

5-30-2022

Enhancing Citizens' Participation in Planning and Budgeting in Kibaha Town Council, Tanzania

Mrisho M. Malipula
Mzumbe University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb>



Part of the [Entrepreneurial and Small Business Operations Commons](#), [Human Resources Management Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Malipula, Mrisho M. (2022) "Enhancing Citizens' Participation in Planning and Budgeting in Kibaha Town Council, Tanzania," *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi*: Vol. 29: No. 2, Article 5. DOI: 10.20476/jbb.v29i2.1362
Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb/vol29/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Administrative Science at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi* by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Enhancing Citizens' Participation in Planning and Budgeting in Kibaha Town Council, Tanzania

Mrisho M. Malipula

Mzumbe University, Tanzania

mmmalipula@mzumbe.ac.tz

Abstract. Citizens' participation is deemed key in the planning and budgeting of developmental activities, but grassroots participation in such endeavors has proven problematic. Against such a backdrop, this study examined citizens' participation in planning and budgeting processes in local governments. It explores the nature and level of citizens' participation in planning and budgeting, as well as challenges impeding their participation in the same KTC. The study employed a qualitative stakeholder analysis that involved a sum of 42 interviewees. 24 participated in 3 FGDs involving women, youth, and farmers, and 18 as Key Informants purposively picked among Councillors, WDC members, CSO leaders, and KTC officials with knowledge of planning and budgeting processes. A desk review was employed to triangulate FGDs and KIIs findings. The data garnered in this study underwent thematic content analysis and was descriptively discussed. The study unveils that space for local participation in KTC is diminutive and most of the Kibaha inhabitants neither have a proper understanding of their Council's planning and budgeting processes nor the ability to informally participate in the same. Equally, procedures and structures for community engagement for effective citizens' participation in the monitoring and evaluating of development interventions hardly exist. Such a situation constrains the promotion of effective, responsive, and responsible government at the local level. In light of the weaknesses highlighted, this article calls for deliberate efforts to build capacities and create space for citizen participation to meet the objective of decentralization and fast-track improved public service delivery in Tanzania.

Keywords: Decentralization, Local governance, Planning, Budgeting, Community Engagement

INTRODUCTION

Citizen's Participation, along with other stakeholders in planning and budgeting, is considered imperative for citizens' wellbeing (Laly and Mokaya, 2018). The imperative delineates why participatory planning and budgeting - which accords an opportunity for stakeholders to jointly decide on what, how, and where their resources should be spent- is undertaken worldwide (Wilkinson et al., 2019). The dominant literature on planning and budgeting in Africa suggests participatory planning and budgeting is gaining traction in LGAs, but its effectiveness is belittled by less educated and unenthused citizens, limited transparency, and weak accountability mechanisms (Asukile and Mbogo, 2022). This is a flow as participatory planning and budgeting is meant to accord citizens space to influence public policies, hold governments accountable, deliberate on the distribution of their resources, increase their level of trust and ownership of government projects, as well as their role in the implementation of development endeavors (Dzinic, 2016; Wilkinson et al., 2019). Kessy (2018)

contends that as a way to enhance citizen participation in local government, including planning and budgeting, many countries, including Tanzania, decentralize their Local Government System (LGS).

Tanzania's experience in decentralization is rather chequered. In the 1970s, development planning, coordination, and management were transferred from central government to regional and district and village/streets administrations to augment grass-root participation without real decision-making, and resource allocation powers moved from the center to influence the transfer (Kessy, 2018). As if the centralization of power was not enough to gag Local Government Authorities (LGAs), the government abolished LGAs in 1973 (Babeiya, 2016). LGAs were reinstated in 1982 for among other reasons, to accord citizens rights and powers to participate in the planning, budgeting, and implementation of development initiatives (Mulikuza et al., 2019). People's participation in decentralized local governance is considered (albeit in writing) to be key in enhancing services delivery and citizens' voice in the development processes such as planning and budgeting (Asukile and Mbogo,



Copyright © Author(s) 2022. Re-use permitted under CC BY SA 4.0. You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. Published by Faculty of Administrative Science, Universitas Indonesia. See rights and permissions at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Correspondence to:
Mrisho M Malipula
mmmalipula@mzumbe.ac.tz

2022). Such consideration rationalizes the bottom-up approach depicted in Tanzania's development planning blueprints, particularly the Opportunities and Obstacles to the Development (O&OD) system that directs the integration of stakeholders' inputs into LGAs planning and budgeting.

Article 146. -(1) Tanzania's Constitution offers the legal basis for LGAs to develop participatory plans that outline programs to meet the development needs of their area of jurisdiction. The right enshrined in Article 146. -(1) is not absolute as LGAs are supposed to plan and implement their plans within the framework of Tanzania's national development plan and budget guidelines issued yearly by the Ministry responsible for Finance. Importantly, the national framework regards O&OD as a tool for facilitating 'bottom-up' participatory development which demands that communities to kick-start the planning processes (PMO-RALG, 2007). The O&OD unfolds the planning and budgeting legal framework, roles, and responsibilities of local government institutions at varied governance levels (District, Ward, and Village/Mtaa levels). In particular, the planning process under O&OD is scheduled to be carried out over a period of twelve days, as indicated in table 1. The end product of the O&OD planning process is a three-year rolling plan which undergoes adjustments yearly.

Table 1. Development of LGAs Three-year Rolling Plans

DAY	RURAL LGAs	URBAN LGAs
1	Social preparation and secondary data collection	
2	Social preparation and secondary data collection	
3	Extraordinary Village Assembly to launch O&OD, formation of focus groups (FGs), selection of map drawers and community resource persons, and primary data collection	Mtaa meeting to launch O&OD; formation of FGs, selection of map drawers and community resource persons, and primary data collection
4	Primary data collection and use of participatory rural appraisal (PRA) tools	
5	Focus group discussions (FGDs) on Tanzania Development Vision (TDV) 2025's first principal objective: 'high quality of livelihood'. Topics: food self-sufficiency and food security, universal primary education, gender equality, and access to primary health	
6	Further FGDs on TDV 2025's 'high quality of livelihood'. Topics: access to reproductive health, infant and maternal mortality rates, access to safe water, life expectancy, and abject poverty	
7	FGD on TDV 2025's second and third principal objectives: 'good governance and 'rule of law'	
8	FG to prepare draft community plan	FG to prepare draft ward plan
9	Village Council prioritizes specific objectives and drafts a community plan	Mtaa meetings to discuss and comment on the draft ward plan
10	Ward Development Committee (WDC) meeting provides technical advice on the draft plan	FG under Ward Executive Officer (WEO) incorporates comments from Mtaa meeting into the draft ward plan
11	Extraordinary Village Assembly to receive and approve community plans	WDC to prioritize all specific objectives, prepare and endorse the three-year ward plan
12	Preparation of simple format by sector at ward level	

Source: PMO-RALG, 2007

The table above indicates the O&OD approach intends to promote transparency and accountability in community development. O&OD requires LGA to organize a public hearing to lay bare the benefits of any project it wishes to undertake plans. The LGA should tell how it expects to execute the proposed project and solicit beneficiaries' views on the same. Participatory planning and budgeting in LGAs are encouraged through Villages/Mitaa, WDC and Council level meetings. Legal support for the actualization of O&OD is enshrined in the Local Government (District Authorities) Act 1982, which directs LGAs to organize public hearings for people to question political leaders and staff. The table and preceding discussions above indicate that frameworks and legislation for participatory planning and budgeting exist. However, citizen's participation in lower-level local government has been tokenistic due to limited knowledge of planning and budgeting, incompetence in evoking their right to participate and hold their leaders accountable, inability to comprehend technical information and Central vs. Local

government power relations which undermine LGAs planning and implementation powers (Asukile and Mbogo, 2022'; Laly and Mokaya, 2018 and Mulikuza et al., 2019).

The background divulged above indicates that normative arrangements exist for citizens' participation in planning and budgeting. However, citizens' limited planning and budgeting know-how, unenthused citizenry, limited transparency, and weak accountability mechanisms, and politicians' limited will to engage electorates in planning and budgeting bars citizens' interests from permeating into planning and budgeting circles. As such, the intended merits of the citizens' participation in planning and budgeting in Tanzania happens to be rhetoric. While the factors impeding citizen participation in planning and budgeting are generally known limited knowledge exists on the relevance of the general factors to Kibaha Town Council (KTC) and what should be done to ensure the effective participation of citizens in KTC planning and budgeting. Against this backdrop, this study intends to mend the gap by exploring the dynamics of stakeholders' participation in KTC planning and budgeting processes. It specifically explores the level of KTC inhabitants' participation in planning and budgeting and the challenges they encounter and draws appropriate recommendations to address the explored challenges for effective citizen participation in KTC planning and budgeting.

The article proceeds with an overview of the study's conceptual and theoretical underpinnings. The conceptual part harbors an overview of citizen participation, participatory planning, and budgeting as well as LGAs, while the theoretical part provides an account of the study's theoretical disposition-the Materialist Political Economy Theory, and its justification and application in the current study. The conceptual and theoretical section is followed by a methodological section that points out the methods applied in the study, their justification and their application in the study. The methodological section is succeeded by a data and results section that presents and discussion of data on the level of KTC inhabitants' participation in planning and budgeting, challenges they encounter in their participation and recommendations on how to address the explored challenges for effective citizen participation in KTC planning and budgeting. Lastly, concluding remarks are provided.

Citizen Participation, PP and PB in LGAs: Theoretical and Conceptual Issues

Citizen Participation in LGAs

Citizen Participation refers to an act of taking part or getting involved in an activity (Salum, 2018). This understanding is challenged on the grounds that it overemphasizes numerical participation and ignores aspects of participation beyond numbers (Misafi and Malipula, 2015). In light of this backdrop, this article adopts Agarwal's substantive understanding of

participation, which entails an individual's ability to have the voice to influence change in decision-making (Agarwal, 2010). Citizen participation in LGAs is associated with decentralization, which refers to transferring some functions, responsibilities, resources, and political and fiscal autonomy from the central government to LGAs. Decentralization of powers entails the promotion of efficiency, empowerment, and participation from the lower levels of LGAs and the people at the grassroots (Kessy, 2018).

The assumption that decentralization improves participation is contestable as citizens in many decentralized countries, including Tanzania, have limited capacity to actively participate in decision-making (Babeiya, 2016). Citizens' participation in such countries is normatively guaranteed in electoral processes but becomes limited to prejudiced and lethargic consultation in between elections (Parvin, 2018). Central governments in these countries commonly limit LGAs' capacities to engage citizens by withholding power and resources meant to be decentralized (Khambule, 2021). As such, calls for citizens' participation beyond elections preoccupy empowerment debates. It is in this context that citizens' engagement in planning and budgetary LGAs is examined in this article.

The PP Concept

Planning takes place within intricate institutional environments influenced by numerous socio-economic and political factors (Noto and Noto, 2019). Currently, international and local institutions consider participatory mechanisms to be an integral part of good governance (Hao et al., 2022). PP emanates from a paradigmatic shift from government to governance meant to augment democracy and participatory decision-making (Salum, 2018). Essentially, PP upholds inclusiveness in planning processes which entails space for people's voices in planning (Fung, 2018). However, the process of ensuring PP is political and dominated by rulers. Thusly, Mulikuza et al. (2019) are doubtful if it can ensure active citizen participation in planning and its benefits. Similarly, Manduna et al., (2015) perceive PP as a way of legitimizing elites' self-serving interests in the name of democracy. Political actors' lack of enthusiasm to unequivocally adopt PP and citizens' inability to reverse such a situation excludes citizens' voices in planning and warrants their participation to be consultative (Malanilo, 2014).

Recently, the voices of incompetent citizens have been amplified by donors, CSOs, and the media, which support participatory decision-making (Khambule, 2021). However, third-party submissions of citizen voices on governments that do not nurture participation and without capacitating citizens cannot bear sustainable fruits (Mulikuza et al., 2019). Agger and Löfgren (2008) contend that solutions of limited citizen participation in planning should be drawn from the assessment of broad social group representation, transparency; the right to express opinions; the right to dissent; mutual respect by all actors; and the capacity

to influence the process. They also propose an assessment of norms, namely, access, political identities, accountability and public deliberation. These norms need to be assessed along the lines of the input-process-outcome stream whereby if citizens have a say in planning, and they should be capable of influencing plans and corresponding budgets and the results thereof (Asukile and Mbogo, 2022).

The PB Concept

PB is a public decision-making tool that permits citizens to discuss and negotiate the allotment of public resources (Williams, 2022). Since PB involves citizens, it is regarded as a device for administrative inclusion, intensifying participation and lessening contestation in the determination of fiscal policy and prioritizing the items for public expenditure and investments (Dzinic et al., 2016). When PB is well executed, it can positively redistribute resources to the poor, improve the quality of public services, and enhance budget transparency (William, 2022). Equally, PB stimulates information flow toward the participants to enable citizens to scrutinize public accounts and procedures during the budgetary planning stage (Mulikuza et al., 2019).

Even though PB is anticipated to positively impact accountability, the decentralization of decision-making authorities, and empowerment, the implications are not guaranteed as they are influenced by socio-economic and political factors (Wilkinson et al., 2019). Ngware (2005), for instance, vehemently argues that there exists scanty evidence worldwide to support the thesis that increased citizens' participation in local governance generates better outputs in terms of public service and public goods. Ngware's view is anchored on the fact that budgets are often reactive tools to satisfy political demands. On some occasions, the capacity of participants to make considerable inputs has been uncertain (Parvin, 2018). Impliedly, the final outputs of the final PB do not reflect the ambitions expressed by participants. In this regard, Malanilo (2014) contends that positive outputs of including social groups in budgeting require relevant management mechanisms to address challenges associated with including social groups (Salum, 2018). The public hearing is one of the most popular PB strategies.

In most cases, it requires participants to attend the hearings physically, and sometimes people lack such time. ICT seems to provide an alternative in developed countries but in poor ones like Tanzania, where internet services are neither affordable nor functioning well. Needless to say, most rural people lack devices to enjoy internet services. As such, investigation into identifying methods and strategies most appropriate for involving citizens in PB is essential.

Materialist Political Economy Theoretical Dispositions

The conceptualization above suggests that participatory planning and budgeting are engulfed in

a materialistic political and economic competition between rulers and the ruled. The rulers have the capacity and opportunities to monopolize planning and budgeting circles compared to the ruled. As such, this study was guided by the materialist political and economic theoretical dispositions. At its core, materialist political and economic viewpoints contend that the effective participation of citizens hinges on the possession of material resources, which determine the nature of the policy processes and influences (Schmidt, 2018). Political economic materialists hold categorical views when it comes to citizen participation in political processes as they divide citizens into the ruling and ruled class whereby the rulers have the material resources to set the modus operandi and opportunities to participate and to subsequently influence decisions on important political processes including planning and budgeting (Mulikuza et al., 2019). As such, equality of opportunities and normative legal-rational arrangements overemphasized by liberal scholars can never ensure broadly based citizen participation as long as the rulers and ruled categories and the disproportionate material resources possession and opportunities to participate in decision-making exist (Malanilo, 2014).

The application of the theoretical disposition to this study is predicated on the minimal participation by the ruled in planning and budget processes attributed to their inadequate understanding of the planning and budgeting processes (Laly and Mokaya, 2018). This is particularly so because the ruled possess limited material resources to afford quality education and access information compared to the ruling class. Similarly, the ruled economic statuses make participation a luxurious endeavor as it consumes time and sometimes material resources that they hardly have to attend decision-making meetings (Salum, 2018). In light of the material impediments to the ruled participation in decision making Mulikuza et al. (2019) recommend that improving citizens' participation at lower levels of local government including planning and budgeting, requires the provision of education and guidance on the decisions to be made, the establishment of relevant channels of information dissemination, provision of logistical, financial and human resources to guarantee planning and budget processes. This article used the materialist political economic approach to analyze KTC stakeholders' participation in planning and budgeting in KTC. It specifically identified the level of participation of the ruled (ordinary citizens and civic groups) and the rulers (KTC officials and Councillors) in the planning and budgetary process at the KTC Full Council, challenges impeding their participation in planning and budgeting. Subsequently, ways and means of improving stakeholders' participation in the same were drawn.

RESEARCH METHOD

Study Design, Area, and Rationale for choosing it

This study employed a case study design of a

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents

1.	Age of Participants (in years)	Frequency	Percentage
	20-39	14	33.4
	40 - 49	16	38.1
	50 - 59	8	19
	60 and above	4	9.5
2.	Sex		
	Male	25	59.5
	Female	17	40.5
3.	Education Level		
	No formal education	0	0
	Primary	16	38.1
	Secondary	14	33.4
	Tertiary	8	19
	University	4	9.5
4.	Marital Status		
	Married	28	66.6
	Single	12	28.6
	Divorced	2	4.8
5.	Occupation		
	Formally Employed	16	38.1
	Farming/livestock keeping	20	47.6
	Entrepreneurship/trading	6	14.3

qualitative nature. Such design warrants in-depth descriptions and analyses of a single case (Bryman, 2015). Since the current study embarked on a thorough investigation of a single unit - stakeholders' participation in planning and budgeting in KTC, the such design was deemed useful. Congruently, the design permits the examination of a phenomenon within its natural setting through multiple data sources suitable for answering "how" and "why" questions inherent in qualitative studies like ours. Such flexibility subjects a phenomenon to a myriad of lenses that allows numerous faces of the phenomenon to be laid bare and understood (Yin, 2014).

KTC was established by the Government Notice No. 352 of 17th September 2004. It is found in Kibaha District. Kibaha District harbors two LGAs-KTC and Kibaha District Council (KDC). KTC is found 40 km west of Dar es Salaam City. Kinondoni District borders it to the East, Bagamoyo to the North, Kisarawe District to the South, and Mlandizi in the North. The population of KTC, as per 2012 census, was 128,488 inhabitants, of which 65,835 were females and 62,653 males, with a household number of 17,788 and an average size for a household of 4.1. KTC has 11 wards: Mailimoja, Mkuza, Kibaha, Pangani, Kongowe, Tumbi, Misugusugu, Visiga, Mbawawa, Picha ya Ndege and Msangani; and 53 Mitaa. The economic mainstay of KTC is subsistence agriculture and livestock keeping, which employs 80 percent of the entire population, and the remaining 20 percent engage in trade/entrepreneurial activities and/or formal employment. The choice of this area is predicated on the presence of studies that, by and large, look at urban and/or rural LGAs. KTC being located close to the business capital of Tanzania- Dar es Salaam with predominantly peri-urban characteristics, provides room for investigating the dynamics of semi-urban people's participation in LGAs planning and budgeting. Equally, there is a recent study by Mulikuza et al., (2019) that deals with citizen participation in KDC. Therefore, this study provides insights into the unstudied part of Kibaha District to portray a broader understanding of citizen participation in planning and budgeting in said district.

Study Subjects and Sampling Methodology

The sample size for the study was 42 interviewees, which was enough to reach the saturation point, which is imperative for qualitative studies (Vasileiou et al., 2018). The saturation point entails the addition of a sample size that cannot generate new information. Brainstorming sessions with KTC staff overseeing planning and budgeting issues identified seven broad groups of stakeholders to participate in the study. The groups identified were women, youth, farmer-based organizations, civil society organizations, Councillors, WDC members and KTC officials. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were used to collect data in the study. KIIs were used to collect in-depth information from a wide range of knowledgeable people on KTC's planning and budgeting matters. A total of 18 respondents took part in such interviews. They include 2 district planning officers, two finance officers, 8 WDC members, 3 CSOs leaders, and 3 Councillors. 3 FGDs, each encompassing 8 participants from women, farmers and youth groups, garnered information about citizen participation in planning and budgeting, challenges impeding their participation in planning and budgeting, and solutions to those challenges. The interviewees' social demographic characteristics were as presented in table 2 below.

Data Type, Collection, and Analysis

The study used conversational interviews in the form of FDGs and KIIs, and documentary reviews like government documents, scholarly books, recent dissertations, journal articles, magazines, and newspapers relevant to the topic under study. Multiple information sources used in the current study are meant to complement the sources, check the information against each other, and increase the validity and reliability of the study's findings. Qualitative data from KIIs, FGDs, and documentary reviews were subjected to thematic content analysis. Thematic analysis was elaborately applied to delineate different themes emanating from the FGDs and KIIs. Transcription of the recorded information and translations of the FGDs and KIIs were accomplished within 48 hours after the interviews so that we could recall any data missing from the recordings. These transcripts were repeatedly read for data quality and to grasp the general sense of the gathered data. The transcribed texts were imported into Atlas ti computer software after being satisfied with the transcription. The software

was used to organize, analyze and examine relationships of the transcribed qualitative data from FGDs and KIIs. The writing of this article was anchored on the downloaded output from the Atlas ti software and narrated as a story capturing the actual details of the data obtained.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Stakeholders' Level of Participation in the KTC Planning and Budgeting Process

The study through FGDs and KIIs garnered information from stakeholders on the level of their participation by exploring their interests in KTC planning and budgeting processes and the power to influence their interests on the same. Table 2 below presents stakeholders' interests in planning and budgeting matters in KTC and their capacity to influence their interests.

Table 2 generally indicates that the interests of all stakeholders in KTC planning and budgeting processes are high but with low power to influence planning and budgeting processes except for the KIIs, who happen to be KTC officials and CSO leaders. The interviews with KIIs and FGDs pointed out that the high level of interest in planning and budgeting among stakeholders is attributed to the overall need of development and the differences in ability to influence the two are hinged on knowledge of planning and budgeting and the role assigned to stakeholders to play in planning and budgeting as the following quote from a young man in an FGD summarises:

"Development depends on our involvement in planning and budgeting, so we must have an interest. ... we have planning and budget meetings in the village that increase our interest to participating... our leaders are interested also and play an active role in these issues because they are employed and paid to do so. They have been educated and have the knowledge to participate actively. As for most of the local people with our mere ability to read and write, we input little into council planning and budgeting at the lower levels and the leaders cook the plans and budgets to their liking and send them back to us in terms of development projects for implementation".

The views presented above depict the centrality of the merit of participatory development in influencing planning and budgeting processes to augur well with Laly and Mokaya (2018), who extensively argue for the matter in their study on citizen participation in

Table 3. Stakeholder Interest and Power to Influence Planning and Budgeting Processes

S/N	Stakeholders	Stakeholders' Interest	Stakeholders' Power/level of influence
1.	Youth	High	Low
2.	Farmers	High	Low
3.	Women	High	Low
4.	CSOs	High	High
5.	WDC Members	High	Low
6.	Councillors	High	High
7.	KTC Officials	High	High

budgeting in the Arusha Municipal Council. It further depicts the presence of normative planning and budgeting process in various levels of the KTC, including the grassroots level from whence plans are expected to emanate as the O&OD system presented above requires. However, the FGDs collaborated. Mulikuza et al., (2019) revelation that the meetings that deliberated on planning and budget issues were not solely for that purpose, as they had other agendas contrary to the O&OD requisites. Most KIIs pointed out that inputs from Mitaa Assemblies were incorporated into Ward plans and submitted to the KTC to input into the Council's draft plan and budget made by KTC's Management Committee (CMT). The CMT subsequently forwarded the draft plan to the Full Council for approval via the KTCs committee responsible for finance. KIIs unveiled that as a matter of procedure, KTC's budget was submitted to the Coast Regional Consultative Committee for consultation, which ensured that it was consistent with the framing and execution of Tanzania's development policy. After such consultations, the budget was submitted to the Ministry responsible for LGAs to be incorporated into the Ministry's budget and eventually tabled before Parliament for deliberations and approval.

KIIs and FGDs indicate that the essence of stakeholders with high interest in planning and budgeting issues and power to influence the same is anchored on the role they play in the planning and budgeting processes and know-how on the two processes. The words of one KI well summarise this position

"KTC officials are well-learned compared to ordinary citizens. They are the executives at the Ward level, and they form the CMT, which draws the Council's draft plan and budget. ... CSO officials are knowledgeable, and some CSOs pump funds into financing public amenities like schools, which warrant them space to influence plans and budgets. As for Councillors, they chair WDCs and are members of the Full Council, which approves the budget".

This line of thought is further amplified by one KII who a bit arrogantly bragged:

"Planning and budgeting is CSO and KTC officials' daily activity, and we are endowed with technical know-how and access to information necessary to influence development planning for the good of the semi-illiterate citizens".

The influence of KTC officials, Councillors, and CSO officials is well seconded by one woman in a FGD who lamented that inputs from the lower local government in the planning and budget process were meaningless as they were always crushed at the Council level.

An interesting view from the seemingly arrogant quote above excludes Councillors. Such exclusion implies that they rank low on the hierarchy of influential stakeholders in planning and budgeting despite their statutory power to approve plans and budgets in the Full Council. The low ranking was clear from the KIIs and FGDs conviction that most Councillors are comparatively less educated than KTC technocrats.

This is understandable as the requirement to contest for political office in Tanzania is to know how to read and write. Also, the Councilor position does not attract well-learned people because it is not a full-time job meriting a salary.

Interestingly, civil servants who massively contribute to the pool of learned people in the country are not free to contest for such positions without resigning from public service. As such, the position attracts less educated politicians and, occasionally, retired civil servants and semi-learned businessmen. In the case of KTC, most Councillors lack university degrees, and their ability to comprehend sophisticated proposals from technocrats is low. More importantly, they are short on advocacy and lobbying skills as well as time to thoroughly go through proposals tabled before Council meetings by technocrats for deliberations as a technocrat in a KII confided:

"Many Councillors are interested in development but are semi-educated, cannot review development documents, and convincingly air their views in Full Council meetings. They can easily be taken for a ride by unethical technocrats. A lot is wanting on their part in advocating and lobbying for favorable plans and budgets."

Engaging the results and discussion under this subsection with political, economic materialism theoretical dispositions provides an interesting academic discourse. While in general terms, the results seem to buy into the theory's contention that the ruling class has the monopoly on the formulation of plans and budgets and oversees their implementation, the influence among the rulers' influencers' is not uniform across levels. This is evidenced by the fact that, on the one hand, the level of citizen participation in KTC planning and budgeting among ordinary citizens is low. On the other, the participation of WDC members and Councillors in the planning and budgeting processes in KTC is low compared to KTC officials and CSO leaders. This seems to suggest a puzzle as Councillors are supposed to be the bosses of the technocrats and CSO leaders as they have the power to approve KTC's budget and are duty-bound to hold KTC officials accountable. In this regard, it can be inferred that the interests of the citizens can only find their way into KTC plans and budgets when they coincide with those of the technocrats with the technical know-how and requisite information for informing development endeavors in KTC. An interesting question that begs answers is why the normative platforms and the stakeholders who are part of them have failed to promote an effective, responsive, and responsible government to facilitate broad-based community participation.

Challenges affecting Citizen Participation in Planning and Budgeting

Limited Knowledge of Planning and Budgeting Endeavours

The KIIs and FGDs mainly attributed citizen

miniature participation in planning and budgeting to their unawareness of the planning and budgeting processes and inadequate facilitation to enhance their capacity to participate in the same actively. A view from a young man who participated in a FGD pointing out that most community members are uneducated and are not aware of the planning and budgeting process, and never heard of community hearings aimed at soliciting their inputs for planning and budgeting substantiates how limited knowledge on planning and budgeting impeded citizen participation:

"We are not aware of planning and budgeting issues. Community hearings are not done. Maybe they are on paper, but they never organized this meeting in our community". The leaders do not need the views of locals who lack education and knowledge to make plans and budgets".

The views of the young man expressed above are interesting as it collaborates with the view that public hearings, as required by the O&OD process, were not well done as views were solicited in meetings with several agendas. More importantly, they reflect the materialist postulations that the ruled lack the know-how and material to have it so they can take part in the planning and budgeting processes. Ordinary citizens limited knowledge of planning and budgeting is worsened by a lack of information on development matters from KTC as the FGDs unanimously expressed the view that KTC leaders do not transparently disseminate information about development initiatives taking place in their area and outcomes of KTC meetings. This is a severe flaw because the public's access to information is critical in enhancing informed participation and accountability, as Salum (2018) alludes:

"An informed citizenry can better advocate for accountability of public officials on their conduct as well as on decisions made on matters affecting public goods."

The impact of limited knowledge on planning and budgeting could be reduced if CSOs capable of aggregating and articulating their interests were available. Babeiya (2016) contends that competent CSOs are imperative for aggregating and articulating disadvantaged groups' demands and interests. However, this was not the case in KTC, as lamentations of a male farmer in a FGD attest:

"Most citizens are poor, uneducated, and lack NGOs to speak on their behalf. How can we discuss and impact plans and budgets without such assistance parti?"

The role of CSOs is further rationalized by the fact that the O&OD system, as stated earlier, is supposed to be concluded in 12 days. The FGDs generally expressed the view that the days are few, bearing in mind the know-how of ordinary citizens, as the following quote from one elderly farmer suggests:

"The 12 days for drawing plans are very few for uneducated and poor citizens like us. We need organizations to help us do so that meet us before the 12 days set by the formal planning sessions."

Additionally, KIIs with Councillors revealed that

access to information about the district's programs and projects is challenging to get, especially information related to tendering and finance, as the following view of one Councillor summarises:

"Development project contracts are confidential. When I demand information on the contract sum, they are not availed to you. This affects our monitoring ability and makes our electorates see us as toothless dogs".

The limited transparency on tendering and financial matters portrayed by the Councillor entails an impediment to the practice of accountability which is key in ensuring good plans and budgets and fostering good governance frameworks (Layla and Mokaya, 2018). Opinions of two Councillors decrying limited access to information and the inability of Councillors and other leaders to hold KTC officials accountable suggests that a lot is wanting:

"Doctor we are not as educated as you are...we hardly access information as sometimes we are told to visit KTC website or bring a flash to get information. Most of us are not computer literate, and the situation is worse for ordinary people. We need to be empowered to monitor KTC budgets and expenditures and track development projects."

"The Full Council and WDCs are supposed to access information and share with citizens but whenever you request financial reports from KTC officials, they see you as a litigant and respond in a very technical manner to make us fail to follow."

The views under this subsection generally entail that KTC technocrats have the knowledge and access to information that gives them an upper hand in the process as they possess the material resources necessary for influencing planning and budgeting processes from a technical viewpoint. However, it puts the political and economic materialist disposition to question as Councillor's political position and role in approving budgets and holding technocrats accountable presupposes a more active role in influencing planning and budgeting for reasons depicted in the preceding subsection.

Social Cultural Division of labor and Practices that incapacitate Females Participation

KIIs and FGDs generally revealed that most street meetings were attended by elderly men and women of varied age groups. Participation of elderly men and a cross-section of women revolve around socio-cultural and labor-related divisions. For instance, one KI believed that "elderly men have investments and are getting support from their children; therefore, they can afford to attend meetings." As for women, particularly married ones and those who depend on men for livelihood, one woman revealed that "we are supposed to attend for our good and on behalf of their husbands/caregivers who tirelessly work for the wellbeing of our families." Such observations suggest limited participation of the primary family income earners in KTC. FGD and KIIs revealed that men dominated the deliberations of the planning and budgeting meetings

as women were passive participants. Women's passiveness was associated with social,-cultural factors that exclude and incapacitate women's participation in public affairs, as the words of a middle-aged women FGD participant posts:

"We have an interest in issues that affect our children and us, but in our culture, we fetch water, cultivate and prepare food and take care of children and their fathers. Men discuss development matters and want us to agree with whatever they decide. When a woman questions the decisions, she is branded as uncultured".

Another woman attributed women's limited powers to affect planning and budgeting decisions to their limited education compared to men, as the following quote substantiates:

"Most of us are standard seven leavers who can read Swahili and understand a little of what is done at the local authority where there are educated experts who lead departments."

The views of the middle-aged women were complemented by an elderly woman in the same FGD who argued that:

"Being a woman in our society is a curse. When I contested for a position in the Mtaa government, my husband and his friends discouraged me. When I won, they doubted my competence simply because women are supposed to be confined to the kitchen and so and act the way men want us to. Such a situation makes many women refrain from participating in public affairs".

The views of the women's limited power to effective planning and budgeting decisions buy into Salum (2018), who pins women's inactiveness in public affairs to patriarch social relations and stereotypes which impair their zeal to acquire formal education and shutters their confidence to take an active role in public affairs including participation in planning and budgeting. Impliedly, women's interests in the planning and budgeting circles depend on the courtesy of men in general and those participating in the planning and budgeting meetings.

Leaders' Vice-like Grip on the Planning and Budgeting Process

KIIs interviews and FDGs revealed that citizen participation in planning and budgeting was impeded by views that not all plans and budgets should originate from citizens, as the following quote of one KTC Official suggests:

"Involving citizens in all decisions is not as sometimes they lack knowledge and it is not easy to reach a timely consensus. Therefore, only logical technocrats and politicians should make decisions that will benefit them on their behalf".

The dominance of technocrats and politicians in planning and budgeting curtailing citizen participation can also be unveiled in the following quote from a young woman participant of the youth FGD:

"Our WEO and Councillor mainly come to us to mobilize us to participate in KTC-directed projects

like building classrooms. When we do not participate in such projects and question why the projects did not emanate from us, we are viewed as bad citizens, ...this dissuades our participation and alienates the voice of the youth in KTC plans".

In the same FGD claims were made suggesting that WDC leaders deliberately side-line the youth, fearing that their active participation in planning and budgeting will put their seats at risk, as the following quote suggests:

"Our leaders hardly consult us, fearing that we will hold them accountable for failing to deliver. Such situations make them block our participation in meetings by shamelessly claiming that we are disrespectful and power-hungry".

The views on the limited participation of youth in planning and budgeting suggest the exclusion of a physically abled generation from the decision-making circles that, according to Salum (2018) is imperative in sustainable development initiatives. It also augurs well with Ahenkan et al., (2013), who associate the side-lining of youth in planning and budgeting with the weakness of the politicians and technocrats to genuinely democratize and provide space for dissenting voices regardless of the worthiness of such voices to the community.

The views in this subsection validate the study's theoretical foundation as they overtly delineate leaders' tendency to decide without involving citizens. The fear portrayed by the youth FGD confirms the Machiavellian conception of politics, suggesting that rulers always strive to maintain the status quo and ensure it is not under threat.

Resource/Logistical Challenges

Another exciting challenge related to the failure of the citizen to exert power in planning and budgeting is logistical. It is worth noting that WDC members are required to facilitate participatory need assessments to feed into higher planning and budgeting levels. However, most members are not actively implementing this task due to logistical challenges, as the following lamentation of one WEO substantiates:

"I oversee activities in scattered communities without even a motorcycle to reach the people I am supposed to serve. Sometimes we borrow motorcycles from colleagues, but there is no money for fuelling the motorcycles."

The failure on the part of Ward extension officials to reach the grassroots to mobilize participation due to limited resources from KTC leaves such a role to the Mtaa leaders, who are not well educated and lack critical information for informed community participation. Inadequacies in resources and capacity negatively impact rural communities' ability to effectively influence policy development compared to other players in the policymaking process. Sometimes it leads to views being forwarded to higher organs after limited or no consultations with the people depicting the potential of community services not reflecting the needs of the people. Generally, the political-economic

materialist theory has been confirmed as it contends that rulers authoritatively distribute public resources in a manner it deems fit, thusly, may decide to provide resources to facilitate or not to facilitate citizen participation in planning and budgeting.

Improving Citizens' Participation in PP and PB

Review of the Budgetary Process

An important aspect that needs to be addressed to enhance PB is the limited time spent on consultations. The budgetary cycle should be adjusted to allow more time to be spent on consultations. For instance, the 12 days for creating a participatory plan under the O & OD guidelines is too little for citizens to participate actively. It is imperative to recall that citizens know little about the budget cycle and lack numerous prerequisites for furthering participatory planning and budgeting. As such, they need to be made aware of the budgetary cycle and be encouraged to forward the budgetary proposal to the respective authorities at the right time to allow the development of proposals for consultation. Since the budget process concludes in the Parliament after the amalgamation of budgets from all LGAs, allotting enough time for consultations gains currency due to Tanzania's geographical and infrastructural challenges.

In particular, it is essential to give adequate time for LGAs with difficult-to-reach terrains to engage their constituents before plans and budgets are prepared effectively. Additionally, every organ within LGAs receiving planning and budgetary proposals from lower organs require evidence of public consultations before it works on the proposals and possibly provides explanations for proposals dropped. Eventually, the Ministry responsible for finance should also require evidence of public consultation before budgets are approved for funding.

Capacity Issues of Stakeholders

As indicated in the theoretical section, community participation is a shared affair between community members and state or donor agencies. In the main, when space is given for the community to participate in development endeavors, the participants must have the requisite capacity to engage the state or donor agencies overseeing development initiatives. Since the capacity of most of the stakeholders who are expected to kick-start planning, budgeting, and ensuring grassroots involvement in the process has proven to lack the capacity to influence decisions, LGAs must invest in developing the capacity of stakeholders in effecting PP and PB. LGAs benefit from empowered and capacitated citizens in PP and PB as this would not only do their work in facilitating planning and budgeting efficiently but also create awareness of the work of the stakeholders and contribute to enhancing their participatory development drive.

Open Government through Electronic Media

Tanzania now has a highly vibrant media landscape,

and several LGAs have embarked on running local radio stations. KTC does not have one. The LGAs and CSO could exploit a local radio held in Swahili to organize open government programs to discuss the planning and budget systems and processes and seek out the input of community members and non-members listening to the programs through phone-ins. The local radio programs can complement cinema van shows, especially in rural communities. Alternatively, LGAs may decide to document their programs on video and show those videos in cinema vans.

Accounts Audit Hearings

Another opportunity for more public engagement and accountability in planning and budgeting could be through accounts audit hearings like the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament typically does. Open audit hearings would allow citizens to be informed about how their funds have been used. Such hearings could be organized in various traditional areas considered suitable by the citizens, which vary among areas LGAs to ensure that as many people as possible participate.

Injecting more Resources into Planning and Budgeting Activities

Limited resources for facilitating effective participatory planning and budgeting, as delineated above, merits a call to the government to allot more resources to KTC to meet the logistical and knowledge-related challenges extensively unveiled in this article. The resources need to ensure that all stakeholders act judiciously as the O&OD and budget guidelines require. The resources should be used to ensure citizens, CSOs and relevant state actors engage and complement each other to realize people-centered plans and budgets.

Concluding Remarks

The view that effective engagement of citizens and other stakeholders in planning and budgeting processes is imperative for enhancing sustainable people-oriented plans and budgets is almost unavoidable in participatory development literature and practices. The discussions above entail the centrality of citizen participation in planning and budgeting as propagated by politicians, development practitioners, and agencies and well documented in blueprints guiding the implementation of citizen participation cannot guarantee automatic practice. The major problem lies in putting the participatory planning and budgeting rhetoric into practice in different socio-cultural, political, and economic circumstances amid stakeholders' weaknesses to effectively play their role in planning and budgeting and the systems within which planning and budgeting take place. The current study established that citizens' participation in the planning and budgeting processes in the lower local government is almost non-existent due to citizens' limited knowledge of planning and budgeting, socio-cultural and political factors impairing women and youth participation as well as limited powers to articulate their demands for

influencing plans and budgets. This is the case despite most citizens having a high interest in development planning and budgeting. Furthermore, procedures and structures for community engagement in the monitoring and evaluating of development interventions seldom exist. Such a state of affairs constrained the promotion of effective, responsive, and responsible government for participatory development planning and budgeting in lower levels of local governance. It indicates that the materialistic political, and theoretical economic views over-glorifying the dominance of the ruled in making public decisions, including planning and budgeting, have been vindicated.

Reversing such a situation requires concerted efforts to be put in building citizens' capacities in planning and budgeting issues so that they can effectively participate in such endeavors and demand space to engage in planning and budgeting processes if they are denied. Citizens must be empowered to graduate from participating through consultation and progress to substantive engagement by developing zeal and know-how and avoiding socio-cultural factors limiting the effective engagement of citizens, particularly women. The capacity building shall be coupled with deliberate attempts to put proper procedures and structures for community engagement in monitoring and evaluating development interventions. Equally, there is a need to facilitate and equip stakeholders with specific knowledge on lobbying and advocacy to improve their planning and budgeting tasks.

The current article managed to divulge the dynamics of stakeholders' participation in planning and budgeting in KTC. In particular, it laid bare the level of KTC inhabitants' participation in planning and budgeting, challenges they encounter in their participation, and appropriate initiatives to address the explored challenges for effective citizen participation in the same. However, its application could only be relevant to LGAs with similar characteristics to KTC. As such, council-specific studies are relevant to understand the specific challenges impeding citizen participation in planning and budgeting so that relevant initiatives to effectively embrace participatory planning and budgeting and benefit from the merits thereof can be devised.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, B. (2010). *Gender and Green Governance: The Political Economy of Women's Presence within and beyond Community Forestry*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Agger, A. & Löfgren, K. (2008). Democratic Assessment of Collaborative Planning Processes. *Planning Theory*, 7(2), 145-164.
- Ahenkan, A., Bawole, N. and Domfeh, K. (2013). Improving Citizens' Participation in Local Government Planning and Financial Management in Ghana: A Stakeholder Analysis of the Sefwi Wiawso Municipal Assembly. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 3(2), 191-210
- Asukile, F. and Mbogo, C. (2022). Influence of Budgetary Practices on Budget Performance of Local Government Authorities in Tanzania. *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 10(2), 112-120.
- Babeiya, (2016). Local Government in Tanzania and the Legacy of a Faulty Take-off. *The African Review: A Journal of African Politics, Development and International Affairs*, 43(1), 128-160.
- Bryman, A. (2015). *Social Research Methods (5th ed)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dzinic, J., Svidronova, M. and Markowska-Bzducha, E. (2016). Participatory budgeting: A Comparative Study of Croatia, Poland and Slovakia. *NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 9(1), 31-56.
- Fung, A. (2015). Putting the Public Back into Governance: The Challenges of Citizen Participation and its Future. *Public Administration Review*, 75(4), 513-522
- Hao, C., Nyaranga, M. and Hongo, D. (2022). *Enhancing Public Participation in Governance for Sustainable Development: Evidence from Bungoma County*. Kenya: Sage Open, 1-15
- Kessy, A. (2018). Decentralisation, Local Governance and Path Dependency. *UTAFITI Journal of African Perspectives*, 13(1), 54-76.
- Khambule, (2021). Decentralisation or Deconcentration: The Case of Regional and Local Economic Development in South Africa. *Local Economy*, 36(1), 22-41.
- Laly, E. and Mokaya, S. (2018). Factors Influencing Citizen Participation in Local Government Budgeting Process in Tanzania - Case Study of Arusha Municipal Council. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 7(4), 909-913.
- Malanilo, A. (2014). *An Analysis of the Participation of Citizens in Budgeting Process in Local Government in Tanzania: The Case of Ngara District Council*. M.A. Dissertation, Mzumbe University Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
- Manduna, K., Zinyama, T., and Nhema, A. (2015). Local Government Participatory Budget System in Zimbabwe: The Case of Harare City Council, 1995-2013. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 5(11), 38-60.
- Misafi, H. & Malipula, M. (2015). Women Participation in Decentralised Local Governance: A Case of Pastoral Women in Kondoa, Tanzania. *Uongozi Journal of Management and Development Dynamics*, 26(1), 95-124.
- Mulikuza, J., Buhori, J. and Kowa, P. (2019). Citizen Participation in the Government Budget Process: The Case of Kibaha District Council, Tanzania. *The African Resources Development Journal*, 4(1), 14-31.
- Ngware, S. (2005). *Is the Local Government Reform Programme Impacting Positively on the Lives of Tanzanians*. a Paper Presented to ESRF Policy Dialogue Seminar, 23rd June 2005
- Noto, G. and Noto, L. (2019). Local Strategic Planning and Stakeholder Analysis: Suggesting

- a Dynamic Performance Management Approach. *Public Organisation Review*, 19(3), 293–310.
- Parvin, P. (2018). Democracy Without Participation: A New Politics for a Disengaged Era. *Res Publica*, 24(3) 31–52.
- PMO-RALG. (2007). *Opportunities and Obstacles to Development: A Community Participatory Planning Methodology*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.
- Salum, J. (2018). *Community Participation in Development Projects in Zanzibar: A Case of Tibirinzi Market Construction in Chakechake District*. MSc Development Policy Thesis, Mzumbe, University, Tanzania.
- Schmidt, I. (2018). Towards a Critique of Marxist Political Economy: Views from the Imperialist Centre. *World Review of Political Economy*, 9(3), 364–386.
- Vasileiou, K., Barnett, J., Thorpe, S. and Young, T. (2018). Characterising and Justifying Sample Size Sufficiency in Interview-based Studies: Systematic Analysis of Qualitative Health Research over a 15-Year Period. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18(148), 1–18.
- Wilkinson, C., Briggs, J., Salt, K., Vines, J., and Flynn, E. (2019). In Participatory Budgeting we Trust? Fairness, Tactics and (in)accessibility in Participatory Governance. *Local Government Studies*. 45(6), 1001-1020.
- Williams, E. (2022). Participatory Budgeting—The Ultimate Way to Co-Create Services for Social Innovation?. *Public Money & Management*, 42(5), 304-305.
- Yin, R. (2014). *Case Study Research Design and Methods (5th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.