5

Table 4.3: Sector Working Groups and Service Delivery

Statement	Response Rate Scale of 1 – 5					Mean	SD
	1	2	3	4	5		
Identification and ranking of departmental priorities affects responsiveness in public service delivery	4%	5%	14%	44%	34%	4.00	1.00
Identification and ranking of departmental priorities affects accessibility in delivery of public service	1%	6%	18%	47%	28%	3.95	0.90
Identification and ranking of departmental priorities affects acceptance of public service by users	2%	6%	26%	45%	21%	3.76	0.93
Developing policies and programs has improved efficiency in public service delivery	5%	5%	28%	26%	36%	3.85	1.12
Developing policies and programs has improved accountability in public service delivery	8%	11%	20%	44%	18%	3.52	1.15
Allocating resources to policies and programs has improved accountability in public service delivery	6%	13%	20%	42%	19%	3.55	1.12
Aggregate						3.77	1.04

A mean score of 3.77 implies that the respondents agreed that when the sector priorities are subjected to public, the citizens give their views which guide each sector in identifying and ranking public priorities in each sector. Similar voices were captured during the interviews; the interviewees submitted that their needs were captured in preparing the Medium Term Budget Policy Statements. However they blamed budget deficits for poor performance of key sectors

The above findings are in line with Oduor (2014) in Uasin Gishu County who found that the County government of Uasin Gishu organized stakeholder meetings with farmers, religious leaders, women and youth leaders. Stakeholder meetings were also held with professionals drawn from various sectors including health, education, water, the association of manufacturers among others. The study found that the public commended these sector working groups for

improved service delivery especially in equipping their hospitals and increasing expenditure in agriculture sector.

All the findings above can be explained by Public Choice Theory on which this study was anchored. The theory by James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock views a local government as an industry where there are buyers and sellers in the market for local services. In this context the buyers are local households and businesses who locate in particular areas and pay for services through local taxes. The sellers are politicians and bureaucrats who either procure or provide direct services to the public (Boyne, 1998: 15-16). However, the way in which local governments procure or provide services is based on the demands made by the market.

4.4 County Budget and Economic Forum and Service Delivery in Kajiado County

The relationship between County Budget and Economic Forum and Service Delivery in Kajiado County was assessed using seven items and the results were analyzed using the likert scale of 1 – 5 as shown in the table below:

Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree =4, Strongly Agree =5

Table 4.4: County Budget and Economic Forum and Service Delivery

Statement	Response Rate Scale of 1 – 5					MEAN	SD
	1	2	3	4	5		
Review of previous year fiscal performance has affected the quality of public service delivery	6%	6%	19%	53%	6%	3.68	1.01
Review of previous year fiscal performance has affected the accountability of public service delivery	7%	9%	25%	39%	20%	3.55	1.13
Advisory on county plans and polices has affected the inclusivity in public service delivery	4%	5%	24%	45%	24%	3.80	0.97
Advisory on county plans and policies has affected the efficiency of public service	1%	4%	20%	38%	38%	4.07	0.91
Resource mobilization has improve accessibility of public service	1%	6%	22%	51%	20%	3.82	0.86
Resource mobilization has enhance efficiency of service delivery	1%	5%	12%	48%	34%	4.09	0.87
Resource mobilization has enhance sustainability of service delivery	5%	6%	27%	34%	28%	3.75	1.08
Aggregate						3.83	0.98

The results imply that the respondents agreed that County Budget and Economic Forum has a positive effect on delivery of public services in Kajiado County. Half of the respondents agreed that County Budget and Economic Forum provide a means for consultation by the county government on the preparation of county plans, the County Fiscal Strategy Paper, and the Budget Review and Outlook Paper for the county and matters relating to budgeting, the economy and financial management at the county level.

The Institute of Economic Affairs (2015) had different findings in Machakos and Taita Taveta Counties. The study found that even though those counties had established County Budget and

Economic Forums (CBEFs) as a formal platform for public consultations on matters of county budget making, these CBEFs were not functional and majority of civil society felt the process of constituting them was not transparent and integral. The findings further indicated that counties provide scant budget information to the public. Similarly Oduor, Wanjiru and Kisamwa (2015) found that the CBEFs had not been very much involved in the budget making and policy formulation because the members had not been inducted on their roles and mandate in matters related to public participation.

4.5 Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum and Service Delivery

The effect on Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum on Service Delivery was assessed using seven indicators. The results were measured using likert scale of 1-5 as shown in table 4.5 below.

Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree =4, Strongly Agree =5

Table 4.5: Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum and Service Delivery

The results indicate that the respondents agree that Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum

Statement	Response Rate Scale of 1 – 5					MEAN	SD
	1	2	3	4	5		
Setting development priorities in service delivery has improved citizen satisfaction and trust in delivery of public service	2%	5%	22%	38%	33%	3.94	0.98
Setting development priorities in service delivery has enhanced availability in delivery of public services	0%	0%	22%	50%	28%	3.96	0.94
Communicating Government plans and policies has improved citizen satisfaction and trust in delivery of public services	2%	6%	19%	45%	28%	3.91	0.96
Communicating Government plans and policies has improved responsiveness in delivery of public services	4%	5%	18%	41%	33%	3.95	1.01
Submissions of memorandums to the Government by the public has improved service quality in delivery of public services	5%	9%	14%	39%	33%	3.86	1.12
Submissions of memorandums to the Government by the public has enhance responsiveness in delivery of public services	2%	5%	20%	36%	36%	4.00	0.99
Submissions of memorandums to the Government by the public has improve inclusivity in delivery of public services	1%	6%	20%	38%	35%	4.00	0.95
						3.95	0.99

results to improved service delivery. This is supported by the standard deviation which indicates higher levels of agreement on the effect of Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum on service delivery. One third of the respondents strongly agreed that setting development priorities during Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forums results to improved citizen satisfaction and trust in delivery of public services. Another one third agreed, a quarter were neutral and less than a quarter disagreed. Slightly more than a third of the respondents agreed that submissions of memorandums to the county government of Kajiado by the public enhance responsiveness in delivery of public services while another one third strongly agreed, a fifth were neutral and less a

tenth disagreed. Half of the respondents agreed that setting development priorities in service delivery enhanced availability of public services, more than a quarter strongly disagreed, less than a quarter were neutral and none disagreed.

4.6 Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings and Service Delivery

The relationship between Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings and Service Delivery in Kajiado County was examined using eight indicators. The results were measured using the likert scale of 1 – 5 as show below

Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree =4, Strongly Agree =5

Table 4.6: Relationship between Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings and Service Delivery

Description	Response Rate Scale of 1 – 5					Mean	SD
	1	2	3	4	5		
Evaluation of economic and budgetary policies has improved efficiency in delivery of public services	0%	0%	34%	41%	25%	3.74	1.00
Evaluation of economic and budgetary policies has improved accountability in delivery of public services	4%	7%	16%	47%	26%	3.85	1.01
Evaluation of economic and budgetary policies has improved continuity and sustainability in delivery of public services	4%	8%	16%	45%	27%	3.84	1.03
Input from the public from the public and chairpersons of departmental has increased accountability in delivery of public services	0%	0%	24%	56%	20%	3.82	0.94
Input from the public and chairpersons of departmental committees has increased responsiveness in delivery of public services	5%	7%	21%	42%	25%	3.75	1.06
Input from the public and chairpersons of departmental committees has increased inclusivity in delivery of public services	4%	6%	19%	36%	35%	3.94	1.05
Validation of public inputs has enhance citizen satisfaction in delivery of public service	1%	2%	16%	38%	42%	4.18	0.88
Budget validation and approval has enhanced accountability in delivery of public services	6%	8%	19%	41%	26%	3.73	1.12
Aggregate						3.86	1.01

Results indicate that the respondents agree that Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings influenced service delivery. The result is supported by the low standard deviation, showing that only a few employees vary in their opinions.

Forty one percent of the respondents agreed with a mean score of 3.74 that evaluation of economic and budgetary policies through Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings improve efficiency in delivery of public services. Similar voices were captured in the interviews where the interviewees said that Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings gave the public

opportunity to scrutinize the budget and therefore proposed development projects that were of priority to them.

However contrasting findings were reported by Oduor, Wanjiru and Kisamwa (2015) in their study in Isiolo, Kisumu, Makueni and Turkana counties. The study found even though the public received information on the proposed projects by the county government of Isiolo County and they were provided with opportunity to give feedback on the proposed projects and budget allocations, most of the projects had already been predetermined and the meetings were intended for information sharing. Even though there were opportunities for communities to share their priority projects, the processes of engagement did not provide clear indication of the extent to which the public view were incorporated.

The findings above are well covered by the agency theory that was used to direct this study. The underlying premise of this theory is that those individuals tasked with representation of others should ultimately commit the corporate resources to value maximization for those they represent. The agents are expected to exercise due diligence and care in making corporate decisions and ensure the interests of the principal are safeguarded. An agency problem arises when there is a conflict of interest between the agents and the principals.

4.7 Testing of Hypotheses

To test the study hypotheses, the researcher conducted a multiple regression analysis and used its output to test the hypotheses at five percent level of significance. Table 4.13 below shows the Regression output.

Table 4.7: Regression Model

Regression Statistics				
Multiple R	0.7720022			
R Square	0.645388			
Adjusted R Square	0.6297222			
Standard Error	0.3357099			
Observations	85			
	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value
Intercept	1.605345	0.400177285	3.34298719	0.000921
Sector Working Groups	0.014214	0.125352746	0.09449695	0.674844
County Budget and Economic Forum	0.267324	0.132088906	1.05563172	0.024732
Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum	0.271619	0.103245143	2.19235038	0.022808
Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings	0.321202	0.121137557	2.20962802	0.021882

Table 4.7 shows that adjusted R squared is 62.97%. This shows that the independent variables jointly explain approximately 63 percent of variations in the dependent variable, while the rest (37%) are explained by other variables not included in the model. Therefore, the model can reliably be used to test the influence of Sector Working Groups, County Budget and Economic

Forum, Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum and Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings on Service Delivery.

Regression Model

From the regression results in table 4.13 above, the model below was generated and used to test the hypotheses.

$$SD = 1.61 + 0.01_{(SWG)} + 0.26_{(CBF)} + 0.27_{(PBP)} + 0.32_{(BAC)}$$

Where,

SD = Service Delivery

SWG = Sector Working Groups

CBF = County Budget and Economic Forum

PBP = Pre-budget public sector consultative forum

BAC = Budget and Appropriations Committee hearings

Four null hypotheses were formulated in this study and were tested as shown below.

Null Hypothesis 01: Sector Working Groups have no effect on delivery of services in Kajiado County

The first null hypothesis shows that the coefficient of Sector Working Groups was 0.01, t-statistics and p-value are 0.09449695 and 0.674844 respectively. The p-value is 0.67 and is greater than 0.05 hence at 5% level of significance, the study accepts the null hypothesis that Sector Working Groups have no significant effect on delivery of services in Kajiado County.

Null Hypothesis 02: County Budget and Economic Forum has no effect on service delivery in Kajiado County

The second hypothesis shows that the coefficient of County Budget and Economic Forum was 0.26, t-statistics and p-value are 1.05563172 and 0.024732 respectively. The p-value is 0.024732 and is less than 0.05 hence at 5% level of significance, the study rejects the null hypothesis that County Budget and Economic Forum has no effect on delivery of services in Kajiado County.

Null Hypothesis 03: There is no relationship between Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum and service delivery in Kajiado County

The third hypothesis shows that the coefficient of Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum was 0.27, t-statistics and p-value are 2.19235038 and 0.022808 respectively. The p-value is 0.022808 and is less than 0.05 hence at 5% level of significance, the study rejects the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between Pre-Budget Public Sector Consultative Forum and service delivery in Kajiado County.

Null Hypothesis 04: There is no effect of Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings on delivery of services in Kajiado County

The fourth hypothesis shows that the coefficient of Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings was 0.32, t-statistics and p-value are 2.20962802 and 0.021882 respectively. The p-

value is 0.021882 and is less than 0.05 hence at 5% level of significance, the study rejects the null hypothesis that there is no effect of Budget and Appropriations Committee Hearings on service delivery in Kajiado County.

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Constitution of Kenya, 2010 put emphasis on public participation in public finance management processes, including budget making at the national and county government levels. Dialogue between the public and government officials on budgeting is a useful mechanism for aligning budgetary decisions with actual public priorities and values, better public services, brings services closer to its publics, produce more transparent public policies and decisions, and help the publics to hold leaders more accountable in contested areas.

In this study, the researcher investigate the effects of county budgeting forums on service delivery in Kenya: the case of Kajiado County. The results are showed that the respondents were extremely dissatisfied with accessibility, efficiency, accountability, inclusivity, responsiveness and quality of the services delivered to them. It was also revealed that there is a huge gap between citizens' expectations of the public services and the quality of services actually delivered. The study also found a significant difference in perceptions of the efficiency of public service delivery relative to services provided by private agents and shortfall in meeting customer expectations in terms of service quality, availability and transparency. The study therefore concludes that there is a problem of poor service delivery by the county government of Kajiado.

5.1 Recommendations for Policy and Practice

1. The county government of Kajiado should align service delivery with the needs of the citizens.
2. The county government of Kajiado should on accessibility, service quality, responsiveness, accountability and continuity of services
3. The county government of Kajiado should find means of getting adequate funds in order to fix poor performance in key sectors among them Health sector, roads, bridges, drainage and sewerage systems and Agriculture.
4. County officials should provide adequate budget information to the public and enhance County Budget and Economic Forums' involvement in the budget making and policy formulation as well as induct members on their roles and mandate in matters related to public participation.
5. The county government should give the citizens the opportunity to scrutinize the budget and propose development projects are of priority to them.

REFERENCES

- Adesopo, A. A. (2011). Inventing participatory planning and budgeting for participatory local governance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(7), 111-125.
- Almquist, R., Grossi, G., van Helden, G. J., & Reichard, C. (2013). Public sector governance and accountability. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 24(7-8), 479-487.

- Clift, S., M. Camic, P., Chapman, B., Clayton, G., Daykin, N., Eades, G., ... & White, M. (2009). The state of arts and health in England. *Arts & Health, 1*(1), 6-35.
- Dabholkar, P. A. (2015). How to improve perceived service quality by increasing customer participation. In *Proceedings of the 1990 academy of marketing science (AMS) annual conference* (pp. 483-487). Springer, Cham.
- Darma, N. A., & Ali, M. (2014). An assessment of public sector service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of federal capital territory area councils, 2007-2011. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability, 3*(8), 1756-1776.
- Darma, N. A., & Ali, M. (2014). An assessment of public sector service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of federal capital territory area councils, 2007-2011. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability, 3*(8), 1756-1776.
- Denscombe, M. (2014). *The good research guide: for small-scale social research projects*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Farah, R. M. (2013). *Factors influencing quality service delivery in public libraries: a case study of Garissa provincial library* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Gauri, V. (2013). Redressing grievances and complaints regarding basic service delivery. *World Development, 41*, 109-119.
- Gomes, C. F., & Yasin, M. M. (2013). An assessment of performance-related practices in service operational settings: measures and utilization patterns. *The Service Industries Journal, 33*(1), 73-97.
- Goncalves, S. (2009). Power to the people: The effects of participatory budgeting on municipal expenditures and infant mortality in Brazil. *London School of Economics*.
- Gonçalves, S. (2014). The effects of participatory budgeting on municipal expenditures and infant mortality in Brazil. *World Development, 53*, 94-110.
- Gwayi, M. S., (2010). *Service Delivery Challenges: King Sabata Dalindyebo Local Municipality: Mthatha*. Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa.
- Hartwich, O. M. (2013). *A global perspective on localism*. New Zealand Initiative.
- Hill, M., & Varone, F. (2016). *The public policy process*. Taylor & Francis. *Service and participation*. Routledge.
- Ibietan, J., & Ndukwe, P. (2014). Local Government Administration in Nigeria and the Localist Theory: Exploring the Nexus. *Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities, 1*(4), 130-139.
- Ibietan, J., & Ndukwe, P. (2014). Local Government Administration in Nigeria and the Localist Theory: Exploring the Nexus. *Studies in Social Sciences and Humanities, 1*(4), 130-139.
- Institute of Economic Affairs. (2014). *First County Integrated Development Planning: Experiences and Lessons from Laikipia, Nandi, Uasin Gishu, and Meru Counties*. Nairobi, Kenya.
- International Budget Partnership. (2014). *Kenya County Budget Training Workshop Facilitator's Manual*. Nairobi, Kenya.

- International Budget Partnership. (2014). *KENYA COUNTY BUDGET TRAINING WORKSHOP*. Nairobi: International Budget Partnership.
- Kageri, L. K. (2010). *Effects of Local Authority Transfer Fund on Effective Service Delivery in Local Authorities in Kenya: A Case of County Council of Nyeri* (Doctoral dissertation, MA Thesis Submitted to the Department of Extra-Mural Studies, University of Nairobi).
- Kamuzora, P., Maluka, S., Ndawi, B., Byskov, J., & Hurtig, A. K. (2013). Promoting community participation in priority setting in district health systems: experiences from Mbarali district, Tanzania. *Global health action*, 6.
- Kamuzora, P., Maluka, S., Ndawi, B., Byskov, J., & Hurtig, A. K. (2013). Promoting community participation in priority setting in district health systems: experiences from Mbarali district, Tanzania. *Global health action*, 6.
- Kamuzora, Peter, Stephen Maluka, Benedict Ndawi, Jens Byskov, and Anna-Karin Hurtig. "Promoting community participation in priority setting in district health systems: experiences from Mbarali district, Tanzania." *Global health action* 6 (2013).
- Khalid, S. A. (2010). Improving the Service Delivery: A Case Study of a Local Authority in Malaysia. *Global Business Review*, 11(1), 65-77.
- Kim, S., & Schachter, H. L. (2013). Public participation in the budget process and local government accountability: Case studies of organizational learning from the United States and South Korea. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 36(3), 456-471.
- Lodge, G. and Muir, R. (2010) Localism under New Labour. *The Political Quarterly* 81, S96-S107.
- Makanyeza, C., Kwandayi, H. P., & Ikobe, B. N. (2013). Strategies to improve service delivery in local authorities. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management*, 15(1), 1-11.
- Matei, L., & Matei, A. I. (2009). Compatibility of the Content of Bachelor Programs in Public Administration with the Needs of Good Governance-A Comparison: EU-US.
- Matovu, G., & Mumvuma, T. (2008). Participatory Budgeting in Africa: A training companion. *UN Habitat*.
- McNulty, S. L. (2015). Barriers to participation: Exploring gender in Peru's participatory budget process. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 51(11), 1429-1443.
- Mohammad, A. A. S., & Alhamadani, S. Y. M. (2011). Service quality perspectives and customer satisfaction in commercial banks working in Jordan. *Middle Eastern Finance and Economics*, 14(1), 60-72.
- Nzinga, J., Mbaabu, L., & English, M. (2013). Service delivery in Kenyan district hospitals—what can we learn from literature on mid-level managers?. *Human resources for health*, 11(1), 10.
- Odiwuor, O. W. (2013). *Constraints to Women Participation in Leadership in the Co-Operative Sub Sector: The Case of Co-Operative Societies in Laikipia East District*. Nairobi: A Research Project Submitted to the School of Humanities and Social Sciences in Partial

- Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of a Degree of Executive Master of Public Policy and Administration of Kenyatta University.
- Oduor, C. O. (2014). *Handbook on County Planning, County Budgeting and Social Accountability*. Nairobi: Institute of Economic Affairs
- Oduor, C., Wanjiru, R., & Kisamwa, F. L. (2015). *Review of status of Public Participation and County Information Dissemination Frameworks: A Case Study of Isiolo, Kisumu, Makeni and Turkana Counties*. Nairobi: Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2010). Strategies to Improve Rural Service Delivery. Available at www.oecd.org/publishing/corrigenda, Accessed on December 12, 2012.
- Peyrache, A., & Zhu, M. (2013). *The quality and efficiency of public service delivery in the UK and China* (No. 05, pp. 1-30). The University of Queensland School of Economics.
- Ramseook-Munhurrun, P., Lukea-Bhiwajee, S. D., & Naidoo, P. (2010). Service quality in the public service.
- Republic of Kenya (2010) *Vision 2030*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya (2010). *The Constitution of Kenya*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya. (2010). The Constitution of Kenya. The Government Printers, Nairobi
- Republic of Kenya. (2012). *Public Finance Management Act, 2012*. Nairobi: Government printer .
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2013). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. Sage.
- Roberts, N. C. (2015). The age of direct public participation. Routledge.
- Rwandese Association of Local Government Authorities. (2010). Factors affecting service delivery in local governments: A Study Report. Kigali, Rwanda
- Schneider, S. H., & Busse, S. (2015). Participatory Budgeting in Germany—Towards a More Systematic, Longitudinal Analysis. In *Konferenzpapier für die ECPR General Conference*.
- Shah, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Participatory budgeting*. World Bank Publications.
- Shah, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Performance accountability and combating corruption*. World Bank Publications.
- Shah, A., & Shah, A. (2008). *Demanding to be served: Holding governments to account for improved access*. World Bank.
- Shah, Anwar, and Furhawn Shah. "Public-centred Local Governance: Strategies to combat democratic deficits." *Development* 50.1 (2007): 72-80.
- Simon Jenkins, *Big Bang Localism*, London: Policy Exchange, 2004, p. 16.
- Speer, J. (2012). Participatory governance reform: a good strategy for increasing government responsiveness and improving public services?. *World Development*, 40(12), 2379-2398.

- Tamrakar, R. (2010). Impact of Public Charter in Service Delivery: A Case of District Administration Office. Kathmandu
- Tanaka, S. (2007). Engaging the public in national budgeting: A non-governmental perspective. *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 7(2), 139.
- The Institute of Economic Affairs (2007). *The Publics Handbook on the Budget: A Guide to the Budget Process in Kenya. 2nd Edition*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- The Nairobi City County Budget and Economic Forum. (2016). *Nairobi County Oversight Report*. Nairobi: The Institute for Social Accountability.
- Un-habitat. (2010). State of the world's cities 2010/2011: bridging the urban divide. Earthscan.
- Wacera, D. C. (2016). *Effect Of Public Participation On Budget Implementation In Kenyan Counties: A Case Study Of Nyandarua County*. Nairobi: A Research
- Wampler, B. (2012). Participatory budgeting: Core principles and key impacts. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 8(2).
- Zhao, D., & Hu, W. (2015). Determinants of public trust in government: Empirical evidence from urban China. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 0020852315582136.