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ABSTRACT

The study addressed the factors affecting public participation in legislative procedures in the Embu County assembly legislature being one of the forty seven County Assemblies in Kenya. Public participation is a major pillar of the new constitutional dispensation in Kenya. Kenya has embarked on a highly ambitious decentralization that seeks to change the relationship between government and citizens. The objective of this study was to find out the factor that affects public participation in legislative procedures in Embu county assembly and bring out the significance of enhanced Public Participation with a view to making recommendations on how to overcome them. Research questions and conceptual framework were formulated to help in carrying out the study. Descriptive research design was used in the study because it is very useful in describing the variables without the researcher's influence. The Study covered a population target of Embu county assembly employees one hundred eighty nine (189). Data was collected using questionnaires and interviews schedules. Literature review was done from internet, journals, books, terms and conditions of service of Embu County assembly service board and gave the opinion of what other authors had said. Data was collected using questionnaires which were disturbed among the one hundred and eighty nine drawn from the target population. Secondary data was collected from various relevant published and unpublished sources. A pilot survey and re-testing techniques was carried out before the actual data collection to define questionnaires reliability. Data was analyzed and presented in terms of tables, graphs, pie-charts percentages and simple frequencies. The researcher prepared work plan represented on table, schedule of activities and a budget drawn for the study. There was a letter on introduction and simple questionnaires. The study found that training has effect on Public Participation on Legislative Procedures and the study also found that social factors influence carrying out public participation on Legislative Procedures. It was also found that economic factors influence public participation in Legislative Process and also that governance influenced public participation in Legislative Process. Training influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County assembly. The study recommends that there should be more structured training programs for assembly staff so that they are effective in mobilizing community participation in Legislative Process in Embu County assembly.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ................................................................................................................ ii
DEDICATION..................................................................................................................... iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ................................................................................................ iv
ABSTRACT ..................................................................................................................... v
LIST OF TABLES .......................................................................................................... ix
LIST OF FIGURES ........................................................................................................ x
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS ................................................................. xi
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS .................................................................... x

CHAPTER ONE .............................................................................................................. 1
1.0 Introduction ........................................................................................................... 1
1.1 Background of the study ...................................................................................... 1
1.2 Statement of the problem .................................................................................... 5
1.3 Objectives ............................................................................................................. 6
1.3.1 Specific objectives .......................................................................................... 6
1.4 Research Questions .............................................................................................. 6
1.5 Justification or Significance of Study .................................................................. 7
1.6 Scope of the Study ............................................................................................... 7
1.7 Chapter Summary ............................................................................................... 7

CHAPTER TWO ........................................................................................................... 8
LITERATURE REVIEW ................................................................................................. 8
2.0 Introduction ........................................................................................................... 8
2.1 Theoretical Literature Review ........................................................................... 8
2.2 Empirical literature Review ............................................................................... 9
2.2.1 Training and Participation ............................................................................ 10
2.2.2 Social Factors and Public Participation in Legislative Process ..................... 13
2.2.3 Economic Factors and Participation in Legislative Process ......................... 16
2.2.4 Governance and Public Participation in Legislative Process ....................... 18
2.3 Summary and Research Gaps ............................................................................. 22
2.4 Conceptual Framework ....................................................................................... 23
2.5 Operationalization of Variables .......................................................................... 19
2.6 Chapter Summary ........................................................................................................ 20

CHAPTER THREE ........................................................................................................ 21

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ..................................................................................... 21

3.0 Introduction ........................................................................................................... 21

3.2 Research Design ................................................................................................... 21

3.3 Target Population ................................................................................................. 21

3.3 Sample and Sampling technique .......................................................................... 23

3.5.1 Validity ............................................................................................................... 23

3.5.2 Reliability Test .................................................................................................. 24

3.6 Data Collection Procedure .................................................................................. 24

3.9 Methods of Data Analysis and Presentation ......................................................... 29

3.10 Ethical Considerations ...................................................................................... 30

3.8.1 Informed Consent ........................................................................................... 30

3.8.2 Voluntary Participation .................................................................................... 30

3.8.3 Confidentiality .................................................................................................. 30

3.8.4 Privacy ................................................................................................................ 30

3.8.5 Anonymity ........................................................................................................ 30

CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 Introduction ........................................................................................................... 32

4.1.1 Response Rate .................................................................................................. 32

4.1.2 General Information of the Respondent .......................................................... 33

4.2 Factors influencing Public Participation on Legislative Procedures .................... 37

4.2.1 Influence of Training in Public Participation in legislative Process .................. 37

4.2.2 Influence of Social Factors influence public participation ............................... 38

4.3 Limitations of the Study ...................................................................................... 49

4.4 Chapter Summary ............................................................................................... 49

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 Introduction ........................................................................................................... 50

5.1 Summary of Findings ............................................................................................ 50

5.2 Conclusion ............................................................................................................. 51

5.3 Recommendation of the Study ............................................................................ 51

REFERENCE .............................................................................................................. 26
APPENDICES .......................................................................................................................................................... 49

APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION .................................................................................. 51
APPENDIX II: RESEARCH STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE ................................................................. 52
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Table Showing the Research Target population..................................................28
Table 4.1: Table Showing the Response rate to the data collection instrument.................32
Table 4.2: Table showing Gender of respondents...............................................................34
Table 4.3: Table showing Marital Status of respondents....................................................34
Table 4.4: Table showing Respondents Age Bracket......................................................35
Table 4.5: Table showing Respondents' highest Academic Qualification........................36
Table 4.6: Table showing effects of training Public Participation on legislative procedures...37
Table 4.7: Table showing Factors attributable to Public Participation on Legislative Procedures....38
Table 4.8: Table showing Influence of resource allocation for Public Participation .............41
Table 4.9: Table showing how adequate amount allocated in the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016......41
Table 4.10: Table showing resource allocation public participation in Legislative Procedures.......43
Table 4.11: Table showing how Public Awareness affects Public Participation ................44
Table 4.12: Table showing Access to information on Public Participation..........................45
Table 4.13: Table showing Challenges in facilitation of Public Participation....................46
Table 4.14: Table showing effect of lack of an enabling legal framework of Public Participation...48
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.3: Figure showing the relationship between theory, independent and Dependent variables.........................................................................................................................25
Figure 3.1: Figure showing the Research of the target population .................................................................28
Figure 4.1: Figure showing Response rate to the data collection Instrument..................................................33
Figure 4.2: Figure showing Gender of respondents..........................................................................................34
Figure 4.3: Figure showing Martial Status of respondents .................................................................................35
Figure 4.4: Figure showing Respondents Age Bracket.........................................................................................36
Figure 4.5: Figure showing Respondents Highest academic qualifications.........................................................37
Figure 4.6: Figure showing effect of training Public Participation on Legislative Procedures......................38
Figure 4.7: Figure showing level of Resource allocation to carry out public Participation................................39
Figure 4.8: Figure showing Access to information on Public Participation....................................................39
Figure 4.9: Figure showing public awareness on the requirements for Public Participation .......................40
Figure 4.10: Figure showing lack of enabling legal framework affect public participation in Legislative procedures.........................................................................................................................40
Figure 4.11: Figure showing influence of Resource allocation for Public Participation........................................41
Figure 4.12: Figure showing how adequate amount allocated in 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 .........................42
Figure 4.13: Figure showing Resource allocation on Public Participation in legislative Procedures .................43
Figure 4.14: Figure showing Public Awareness affects Public Participation ......................................................44
Figure 4.15: Figure showing Access to information affects Public Participation..................................................44
Figure 4.16: Figure showing political will to mobilize people for public Participation.....................................45
Figure 4.17: Figure showing Lack of Civic Education on Public Participation....................................................46
Figure 4.18: Figure showing Political uncertainties..........................................................................................47
Figure 4.19: Figure showing lack of standard structure to manage Public Participation ..................................48
Figure 4.20: Figure showing lack of an enabling legal framework of Public Participation.............................49
**LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAE</td>
<td>County Assembly of Embu</td>
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<td>MOLG</td>
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</tr>
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<td>World Business Council for sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Public participation - refers to a process in which people can influence projects and decision making on issues that are relevant to their lives and the environment they live in. Specifically in this context it refers to the process where the public are engaged to give opinion in legislative procedure.

Legislative procedure - refers to the array of activities in making a law often involving studying and prioritizing the issues in the community, making the policy to address them, drafting bill, committing it the assembly, public participation process, enacting the bill into an Act of the County Assembly.

Facilitate - means to “make easy or easier”
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses, background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, Specific objectives of the study, four research questions, significance of study, scope of the topic under study and chapter summary.

1.1 Background of the Study

The development of an integrated devolved development concept these days without the mobilization of participants in the realm of civil society is just as unimaginable as a lack of involvement of the affected parties during devolved renewal processes (Pran Manga and Wendy Muckle Chappel, 1997). Pran Manga and Wendy Muckle Chappel, (1997) suggest that public participation may also be a response to the traditional sense of powerlessness felt by the general public when it comes to influencing government decisions (Pran Manga and Wendy Muckle Chappel, 1997). Involvement or public participation has become one of the important conditions and is essential for the implementation of programmes and projects and also a fundamental condition to attract projects and programmes (Pran Manga and Wendy Muckle Chappel, 1997). In many cases support on behalf of the decision makers is lacking, as political and administrative bodies fear constraint of their authority (Pran Manga and Wendy Muckle Chappel, 1997). International and regional agreements, as well as popular pressure to open up governmental decision-making processes, are spurring national governments to take steps to improve transparency, participation, and accountability (Pran Manga and Wendy Muckle Chappel, 1997). Environmental and other activists must take a large part of the credit for their role in creating awareness for and popularizing the notion that people must have a say in decisions that affect their lives and well-being (Pran Manga and Wendy Muckle Chappel, 1997).

In turn, the struggle for the environment was taken up by communities, public interest lawyers and other groups, creating a pool of expertise on which governments came to rely 1998 The recognition that much of the specialist knowledge required to draft and implement environmental policy resides in civil society helped create the space for new and more participatory forms of
governance in the national, regional and international spheres (World Bank, 2004). Earth Summit in Rio (1992), for example, nations from around the world adopted Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration, which recognized the critical role that civil society plays in protecting and managing the environment. Principle 10 emphasizes the importance of public access to information, participation in decision-making processes and access to judicial procedures and remedies, affirming that: "environmental issues are best handled with the participation of all concerned citizens at the relevant level (World Bank, 2004). In Agenda 21, the plan of action that accompanied the Rio Declaration, governments pledged themselves to the pursuit of broader public participation in decision-making processes and policy formulation for sustainable development – understood as development that meets present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs Webler, (2001). In, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (1998) adopted the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (known as the Aarhus Convention). This binding convention establishes minimum legal and institutional requirements to ensure that citizens have the opportunity to obtain environmental information, participate in decision-making processes, and have access to judicial and administrative redress to protect the environment(World Bank, 2004). The Aarhus Convention has energized countries and organizations around the world seeking to promote environmental governance (World Bank, 2004).

In democracies such as Canada, public participation in government decisions is now a regular feature of political life society (Aminuzzaman, 2008). Public participation became a feature of public policy in Canada from the 1960s and 1970s and, today, decisions by government without public consultation are the exception rather than the rule society (Aminuzzaman, (2008). For example, the Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development was established in 1996 to help Canadians outside government contribute to the development of Canadian foreign policy society (Aminuzzaman, (2008). At the latter conference, the Program to Eradicate Poverty was employed as a basic instrument to support policies and programmes aimed at transforming relations between the state and civil society Aminuzzaman, (2008). Some of the key principles included in the CEPA include: the right to a healthy environment; improved access to the courts to prosecute and to sue where ones right to a healthy environment has been infringed upon;
increased public participation in government decision-making; improved monitoring and reporting to the public on the state of the environment; increased government responsibility and accountability for the environment (Webler et al, 2001).

In Germany, Specialist divisions in the ministries receive and monitor potential issues for legislation, and invite interest groups to attend discussions with a view to exchanging views and information (Webler et al, 2001). These groups do not act arbitrarily on behalf of a few individuals, but represent, in principle, the interests of broader social groups (Webler et al, 2001). It also means that interest groups can influence a Bill before it reaches the lawmakers (Webler et al, 2001). As in South Africa, the Bill then goes to the relevant committee where it is discussed clause by clause (Webler et al, 2001).

Local people often know the causes and best remedies for such problems as deforestation or soil erosion, how to find and use plants with unique properties and how to prevent animals from damaging their crops (World Bank, 2004). Equally, when people are allowed to take part in assessing problems, resources and opportunities, they acquire information and enhance their awareness of factors affecting their lives (World Bank, 2004). Thus, public participation encourages people to take more responsibility for their actions and puts pressure on governments to address environmental issues more explicitly and effectively (World Bank, 2004). Although public participation in decision-making is on the increase in Africa, there is a serious need to promote the access of women and youth to decision-making processes (Legal Resources Foundation Trust, 2009). The African Charter for Popular Participation in Development and Transformation is another example of the trend towards public participation (Legal Resources Foundation Trust, 2009). Over the years, Kenya has progressively shifted from a centralized to a decentralized form of governance and this paradigm shift was precipitated by the shortfalls that are often characteristic of highly centralized systems (Legal Resources Foundation Trust, 2009). The shortfalls include administrative bureaucracies and inefficiencies, misappropriation of public resources and the marginalization of local communities in development processes (Legal Resources Foundation Trust, 2009). Consequently in the late 1990s, the government began the devolvement of specific funds and decision making authority to the districts, local authority and constituency levels (Legal Resources Foundation Trust, 2009).
According to the World Bank Group, Working Paper 2, (February 2015), Basic requirements for Public participation in Kenya's Legal Framework, has observed that the constitution refers to the principles of public participation in Articles 10 and 174 and reference is made specifically to participation in Public Finance (Article 201), the process of policy -making (Article 232) and, the governance and management of urban areas and cities (Article 184).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to Muriu, (2011) in 2010, Kenyans promulgated a new constitution. One of the major highlight in the new constitution is the decision to transit from a central form of government to a devolved one (Muriu, 2011). Devolution is at two levels: national and county its extensively provided for in the Kenya constitution. Public participation is having an open, accountable and structured process where citizens or people or a segment of a community can interact, exchange views and influence decision making (Muriu, 2011). Actually, public participation is part of a democratic process. Public participation is now a guaranteed process in Kenya, constitution in various chapters and clauses require that public participation be undertaken at all levels of government before government officials and body makes official decisions(Muriu, 2011). On the other hand, there is little capacity building on the citizens to enable them engage in the process from an informed, structured and meaningful way (Muriu, 2011). The focus of this study would try and establish why there is apathy by the officers and members of the County Assembly of Embu towards public participation in the legislative procedures of the assembly. The Constitution of Kenya 2010 puts a lot of emphasis on participation by the public in policy making and legislative matters.

1.3 General objective of The Study

The General objective of this study was to examine the factors that influence public participation in legislative process in Embu County Government.

1.3.1 Specific Objectives.

i. To determine how training influences public participation in legislative process in Embu County Assembly.
ii. To evaluate how social factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly.

iii. To assess the extent to which economic factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly.

iv. To assess how governance influences public participation in legislative process in Embu County Assembly.

1.4. Research Questions

i. How does training influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

ii. In what ways do social factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

iii. To what extent do economic factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

iv. How does governance influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The researcher carried out this study to help in unearthing some of the reasons why Public Participation has remained a mirage, examine the adequacy of the mechanisms and structures, explore whether the allocation in the county budget was adequate.

The study established the reasons for lackluster input legislative measures of the county governments and specifically the case of Embu County Assembly. The result of the study would be used by both the national and county governments; stakeholders in making policy statements that can address active public participation. The study will provide new insights to the government on how to address the public participation. The research will help the staff of County assembly in drafting the bills, committing it to the assembly and enacting the bill into an Act of the County Government of Embu.

1.6. Scope of the Study

The study was confined to the County Government of Embu and specifically to the legislative
arm of Government which is County Assembly of Embu.

The study was carried out in Embu County in the assembly precincts where members and staff report on duty. Target population was the Honorable Members and employees of the County Assembly of Embu totaling to 189. The study took three months to complete from July to September 2018.

1.7 Chapter summary

The chapter contains introduction of the study and discussed background of the study, statement of the problem, general objective of the study, specific objectives, and research questions, significance of the study and Scope of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter discussed the Theoretical literature review discussing the theory of Democratic, ladder of Citizen Participation Theory, Empirical literature review, summary and research gaps, conceptual framework, operationalization of variables and chapter summary.

2.0 THEORETICAL REVIEW

Democratic Theory

Involved self-governing system pressures on the inclusive contribution of residents in the procedure of partisan schemes (Neuman, 2010). It imagines the extreme contribution of countries in their self-governance struggles to generate chances for all associates of a populace to type telling helps towards choice making and pursues to spread the access to such prospects (Neuman, 2010). He says that an ideal democratic process ought to satisfy the five principles’; the first one being the Equality in voting- Robert says that citizens in a democratic state should (Neuman, 2010).

Been titled to one person one vote which shall equalize all the citizens regardless of their socio-economic status, race, religion or gender. This way, the rights of the minority shall be safeguarded (Neuman, 2010). The second criteria is Effective participation- According to Robert, citizen sought to have as antis factory and to express their suitability in the verdict creation procedure

Thirdly is Rational considerate– for citizens to effectively y participate in the democratic process they must be enlightened by having access to evidence. Robert states that a self-governing civilization must be as quareofide as, free press, free speech and citizens must be able to understand issues. Citizen regulator of the agenda is the fourth criteria whereby citizens should have a collective right to control the agenda in the decision making process.

The fifth criteria is Enclosure– According to Robert the government need comprise and extend privileges to all those focus to its law, citizen ship must be exposed to all main stream rule in
selecting changes , the will of completed half the voters should be trailed. At the similar time, manacles on the common must also be located so as to evade situations where the mainstream have free reign over entirety they want. Marginal privileges, the constitution must warranty the rights of those who do not fit into the mainstream simple ethics such as liberty of dialogue and of assemblage are vital minority rights. Equalities necessity also comprises emblem of the affiliation amid the few privileged and the many supporters. In politics, this means that the desires of the folks should be genuine in government over the choices of chosen officials. Based on the literature review, the researcher can summarize the ideas and knowledge in the research area (Neuman, 2010).

Ladder of Citizen Participation Theory

Arnstein (2016) is credited with the theory that has shaped subsequent studies on public participation and citizen engagement. He recognized that there exist different levels of participation (Burns, 2014). The three levels which summarizes eight sub-level as follow; Level 1: Non-Participation - this is comprised of what he called manipulation and therapy and at this level there is no participation at all (Burns, 2014).

Level 2: Tokenism – this is the level where public participation is done just to fulfil the requirement of the law or operations manual of the government entity (Burns, 2014). He identified various ways in which it is carried out namely Informing, Consultation and Placation (Burns, 2014).

Level 3: Citizen Power – this is the desired equal where the community is actively and meaningfully involved I the affairs that affect them (Burns, 2014). The citizens are empowered to determine their destiny by being engaged in various activities (Burns, 2014). They are empowered to demand for their inclusion in all dimensions of subject matter including planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation (Burns, 2014).

Burns makes a discrepancy between “cynical” and “genuine” discussion and between commended and self-governing citizen control (Burns, 2014). The singularities of civic puff gradually renowned through the 1990s (Harvey 2010) is assimilated at the bottom step of the ladder. This fundamentally gives communal participation as a publicizing workout in which the anticipated end result is traded to the public (Burns, 2014).
2.2 Empirical literature review

Sherry Arnstein discussed eight types of participation in A Ladder of Citizen Participation (1969). Often termed as "Arnstein's ladder", she defines citizen participation as the redistribution of power that enables the citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future (Harvey 2010). Robert Silverman expanded on Arnstein's ladder of citizen participation with the introduction of his "citizen participation continuum (Harvey 2010)."

On the have-nots' side, they include inadequacies of the poor community's political socioeconomic infrastructure and knowledge-base, plus difficulties of organizing a representative and accountable citizens' group in the face of futility, alienation, and distrust(Harvey 2010). Borrowing from the theory, the County Government will explain how does community participation in decision making influence participation in Legislative Process in Embu County, Kenya (Harvey 2010).

2.2.1 Training and Public participation

Another major result of sustained stakeholder participation in decisions and their implementation is the development of capacity for managing difficult social problems (Dukeshire & Thurlow, 2002). This capacity includes improved relationships between decision-makers and the public, and among different stakeholders themselves (Dukeshire & Thurlow, 2002). Dukeshire & Thurlow, (2002) affirm that living in a democratic society means we elect representatives to speak on our behalf at the government level. By virtue of their larger population, urban areas tend to have greater representation in the National parliament and other higher legislatures than rural communities (Dukeshire & Thurlow, 2002).

The greater number of urban representatives is one factor that can lead these elected bodies to have a more urban focus and reduce the influence rural community members have in the decision making process and Specific communities and groups of community members must also be considered in the rural policy-making process (Walzer & Hamm, 2012). Common among successful initiatives has been a clear vision and set of consistent goals, targets, and desired
outcomes that can lead to changes resulting from successful community interventions (Walzer & Hamm, 2012). However, especially in the field of community development with broadly defined goals, reaching a clear consensus about measurable outcomes and indicators can be difficult (Walzer & Hamm, 2012).

Once stakeholders are invited into the decision process, it becomes more difficult for them to merely stand to the side and say no (Walzer & Hamm, 2012). Passive strategies very often involve a one-way flow of information from the planners to the public Kumar, (2002).

The information being shared belongs to outsiders or professionals (Walzer & Hamm, 2012). Decisions are more implementable and sustainable because the decision considers the needs and interests of all stakeholders and stakeholders better understand and are more invested in the outcomes (Walzer & Hamm, 2012). Decision-makers who fully understand stakeholder interests also become better communicators, able to explain decisions and decision rationale in terms stakeholders understand and in ways that relate to stakeholders' values and concerns (Walzer & Hamm, 2012).

Nampila, (2005) agrees that different individuals in the same community may have different interests and may not necessarily want to participate in development projects (Nampila 2005). The common belief is that involving publics in rural programmes and empowering them have the potential to boost their livelihoods and foster development (Kakumba and Nsingo, 2008). Such involvement facilitates the reversal of the inequalities that have been developed under colonialism by helping people to engage in the process of identifying problems and acting on them (Nampila 2005).

Open public participation is one communication strategy that has proven to be successful (Community Development Society, 2000). If the project proceeds too far before community are informed there may be problems with rumours and the spreading of misinformation (Community Development Society, 2000). To build community support for your project there is need to ensure that the community is well informed and ideally, part of the initial planning for the project (Community Development Society, 2000).

Inviting the public to express their views and concerns about the legislation can help to enhance community support and ultimately the success of the project (Kumar 2002).
Development agencies should create conducive platform which would enable communities to air their views (Kumar 2002). The community participation process provides participants with the information they need in order to participate in a meaningful approach Kumar, (2002).

They also should have the authority to make decisions with regard to their expertise because this affects them directly (Kakumba & Nsingo, (2008). African Development Bank (2001), indicate that offering publics more choice would stimulate competition, geared at making the public service more efficient and service oriented by capturing the larger publics' public interest (Kakumba & Nsingo, (2008). Oakley and Marsden, (1991) state that community participation in the context of rural development is not concerned in the first instance with how to achieve a totally participatory society but we are more concerned with how to bring about some significant participation in the improvement of the rural sector on the part of those who depend on that sector for a livelihood (Nampila 2005).

2.2.2 Social Factors and Public Participation in Legislative Process

Research has shown that there are certain characteristics of communities that influence their ability to do capacity building and create social capital, (Mattessich & Monse 2004). Trevor, (2006) asserts that knowing the community, who are to be the beneficiaries of any development initiative, is critical to building support. There are many barriers to participation in society; poverty, literacy levels, disability, age, race and ethnicity are some of the characteristics that often marginalized people (Oakley & Marsden, 1991). In every project there is a need to identify those and facilitate their participation Kinyondi, (2008).

As stressed by Thomas-Slayter & Sodikoff (2001:45) women as well as men are key resource users and managers and have different roles, responsibilities, opportunities and constraints in managing natural resources, both within the household and in the community‘(Oakley & Marsden, 1991)

There is a strong link between development and education (Hunt 2009). Indeed, formal and non-formal education is the bedrock of a transformative approach to community development (Kane, 2006; & Fraser 2005). Education can enhance the potential for people at the grassroots level to experience social change Kane, (2006). It engenders the acquisition of educational experiences
which go beyond academic or professional qualifications, and it helps the individual to find his or her purpose in the community Hunt, (2009). Hence, to explore the level of participation of common people in project development, literacy rate or educational status has been chosen as an indicator in this study (Kane, 2006; & Fraser, 2005).

Illiterate people are often looked down upon as problematic as they more often cannot articulate their demands and put forward their opinions in a systematic way (Hunt 2009). Asiabaka, (1990) found that educated women participated more in the rural development program of government (Better Life Program). If the people appreciate public development his attitude towards participating in public project developments is likely to be favourable (Oakley & Marsden, 1991).

Furthermore, Onu, (1990) reported the importance of education among rural development agents. Participation also occurs in a setting where a diversity of voices are heard in order to explore problems, test solutions and make changes to the policies when the community find flaws (Kazemek, 2004). Brandt cited in Kazemek, (2004), views literacy as a combination of individual and economic development. Unfortunately, this is not the case in rural areas where development is indeed an anti-politics machine Ferguson, (1994), the claim is that participation provides a remarkably efficient means of greasing its wheels where the dominant elite dominate the poor. They further stated that participation increases with education, but beyond the high school level the increase is greatest in non-church-related organizations (Hunt 2009). It was further expressed that effective participation obviously requires communicative and human relational skills which must be learned; hence those who are better educated would be better empowered for participation because their attitude would likely be favorable (Kazemek, 2004).

Societies in poor rural areas are not necessarily homogeneous nor are they fully transparent and accountable to all population segments (Kazemek, 2004) they will have differences in class, gender, race/ethnicity, religion, and vulnerability (extreme poverty, agedness, physical and mental disabilities and debilitating diseases such as HIV/AIDS). Ekong, (2003) reported that age is more often used as a tenable criterion for some social status than education. Politico- cultural
factors are also responsible for constraining participation of people in projects run by local government (Kazemek, 2004).

Likewise, socio-economic factors, political backgrounds of stakeholders have been influential factor in shaping the participation outcomes (Samad 2002). Powerful stakeholders, who are politically, socially and economically dominant, for their own interests may thwart the participation of their counterparts Samad, (2002). In fact, in most of the cases, interests of the political elites and administrators, who run the regime, penetrate the arena and shape the outcomes (Samad 2002). Communities with robust democratic networks can be viewed as communicatively integrated, Friedland, (2001). This type of integration involves the communicative activities that link individuals, networks and institutions into a community of place or interest (Samad 2002). In practical terms, citizens find it difficult to engage in dialogue with more rational scientists, engineers or political or corporate elites (Samad 2002). The problem is compounded when there is technical arrogance or limited receptivity to local voices (Samad 2002). It is therefore difficult to hear local voices, for they are filtered through more dominant perspectives (Samad 2002).

The participation of local people in the implementation of projects brings stiff competition for a limited number of new or expanded facilities and opportunities in a given year within the project parameter (Shaffer et al. 2006). Some communities may realize that another way to create jobs is to work with project developers already in the area to maximize the likelihood that, if they need to expand existing operations or start new ones, they would do so in the community and not elsewhere (Shaffer et al. 2006). Even if an expansion is not involved, some businesses may relocate their operations to other areas for pull or push reasons Pittman, (2007). If the problem is labor, they can establish labor training programs (Pittman, 2007). If the problem is high taxes, they can grant tax incentives in return for creating new jobs, Entergy, (2005).

In a study by Phillip & Abdillahi, (2003) reported that relatively high level of participation depends on the household income earned per month. As a result, it can be said that lower income level affects participation (Pittman, 2007). Economic condition of people also determines their active participation in projects run by County Government (Shaffer et al. 2006). Too often, financing is seen as the sole responsibility of the donor agency and local revolving funds are
viewed as political patronage and thus arrears become unsustainably high (Guadgani et al., 2000).

Postponement of efforts to obtain funding to later stages of the project can be a major obstacle to project sustainability (Akerlund, 2000; & Marek et al., (1999).

On the other hand, internal factors could include the nature of available resources and local community’s assets; local community’s demographic factors; quality of the organizational resources; continuity or discontinuity, as well as skills, of personnel in organizational structures; capacity to absorb financial shocks with some degree of flexibility and take advantage of opportunities; having the necessary systems in place to operate efficiently, including appropriate technological resources, maintenance; access to market; existence of local financial measures that sustain risk management; existence of clear definitions of roles and responsibilities for avoidance of institutional conflicts; and degree of linkages with well-established institutions including private sector companies and/or civil society organizations(Pittman, 2007). They often focus so much on replacing that funding, they don’t question whether or not the policy strategy is worth sustaining (Kazemek, 2004).

2.2.4 Governance and Public Participation in Legislative Process

According to Galadima, (1998) governance is a process of organizing and managing legitimate power structures, entrusted by the people, to provide law and order, protect fundamental human rights, ensure rule of law and due process of law, provide for the basic needs and welfare of the people and the pursuit of their happiness (Galadima, 1998) The key principles of good governance as applied in the public interests include strong commitment to integrity, ethical values, and the rule of law; and openness and comprehensive stakeholder engagement. Good governance is an issue for all individuals, agencies and organizations (state, private sector and civil society) that hold power in making decisions affecting access to rights (Galadima, 1998) Governance is good when it ensures that political, social and economic priorities of the communities who aspire for development change are based on a broader consensus in society, and that the voices of all are heard in decision-making over allocation of resources(Galadima, 1998) Ever since participation entered mainstream development discourse, critics have attacked it as form of political control. If development is indeed an anti-politics machine Ferguson, (1994)
the claim is that participation provides a remarkably efficient means of greasing its wheels. Second, participatory development’s ability opens up new spaces for political action, arguing that celebrations of individual liberation and critiques of subjection to the system both over-simplify participation’s power effects (Galadima, 1998). As a result, rural community development projects normally take place in a hostile environment (Ostergaard et al., 2003). Most of the time, politicians are of the view that because they are appointed by the people, they are legitimate representatives of the people and are therefore free to make decisions on behalf of the people (Galadima, 1998). As a result the politicians’ interests end up at the frontline; regardless of the needs of the people they represent (Mdunyelwa, 2009).

They noted that politicians tend not to run for office on promises of making the price of goods reflect their real (higher) costs for the sake of sustainable development; consumers tend not to demand to pay such higher costs; business tends not to lobby lawmakers for higher prices (Holliday, Schmidheiny & Watts, 2002, p. 18). Many poor people and poor countries do not have adequate access to technology, lacking the resources, infrastructure, quality of governance, and business environment necessary to stimulate sustainable development (Economic Commission for Africa, 2002).

Chasek, Downie & Brown (2010, pp. 37-38) reported that few countries have lived up to their Rio commitments, stating that National Agenda 21 efforts led to increased academic debate, heightened public awareness and minor adjustments in the system of national accounts and taxation rules, but they have not fundamentally altered the way we manage and measure our national economy, (Schmidheiny & Watts, 2002). The interest in better accountability is part of a larger initiative dating back to Federal legislation, such as the Government Performance and Results Act in 1993 that pushed Federal agencies to set goals and strategies and to track outcomes (Plantz, Greenway, & Hendricks, 1997).

More recently, foundations and funding agencies want to determine that their spending generates significant results (Phillips, 2003). Likewise, the growing professional management practices and tighter budgets in local government agencies further intensified the pressures for better measures and accountability, including using trend data to monitor or evaluate effectiveness (Moynihan, 2008). At the same time, community development organizations internationally have
addressed the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals, including priorities such as poverty reduction, expanded access to education, and environmental sustainability (United Nations, n.d.). An organization or government may have good governance if they are accountable and transparent to their people (Schmidheiny & Watts, 2002). Accountability improves public participation and increases awareness of knowledge and capacities to improve ability to negotiate as equals with authorities and other stakeholders to promote common objectives, and increase responsiveness to conflicts within the public (Schmidheiny & Watts, 2002). Accountability and transparency enhance public participation in public sector agencies, public participation in management and public hearings (Cummins 2007).

An M&E system can provide a regular flow of information on the performance of policies (World Bank, 2011). Monitoring can also be said to be a management function which uses a methodical collection of data to determine whether the material and financial resources are sufficient, whether the people in charge have the necessary technical and personal qualifications, whether activities conform to work plans, and whether the work plan has been achieved and had produced the original objectives (Schmidheiny & Watts, 2002).

Crawford & Bryce, (2003) argue that monitoring is an ongoing process of data capture and analysis’s for primarily project control with an internally driven emphasis on efficiency of project. Evaluation is the episodic (not continuous as the case with monitoring usually mid-term and at end of the project) assessment of an on-going or completed project to determine its actual impact against the planned impact (strategic goal or objectives for which it was implemented) efficiency, sustainability, effectiveness (McCoy et al., 2005). Ongoing project evaluation is viewed as a valuable tool to promote sustainability (Schmidheiny & Watts, 2002).

To mobilize resources required to sustain the project beyond its initial grant, it is not enough that the project attains its objectives (Schmidheiny & Watts, 2002). The project must be able to document its success and disseminate the evidence among stakeholders (Mancini & Marek, 2004; Shediac-Rizkallah & Bone, 1998; Steadman et al., 2002). Some studies show that advertisement of the project’s effectiveness not only to its stakeholders but also to the general public serves as a meaningful predictor of the sustainability of the project (Pentz, 2000; Stephen et al., 2005) in that it enhances community support. Unfortunately, the majority of the programs
studied evince an absence or paucity of community participation in the evaluation and monitoring stages (Pentz, 2000) In general about 65 percent programs do not include community participation in the monitoring and evaluation phase. In the remainder of the cases, participation is weak or indirect. Additionally, implementation issues can also affect the long-term sustainability of interventions (Pentz, 2000).

2.3 Summary and Research Gaps

There is a solemn gap amid the prospects of the law and what is trendy on the pounded. This makes it necessary that the study be carried out to comprehend the disproportion and thereafter recommend credible remedies for the inadequacies. According to a report by the Society for International Development [2016], most County Governments did not provide podiums for active citizen participation. Without active public participation in legislative process, decisions made by a few often deny the majority their rights to influence the legislation treatise. Despite the facility of the constitution under Article 10 (2) where it has recognized public participation as amongst the nationwide values and philosophies of supremacy little appear to be the case when it comes to stakeholder participation in legislative events.
2.4. Conceptual Framework

Reiche & Ramey, (1991) define a conceptual framework as a set of broad ideas and principles taken from relevant fields of enquiry and used to structure a subsequent presentation.

Figure 2.1 Figure showing the Research Conceptual Framework

Source: Author, (2018)
2.5 Operationalization of Variables

The researcher developed conceptual model that served as roadmap of the major concepts associated with public participation and their interrelationships. The synergy below shows: relationship between independent, moderating, intervening and dependent variables.

Moderating variables include policy and legislations form the government may impact either positively or negatively. Indicators are shown in figure 1 by the main variables under the study to ensure that they are measurable.

Training and Public participation

Training will sustain stakeholder participation in decisions making and will help in implementation and development of capacity for managing difficult social problems (Dukeshire & Thurlow, 2002). This capacity includes improved relationships between decision-makers and the public, and among different stakeholders themselves (Dukeshire & Thurlow, 2002).

Social Factors and Public Participation in Legislative Process

Social exclusion is a concept that embodies political, cultural, and economic deprivation. It refers to a cumulative process whereby different risk factors interact in time and space to decrease the capabilities of vulnerable social groups to mitigate these risks and to satisfy basic civil and economic needs (Oakley & Marsden, 1991). Research has shown that there are certain characteristics of communities that influence their ability to do capacity building and create social capital (Oakley & Marsden, 1991).

Economic Factors and Participation in Legislative Process
Economic factors enhance economic development which is the process of creating wealth through the mobilization of human, financial, capital, physical and natural resources to generate marketable goods and services (Kazemek, 2004).

Communities that are successful in economic development devote the appropriate resources to the effort, design good programs, and stay with them for the long-haul.

Over time a good economic development program pays dividends (Kazemek, 2004).

**Governance and Public Participation in Legislative Process**

Governance is about power, relationships and accountability, a process in which communities communicate their interests, their input is absorbed, decisions are taken and implemented, and decision makers are held accountable (Galadima, 1998)

**2.6 Chapter Summary**

Chapter two contains the literature review and discusses literature review theories, empirical literature review, summary and research gaps, conceptual framework, operationalization of variables and chapter summary.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter assisted the researcher to look into the following; research design, target population, sampling procedure used methods of data collection, validity and reliability of data collection instruments, methods of data analysis, ethical considerations and summary of the chapter.

3.2 Research Design

Descriptive research design was used in the study because it is very useful in unfolding the objectives without the researcher's influence. According to Wangai (2006) descriptive research is a scientific method of investigation in which data is collected and analyzed in order to describe current conditions, term or the relationships concerning a problem in their natural setting. Descriptive survey design involves collection of data from a sample of population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003)

Descriptive design should be used in those cases where certain factors may be known to the researcher as causing the problem and where there is a need for the subjects to describe these factors in order to develop frequency of responses to each of these factors (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003)

3.3 Target Population
The target population was the honorable Members and employees of the County Assembly of Embu totaling to 189 (County Assembly of Embu - Human Resource Departmental Records (2015). The population characteristic is summarized in the table below.

Table 3.1: Table Showing the Research Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/ type of employee</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Percentage (%) to total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of County Assembly</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management staff</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior staff</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** County Assembly of Embu- Human Resource Departmental Records (2015).

Figure 3: Figure showing the Research of Target Population

**Source:** County Assembly of Embu- Human Resource Departmental Records (2015).

The study shows that this category of population shall be in the best position to provide information on the factors that affects public participation in the legislative procedure of the county assembly of Embu. This belief shall be derived from the fact that the selection of the
respondents will be representative of the staff cadres and Members of The County Assembly (Ward Representatives) employed at the County Assembly of Embu based on their proportion.

3.3 Sample and Sampling technique

The study adopted stratified random sampling technique. According to Thomson, (2012) asserts that sampling is a procedure that consists of selecting some part of a population to observe so that one may estimate something about the whole population.

Gay, (2003) suggests that 10% of the accessible population is adequate to serve as a study sample. From the above population of 189 staff members, the study covered a sample to which shall be obtained using a stratified random sampling technique.

3.4 Data Collection Instruments

The main data collection instrument used in the study is the primary and secondary data. Primary data was through self-reporting Questionnaire. The Questionnaire included both structured and unstructured questions in order to capture both quantitative and qualitative data.

Secondary data was obtained from all relevant published and unpublished sources, internet, books and journals and information from past researchers.

3.5 Pilot Study

A pilot survey and re-testing techniques was carried out before the actual data collection to define questionnaires reliability. Data was analyzed and presented in terms of tables, graphs, pie-charts percentages and simple frequencies

3.5.1 Validity

The Validity of the research instrument was done according to Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003) where observes that validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which is based on the research results. Sample questionnaires will be prepared and pretested to a few respondents. The questions was simple, brief and to the point. The questionnaire was divided into parts with each part bearing the questions that attract responses that are relevant to the objectives of the
study Kothari, (2003). This was achieved by the proper layout of questions, simplicity of the questions that is meant to collect quantitative and qualitative information Ogechi, (2001).

3.5.2 Reliability Test

The reliability according Joppa, (2000) defines reliability as the extent to which results would be consistent over time. To test the reliability the data collection instruments will be pretested, tested and retested and where consistency of the results was observed and concluded that the data collection instruments is reliable.

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

This section discussed the procedure that was used in data collection and the instruments which will be used in the process. The researcher used self-administered questionnaires with appropriate guidance to collect data. The questionnaire contained structured and unstructured questions. The questionnaire was distributed to the respondent who upon filling the required information was returned for analysis.

The Questionnaires was the most effective method of data collection for this study since it is a cost effective (cheap), the respondents who had adequate levels of education were able to fill them easily. Due to constraints of time this method was effective to collect the data. The response rate anticipated was 64.6%.

3.7 Data Analysis and Presentation

The collected data was later analyzed and presented using Microsoft excel using tables and figures to show the significant relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The information provided by the respondents was held with high levels of confidentiality and was used only for academic purposes. Independence of the respondents was also observed. Prior revelation of any information about the research consent was sought from the respondents.

3.8.1 Informed Consent
The researcher ensured the participant was protected. The researcher made sure that his or her participant was fully informed and therefore may freely choose to participate in the study.

3.8.2 Voluntary Participation

The respondents were encouraged to voluntary participate in the study by filling the questionnaire.

3.8.3 Confidentiality

The researcher assured the respondents that the information given would not be revealed to anybody and was be purely for academic purpose. The researcher assured confidentiality of their responses from the participants. Safeguarding this information was a key part of the relationship of trust and respect that existed between the researcher and the participant.

3.8.4 Privacy

The researcher declared to the participant that the information given was given the privacy it deserves. Privacy refers to “persons and to their interest in controlling the access of others to themselves,” and no participant should ever be forced to reveal information to the researcher that the participant does not wish to reveal.

3.8.5 Anonymity

The researcher revealed to the participants that their identity was protected.

3.9 Chapter summary

Chapter three contains the research methodology and discusses research design, target population, sample and sampling technique, instruments, pilot study, validity, reliability test, data collection procedure, data analysis and presentation and ethical consideration.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and discusses the analysis obtained from the study. The analysis is pertinent to the research questions that were stated earlier in the study. The quantitative analysis is followed by qualitative analysis in this chapter.

4.1.1. Response Rate

According to the sample taken of Thirty Eight (38) respondents all the questionnaires were printed and sent out. Thirty three (33) questionnaires were received back and thus the researcher managed to receive a good response rate of eighty seven per cent (87%) because of good follow up through the mobile phones and face to face request to respond to questionnaires. This made it easy since the questionnaires were filled instantly.

Table 4.1: Response Rate to the data collection instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From table 4.1 above, 87% questionnaires were returned out of 38 questionnaires submitted. 13% questionnaires were not returned. The shortfall witnessed was because some of the respondents did not return the questionnaires. This was considerable representation of the
respondents in the target population. The reason for non-response is attributed to the incomplete questionnaires which were not analyzed in this study to avoid bias. Some respondents did not wish to respond to specific questions for personal reasons, a position which the researcher respected.

### 4.1.2. General Information of the Respondent

The respondents were requested to provide personal information which the researcher deemed would be necessary to facilitate understanding of the rationale for the responses. The following were specifically required; Gender of respondents, Marital Status of respondents, Respondents Age Bracket, Respondent’s highest academic qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2:** Gender of respondents

**Source:** Author, (2018)
Figure 4.2: Gender of respondents

![Pie chart showing gender distribution]

Source: Author, (2018)

Table 4.2 shows that 64% of the respondents were male while 36% of the respondents were female. The majority of the respondents were males. This may be due to them being many in the workforce as a result of the nature of the duties and the available vacancies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2018)
From the table 4.3 it can be seen that 51% of the respondents were married, while 39% were single, while 10% fall into others, such as divorced and separated. The majority of respondents were married because most of the respondents were between 18 and 50 years, where most people at this age are married.

Table 4.4: Respondents Age Bracket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2018)

**Figure 4.4: Respondents Age Bracket**

![Respondents' Age Bracket](image)

Source: Author, (2018)

From table 4.3 above 58% of the respondents were below 34 years of age, 24% are between 35 and 44 years, 18% are between 45 and 50 years and there were no respondents above 50 years of age. This reflects the employment trends within the CAE after the devolution era after 2013.

**Table 4.5: Respondent’s highest academic qualification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest academic qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Author, (2018)

**Figure 4.5:** Respondents’ Highest academic qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Highest Level of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Author, (2018)

From table 4.5 9% of the respondents had secondary level of education. 36% were graduates while 55% had post graduate qualifications. The majority of respondents had post graduate qualifications. This is because the minimum academic requirements for one to be employed within CAE was a university degree and above. Most of the respondents had post graduate diplomas in their education.

### 4.2. Factors Influencing Public Participation on Legislative Procedures

The study was premised on the assumptions that, the level of Public Participation on Legislative Procedures in County Assembly of Embu (CAE) is attributable to Training, economic factors, social factors, and governance Structures.

#### 4.2.1 Influence of Training in Public Participation in Legislative Process

**Table 4.6:** Effect of training Public Participation on Legislative Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Author, (2018)

**Figure: 4.6:** Effect of training Public Participation on Legislative Procedures

From Table 4.6 on Effect of training Public Participation on Legislative Procedures in CAE, the respondents who said they strongly agree were 46% with another who said they Agree being 36% and 18% said they somehow agree that training has effect on Public Participation on Legislative Procedures.

**4.2.2. Influence of Social Factors Influence Public Participation**

**Table: 4.7:** Factors attributable to participation on legislative procedures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>No extent at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of resources allocation to carry out public participation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information on public participation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness on the requirement for public participation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of enabling legal framework affect public participation in legislative procedures</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Author, (2018)

The respondents were to give their opinions on the some of the factors influencing public participation by public participation in legislative matters of the CAE. The responses were as shown below

**Figure 4.7:** Level of resources allocation to carry out public participation
Source: Author, (2018)
From Figure 4.7 on Level of resources allocation influencing carrying out public participation to carry out public participation 45% said to a large extent, while the rest being 55% said to a moderate extent.

Figure 4.8: Access to information on public participation

Source: Author, (2018)

From Figure 4.8 on Access to information on public participation those that said to a large extent were 55%, and while 27% said to a very large extent and those who said to a Moderate extent were 18% of respondents.

Figure: 4.9: Public awareness on the requirement for public participation
As shown in Figure: 4.9. on influence of Public awareness on the requirement for public participation those who said to a large extent were 64%, while those who said to a moderate extent were 27% with 9% of respondents saying to a small extent.

**Figure 4.10:** lack of enabling legal framework affect public participation in legislative procedures

As shown on Figure 4.10 lack of enabling legal framework affect public participation in legislative procedures to some extent with some who said it affects to a Large extent being 72%, while those who said to a very large extent were 18% and those who said to a small extent ware 9% of respondents.
4.2.3. Influence of Economic Factors Public Participation in Legislative Process

**Table: 4.8.: Influence of resource allocation for public participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2018)

**Figure 4.11: Influence of resource allocation for public participation**

Source: Author, (2018)

As shown on Table: 4.8, the respondents were asked whether in their opinions the level of resource allocation affects public participation in legislative procedures at CAE and those who said No were 9%, while those who said Yes were 91% of respondents.
Table 4.9: How adequate amount allocated in the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very large extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large extent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate extent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little extent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2018)

Figure 4.12: How adequate amount allocated in the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016

Source: Author, (2018)

Table 4.9 shows responses on how adequate amount allocated in the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 County Budget for carrying out public participation at CAE.
The respondents who said to a large extent were 55% with those who said to a Moderate extent being 36% and those who said to No extent at all being 9% of respondents.

**Table: 4.10: Resource allocation public participation in legislative procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2018)

**Figure: 4.13. Resource allocation public participation in legislative procedures**

Source: Author, (2018)

Table: 4.10. On Resource allocation influencing public participation in legislative procedures indicates the Level to which the respondents agreed that resource allocation affects public participation in legislative procedures at CAE.
With those who said they strongly agree being 55%, with those who Agreed being 36% and those who said they Somehow agree being 9% of respondents.

4.2.4: Effect Governance structure in Public Participation in Legislative Process

Table 4.11: Public Awareness Affects Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2018)

Figure: 4.14.: Public Awareness Affects Public Participation

![Frequency Chart](image)

Source: Author, (2018)

Table 4.11 shows how Public Awareness Affects Public Participation on legislative procedures at the CAE, those who said they Agree were 37%, and those who said they
strongly agree were 27% and some who said they somehow agree being 27%, there was however those who Disagreed being 9% of respondents.

**Table: 4.12.** Access to information on public participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Author, (2018)*

**Figure: 4.15:** Access to information on public participation

*Source: Author, (2018)*

**Table: 4.12.** Shows on responses on influence of Access to information on public participation in the CAE has been a challenge and those who Agree are 37% with those who Somehow agree being 27% and those strongly agree being 9% with another 27% of respondents saying they Disagree.
Table: 4.13: Challenges in Facilitation of Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Little extent</th>
<th>No extent at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political will to mobilize people for public participation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of civic education on public participation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political uncertainties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of standardized structures to manage public participation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author, (2018)

The following were stated as some of the challenges faced in facilitation of public participation in the County Assembly of Embu. The respondents extent of agreeing were as shown in the figures below.

Figure 4.16: Political will to mobilize people for public participation

Source: Author, (2018)
Figure 4.16 shows the influence of Political will to mobilize people for public participation, with those who said to a very large extent being 55%, and those who said to a large extent being 36% and there were those who said to a moderate extent being 9% of respondents.

**Figure 4.17:** Lack of civic education on public participation

Source: Author, (2018)

Figure 4.17 Lack of civic education on public participation, those who said to a large extent were 36% and other who said to a very large extent being 27% and those who said to a moderate extent being 27% and there were those who said small extent being 9% of respondents.

**Figure 4.18:** Political uncertainties

Source: Author, (2018)
Figure 4.18 shows how Political uncertainties influenced public participation with those who said to a very large extent being 46%, and those who said large extent being 27% and those who said to a moderate extent being 27% of respondents.

**Figure: 4.19:** Lack of standardized structures to manage public participation

![Lack of standardized structures to manage public participation](image)

**Source:** Author, (2018)

From Figure: 4.19. The respondents said Lack of standardized structures to manage public participation had effect as stated by 46% to be to a very large extent and large extent being 27% and those who said to a moderate extent being 27% of respondents.

**Table: 4.14.:** Effect of lack of an enabling legal framework of public participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Author, (2018)
As shown on Table: 4.14, the Effect of lack of an enabling legal framework of public participation the respondents level of agreement was that lack of an enabling legal framework has affected public participation at the CAE with those who had this opinion being Strongly agree at 46%, and those who somehow agree being 27% and there was those who said they Agreed being 18% of respondents.

4.2 Limitations of the Study
The researcher faced some limitations in that some of the respondents were afraid to give the information required but the researcher assured them of confidentiality and also assured them that the data collected was only used for academic purposes only. Some of the respondents had busy schedules but the researcher gave them the questionnaires an left them for about two weeks for them to feel at their own free time.

4.3 Chapter Summary
This chapter discussed the presentation of the research findings and limitations of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0. Introduction
This chapter is the final chapter for the study and reports on summary of findings, answer to
research questions, conclusions, study recommendations and recommendations for further study.

5.1. Summary of Findings
According to the sample taken of Thirty Eight (38) respondents thirty three (33) questionnaires
were received back and thus the researcher managed to receive a good response rate of 87%,
and that from the analysis it was found that, 64% of the respondents were male while 36% of the
respondents were female. The majority of the respondents were males. It was found that 51% of
the respondents were married, while 39% were single, while 10% fall into other categories, It
was found that 58% of the respondents were below 34 years of age, It was also found that 55%
of the respondents had post graduate qualifications. The majority of respondents had post
graduate qualifications.

on Effect of training Public Participation on Legislative Procedures in CAE, the majority of
respondents who said they Strongly agree were 46% that training has effect on Public
Participation on Legislative Procedures. On Level of resources allocation influencing carrying
out public participation the majority of respondents 55% said to a moderate extent. On Access to
information influencing public participation the majority of respondents who said to a large
extent were 55% and on influence of Public awareness on the requirement for public
participation the majority of respondents who said to a large extent were 64%, on lack of
enabling legal framework affect public participation in legislative procedures the majority of
respondents 72%, said to some extent.

On lack of enabling legal framework affect public participation in legislative procedures the
majority of respondents 72% said they to a large extent. The respondents were asked whether in
their opinions the level of resource allocation affects public participation in legislative
procedures at CAE and the majority 91%of respondents said yes.
On how adequate amount allocated in the 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 County Budget for carrying out public participation at CAE the majority of respondents 55% said to a large extent, while on Resource allocation influencing public participation in legislative procedures the majority 55% of respondents agreed that resource allocation affects public participation in legislative procedures at CAE.

On how Public Awareness Affects Public Participation on legislative procedures at the CAE, the majority 37% of respondents who said they strongly agree. On influence of Access to information on public participation in the CAE has been a challenge the majority 37% of respondents said they somehow agree, while on the influence of Political will to mobilize people for public participation, the majority 55% of respondents said to a very large extent and on influence of Lack of civic education on public participation, majority 36% of respondents said to a large extent.

On how Political uncertainties influenced public participation the majority 46%, of respondents said to a very large extent while on Lack of standardized structures to manage public participation had effect as stated the majority 46% of respondents said to a very large extent.

On the effect of lack of an enabling legal framework of public participation the respondent’s level of agreement was that lack of an enabling legal framework has affected public participation at the CAE with the majority 46%, of respondents saying they strongly agree.

5.2. Conclusion

The study found that training has effect on Public Participation on Legislative Procedures and the study also found that social factors influence carrying out public participation on Legislative Procedures. The study also found that economic factors influence public participation in Legislative Process and also that governance influenced public participation in Legislative Process.

5.3 Recommendation of the study.

On Training influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County the study recommends that there should be more structured training programmes for the country assembly staff so that they are effective in mobilizing community participation in Legislative Process in
Embu County assembly. On social factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County assembly the study recommends that broader approach should be used to identify more relevant social factors that directly relate to the public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County assembly.

On what extent economic factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County the study recommends that the economic factors that are used to evaluate public participation should be individual based economic factors than public related factors. On what extent governance influences public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County assembly recommends that a more participatory community structure to governance would be effective in the overall effectiveness of community participation in Legislative Process in Embu County assembly.
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APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Introduction

I am an Undergraduate student at Management University of Africa. I am required to submit as part of my research work, a research project report on “Factors Affecting Public Participation in Legislative Procedures in County Governments (A Case of County Assembly of Embu)”. To achieve the objectives of the study, you have been chosen to participate in the study.

I humbly request you to fill the questionnaires at your own free time for the purpose of the study. The information will be confidential and also it will be used for academic purposes only. The results of the survey will be in summary form and will not disclose any individual, organization information in any way.
APPENDIX II: RESEARCH STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE: EMPLOYEE

Introduction

I am an Undergraduate student at Management University of Africa. I am required to submit as part of my research work, a research project report on “Factors Affecting Public Participation in Legislative Procedures in County Governments (A Case of County Assembly of Embu).” To achieve the objectives of the study, you have been chosen to participate in the study.

I kindly request you to fill the attached questionnaire to generate data required for this study.

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION OF THE RESPONDENT ((Please tick [✓] where appropriate)

1. Gender/Sex  Female [ ]  Male [ ]

2. Marital status  Single [ ]  Married [ ]

Other (specify) __________________

3. Age Bracket  -

18-24 Years [ ]  25-34 Years [ ]  35-44 Years [ ]

45-50 Years [ ]  50-65 Years [ ]

4. Highest academic qualification

Primary [ ]  Secondary [ ] Graduate [ ]  Post graduate [ ]

Other (please specify) ____________________
SECTION B: FACTORS INFLUENCING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

(Please tick [✓] where appropriate)

5. How does training influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County?

Indicate in your opinion training influence public participation.

Yes [ ] No [ ]

6. In what ways do social factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

Indicate the extent to which each is applicable in Embu County Assembly.

1- Very large extent 2- Large extent 3- Moderate extent
4- Small extent 5- No extent at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. To what extent do economic factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

Indicate the extent to which each is applicable in Embu County Assembly.

1- Very large extent 2- Large extent 3- Moderate extent
4- Small extent 5- No extent at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How does governance influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

Indicate you agree governance influence public participation.
• Strongly agree
• Agree
• Somehow agree
• Disagree
• Strongly disagree
APPENDIX II: RESEARCH STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

MEMBERS OF COUNTY ASSEMBLY

Introduction

I am an Undergraduate student at Management University of Africa. I am required to submit as part of my research work, a research project report on “Factors Affecting Public Participation in Legislative Procedures in County Governments (A Case of Embu County Assembly)”. To achieve the objectives of the study, you have been chosen to participate in the study.

I kindly request you to fill the attached questionnaire to generate data required for this study.

SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION OF THE RESPONDENT ((Please tick [✓] where appropriate)

1. Gender/Sex  Female [ ]  Male [ ]
2. Marital status  Single [ ]  Married [ ]
   Other (specify) ________________
3. Age Bracket -
   18-24 Years [ ]  25-34 Years [ ]  35-44 Years [ ]
   45-50 Years [ ]  Above 50 Years [ ]
4. Highest academic qualification
   Primary [ ]  Secondary [ ] Graduate [ ]  Post graduate [ ]
   Other (please specify) ________________

SECTION B: FACTORS INFLUENCING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

(Please tick [✓] where appropriate)
5. How does training influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Government?

Indicate in your opinion training influence public participation.

Yes [ ]

No [ ]

6. In what ways do social factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

Indicate the extent to which each is applicable in Embu County Assembly.

1- Very large extent  2- Large extent  3- Moderate extent
4- Small extent  5- No extent at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. To what extent do economic factors influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

Please indicate the extent to which each is applicable in Embu County Assembly.

1- Very large extent  2- Large extent  3- Moderate extent
4- Small extent  5- No extent at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How does governance influence public participation in Legislative Process in Embu County Assembly?

Indicate you agree the governance influence public participation.

Strongly agree [ ]

Agree [ ]

Somehow agree [ ]

Disagree [ ]

Strongly disagree [ ]