

**ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS INFLUENCING INCLUSION OF PEOPLE WITH  
DISABILITIES IN COUNTY PLANNING AND BUDGETING: THE CASE OF  
MUHORONI SUB-COUNTY, KISUMU COUNTY**

**BY  
MOHAMED ALI IBRAHIM**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF RESEARCH AND PUBLIC POLICY (MRPP)**

**SCHOOL OF DEVELOPMENT AND STRATEGIC STUDIES**

**MASENO UNIVERSITY**

**© 2023**

**DECLARATION**

**Student**

I declare the ownership of this thesis research as my original work which has not been presented in any other University for examination. I take any responsibility for the errors due to omission and/or commission.

**Mohamed Ali**

Sign..... Date.....

**Supervisors:**

We declare that this thesis research has been submitted with our knowledge as the official supervisors of the student.

**Dr. Barack Calvince Omondi**

School of Development and Strategic Studies  
Maseno University

Sign..... Date.....

**Dr. Jane Lusenaka**

School of Development and Strategic Studies  
Maseno University

Sign..... Date .....

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to, first and foremost thank the Almighty Allah for giving me the strength and motivation I needed to complete this study, without His guidance and blessings, I would not have made it this far. I will forever be grateful for the opportunities He has provided me.

Secondly, I would like to thank my supervisors Dr. Barack Calvince Omondi and Dr. Jane Lusenaka for their guidance, support, and input which have been vital in motivating me to do my best in writing this thesis. I also thank the members of Maseno University Scientific Ethics and Review Committee for their attention to detail, expertise, and professionalism proved to be invaluable in helping me be as ethical as possible during my research.

Thirdly, I would like to thank my colleague classmates, especially our Chairman Mr. Pildas Odidi, Mr. Joseph Mboha Mr. Wilson Obong'o, Mrs. Truphena Okeyo, and Mr. Charles Omondi for the support and advice toward this academic journey.

Fourthly, I would like to thank my family especially my wife and kids for supporting me in my academic endeavors and giving me the freedom to pursue this path. I also wish to thank my financial supporters notably Engineer Mohamed Adow Adan, who offered assistance in this study whenever I faced difficulties.

## **DEDICATION**

My sincere dedication goes to my family who provide support and encouragement.

## ABSTRACT

In the 21st century, disability issues have gained prominence in discussions surrounding inclusive development. These concerns are not only evident in global development frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) but have also been enshrined in national laws and policies worldwide. Despite these significant policy achievements, evidence still indicates that development processes often fail to truly address the needs of people with disabilities (PWDs), remaining inadequately sensitive to their unique requirements especially due to their non-inclusion into the process. In Kenya, the introduction of the devolved system of governance in 2013 aimed to bring policymaking and decision-making closer to PWDs, similar to other segments of the public. While numerous studies have examined public participation in various aspects of county governance processes, a lack of research specifically explores the extent of PWDs' engagement in county-level planning and budgeting processes. This study addresses this gap by focusing on the participation of PWDs in county planning and budgeting, particularly in rural areas – areas that often present challenges such as limited transportation and geographical detachment from town halls, where much public participation occurs, further environmentally discouraging PWDs involvement. The study's selected site, the Muhoroni sub-county, exemplifies these rural characteristics. The specific objectives of this research were as follows: to assess the level of awareness among rural-based PWDs regarding legal and policy documents concerned with planning and budgeting; to explore the structures employed to enhance participation of rural-based PWDs in county development processes; and to analyze the methods used to mobilize rural-based PWDs for participation in planning and budgeting processes. The study employed a mixed-methods research design and drew upon the Social Model Theory of Disability, which differentiates between impairment and disability, attributing the exclusion of PWDs to socially created barriers. The study population included 775 PWDs from the five wards of the Muhoroni sub-county from which a sample size of 30% was chosen and surveyed, as well as 19 key informants representing various levels of PWD organizations and policy-level actors purposively selected, and 5 FGDs with PWDs self-help groups from the five wards. Data collection utilized survey questionnaires, focus group discussions (FGDs), and key informant interviews (KIIs). The qualitative findings were subjected to qualitative thematic content analysis while quantitative data was analyzed descriptively using SPSS v.20. The mixed-methods approach enhanced data triangulation for a comprehensive analysis. Findings showed low awareness of legal provisions. Inclusion structures exist but were perceived ineffective, inhibiting PWDs' participation, and finally, mobilization strategies yielded mixed success. Rural challenges constrained participation, including transportation and communication barriers. In conclusion, PWDs' participation in county planning and budgeting faced multifaceted challenges. Awareness, inclusion structure effectiveness, and mobilization emerged as critical issues. These findings underscored the need for targeted interventions to promote PWDs' inclusion and ensure equitable development. By addressing these findings, countries can foster a more inclusive society that values and integrates the perspectives of all citizens, regardless of ability, and contribute eventually to the global clarion call: “leaving no one behind”.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	iii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	x
GLOSSARY OF TERMS .....	xi
LIST ODF TABLES .....	xii
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background to the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of Problem.....	6
1.3 Research Objectives.....	8
1.3.1 Specific Objectives .....	8
1.4 Study Questions .....	8
1.5 Significance of the Study .....	8
1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study .....	10
1.7 The Theoretical Model: Social Model of Disability .....	11
1.7.1 Utility and Relevance of the Theory .....	12
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 Introduction.....	14
2.2 Awareness of policy and legislations on PWDs Participation.....	14
2.3 Awareness of County Planning and Budget Processes.....	19
2.4 Identification and recruitment strategies of PWDs to participate in County Budgeting and Planning Processes.....	21
<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1 Introduction.....	24
3.2 Research Design.....	24
3.3 Geographical Area .....	25
3.4 Study Population.....	26
3.5 Sampling Size and Sampling Procedure .....	28

3.6 Data Collection Techniques .....	29
3.6.1 Secondary Data .....	30
3.6.2 Primary Data .....	30
3.6.2.1 Semi-Structured Survey Questionnaires .....	30
3.6.2.2 In-Depth Key Informant Interviews.....	30
3.6.2.3 Focus Group Discussions.....	31
3.7 Reliability and Validity.....	31
3.8 Data Analysis and Presentation .....	32
3.9 Ethical Considerations .....	33
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES LEVEL OF AWARENESS OF LEGAL AND POLICY PROVISIONS ON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING AND BUDGETING IN KISUMU COUNTY .....</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	35
4.2 Analysis of Socio-demographic Variables.....	35
4.2.2 Respondents Distribution by Gender .....	37
4.2.3 Respondents Distribution by Disability Type of Disability.....	37
4.2.4 Respondents Distribution by Category .....	38
4.2.5 Respondents Distribution by Employment Status .....	39
4.2.6 Distribution by Level of Education.....	39
4.3 Status of Awareness of Policy and Legal Frameworks Providing for Public Participation of the People with Disability in County Budgeting and Planning .....	40
4.3.1 Awareness of Kisumu Annual Development Plan.....	41
4.3.2 Awareness on County Integrated Development Plan .....	42
4.3.3 Awareness of the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF) .....	42
4.3.4 Awareness of the Kisumu Disability Act.....	44
4.3.5 Awareness of the County Fiscal Strategy Paper .....	46
4.3.6 Awareness of the County Budget Proposal .....	48
4.3.7 Awareness of County Appropriation Act .....	50
4.3.8 Awareness of County Budget Implementation Reports.....	51
4.3.9 Awareness of County Budget Review and Outlook Papers (CBROP).....	52
4.3.10 Awareness of the County Audit Report .....	54

4.4 Chapter Summary and Discussions .....	55
4.4.1 Summary .....	55
4.4.2 Discussions: Trends, Theoretical and Policy Implications .....	55
4.4.2.1 Theoretical Implications .....	57
4.4.2.2 Policy Implications .....	58
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: THE STRUCTURES EMPLOYED TO ENHANCE RURAL-BASED PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES PARTICIPATION IN COUNTY PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESSES IN, KISUMU COUNTY .....</b>	<b>59</b>
5.1 Introduction.....	59
5.2 Inclusion through Kisumu County Village Council Units.....	59
5.3 Inclusion through the County Budget and Economic Forum .....	60
5.4 Inclusion through Grass-roots leadership .....	61
5.5 Inclusion through Formal PWDs Offices Created at the County to promote inclusion into planning and budgeting.....	62
5.6 Inclusion through Monitoring and Evaluation of the implementation of the Budget Process	64
5.7 Promoting Disability Persons Inclusion in planning and budgeting Processes through inclusion of their relevant project .....	65
5.8 Chapter Summary and Discussions .....	65
5.8.1 Summary .....	65
5.8.2 Discussion: Trends and Theoretical and Policy Implications.....	67
<b>CHAPTER SIX: EFFECTIVENESS OF THE METHODS OF MOBILIZATION OF RURAL-BASED PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES INTO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESSES IN KISUMU COUNTY .....</b>	<b>70</b>
6.1 Introduction.....	70
6.2 Political Leadership as Mobilization Strategy .....	70
6.3 Utility of Radio .....	72
6.4 Utility and Effectiveness of WhatsApp .....	73
6.5 Utility and Effectiveness of Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs .....	74
6.6 Utility and Effectiveness of Television-based Communication (TV) as a Means for Mobilizing Persons with Disability .....	75
6.7 Utility and Effectiveness of Non-Governmental Organizations.....	76



6.8 Salient Challenges to Effective Mobilization .....	77
6.9 Chapter Summary and Discussions .....	80
6.9.1 Summary .....	80
6.9.2 Discussions: Trends, Theoretical and Policy Implications .....	81
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>84</b>
7.1 Introduction.....	84
7.2 Summary .....	84
7.3 Conclusion .....	85
7.3.1 Main Conclusion.....	85
7.4 Recommendations.....	86
7.5 Suggestions for Future Studies .....	87
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>92</b>

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

<b>PWDs</b>	:	People with Disability
<b>UN</b>	:	United Nations
<b>MGDs</b>	:	Millennium Development Goals
<b>UNDP</b>	:	United Nations Development Programme
<b>SGS</b>	:	School of Graduate Studies
<b>MUERC</b>	:	Maseno University Ethics Review Committee
<b>FGDs</b>	:	Focus Group Discussions
<b>IDIs</b>	:	In-depth Interviews
<b>SPSS</b>	:	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
<b>CDSK</b>	:	Cheshire Disability Services Kenya
<b>UPDK</b>	:	United Persons with Disability of Kenya
<b>CBEF</b>	:	County Budget and Economic Forum
<b>PFMA</b>	:	Public Finance Management Act
<b>CGA</b>	:	County Governments Act
<b>APDK</b>	:	Association of People with Disabilities of Kenya
<b>AND</b>	:	Action Network for the Disabled
<b>NACOSTI</b>	:	National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation
<b>CIDP</b>	:	County Integrated Development Plan
<b>CADP</b>	:	County Annual Development Plan

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

**People with Disability:** “means a physical, sensory, mental or other impairment, including any visual, hearing, learning or physical incapability, which impacts adversely on social, economic or environmental participation” Government of Kenya (2003, p. 5).

**Rural-based People with Disability:** these are PWDs who are permanent residents in rural settings. Rural settings are characterized by difficulty of access to several essential services, which for this study include participation in county budgeting and planning services. Coupled with the fact that these PWDs have no regular incomes and at the same cannot go about their daily duties as able-bodied, targeting them for such a study will be warranted.

**Participation:** Participation is a right of everyone, provided their lives are or will be affected by the given intervention which a public or provided undertaking aims to implement. In this study, county budgeting and planning processes are such a critical aspect PWDs development, especially those who stay in the village, are only possessing form four education and below, and are not having any regular incomes through formal employments. These features make this category of population more marginalized into public participation processes.

**County Budgeting and planning:** The processes of deciding on the projects to undertake and the process of allocating resources to those selected projects. Both deciding and actual processes of allocating resources requires participation by the different segments of the public, including the disabled persons. Both the PFMA and CGA are very clear about the role of the Counties are duty-bearers to ensure that all necessary steps are taken not only to ensure participation of PWDs but also to ensure that forums such as CBEF are disability-friendly and facilitative not prohibitive of PWDs participation.

## LIST ODF TABLES

Table 3.1: Sampling Framework.....	29
Table 4.1: Questionnaires Return Rate.....	36
Table 4.2: Gender of respondents.....	37
Table 4.3: Respondents Distribution by Disability Type of Disability.....	38
Table 4.4: Respondents Distribution by Category.....	38
Table 4.5: Respondents Distribution by Employment Status.....	39
Table 4.6: Distribution by Level of Education.....	39
Table 4.7: Awareness of Kisumu Annual Development.....	41
Table 4.8: Awareness on County Integrated Development Plan.....	43
Table 4.9: Awareness of the County Budget and Economic Forum.....	44
Table 4.10: Level of Participation in CBEF.....	44
Table 4.11: Awareness on the Kisumu Disability Act.....	45
Table 4.12: Effect of PWD level of education on Awareness on Kisumu County Disability Act.....	46
Table 4.13: Awareness [have heard] of the County Fiscal Strategy Paper.....	47
Table 4.14: Level of Participation in County Fiscal Strategy Paper .....	47
Table 4.15: Awareness of the County Budget Proposal.....	48
Table 4.16: Access to Citizens Versions of the County Budget Proposal.....	49
Table 4.17: Participation of PWDs in the County Budget Proposal.....	49
Table 4.18: Awareness of County Budget Appropriation Act (CBAA).....	50
Table 4.19: Awareness of County Budget Implementation Reports.....	51
Table 4.20: Awareness of County Budget Review and Outlook Papers (CBROP).....	52
Table 4.21: Participation in County Budget Review and Outlook Papers (CBROP).....	54
Table 24: Awareness or and Participation in Audit Report Review Seminars.....	55
Table 5.1: Participation through the Kisumu County Village Council Units.....	60
Table 5.2: Participation through the CBEF.....	61
Table: 5.3: Does Formal Offices for the PWDs enhance their inclusion into County Planning and Budgeting.....	63
Table 5.4: Doe the Formalized Offices of the PWDs serve the PWDs interests.....	64

Table 5.5: Participation of PWDs in monitoring and evaluation of county budgeting and planning processes.....	64
Table 5.6: Does the County Implement your PWDs suggested Projects.....	65
Table 6.1: Effectiveness of Local Political Leadership as Mobilization Strategy.....	71
Table 6.2: Effectiveness of radio as a means of mobilizing rural-based PWD into planning and budgeting for a.....	72
Table 6.3: Effectiveness of WhatsApp as means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting.....	73
Table 6.4: Effectiveness of Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs as a Means for Mobilizing Persons with Disability.....	74
Table 6.5: Effectiveness of TV-based communication as a Means for Mobilizing Persons with Disability.....	76
Table 6.6: Effectiveness of NGOs as means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting.....	76
Table 6.7: Friendliness of Locations and Amenities to PWDs during Public Participation.....	78
Table 6.8: Time allowed for Discussions.....	79
Table 6.9: Level of Technicality of the Language Used.....	79

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background to the Study

Disability inclusion is of paramount importance in global development processes. International agreements and conventions that emphasize the rights and well-being of people with disabilities emphasize that development cannot be attained without inclusion of people with disability (PWD). One such significant global framework is the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). The CRPD, adopted in 2006, has been ratified by a large number of countries worldwide, highlighting the international commitment to upholding the rights of individuals with disabilities. The convention emphasizes the principles of non-discrimination, equal opportunity, and accessibility, promoting the full and effective participation of people with disabilities in all aspects of society, including development processes.

Another global initiative that underscores the significance of disability inclusion is the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The SDGs, adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015, explicitly recognize the importance of leaving no one behind (Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, 2022, p. 6). Goal 10, in particular, focuses on reducing inequalities, including those based on disability, and ensuring the inclusion of all. The integration of disability issues into the SDGs is a testament to the recognition that inclusive development is essential for achieving the broader goals of eradicating poverty, ensuring quality education, and promoting sustainable economic growth. Other global regimes, not directly specific to PWD issues have also encompassed provisions on disability further asserting the important of disability and its relationship with other developmental issues. For example, the Global Compact on Refugees, which addresses the challenges of forced displacement, underscores the importance of considering the unique needs and vulnerabilities of refugees with disabilities. It calls for inclusive policies and programs that take into account the specific requirements of displaced individuals with disabilities.

These global principles of inclusion have influenced regional policies and regimes, including in Africa. For instance, the African Union (AU) adopted the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Africa. This protocol is

aligned with the CRPD and provides a regional framework for safeguarding the rights and dignity of people with disabilities. Most African countries have also made efforts to integrate disability inclusion into national policies, recognizing the need for a more equitable and accessible development process that leaves no one behind. These regional initiatives, inspired by global principles, aim to address the unique challenges faced by individuals with disabilities in Africa and ensure their full participation in the development journey.

Given the global shift towards disability-inclusive development, it is now widely recognized that any efforts to alleviate extreme poverty globally must address the challenges faced by people with disabilities, particularly in developing countries where the issues affecting them are particularly acute. In these regions, over one in six adults is estimated to have a disability (WHO & World Bank, 2011; Mitra & Vick, 2013; UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2018). Unfortunately, individuals with disabilities not only experience lower incomes but also face disparities in health, education, employment, and social inclusion (Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, 2022). Concerningly, it is feared that as developing countries progress economically, the disability inclusion gap may widen further, as the development process inherently lacks inclusivity (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2018). This raises questions about what constitutes an inclusive development process for people with disabilities.

This trend has seen global, regional, and national initiatives emphasizing the significance of disability inclusion to achieve sustainable and inclusive development. The Kenya government like those in other countries has been keen to formulate policies and enact laws that spell out not only disability issues generally, but on their participation within the framework of new system of governance – devolution – developing specific laws and policies providing for the necessity and legality of PWDs participation in the county development process. The focus of this study is to examine how these frameworks translate in practice and whether PWDs participation has been realized or not. The current study investigated the factors influencing the inclusion of people with disabilities in county planning and budgeting processes, with a specific focus on rural-based individuals with limited or no formal education beyond form four and no formal employment. The research centered on Kisumu County, targeting people with disabilities living within Muhoroni Sub-County. The study's scope encompassed three areas where existing research on the participation of people with disabilities in county development processes reveals gaps:

awareness among people with disabilities regarding policy and legal frameworks that mandate their inclusion, their engagement in county budgeting processes, and the effectiveness of methods and techniques used to mobilize and recruit them into these processes.

The importance of public participation, including the involvement of people with disabilities, is enshrined in various laws, policies, and governance documents in Kenya. Legal frameworks and policies such as the County Government Act, of 2012 emphasize the necessity of citizen participation in county planning and budgeting. Section 104 of the County Government Act, 2012, stipulates that public funds should only be expended following planned actions and public participation. The Public Finance Management Act, of 2012, requires counties to formulate a county integrated planning policy to define all county priorities. Additionally, Section 126 of the Public Finance Management Act, 2012, in alignment with Article 220(2) of the Constitution of Kenya (2010), mandates the 47 County Governments to develop an integrated development plan that outlines medium-term strategic priorities and programs to be delivered. Furthermore, Section 102 of the County Government Act, 2012, upholds the principles of county government planning and budgeting, emphasizing the protection and integration of the rights and interests of minority and marginalized groups and communities in these processes.

Devolution must, therefore, play a crucial role in reinforcing public participation by ensuring that vulnerable groups, such as Persons With Disabilities (PWDs), are not left behind. The Constitution of Kenya (2010) inherently supports the right to participation in various aspects of development and planning, as evident in several Articles, including Articles 12, 19, 21, and 27, among others. Article 19(2) grants all Kenyans the freedom to enjoy rights specified in the Bill of Rights, in a manner that promotes social justice and enables every individual to realize their full potential. Article 21(3) obligates all duty-bearers to address the needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups, including youths, women, and PWDs, by providing them with equal opportunities to participate in development processes that directly affect their lives. Article 27(4) explicitly prohibits discrimination on various grounds, including disability, race, and gender. These constitutional provisions aim to ensure the inclusion and equal participation of PWDs, just as with other segments of the population. However, despite these constitutional safeguards and decreasing poverty levels, the disability inclusion gap continues to widen in many developing countries, prompting the need for a scientific study to uncover the underlying reasons for this



discrepancy. The Constitution's provisions that encourage and guide public participation in Kenya are echoed in various case laws and policies that have made it a prerequisite for county planning, budgeting processes, and other development procedures. The County Government Act (CGA) of 2012, under section 106(4), explicitly states that "county planning shall provide for citizen participation" and should involve meaningful engagement of citizens in the process. To ensure this meaningful engagement of citizens, the CGA outlines specific mechanisms, including the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF), County Citizen Engagement Framework (CCEF), County Communication Platform and Strategy (CCPS), and County Civic Education Strategy (CCES) (The Institute for Social Accountability, 2020, p. 9). These instruments underscore the legal requirement for active citizen involvement and participation in county-level planning and budgeting, reinforcing the principles embedded in the Constitution.

Despite the existence of a robust legal and policy framework and various avenues for public participation, including those designed for vulnerable groups like Persons With Disabilities (PWDs), evidence that these frameworks have been translated into practice and that PWDs are included in county budgeting and planning processes remains dearth. At the scholarly level, there remains a conspicuous gap in scholarly research regarding the practical implementation of these provisions within devolved systems of governance. Critical questions persist concerning the levels of awareness among citizens, especially PWDs, regarding the legal and policy underpinnings that validate their participation., in the first place (Erickson, W. A. et al., 2014; Stapleton, et al., 2006; Gröschl, 2007; Bickenbach, et al., 2012; Peters, 2007; Dirth, T. P., & Branscombe, N. R. 2017; Groce, N., et al., 2011). Additionally, there is a lack of empirical knowledge about the nature/types of structures employed to enhance disability inclusion into county budgeting and planning PWDs facilitate their inclusion in county planning and development. Moreover, it remains unclear whether the structures and techniques used to recruit PWDs into such processes are effective or otherwise in promoting PWDs inclusion in budgeting and planning processes at the county level.

The bulk of existing studies have predominantly concentrated on general public participation in county planning and budgeting processes (e.g., Opondo, 2017; Wacera, 2016; Trocaire Kenya, 2019; Hasan, 2019). These studies have shed light on the common challenges and some noteworthy best practices that can be gleaned from certain counties regarding public engagement

in development activities. However, these studies have largely omitted exploration of PWDs' awareness of pertinent policies and laws on public participation, the attempts made by counties to enhance such participation, and the effectiveness of such attempts. This study, in particular, seeks to address these gaps by delving into the experiences of rural-based PWDs, who are often the most adversely affected by exclusion from county planning and budgeting.

A noteworthy study by Trocaire Kenya (2019) assessed public participation levels in the formulation and execution of CIDPs and ADPs in five counties: Turkana, TharakaNithi, Kitui, Nakuru, and Nairobi. This research unveiled that awareness of the existence of CIDPs and ADPs, along with the mechanisms to promote public participation outlined in CGA Section 87, is generally low across all five counties. Furthermore, there were insufficient levels of involvement in the formulation of CIDPs in these counties. In light of the lack of such an evaluation in Kisumu County, specifically in the realm of PWDs' participation in budgeting and planning processes, there is a pressing need for a scientific inquiry. This study scrutinized the factors that determine PWDs' participation in these underexplored areas, which have thus far been neglected by existing research.

Opondo (2017) conducted a study examining the effectiveness of the legal framework for community participation in the Nairobi City County Government. His research revealed that a mere 37% of the population was aware of the existence of the Nairobi County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF), and only 36% of those who were aware had actively participated in the budgetary process. This highlights the need for systematic investigations into public awareness concerning budget and planning processes and the tools employed, such as CBEFs, CIDPs, and ADPs, as factors that influence public participation in county planning and budgeting. This study aims to address this knowledge gap within Kisumu County, with a specific focus on the category of Persons With Disabilities (PWDs).

Wacera (2016) delved into the effects of citizen participation in budget implementation in Nyandarua County and discovered a lack of systematic engagement of the public in the budget implementation process. While the reasons for this lack of systematic involvement are not entirely clear, the study did reveal that the public, in general, had limited awareness of the relevant laws, policies governing public participation, and the intricacies of budget and planning

processes. The present study, concentrating on PWDs as a marginalized segment of the public, was systematically investigate the factors that influence their meaningful participation in county budgeting and planning processes, aiming to provide recommendations tailored to policymakers. This focus on PWDs, particularly those residing in rural areas and without formal employment, is grounded in the assumption that this category is potentially more vulnerable than others, as they often reside far from urban centers where most public participation meetings occur (Opondo, 2017). Additionally, Hasan (2019) has identified their lack of formal employment and limited education or semi-education as hindering factors to their participation, as recruitment into public participation platforms typically targets the educated, and their non-employment restricts their mobility to city centers, where most public meetings transpire.

Kisumu County possesses a range of legal instruments, in addition to the structures and policies particularly to planning and budgeting according to the law. These include the Disability Bill (2014), Public Participation Act (2015), and the Village Council Act, which established the Village Council Units with the aim of facilitating more inclusive and meaningful participation. These frameworks extend to marginalized groups, including PWDs and vulnerable women, and align with national values and principles governing public participation, such as the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA), County Government Act (CGA), and the Constitution of Kenya (2010), among others. To contextualize these policies and laws and gauge their practical impact, it was essential to conduct this study, exploring how these instruments and tools either positively or negatively affect PWDs' participation and why. The findings of this study is aimed at contributing to enhancing efforts to engage PWDs and further the goals of devolution in Kisumu County.

## **1.2 Statement of Problem**

In the realm of devolved governance and public participation in Kenya, a critical issue persists regarding the effective inclusion of Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) in county planning and budgeting processes. While the legal and policy environment emphasizes the importance of inclusive participation, the practical implementation and the impact on marginalized groups, especially PWDs, remain inadequately explored. Furthermore, there is a significant lack of understanding about the extent of public awareness concerning budget and planning processes, including the tools and mechanisms designed for participation, and how this awareness

influences meaningful involvement in county planning and budgeting. Extant research is also inadequate in light of what types of structures are used to enhance PWD participation, as well as the effectiveness of such mechanisms. These issues are particularly pronounced in rural and resource-constrained areas such as Muhoroni Sub-County, which provides a unique opportunity to understand the dynamics of PWDs' inclusion in geographically and resource-wise secluded regions, especially in the SDG's call for "leaving no one behind".

Despite constitutional provisions and regional policies, the experiences and challenges faced by PWDs, especially those residing in rural areas like Muhoroni Sub-County, have received limited scholarly attention. The absence of systematic research on these issues, combined with disparities in awareness levels of legal and policy frameworks related to public participation, raises questions about the efficacy of existing mechanisms in ensuring the inclusion of PWDs in the decision-making processes at the county level. Moreover, the challenges faced by PWDs, who are often marginalized and excluded, in participating in county planning and budgeting processes within the context of Muhoroni Sub-County remain largely unexplored. This knowledge gap calls for a comprehensive study that examines the determinants of meaningful participation of PWDs in county planning and budgeting. This study attempted to bridge this gap by undertaking a mixed-methods research in Kisumu County, focusing specifically on Muhoroni Sub-County, a predominantly rural-based region that presents a unique setting to comprehend the intricacies of inclusion dynamics for PWDs in geographically and resource-isolated areas.

This research delved into the complexities of PWDs' participation in Muhoroni Sub-County, exploring factors such as their limited awareness of legal and policy frameworks, the challenges associated with recruitment and mobilization, and the contextual barriers posed by residing in rural areas without formal employment or extensive education. By addressing this research problem, the study endeavors to offer insights and recommendations aimed at informing more inclusive and effective public participation, particularly for PWDs, in Kisumu County, with a specific focus on Muhoroni Sub-County, ultimately contributing to the enhancement of the devolution process in Kenya and the promotion of equitable development in resource-constrained regions.

### **1.3 Research Objectives**

The main objective of this study was to explore the factors that account for the inclusion of rural-based PWDs in Kisumu County planning and budgeting processes.

#### **1.3.1 Specific Objectives**

- i) To determine the level of People With Disabilities awareness of legal and policy provisions on public participation in planning and budgeting in Muhoroni sub-county, Kisumu County;
- ii) To examine the structures of enhancing rural-based People With Disabilities participation in county planning and budgeting processes in Muhoroni sub-county, Kisumu County;
- iii) To assess the effectiveness of the methods of mobilization of rural-based People with Disabilities into public participation in planning and budgeting processes in Muhoroni sub-county, Kisumu County.

### **1.4 Study Questions**

- i) (a) What is the level of awareness of rural-based PWDs of the legal and policy provisions providing for their participation in county planning and budgeting processes in Muhoroni sub-county, Kisumu County?
- ii) What structures have been implemented by in Kisumu County to enhance inclusion of People with Disabilities in the county planning and budgeting processes Muhoroni sub-county, Kisumu County?
- iii) What avenues are used for mobilizing rural-based People With Disabilities in into county planning and budgeting processes in Muhoroni sub-county, Kisumu County?

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

The study's findings and insights are of substantial significance in terms of policy and practice. By investigating the determinants of meaningful participation of Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) in county planning and budgeting processes, especially in the context of Muhoroni Sub-County within Kisumu County, the study can contribute to the development of more effective and inclusive policies and practices. This research can provide a nuanced understanding of the challenges and barriers faced by PWDs in participating in devolved governance and public

planning, which, in turn, can inform the adaptation and improvement of existing legal and policy frameworks. The findings may lead to the formulation of specific strategies to enhance PWDs' involvement, creating more equitable and accessible pathways for participation.

The study holds normative significance by shedding light on the gap between the normative expectations embedded in legal and policy frameworks and the realities of public participation, particularly for marginalized groups like PWDs. The research aims to reveal whether the principles enshrined in the Constitution of Kenya (2010) and related legal instruments are effectively translating into meaningful participation for PWDs. This normative analysis has the potential to challenge or reinforce the prevailing norms regarding inclusivity, shedding light on the extent to which these norms are actualized in practice and whether they align with principles of justice and equity.

In the field of public policy analysis, this study makes a significant contribution by providing empirical evidence on the implementation and impact of public participation policies, especially within devolved governance structures. It will offer policymakers, scholars, and practitioners a comprehensive understanding of the determinants and challenges associated with PWDs' participation, particularly in rural and resource-constrained areas. This empirical evidence will inform evidence-based policy recommendations, which can guide public policy and development practitioners in designing more inclusive and effective public participation processes.

The study's philosophical contributions are rooted in its pursuit potential contributions to discourses in justice, inclusivity, and equality. It aligns with the broader philosophical ideals of democratic governance and social justice, underpinned by the belief that all citizens, regardless of their abilities, should have an equal and meaningful role in shaping the policies that affect their lives. The research contributes implicitly to the philosophical aspects of how societal norms and values regarding inclusivity are actualized and the extent to which they align with the principles of fairness and human rights.

This study's significance encompasses both practical implications for policy and practice and broader contributions to normative ideals, the field of public policy analysis, and philosophical discourse on justice and inclusivity in governance. The knowledge generated by this research has

the potential to drive positive change in the landscape of public participation, particularly for marginalized groups, and to enrich the discourse on justice and equity in democratic societies.

### **1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study**

This study explored the factors that determine the levels of participation of rural-based PWDs in county planning and budgeting in Kisumu County. The study was constrained to a mixed-method approach of collection and analysis of secondary and primary qualitative and quantitative data pertaining policies, and laws on public participation; pertaining to county planning and budgeting processes; and lastly pertaining to methods of recruitment of PWDs into county planning and budgeting processes. The study was limited to selected PWD groups from the rural areas of Muhoroni Sub-County, Kisumu County. Focus particularly was on those who are not formally employed and whose education levels are form four and below; making them the most marginalized within the PWDs category of Kisumu County citizenry.

Kisumu County hosts about 1 155 574 people according to latest national housing and population census. 4% (or about 46, 223) are people with disabilities. This places the county at number 5 in disability prevalence coming after four counties ranking top nationally as follows: Embu County (4.4% or 29, 946 out of a total population of 608, 599); Homa Bay County (4.3% or 48, 674); Makeni County (4.1% or 40, 494) and finally Siaya County (4.1% or about 40, 721) (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics [KNBS], 2019). Therefore, nationally, qualitatively (in terms of real numbers not percentages) Kisumu County ranks second only after Homa Bay County. Therefore, in terms of county governance disability people become a key population in these two Western Kenya Counties. Moreover, unlike Homa Bay County which lags in terms of policy and legislative frameworks to increase the inclusion of these marginalized people, the people with disabilities, Kisumu County has gone a step further to institute frameworks to bring participation closer to the constituents, including PWDs. Kisumu County has in place village council units (VSUs), Disability Bill (2014), and has had two county integrated development plans (CIDPs) and yearly annual development plans (ADPs) from 2014 to-date. The CIDP and ADP are the key structures under which public participation on planning and budgeting takes place. The VSU is an additional structure in Kisumu County intended to improve the decentralization of decision-making by allowing participation of people at the lowest levels of devolved governance –

villages. This sets out Kisumu County as a special county to examine the dynamics of the inclusion of PWDs into county development processes.

The study findings were limited to the perspectives of rural-based PWDs in Muhoroni sub-County most of whom are formally unemployed and semi-literate PWDs. The findings may not reflect the perspectives of other categories of PWDs. However, either way, the study aims to make a very important contribution to the literature of participation, particularly on PWDs inclusion literature by enriching that genre of literature with an often overlooked dimension- that of rural-based PWDs. The study experienced some mobilization challenges since PWDs experience challenges meeting at one point for discussions, especially the physically challenged. The research attempted to remedy this anticipated challenge by undertaking a house-by-house-household survey through the help of a grassroots disability persons' organizations (DPOs) in Muhoroni who helped in the identification of the rural areas and villages. This also increased participation of the target population.

### **1.7 The Theoretical Model: Social Model of Disability**

The theoretical framework employed in this study draws upon the social model of disability, as articulated by Professors Dimitris Anastasiou of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, USA, and James M. Kauffman of the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, USA. This theoretical perspective diverges from traditional models of understanding and addressing the challenges faced by Persons With Disabilities (PWDs), such as the charity model, individual tragedy theory, and the biological and medical models. The social model of disability, as expounded by Anastasiou and Kauffman (2013), is grounded in the fundamental dichotomy it establishes between impairment and disability.

According to Anastasiou and Kauffman (2013), the central concept within the social model of disability is that "disability is wholly and exclusively social." They contend that a social theory of disability is best explored through the lens of the concept of oppression. This model's foundational principles trace back to a statement by the Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS) in 1976, which asserted that society, rather than the individual's impairment, imposes disability. This understanding posits that disability results from the unnecessary isolation and exclusion of individuals with impairments from full participation in



society, rendering disabled people an oppressed group. In this model, "impairment" refers to physical dysfunction, while "disability" pertains to the social structures that limit opportunities for equal participation in the community due to physical and social barriers (Anastasiou& Kauffman, 2013).

This social model of disability encompasses several core tenets, as outlined by Anastasiou and Kauffman (2013). These principles include a sharp distinction between impairment and disability, emphasizing that impairment denotes bodily dysfunction, while disability relates to the social organization that creates barriers. Additionally, the model posits that disability is not a result of bodily pathology but is rooted in specific social and economic structures responsible for the exclusion of disabled individuals from full participation in mainstream social activities. This exclusion leads to the acknowledgment of disabled people as an oppressed social group, a condition attributed to capitalist modes of production and the historical development of categories for disabled individuals. Furthermore, the social model of disability rejects the concept of disability as a matter of personal tragedy, advocating for the transformation of society rather than the fixing of individuals.

In the context of the present study, the social model of disability provides a critical theoretical foundation for understanding the experiences and challenges faced by PWDs in Muhoroni Sub-County, Kisumu County, Kenya, particularly in the context of public participation in county planning and budgeting processes. This theoretical framework allows for an exploration of the dynamics between impairment and disability, the societal structures that impact PWDs' participation, and the potential for social change to facilitate more inclusive governance and development processes. By adopting the social model of disability, this study aligns with a broader discourse on equity, justice, and inclusive governance in the context of PWDs' participation in devolved governance structures.

### **1.7.1 Utility and Relevance of the Theory**

This theory was the most relevant to explore the research problem under investigation. This is first and foremost because it goes beyond the limited understanding of PWDs challenges and the need to remedy them. Secondly, the current study is undertaken in a social context hence other disability theories [individual tragedy theory, biological and medical theories, charity theories,

functionalism theory and so on) may not suffice. These two rationales for selecting the theory can best be illustrated through the limitations of other major theories used in disability studies and policy as well as other interventions. The medical or biological model looks at disability as a disease and lays emphasis on the treatment aspects. The model thus cannot explain reasons for exclusion of PWDs in social processes such as planning and budgeting at the county level. The charity model emphasizes the weaknesses of PWDs and advises stakeholders to help PWDs. This approach leaves out the critical need to uproot structural factors hindering PWDs participate and influence development processes. The individual tragedy theory on the other hand sees disability as a personal problem and advises on the ways to avoid the same. This is key, like other two models explained but fails to undertake a social understanding of the development environment and reform it to be PWDs-responsive.

These limitations therefore made the researcher select the social model theory as the most suitable to contextual the study and investigate the dynamics of PWDs participation in the planning and budgeting of Kisumu County Government. If PWDs are oppressed and excluded as supports the social model, PWDs living in geographically isolated regions such as the rural areas, are likely more oppressed. For this assumption, this study narrowed in on Muhoroni sub-county, which is largely rural considering the region's lack of access to social amenities such as good roads, piped water, and stable electricity and so on.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

In this chapter, the researcher presents extant literature unto which this study is grounded. This was done by identifying gaps in the literature along the study objectives. The first part was to review the literature on objective one which is Awareness of PWDs of the policy and legislation providing for their participation. On this objective, the researcher elaborated on the policy and legal provisions on disability participation before embarking on empirical findings of past studies on the levels of awareness of such instruments among PWDs. The next section was on review of literature on PWDs' awareness of county budgeting and planning tools and processes. The final section of this chapter reviewed literature on the methods and techniques used to recruit PWDs into participating in county budgeting and planning processes/activities, and structures used to enhance their inclusion, as well those strategies employed to mobilize them into such processes.

#### **2.2 Awareness of policy and legislations on PWDs Participation**

Awareness of policy and legislation regarding the participation of Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) is a fundamental aspect of Kenya's public governance, particularly within the context of devolved governance structures. The Constitution of Kenya (CoK, 2010) upholds the principles of public participation as a central component of the nation's values and governance (Ministry of Devolution and Planning & Council of Governors, 2016). These principles are deeply ingrained in Article 10 of the CoK, 2010, emphasizing the engagement of the public in various phases of policy formulation, monitoring, and implementation.

Article 174(c) of the CoK, 2010 underscores one of the primary objectives of devolution, which is to empower people and enhance their participation in decision-making processes that affect them. It assigns the responsibility for ensuring and facilitating public engagement, as well as building the capacity of the public for participation, to county governments, as outlined in Function 14 of Schedule 4 Part 2. This mandates county governments to create mechanisms for engagement, involving both state and non-state actors, and to provide the resources and tools necessary to ensure effective public participation in governance processes.

Of particular importance within the CoK, 2010, is Article 27(4), which explicitly prohibits any form of discrimination on various grounds, including disability. This constitutional provision reinforces the notion that the state must not discriminate directly or indirectly against any individual due to disability, among other factors. Furthermore, Article 54(1a-e) and (2) of the CoK, 2010 outlines the entitlements of persons with disabilities, which include reasonable access to public places, transportation, and information. These provisions emphasize the need for mechanisms such as sign language, Braille, and other appropriate means of communication to ensure that PWDs have equitable access to resources and opportunities.

These constitutional imperatives underscore the importance of citizen participation in the planning process. The County Government Act (CGA), 2012, in Section 106(4), explicitly states that county planning must incorporate citizen participation as a fundamental requirement. Furthermore, the CGA specifies that this process should involve meaningful engagement of citizens (CGA, 105(1-d)). To facilitate this engagement, the CGA establishes several key mechanisms. The County Budget and Economic Forum (CB&EF), as mandated by the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA), 2012 (Section 137), comprises a diverse group of stakeholders, including Non-State Actors (NSA) such as professionals, business representatives, labor unions, women's groups, PWDs, the elderly, and faith-based organizations at the county level. The CB&EF's primary function is to facilitate county budget consultations, ensuring that a wide range of perspectives are considered in the budgeting and economic management processes.

County Citizen Engagement Framework, as outlined in CGA Part VIII, county governments are required to establish structures that promote citizen participation. These structures are guided by principles enshrined in CGA Section 87 and aim to enhance citizen involvement in various governance processes. County Communication Platform and Strategy, detailed in CGA Part IX, county governments are obliged to integrate communication into their development activities. This includes ensuring access to information, in line with Article 35 of the CoK, 2010. County governments are expected to establish effective communication and sensitization frameworks using diverse media forms, targeting a broad spectrum of stakeholders within the county.

County Civic Education Strategy, mandated by CGA Part X, county governments are required to develop an effective civic education framework. This framework is designed to empower and enlighten citizens continually and promote the principles of devolution as outlined in the constitution. Additionally, county assemblies are empowered to develop laws and regulations that facilitate effective citizen participation in development planning and performance management within the county. These regulations are required to adhere to national standards (CGA 115(2)).

In the specific context of the study, which focuses on PWDs' participation in Muhoroni Sub-County, Kisumu County, it is crucial to recognize that these legal and policy frameworks set the stage for inclusive and equitable public participation, ensuring that marginalized groups, especially those with disabilities, are not left behind. The study explores the extent to which awareness and implementation of these frameworks have impacted the inclusion of PWDs, particularly those residing in rural areas, in the county's planning and budgeting processes. The findings aim to shed light on the practical implications of these constitutional and legal provisions within a specific geographical context, to enhance the inclusion and meaningful engagement of PWDs in county governance.

The County Government Act of 2012 places significant emphasis on the responsibility of county governments to meticulously plan for their respective counties. A pivotal requirement, as outlined in Section 104, mandates that no public funds shall be allocated or appropriated outside the ambit of a comprehensive planning framework meticulously developed by the County Executive Committee (CEC) and subsequently ratified by the County Assembly. This legal framework underscores the essential role of structured planning in the effective utilization of public funds within the county.

Furthermore, Section 126 of the Public Finance Management Act of 2012, in alignment with Article 220(2) of the Constitution of Kenya (CoK) 2010, sets forth the obligation of the 47 County Governments to establish an integrated development plan. This plan is mandated to encompass the strategic priorities for the medium term, reflecting the county government's overarching objectives and strategies. It encompasses a comprehensive description of how the county government intends to respond to fluctuations in the financial and economic environment.

Additionally, this plan outlines the specific programs to be delivered, providing detailed information for each program. These statutory requirements underscore the meticulous planning processes integral to county governance.

The County Government Act of 2012, Section 87, articulates the fundamental principles that should guide public participation in various county development processes, particularly in the realms of budgeting and planning. These principles include ensuring timely access to relevant information, documents, and data crucial for policy formulation, implementation, and oversight. Furthermore, public participation involves the provision of officially approved and unambiguous documents for public discussion. It also encompasses granting reasonable access to the processes involved in formulating and implementing policies, laws, and regulations, including the approval of development proposals, projects, and budgets. Safeguarding the interests and rights of marginalized groups, minorities, and communities is another key facet of these principles. These principles promote multiple opportunities for public participation, with an emphasis on the legal standing of interested parties and communities to appeal decisions or address grievances. The principles emphasize a balanced partnership between county governance and non-state actors, highlighting the significance of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) and recognizing the reciprocal roles of non-state actors' participation and governmental facilitation and oversight.

In addition to these legislative and policy frameworks, Kenya made eight distinct commitments in 2018 under the Global Disability Summit Commitments. These commitments encompass various areas such as inclusive education, economic empowerment, ending stigma and discrimination, data collection on disabilities, and the utilization of technology and innovation to drive disability policies and programs. A pivotal cross-cutting concern in fulfilling these global commitments lies in the active and inclusive participation of Persons With Disabilities (PWDs) in all spheres of development, encompassing political, economic, and beyond (Government of Kenya, 2022). However, despite the clear provisions within these legal and policy frameworks regarding public participation, including PWDs, there remains a lingering question about the awareness of these provisions among the public, particularly among rural-based PWDs. It is essential to ascertain whether this demographic is cognizant of the legal and policy mandates that dictate their participation in county budgeting and planning processes. Their awareness of these provisions is not only a matter of good practice but is also intricately tied to the law and formal

public policy, emphasizing the need for comprehensive understanding and active engagement within the realm of county governance. Despite these frameworks being in place, a notable gap in the realm of scientific research lies in the limited exploration of PWDs' awareness of policy and legal provisions and instruments as a determining factor for their informed and effective participation in county budget and planning processes. As an illustration, the Trocaire Kenya (2019), which sought to investigate the levels of public participation in County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) and Annual Development Plans (ADPs), revealed that a significant hindrance to successful public participation was the lack of awareness among the participants regarding the policies and laws that delineate the responsibilities of the County Government and other stakeholders in development. Furthermore, the study highlighted the participants' limited understanding of their rights as citizens. While this finding is an important indicator, there remains a scarcity of systematic studies that have specifically examined the levels of awareness among PWDs, a vulnerable demographic within the public. This study aims to bridge this gap by delving into the levels of awareness among rural-based PWDs regarding the legislative and policy frameworks discussed earlier. It operates under the premise that this awareness significantly influences their participation in budgeting and planning processes within Kisumu County.

In a study conducted by Wacera in 2016, the research found that public participation in county development processes did not effectively increase the representation of vulnerable populations, such as women and PWDs, in the decision-making cycles of the County. This was attributed to the respondents' perception that the invitation of women and PWDs was not carried out representatively and as a matter of legal obligation. Instead, it was perceived as a formality exercise to merely endorse the viewpoints of the County elites. The current study seeks to delve deeper into this issue by exploring the specific laws and policies that the selected PWDs are aware of. It also aims to assess the extent to which the county government of Kisumu has adhered to these laws and policies in its efforts to promote the inclusion of PWDs in the budgeting and planning processes of the county. A study conducted by Hasan (2019) identified four factors that significantly impact the overall participation of PWDs: the accessibility of infrastructure, technology usage, educational levels, and resource availability. About infrastructure, the research revealed that disability-friendly facilities are predominantly available

in urban or town settings, limiting access for those who reside in rural areas or lack the resources to reach such locations. The study also highlighted technology as a key consideration, which aligns with our third objective concerning recruitment into public participation. In cases where the use of phones or televisions is inaccessible to rural dwellers, their ability to participate is compromised. Additionally, the level of education plays a pivotal role in influencing participation, as individuals with post-secondary education are more likely to possess an understanding and awareness of the participation processes. Hasan's study offers valuable insights, yet it also presents gaps that the current study aims to address. While it identifies general hindrances to PWDs' participation, it does not systematically explore the cause-and-effect relationship between PWDs' awareness of their rights to participate and their meaningful involvement in county budgeting and planning processes. Moreover, Hasan's study relied on the perspectives of able-bodied individuals speaking on behalf of PWDs, rather than directly capturing the experiences and insights of PWDs themselves. This study seeks to investigate awareness levels among PWDs by directly engaging rural-based PWDs in Kisumu County, as well as other PWDs in the region and related policymakers. This approach was designed to provide a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of PWDs' experiences, aligning with the objectives outlined in the study.

### **2.3 Awareness of County Planning and Budget Processes**

In the context of Kenyan county governments, the process of budgeting and planning is inextricably linked and is fundamental to the effective implementation of development projects. At the heart of this system is the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), a five-year term planning tool that serves as the strategic blueprint encompassing all planned projects across various sectors and departments. Public participation in the formulation of CIDPs is pivotal, as it ensures the collective input of the community, thereby reflecting their needs and priorities. Additionally, the County Annual Development Plan further refines the CIDP, breaking down its implementation on an annual basis, albeit with necessary adjustments based on prevailing financial circumstances. Kisumu County, for instance, has implemented two CIDPs for the periods 2013-2017 and 2018-2022, both of which constitute the foundation for this study.

The 2018-2022 CIDP, specifically, underscores the imperative role of citizens in county budgeting and planning, emphasizing their involvement in activities such as the design,



implementation, and use of findings generated through monitoring and evaluation (M&E) initiatives within the County. Correspondingly, the County has devised Annual Development Plans (ADPs) spanning fiscal years from 2013/14 to 2021/22. These documents provide the context for the current study's more in-depth analysis concerning rural-based PWDs' participation over the last five fiscal years. Despite the centrality of these planning and budgeting tools in county governance, there remains a dearth of academic literature exploring the extent of PWDs' participation, particularly those living in rural areas and lacking formal employment. The present study aims to contribute significantly to the literature in this domain, shedding light on PWDs' involvement in county planning and budgeting processes using these crucial tools, as mandated by the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) and the County Government Act (CGA).

However, for members of the public, especially those considered vulnerable, to participate effectively and meaningfully, they must possess awareness of the various platforms and mechanisms established to facilitate their involvement, including entities such as the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF), as outlined in the PFMA and CGA. Paradoxically, there has been minimal scientific inquiry into the role of public awareness as a potential hindrance to meaningful participation, particularly among naturally vulnerable demographics, such as PWDs.

A study by Trocaire Kenya in 2019 serves as a reference point in this regard. This mixed methods study investigated public participation levels in the formulation and implementation of CIDPs and ADPs across five Kenyan counties. The findings were telling; despite the County Budget and Economic Forum being a central platform for public participation, awareness of the existence of CIDPs and ADPs remained low across the counties studied, with limited participation in their formulation. Furthermore, the public exhibited a lack of understanding regarding the content and significance of CIDPs and ADPs, highlighting a considerable gap in awareness and knowledge. The study also revealed that none of the sampled participants had even heard of CBEFs, underscoring the substantial awareness deficit.

Equally illuminating was the research conducted by Opondo (2017), which focused on public awareness of the Nairobi County Budget and Economic Forum. The study found that merely 37% of respondents were aware of the forum, and only 36% of those who were aware had

participated in the budget process. These findings underscore the idea that lack of awareness can indeed pose a significant obstacle to effective public participation in budgeting and planning processes. Building on these insights, Wacera(2016), which investigated citizen participation in Nyandarua County's budget implementation, presented a rather negative perspective from the public. It was evident that public participation in budget-making was perceived as falling short in its objective of enhancing inclusion and service delivery, particularly for women and PWDs. A substantial proportion of respondents disagreed that through participation in budget processes, women and PWDs could gain a strong voice to advocate for projects aligned with their needs. Similarly, public participation in budget implementation was not widely perceived as a viable mechanism for monitoring the impacts of projects and programs. Notably, the study unveiled a deficiency in the explanatory efforts related to County Budget and Economic Forums, as participants found these concepts to be inadequately clarified.

To address these crucial gaps in understanding and promote meaningful public participation in budgeting and planning activities, it is essential to comprehensively explore the awareness levels of PWDs, particularly those based in rural areas. This study targeted these PWDs to grasp their awareness of county budgeting and planning processes, including but not limited to the significance of CIDPs, ADPs, and CBEFs, which are indispensable for their meaningful engagement in county budgeting and planning, and thus the broader development process.

#### **2.4 Identification and recruitment strategies of PWDs to participate in County Budgeting and Planning Processes**

Apart from the awareness of PWDs regarding policies and legal frameworks that endorse their participation, the methods and strategies employed to recruit them into budgeting and planning processes can significantly impact the extent of their meaningful involvement. The third objective of this study is to delve into PWDs' perspectives on the recruitment strategies employed by Kisumu County in integrating them into the budgeting and planning procedures.

Within the domain of disability research, there is a limited focus on systematically examining the repercussions of methods and techniques used to recruit the public into public participation activities on overall participation and its effectiveness. Existing studies have uncovered several challenges related to recruitment mechanisms and their impact on the participation of PWDs. For

instance, Wacera's (2016) research highlights the reliance on traditional media as the primary platform for disseminating information about county public participation days. Nevertheless, according to Hasan (2018), these conventional communication channels are often ineffective since PWDs may not always be aware of the precise timing of such events, and radios or televisions may not consistently broadcast these announcements.

Trocaire's (2018) study further reveals that public participation in county budgeting and planning processes faces challenges related to clannism. In this context, only those individuals who maintain close relationships with PWD leaders or politicians are invited to participate, effectively excluding a vast majority without such connections. Other hurdles to public participation identified by Trocaire encompass the provision of unclear and non-targeted messages to the public, political interference and manipulation of the process, and the absence of a public dialogue approach that would explain technical budget and planning terminologies to the public, thereby ensuring their meaningful participation.

The present study aims to scrutinize the various strategies through which rural-based PWDs are recruited into Kisumu County's budgeting and planning processes. By doing so, it contributes valuable data to the existing literature, providing specific recommendations for enhancing the inclusion of PWDs in the development of Kisumu County.

For meaningful participation of PWDs, more comprehensive measures are requisite. PWDs necessitate a specialized means of communication and an adapted language to voice their opinions in public discourses. Furthermore, their unique requirements dictate that public meeting settings be tailored to preserve their dignity while partaking in these processes. This entails accommodating specialized needs such as accessible washrooms, ramps, documents written in Braille, and various other accommodations. Notably, within the disability and public participation literature, there exists a tendency to categorize PWDs as a homogenous group, thereby overlooking the nuances that differentiate them. This study aims to rectify this by distinguishing between rural and urban PWDs and exploring the distinct experiences of rural-based PWDs in the budgeting and planning processes of Kisumu County.

Kisumu County established a Village Council Unit (VCU) Act in 2015, designed to provide a structural foundation for participation at the ward level by establishing Village Savings and Credit Cooperative (VSU) units across the county. However, it remains unclear whether this platform has effectively facilitated the participation of PWDs at the village level. The core question this study seeks to answer is whether these structures have, in practice, enabled or enhanced the participation of rural-based PWDs in Kisumu County's budgeting and planning processes. This investigation promises to generate new insights and ignite fresh discussions regarding the indispensability of participatory platforms in enhancing the involvement of vulnerable citizens within the county, particularly PWDs.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents a detailed overview of the research methodology employed in this study to address the research questions. It encompasses various aspects, including the research design, study area, study population, sampling procedures and design, data collection techniques, considerations of reliability and validity, data analysis and presentation, and ethical considerations. This comprehensive methodology underpins the entire research endeavor, ensuring the rigor and effectiveness of the study.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

In this section, the study elucidates the research design utilized for the study. It discusses the chosen design and its rationale, emphasizing how it supports the investigation into the awareness and participation of rural-based PWDs in Kisumu County's budgeting and planning processes.

This study adopted a mixed-method design, drawing inspiration from Anyiro's concept that this approach involves the utilization of both primary and secondary data sources, a combination of primary and secondary data collection methods, and the incorporation of primary and secondary data analysis techniques Anyiro (2021). He further explains that the integration of both qualitative and quantitative data and the utilization of primary and secondary data analysis methods offer the researcher the valuable advantage of triangulation and a comprehensive exploration of the underlying causal factors in the research problem. Moreover, Creswell (2008) highlights that mixed-method design serves the purpose of filling gaps in a particular method, which is typically unattainable when exclusively, employing a single type of data or method.

In alignment with this approach, the study leverages a mixed-method design to facilitate triangulation and conduct an in-depth examination of the dynamics of PWDs inclusion into county budgeting and planning processes. This research harnesses both quantitative and qualitative data, allowing for the triangulation of findings and the provision of a more comprehensive understanding of the research problem. By collecting quantitative data through survey questionnaire from PWDs at the individual levels, and by gathering qualitative information from PWDs as a group (FGDs), and key informant interviews with PWD

organizations and concerned policymakers, the study was able to establish the nuances around the subject of inclusion of rural-based PWDs into county planning and budgeting processes.

### **3.3 Geographical Area**

This study was conducted in Muhoroni Sub-County, a part of the broader Kisumu County. Muhoroni was selected by way of random sampling, the sub county is predominantly rural region, bears the significant capacity to shed light on the experiences of Persons With Disabilities (PWDs) in remote, resource-limited settings. These unique attributes of the study area provided valuable insights into the dynamics of PWDs' inclusion in regions that often get overshadowed in the development landscape.

Kisumu County, of which Muhoroni is a part, has an interesting story to tell when it comes to disability prevalence. In the latest national population and housing census conducted by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) in 2019, Kisumu County was ranked 5th in terms of disability prevalence in Kenya. The ranking is based on the percentage of the population with disabilities. Kisumu County's prevalence rate stood at 4%, which translates to approximately 46,223 individuals with disabilities out of the total population of about 1,155,574 (NBS, 2019). In simple terms, this places Kisumu County as the 5th highest in terms of disability prevalence nationally. In real numbers, not percentages, it stands second only to Homa Bay County. Therefore, in the context of county governance, PWDs are a significant population in these two Western Kenya counties.

What sets Kisumu County apart from some of its peers is its commitment to putting in place frameworks and structures to promote the participation of marginalized populations, including PWDs. Unlike some other counties that lag in terms of policy and legislative support for inclusivity, Kisumu County has taken proactive steps. It has established village council units (VCUs), passed the Disability Act in 2014, and formulated two County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) and annual development plans (ADPs) since 2014. The CIDPs and ADPs serve as essential structures for public participation in the planning and budgeting processes. The introduction of VSUs takes decentralization of decision-making a step further by allowing participation at the grassroots level – the villages. All these factors make Kisumu County a prime candidate for studying the dynamics of PWDs' inclusion in county development processes.

The choice of Muhoroni Sub-County, with its five wards (Masogo-Nyangoma, Miwani, Ombeyi, Chemelil, Muhoroni Koru), is strategic. These wards are primarily rural, characterized by a lack of electricity in many areas, muddy roads, and a scarcity of piped water (Household and Economic Survey, 2022). These challenging conditions have a direct impact on the participation of PWDs and are an integral part of the social construction of disability, as explained by Anastasiou and Kauffman (2013). This study isn't just theoretical; it's grounded in real-world experiences. To ensure that we have a realistic understanding of the number of PWDs in the area and to make well-informed plans, we conducted a preliminary survey with the invaluable assistance of Madam Roselyne, the PWDs representative for Muhoroni Sub-County. Over five days, we visited all five wards and identified approximately 775 PWDs residing in rural areas. Additionally, there are 37 PWDs self-help groups in the sub-county, most of whose members have completed education at the Form Four level or below. Importantly, these PWDs are not formally employed and mostly engage in subsistence enterprises. These characteristics of the study area align perfectly with the goals of this research, as it hosts rural PWDs who face unemployment, lack formal education beyond secondary level, and grapple with various challenges.

### **3.4 Study Population**

Study population was identified and define, comprising rural-based PWDs in Muhoroni sub-county. The section delves into the characteristics, demographics, and specific inclusion criteria that govern the selection of participants. The rationale for selecting this particular population and the potential implications for the study's outcomes was also explored.

The main focus of this study is to engage with Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) in Muhoroni sub-County, Kisumu, County. A two-pronged approach: one for gathering quantitative data and another for collecting qualitative insights was employed. The study population strategically targeted to answer both qualitative and quantitative questions of this study. For the quantitative aspect of the research, the spotlight was firmly on the PWDs at the individual level. The intension was to hear their voices, experiences, and perspectives when it comes to their inclusion in county budgeting and planning. PWDs, as the primary stakeholders, are crucial to understanding the challenges they face. In this phase, a carefully selected group of PWDs was composed and also engaged with policymakers who deal with PWDs' issues in the Kisumu

County Government. It was essential to gain a well-rounded view that encompasses the experiences of those directly affected by policies and those who create and implement them.

On the qualitative part of the study, the researcher delved even deeper. Working closely with various organizations, and policymakers at the county level from various structures concerned with PWDs that are actively involved with PWDs. These organizations and policy-level actors play a pivotal role in advocating for the rights and welfare of PWDs, and had an in-depth knowledge on what has transpired and the way forward to more robust PWDs inclusion. The respondents for collecting qualitative data were drawn from these key entities, officials from PWDs self-help groups (5), PWDs leaders at different administrative levels (ward -2, sub-county-2, and county-3), and representatives from significant disability-based organizations such as the Association for the Physically Disabled of Kenya (APDK) - Kisumu County branch (2), United Disabled Persons of Kenya (UPDK) (2), Action Network for the Disabled (AND) (2), and Chesire Disability Services Kenya (CDSK) (2).

To ensure that the study was scientifically rigorous and truly representative of the PWDs' views in Kisumu County, the study used a systematic selection process for both individually administered questionnaires and FGDs and KIIs. For the quantitative dimensions, In Muhoroni Sub County, it's estimated that there are around 775 PWDs, this was according to Muhoroni Sub County PWD leader which was also confirmed by the cumulative data from five ward representatives. The study surveyed 233 PWDs, which constitutes 30% of the total PWD population from each ward. This approach ensured a fair and accurate reflection of PWDs' perspectives from all the target wards. Scientifically, Muganda & Muganda (2003) assert that for a population which is less than 10, 000, any sample which is 10% and above the known total population can suffice for generalization. Hence the study was over and above the minimum requirement.

Moreover, the study recognized the diversity within the PWD community. PWDs don't have a single, homogenous experience; they encompass various categories. This study respected and understood these distinctions. The seven major categories of PWDs outlined by the Kenya Disability Council are all represented in the sample. These categories encompass people with vision impairments, with deaf or hard of hearing, individuals with mental health conditions,



those with intellectual disabilities, people who've experienced and acquired brain injury, individuals with autism spectrum disorder, those with physical disabilities, and people facing multiple disabilities (Government of Kenya, 2003). In the end, the actual groups/categories involved were those that existed in the study area. This thoughtful approach provided a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and experiences of different PWDs, ensuring their voices are truly heard. For the policymakers and disability groups categories, it was important for the researcher to recruit selected representatives purposively.

### **3.5 Sampling Size and Sampling Procedure**

Selecting the right sample size and sampling procedure is paramount in ensuring the accuracy and reliability of study findings. Kisumu County encompasses seven sub-counties, with three of them bordering the city center (West, East, and Central sub-counties), while the remaining four (Nyando, Muhoroni, Nyakach, and Seme) predominantly exhibit rural characteristics. To choose one of the rural sub-counties for the study, the researcher employed a simple random sampling technique. This process involved writing down the names of the potential study areas on pieces of paper, shuffling them, and selecting one at random. The outcome pointed us to Muhoroni sub-county, which subsequently served as our study site.

The rationale behind this choice lies in its potential to enhance the generalizability of the findings, thereby increasing the overall reliability and validity of the results. Additionally, it helped to avoid unnecessary expenditure of time and resources during the research process, as highlighted by Fisher et al., 1991. In terms of the sample size determination, the study did not employ Fisher et al., 1991 formula, as the total population is finite, given that it is fewer than ten thousand.

To ensure that a scientifically representative sample was selected, the survey involved a total of 233 sampled PWDs, with an equal representation from each of the five wards. This number corresponds to 30% of the total PWD population in Muhoroni sub-county (775), with a proportionate distribution across the five wards. This was so because our universe (the entire population) was relatively small, which makes it inappropriate to apply scientific sampling formulae such as Fisher et al.'s (1991) or Yamane's 1967 formulae.

The table below offers a summary of the sample procedure and size across the five wards. Within each ward, the sample selected randomly, ensuring equal participation from qualifying PWDs. For the qualitative aspects of the study, such as Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and in-depth interviews key informant interviews; targeted purposive, snowballing and convenience sampling was employed. The purposive method helped the researcher reach to those presumed to possess the needed information to answer the research questions. The snowball method provides a flexibility space for the researcher to track potential useful respondents suggested by other respondents in the course of the study and to help build the story of the these further. The convenience sampling was useful in the case where the researcher attended offices for policy makers and these people were found to be busy, yet within the same office there was someone who could be useful and help the researcher fill in for such lost opportunities. This approach was justified by the fact that PWDs leaders and officials from the organizations listed in section 3.4 possess the requisite information needed to answer our research questions, thereby enabling triangulation with the findings from other sample categories and our quantitative results. Here's a summary of the sampling framework.

**Table 3.1: Sampling Framework**

<b>TOTAL POPULATION=775</b>		
<b>WARDS</b>	<b>TOTAL POPULATION</b>	<b>SAMPLE SIZE=30*100*775 = 233</b>
Muhoroni-Koru	150	45
Miwani Ward	130	39
Masogo-Nyangoma	120	36
Ombeyi	225	68
Chemelil-Tamu	150	45
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>N=233 (100%)</b>

**Source: (Researcher, 2023).**

### **3.6 Data Collection Techniques**

In this study, the study employed a comprehensive approach, integrating both qualitative and quantitative methods to gather data. Qualitative data were collected through in-depth interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), while structured questionnaires were used for quantitative data collection. Additionally, both secondary and primary data sources were incorporated to enrich the study.

### **3.6.1 Secondary Data**

The study tapped into relevant secondary sources, such as textbooks, journal articles, government policy documents, and legislations, along with all pertinent Kisumu County records concerning PWDs, planning, and budgeting. The review of policy and legal documents concerned with public participation (generally) and PWDs inclusion, more specifically, enabled the researcher to set the tone for examining the levels of awareness of such frameworks on the part of PWDs. The review of academic works on the subject, along the research objectives and key concepts was critical in positioning this study in empirical works, to identify gaps and discuss the value addition of this thesis.

### **3.6.2 Primary Data**

To collect quantitative data, the following methods were utilized:

#### **3.6.2.1 Semi-Structured Survey Questionnaires**

For quantitative data gathering, the study employed semi-structured questionnaires. This approach allowed for collection of quantitative information from PWDs while simultaneously capturing explanatory insights through open-ended questions. The study ensured that the 233 participants representing all five wards were diverse, representing all PWD categories and genders. The study also attempted to capture gender-disaggregated information and long PWD categories in Muhoroni sub-county, thus it implicitly contributes to intersectional debates.

The questionnaire consisted of questions aligned with the study's three thematic objectives, investigating PWDs' awareness of policies and laws related to their participation, the strategies used to enhance their participation and the strategies used to recruit them into county planning and budgeting processes.

#### **3.6.2.2 In-Depth Key Informant Interviews**

The study undertook 19 key informant interviews. This included officials from PWDs self-help groups (5; one from each ward), PWDs leaders at different administrative levels (ward -2, sub-county-2, and county-3), and representatives from significant disability-based organizations such as the Association for the Physically Disabled of Kenya (APDK) - Kisumu County branch (2), United Disabled Persons of Kenya (UPDK) (2), Action Network for the Disabled (AND) (2), and Chesire Disability Services Kenya (CDSK) (2).

Key informant in-depth interviews were conducted, following a purposive, snowball and convenience sampling techniques. These interviews collected qualitative data on the study's major themes, offering explanations for the quantitative data that had emerged from the structured questionnaires. They facilitated triangulation for in-depth analysis of the determinants of PWDs' participation in county budgeting and planning processes.

This category of disability policy and programming stakeholders allowed the researcher to explore the policies and laws relevant to PWDs' participation in planning and budgeting processes, particularly the county's efforts in localizing these provisions and the participatory platforms established under PFMA and the CGA, such as the CBEF. By tapping into their expertise, the study aimed to provide a balanced analysis, drawing insights from both PWDs' responses and expert opinions, and ultimately crafting practical recommendations for concerned stakeholders.

### **3.6.2.3 Focus Group Discussions**

Bhattacharjee (2012) suggests that using multiple data collection techniques in a scientific study enhances the reliability of the results. FGDs were conducted in this study to serve two important functions in achieving the study's objectives and ensuring data reliability. Five FGDs were held among 5 different groups out of the 37 self-help groups of PDWs in the sub-County, one group in each ward. Each FGD was composed of 8 members of the group, including three group officials and 5 members. The composition consisted of homogenous people characteristically, hence there no power dynamics limitations on the participation of the FGD participants. These FGDs played a critical role in the study by addressing biases that were unavoidable during surveys and one-on-one in-depth interviews, owing to varying interests of these groups. Furthermore, the FGDs functioned as a preliminary validation platform for the study's findings. They allowed matters arising from the surveys and interviews to be raised for group discussions and deliberations at two primary levels of the study: among the right bearers (PWDs) and the duty-bearers (PWDs officials).

### **3.7 Reliability and Validity**

Maintaining the reliability and validity of this study was paramount to ensure the trustworthiness and accuracy of the findings. Several steps were taken to achieve this:

The researcher used two enumerators/research assistants. Study enumerators received comprehensive training about the study, its objectives, and the research collection tools. This training was crucial as the survey administration involved self-administered questionnaires, aided by assistants and the researcher. Proper training ensured that enumerators could ask questions in line with the study's goals, reducing the risk of misinterpretation and ensuring the data collected was reliable. Additionally, the enumerators also participated in the key informant interviews (KIIs) and FGDs.

**Another avenue for reliability was through conducting a pre-test.** A pre-test of the survey tool was conducted among PWDs in Kisumu Central sub-county. This step aimed to identify any emerging issues, unclear questions, or areas requiring revision. By addressing these concerns, the internal validity of the constructs intended to measure the study variables was enhanced. Moreover, a pre-survey was undertaken well before the pre-test to establish the rough estimate of PWDs within the sub-County. This also helped the researcher build a map and construct a movement plan, ensuring a near complete coverage of the area, representatively.

**Third issue of reliability and validity related to data storage.** Qualitative data, collected through audio tapes and notebooks, were securely stored to prevent data loss during analysis. Measures were taken to ensure that audio recorders and notebooks were safeguarded, providing an additional layer of data reliability. While survey questionnaires were safely kept in a safe lockable metallic box for safety, avoid unauthorized access and prevent loss.

### **3.8 Data Analysis and Presentation**

Upon the completion of data collection, the next steps involved sorting, cleaning, and coding the data for analysis. Quantitative data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) v.23. Descriptive statistics, such as frequencies and cross-tabs, were employed to analyze the quantitative data. The results were then presented through various means, including frequency tables, cross-tabs, pie charts, and other graphical representations available in SPSS v.23. Qualitative data, on the other hand, was analyzed using thematic content analysis. The main themes, aligned with the study's three objectives, were identified and categorized. Under each theme, sub-themes were sorted, and the underlying issues were presented in a clear and organized manner.

### **3.9 Ethical Considerations**

Maintaining ethical standards throughout the study was of utmost importance. The study adhered to established ethical guidelines for social science research, including consent, confidentiality, anonymity, non-harm, and obtaining ethical authorizations from relevant university committees, as discussed by Kothari (2004). Specifically, the study sought ethical approval from the Maseno University School of Graduate Studies (SGS) Ethics Review Committee before embarking on fieldwork. The necessary permits were granted after meeting the requirements of each department or institution, following thorough reviews. A permit from National Commission for Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) was critical in convincing the policy-level stakeholders to partake of the study, as they realized the study was legally registered by the research and science governing body.

In addition to general ethical principles, this study considered the unique ethical issues related to disability research. The study adhered to ethical issues specific to disability issues, such as use of language, and treatment of PWDs as you interact with them. For example, the study was sensitive on language and referred to participants as "people with disabilities" (PWDs) rather than "disabled people" or people living with disability as covered in Kenya's disability Act, and Global Compact on Disability. The study was sensitive to avoid demeaning language or behavior towards PWDs during surveys and interviews, taking care to use respectful terminology, and for example asking the PWDs if they needed any help with carrying their assistive devices. For example, PWDs with mental challenges were referred to as "mentally challenged" rather than "mad people" to ensure their dignity and respect. Moreover, both National Disability Act and Kisumu Disability policy calls for participation of all people with disability including through caretakers and guides. For this matter, the study was able to involve the mentally challenges through those who are caring for them, people who were able to give very valued information on the experiences of this people. Moreover, the visually impaired, especially the completely impaired (blind) were involved through their guides. On the same note, parents and/or guardians of children living with disability were able to assent for their kids before their involvement.

The study also implemented data protection mechanisms. The researcher was the sole custodian of all audio records collected in the field and took measures to safeguard these records. Audio data was securely transferred from audio recorders to the researcher's laptop and password-

protected. Once the data was transcribed into text, the audio files were deleted to prevent unauthorized access. Participants were given consent forms committing to the principles of confidentiality, anonymity, informed consent, and ensuring no harm, both psychologically and emotionally. These ethical considerations were crucial in conducting a respectful and responsible study.

**CHAPTER FOUR**  
**PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES LEVEL OF AWARENESS OF LEGAL AND POLICY**  
**PROVISIONS ON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING AND BUDGETING IN**  
**KISUMU COUNTY**

**4.1 Introduction**

This study aimed to explore the factors that account for the inclusion of rural-based PWDs in Kisumu County planning and budgeting processes, focusing on Muhoroni sub-County. The exploration was undertaken between September 2022 and June 2023 and was designed to be guided by three specific objectives. The settling on the objectives was a matter of some rigorous work. It was informed by researcher's ability to undertake comprehensive literature review and preliminary field visits to harmonize perspectives on the literature and the realities observed first hand and revise the objectives of focus. Based on the very nature of the main research problem which is largely explorative, the key interest of this study was what dimensions of the subject of disability inclusion in county budgeting and planning.

This chapter of the thesis research presents an analysis of socio-demographic factors that inform the context of the study and the findings and discussions from the data pertaining to objective one. Socio-demographic factors analysis cut-across all objectives hence it is important to present them in this first findings chapter. Findings from objective one attempted to establish the status of People with Disabilities' (PWDs) awareness of legal and policy frameworks provisions on public participation in planning and budgeting in Kisumu County. Such frameworks are informed by the public finance management act (PFMA) 2012 and County-specific legislations. The study explores awareness along the following lenses of four indispensable frameworks on public participation on issues of budgeting and planning particularly as applies in the context of disability: county budget and economic forum [CBEF]; Kisumu Disability Act, Kisumu Annual Development Plan; Kisumu County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP). Socio-demographic variables are discussed as follows, before a presentation of the objective findings.

**4.2 Analysis of Socio-demographic Variables**

Studies in psychology and other social sciences have proved the need for collecting and analyzing socio-demographic variables in social science studies (Bolsoni-Silva & Loureiro, 2015; Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, J. H. (2016). Bolsoni-Silva & Loureiro (2015) specifically argue that



any social phenomenon to relates to human beings as largely as possible based on the socio-demographic indicators of that human being’s status. In the same vein, the condition of disability (in this thesis called impairment as informed by social model theory) is a sum total of the socio-demographic conditions of a person who is identified or self-identifies as a PWD. It is therefore key to begin the analysis by understanding the social-economic and the demographic context of those whose responses this study is grounded. The variables of importance for this study were: gender, name of ward, type of disability, category of disability, education status and employment status. These are presented below.

#### 4.2.1 Questionnaire Return Rate

Questionnaire return rate refers to the comparison of what number of questionnaires were disbursed to the respondents and the actual questionnaires returned. It can also go further to include a comparison of what is returned and what is usable for actual analysis and thesis conclusion drawing (Babbie, 2008). Based on the presentation below, return rate in terms of questionnaires administered and questionnaires returned was 96%. However not all questionnaires returned could be used due to either missing values exceeding 5% of the all the 53 questions asked in a given questionnaire and well as due problems with extremes or what is called outliers (Haire, 2010), leading the researcher to use 86% of those returned questionnaires. This response rate is still valid in a scientific study as provided by Mugenda & Mugenda (2013) that a return rate of at least 50% is well and good to proceed to analysis and generalize the results.

**Table 4.1: Questionnaires Return Rate**

<b>TOTAL POPULATION=775</b>				
<b>WARDS</b>	<b>TOTAL POPULATION</b>	<b>SAMPLE SIZE=30*100*775 = 233</b>	<b>QUESTIONNAIR ES RETURNED</b>	<b>Q. RETRUNED AND USABLE</b>
Muhoroni-Koru	150	45	40	36
Miwani Ward	130	39	36	30
Masogo Nyangoma	120	36	35	32
Ombeyi	225	68	68	60
Chemelil-Tamu	150	45	45	43
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>N=233 (100%)</b>	<b>N2=224 (96%)</b>	<b>N3=200 (86%)</b>

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

#### 4.2.2 Respondents Distribution by Gender

According to the study summary of analysis shown in table 4.2 below, the study sample size was 200 participants, majority of which were females (50.5% or 101) while 49.5% (99) were males. This could show that female PWDs are more than male PWDs. This is a consistent finding according national demographics trends. For example, in both 2009 and 2019 censuses, women PWDs were more than men PWDs. In 2019 it was 2.5% of women against 1.9% of men while in 2009 it was 3.5% women against 3.4% men (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics [KNBS], 2019). Added to the fact women are a vulnerable category (Government of Kenya, 2019) compared to men, the point of inter-sectionalism of gender and disability brings in to sharp focus the need for targeted programs for inclusion of women PWDs while not discriminating their men counterparts. The KNBS (2019) also shows that disability prevalence is common in rural areas than in urban settings; “2.6% (0.7 million) of people in rural areas and 1.4% (0.2 million) of people in urban areas have a disability” (Development Initiatives, 2020). This further justifies the study choice of a rural setting.

**Table 4.2: Gender of respondents**

1. Gender of respondent					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	99	49.5	49.5	49.5
	Female	101	50.5	50.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

#### 4.2.3 Respondents Distribution by Disability Type of Disability

As shown in table 4.3 below, this study involved participants who had mostly (42.5%) physical disability, followed by those with hearing and mental disability both at (25.0%). Again this is in tune with the national trends which shows that the physically impaired are more in number compared with other categories of disability. Development Initiatives argue in this regard that:

*Analysis of disability by domain reveals that mobility is the most commonly reported difficulty, experienced by 0.4 million Kenyans and representing 42% of people with disabilities. The other domains of disability – seeing, hearing, cognition, self-care and communication – are experienced by between 36% and 12% of people with disabilities. Albinism is a condition experienced by 0.02% of Kenya’s population (<https://devinit.org/resources/status-disability-kenya-statistics-2019-census/>).*

**Table 4.3: Respondents Distribution by Disability Type of Disability**

<b>4. Type of disability</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Physical	85	42.5	42.5	42.5
	Hearing	50	25.0	25.0	67.5
	Mental	50	25.0	25.0	92.5
	Visual	15	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

#### **4.2.4 Respondents Distribution by Category**

As shown in the table 4.4 below, the study also involved caretakers. Care taker involvement in PWDs research is imperative because it solves the bias of exclusion of PWDs who are unable to fully and effectively participate in a study without aid. Moreover, it is an ethical issue because some PWDs (such as those with hearing impairment) are unable to give their informed consent without the assistance of a third party, which ideally should be those they are used to.

As the table 4.4 shows, most respondents were (77.5%) PWDS with only 22.5% being caretakers.

**Table 4.4: Respondents Distribution by Category**

<b>5. Category of Respondent</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Caretaker	45	22.5	22.5	22.5
	PWD	155	77.5	77.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

This shows that study met the intended population. It could also indicate that most PWDs are capable and able to participate in research forums for themselves hence this was good since talking directly to the PWDs increased the accuracy of findings as they know best where the rubber meets the road. Additionally, understanding the perspectives of the PWDs who are cared for holistically, require understanding their perspectives as well as those of their care-givers. Also, caregivers of adult but severely disabled were key participants because they could tell of the stories of those whom they take care of, filling the possible gap of missing their voices in the study.

#### 4.2.5 Respondents Distribution by Employment Status

As table 4.5 below shows, this study involved participants who mostly were unemployed (37.5), followed by those in the informal sector 27.5% as the least being salaried but temporary and salaried and permanent both being (17.5%).

**Table 4.5: Respondents Distribution by Employment Status**

7. Employment status					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not doing anything for employment	75	37.5	37.5	37.5
	Juakali or informal sector	55	27.5	27.5	65.0
	Salaried but temporary	35	17.5	17.5	82.5
	Salaried and permanent	35	17.5	17.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field work (2023)*

This signifies that most PWDs are unemployed reasons could be because of their disability type, there could be a number of jobs that they cannot do. Salaried being least since many a times, employers prefer able bodied as opposed to PWDs. These are tested assertions in previous empirical research (see e.g., Development Initiatives, 2020). The value addition for involving both employment non-employed, educated and non-educated PWDs was so that while examining factors that determine their inclusion in county budgeting and planning processes, the relationships with such socio-economic and demographic variables can be tested.

#### 4.2.6 Distribution by Level of Education

The study found that majority (50.0%) had no formal education. 17.5% had completed primary school while 17.5% had completed college/university. 15.0% secondary not completed was least.

**Table 4.6: Distribution by Level of Education**

8. Level of education					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No formal education	100	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Primary completed	35	17.5	17.5	67.5
	Secondary not completed	30	15.0	15.0	82.5
	College/university completed	35	17.5	17.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

This implies that most PWDs do not have formal education, reason could be challenges they face during the schooling period. During interviews the researcher was able to explore why this state affair was prevalent in rural areas of Miwani among PWDs. Many a times, they are not capable to afford for the equipment/materials they need for their learning this reciprocate again to the least college/university as only a few can afford the materials; brails. One caretaker narrated the schooling story of her PWD kid – which mirrors the story of many others - who by the time of fieldwork was an adult. She narrated:

*Education of PWDs is such a nightmare. We need a lot of equipment to ensure the kid stay in school. We face weather challenges and when it rains the kid cannot go to school due to mud and flooding common in Muhoroni especially in Miwani. Moreover, even when you try your best to take your child to school in a normal school, teachers and students direct their stigma against PWD kids. I just decided to stay with my kid at home {Mrs. X, during a focus group discussion at Miwani Ward, 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2023}*

Additionally, the type of disability could have also resulted to high non formal education as movement to learning points and coping being difficult. This is in tandem with the revelations about the type of disability as in section 4.2.4.

### **4.3 Status of Awareness of Policy and Legal Frameworks Providing for Public Participation of the People with Disability in County Budgeting and Planning**

This section of the chapter presents findings that reveal the status of PWDs awareness on four key county budgeting and planning frameworks including; the county budget and economic forum [CBEF]; Kisumu Disability Act, Kisumu Annual Development Plan; Kisumu County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP). According Institute of Economic Affairs (2017) it is impossible to attain equitable and effective public participation if vulnerable categories are not awareness of instruments that place their participation within the domain of rights, hence placing the responsibility for awareness creation to certain right-bearers. Therefore, to effectively explore the factors that account for the inclusion of rural-based PWDs in Kisumu County planning and budgeting processes, it is imperative that such an analysis begin at the point of establishing the status of awareness. Findings and discussions are as presented below.

### 4.3.1 Awareness of Kisumu Annual Development Plan

Table 4.7 below shows that most participants 170(85%) did not know about that while only 30(15%) knew about the same. The meager inclusion of the PWDs is a worrying condition because while this is among the critical steps after the county budget review and outlook paper (CBROP) on budgeting, that sets the yearly budget as extract from the CIDP.

**Table 4.7: Awareness of Kisumu Annual Development**

<b>34. Do you know what the Kisumu Annual Development Plan is?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	20	10	10	10
	No	180	90	90	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

The Annual Development Plan (ADP) is the second step in the county budget calendar and should be should be tabled in County assembly latest by 1<sup>st</sup> September. Counties are required to create and present the Annual Development Plan (ADP) in the County Assembly by the specified deadline. Important to this study is the fact the plan must be made accessible to the public within a period of 7 days. The ADP serves as the principal planning document that directs the budget preparation for the upcoming year. It represents a one-year segment of the larger County Integrated Development Plan, a five-year plan that each county is obligated to develop (GoK, 2012).

According to the expected standard procedure, the county presents these plans to the assembly annually before September 1, outlining their strategic priorities, responses to economic changes, and the proposed programs and capital projects for the relevant fiscal year, as stipulated in the Public Finance Management Act, Section 126. It is crucial to emphasize that all projects in the budget must align with county plans. The ADP serves as a valuable occasion for the public to influence and refine the proposals within the five-year County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), specifying the sectors and programs they wish to prioritize for the upcoming fiscal year.

### 4.3.2 Awareness on County Integrated Development Plan

As shown in table 4.8 below, most participants 130(65%) have never heard of the, as only 70 (35%) knew about the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP). This shows a relatively higher levels of awareness than the ADP and all other policies concerned with county budgeting. Most PWDs reported that this was a common word during their meetings and that’s how they had heard of it. These meetings included mainly market place and NGO-sponsored meetings such as during research organized by NGOs. One PWD said during the interviews:

*I recall this thing called CIDP. Research was done by some NGO and the consultants also asked us about CIPD and we learnt that it was a policy of the county government. The research was called cost of disability and was done by Leonard Cheshire [Male PWD, 12 May 2023].*

This reveals two things. Awareness does not imply participation necessarily. Secondly that, NGOs are planning an important role in creating awareness through their programs, including research albeit sometimes unintentionally.

**Table 4.8: Awareness on County Integrated Development Plan**

<b>22. Are you aware of the Kisumu County Integrated Development Plans?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	25	12.5	12.5	12.5
	No	175	87.5	87.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

### 4.3.3 Awareness of the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF)

As indicated in table 4.9 below, most participants (87.5%) were not aware of CBEF as compared to only 12.5% who knew about the same. The CBEF, established under Section 137 of the Public Finance Management Act, 2012, is a key public participation platform within the counties and has the potential to be an opportunity to highlight views of vulnerable categories such as PWDs and better the responsiveness of county governments to the needs and interests of such categories in the spirit of leaving no one behind. However, this finding appears to show the reverse because if the simple logic that participation is impossible without proper awareness of what one is participation in is followed, it follows that the CBEF is either turned into something else or the PWDs leaders or representatives to this platform do so under their own motivation and for their own interests rather than the interests of the PWDs community they represent.

Both of these contracting sides of the CBEF were expressed during the key informant interviews with Organizations of Persons with Disability (DPOs) and grassroots PWDs leadership. A cross-cutting understanding revolved a critical perspective of the CBEF. Most interviews expressed a bitter perspective on this platform agreeing that the while in principle the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF) operates under the stringent regulations of Section 137 of the Public Finance Management Act, 2012 and is supposedly established to gather public opinions during the budgeting process, it pretentiously poses as a think-tank for the County government, overseeing financial and economic policies. In reality, the CBEF merely serves as a puppet to the Governor, who chairs the forum, and is composed of hand-picked CEC members and token representatives from various organizations, including professionals, business, labor, women, persons with disabilities, the elderly, and faith-based groups. This way, many critical views place the CBEF as a setup that serves nothing but a mere façade to create an illusion of citizen participation while ensuring the Governor's absolute control. Therefore, representatives from the DPOs asserted, whether CBEF truly assists the county in meaningful analysis and prioritization of programs is highly questionable, given the evident lack of independence and representation within the forum.

One leader from a DPO of national scope argued that the problem causing under awareness of CBEF among rural-based PWDs was that the PWDs representatives to this forum were simply those handpicked by politicians, and completely detached from the realities of the rural-based PWDs. Moreover, it was not seen a key item the need to have the rural-based largely uneducated PWDs to be part of this processes because, argued one grassroots leaders, “the process of budget-making was so elitecised to open up for the views of the poor”.

The further explored the nature of those who were aware of it as asked them how they were involved in the platform. As table 10 below shows, most (87.5%) have never been part of CBEF as opposed to only 12.5% who have been part of it. These coincide with the data in the previous table and shows that awareness in deed affects participation in CBEF.



**Table 4.9: Awareness of the County Budget and Economic Forum**

<b>15. Do you know the county budget and economic forum [CBEF]?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	25	12.5	12.5	12.5
	No	175	87.5	87.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

**Table 4.10: Level of Participation in CBEF**

<b>16. Have you ever been part of it?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	25	12.5	12.5	12.5
	No	175	87.5	87.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

However, when the nature of involvement of PWDs in CBEF was examined further during FGDs held at the ward levels, it emerged that this was through indirect participation which again suffered the lack of seriousness already discussed. Most of the 12.5% who said they had participated argued that this participation was not effective as they were represented by handpicked, primarily on political not representative ground. One holder of college certificate and rural based PWD expressed that:

*Yes, we have participated but indirectly. This means that I know what CBEF is about and what purposes it should serve. However, I don't say that this indirect participation is effective. What is that out representative was a person who walked with the Governor's team as he sought to be elected and later was appointed as our rep at CBEF and as the governor's advisor on PWDs issues. Nothing has been done and it is expected within the context of her appointment [A P1 Teacher and a PWD leaving in Muhoroni Koru Ward, 25<sup>th</sup> April 2023].*

#### **4.3.4 Awareness of the Kisumu Disability Act**

The foundation for the legality of all disability related issues, including PWDs participation and need for it is the Kisumu County Disability Act (KCDA). As the PFMA and the Kenya National Public Participation Policy requires, county governments do not only have the responsibility to make disability policies and laws, the also have the responsibility to ensure that PWDs are aware of such frameworks. The KCDA was launched in 2016 with the sole aim of localizing the

national PWD Act by mainstreaming PWDs issues into county governance and developmental issues. It aims to transform among other things, other things interventions targeted at PWDs from charity-based approaches to rights-based approaches through their inclusion.

However, as shown in table 4.11 below, county government of Kisumu seems not to have launched enough campaign or no campaign at all as most PWDs 180 (90%) have never heard of the act as compared to only 20 (10%) who have heard Kisumu Disability Act.

**Table 4.11: Awareness on the Kisumu Disability Act**

<b>19. Do you know or have you ever heard of what the county of Kisumu Disability Act is about and/or read about it?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	20	10	10	10
	No	180	90	90	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

This raises the question of what really compels the PWDs to participate if they are not aware of the Act that touches on their right to participate and be included in county processes, key among which is the budgeting and planning process. Examining this worrying finding during the FGDs with representatives of PWDs from each wards, the researcher realized that even the grassroots leaders themselves were wallowing in a state of unawareness. The question that became traumatizing to the researcher being; how can a bling man lead a blind man? If grassroots leaders who should serve as the mouth-pieces of rural-based PWDs by attending and bringing back feedback on this such as laws are unaware what can be so unexpected? This finding is consistent with the social model perspective that argues that the problem facing disability is not impairment but the social construction of impairment as disability which leads to the view of PWDs as those should only be dealt with on charity basis not as actively and proactive individuals partaking in their own development. One class-eight dropout asserted this view during a phone call-administered questionnaire thus:

*What policymakers think is that they know our problem. They can sit, think fir us and do what we need. This cannot happen. We say nothing is for us without us. We must be involved for our lives to change [A participant PWD during a survey on Phone, 3th May 2023]*

However, upon cross-tabulating this question on awareness of KCDA with the socio-demographic variable of level of education, it emerged very interestingly that all 20(10%) those PWDs who had college/university education across the wards had heard and read the Act. This further shows us the need for proper education of the PWDs. Education, seems to be a determinant of their participation in county budgeting and planning processes, as those aware are likely participate in the processes.

**Table 4.12: Effect of PWD level of education on Awareness on Kisumu County Disability Act**

<b>8. Level of education * 19. Do you know or have you ever heard of what the county of Kisumu Disability Act is about and or/read it? Cross-tabulation</b>				
<b>Count</b>				
		19. Do you know or have you ever heard of what the county of Kisumu Disability Act is about?		Total
		Yes	No	
8. Level of education	No formal education	0	100	100
	Primary completed	0	35	35
	Secondary not completed	0	30	30
	College/university completed	20	15	35
<b>Total</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>200</b>

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

#### **4.3.5 Awareness of the County Fiscal Strategy Paper**

The County Fiscal Strategy Paper (CFSP) is another important budget planning policy paper. PWDs awareness of it therefore, is part and parcel of the determinants of their inclusion in county budgeting processes. However, the study established that only 2% (four PWDs) were aware or had heard about this policy paper. This shows that awareness of this paper was poorest compared to the CBEF and the Disability Act. This shows the need for even a huge investment in public awareness creation. In deed the two were tracked through the questions and interviewed as key informants. The study established that they were all university graduates one in social work and another in sociology and were employed and all had had some experiences with working at county-related departments. This shows that had they been just the common PWDs, they would exhibit the lack of awareness faced b their colleagues. This is summarized below.

**Table 4.13: Awareness [have heard] of the County Fiscal Strategy Paper**

<b>20. Do you know or have you ever heard of what the County Fiscal Strategy Paper is?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	4	2	2	2
	No	196	98	98	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

What does the CFSP mean? The document provides an overview of the county's performance during the current half-year, along with financial projections, sector priorities, and sector ceilings for the upcoming year. It also includes essential economic data and assumptions used in developing the budget for the next fiscal year, as outlined in the Public Finance Management Act, Section 117 (GoK, 2012). It is crucial to emphasize that the County Fiscal Strategy Paper (CFSP) represents the government's initial budgetary thinking for the following year, acknowledging the possibility of accommodating new developments that may arise during the budget formulation period. Moreover, the CFSP considers feedback from various stakeholders, such as the cabinet, legislature, civil society, and the public – including the PWDs. However, the sector ceilings outlined in the Budget Policy Statement (BPS) should generally remain unchanged throughout the budgeting process.

Since the CFSP has a window of opportunity for public participation, the study explored if those who were aware participated in this platform through giving their feedback in terms of suggestions of what allocations they think should go to the PWDs sub-sector. As the table below shows, none of the PWDs, including those that were aware of the CFSP was had took part in it. This further highlights the gap that exists in terms of PWDs inclusion into County Planning and Budgeting Processes (CPBP) in Kisumu County.

**Table 4.14: Level of Participation in County Fiscal Strategy Paper is**

<b>21. Have you ever participated in the County Fiscal Strategy Paper is?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	0	0	0	0
	No	200	100	100	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

### 4.3.6 Awareness of the County Budget Proposal

As the table 4.15 below summarizes, the study established that awareness of the County Budget Proposal (CBP) was very low with only 10 PWDs (5%) saying that they aware of this policy paper.

**Table 4.15: Awareness of the County Budget Proposal**

<b>24. Do you know or have you ever heard of what the county budget proposal is?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	10	5	5	5
	No	190	95	95	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

However, turning to the policymakers at the department of Social services, gender and PWDs through Key Informant Interviews, the study found that awareness was high and with in-depth understanding of the Proposal almost closer to how it is described in the PFMA. One policymaker, at the National Gender Focal Person’s Office asserted:

*The budget proposal is a comprehensive document that is submitted to Parliament and should be made accessible to the public in a timely manner. It encompasses a range of crucial information, including revenue and expenditure estimates, macroeconomic indicators, debt details, multi-year budget data, and public policy information [Policy Maker at County, 20<sup>th</sup> May 2023]*

This begs the question of what are policymakers doing in terms of disseminating critical information for members to come and participate. Significantly, the budget proposal plays a vital role as it serves as the principal means through which the government translates its key policy objectives into actionable plans. It is important to note that, in Kenya, the revenue collection measures are presented separately in the Finance Bill. Nevertheless, the level of expenditure is founded on the revenue estimates already presented in the County Fiscal Strategy Paper (CFSP) or the Budget Policy Statement (BPS). Given that the government makes decisions regarding revenues, expenditures, and debt on behalf of all citizens, it becomes imperative for the government to offer a comprehensive justification for its taxation, borrowing, and spending plans well before the budget is enacted. This approach enables informed public debate and facilitates informed legislative discussions and approvals. Moreover, it allows citizens to gain insights into

how their hard-earned money is being collected and allocated. Additionally, according to the PFMA (GoK, 2012), the government should produce a more accessible version of the budget, known as the CITIZENS BUDGET, in non-technical language. This version is specifically tailored to ease the process of public deliberation, ensuring that citizens can engage more effectively with the budgetary information and actively participate in the decision-making process. Upon examining this provision of the citizen’s version, during KIIs and FGDs. The results show that PWDs don’t care about these platforms. The few they tried it was misunderstanding. The table below does a summary of this finding.

**Table 4.16: Access to Citizens Versions of the County Budget Proposal**

<b>24. Have you ever got a copy of the CITIZEN’S BUDGET?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	0	0	0	0
	No	200	100	100	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

The study went ahead to examine the levels of participation of PWDs in the County Budget Proposal. The study established that 5% (10 PWDs) had participated in the CBP with majority reporting that they had not been part of this process table. This is the same number of those who were aware further hinting to us that awareness affects participation. Moreover, this shows that those PWDs that attend these discussions are not provided with copies of the popular version. Secondly most PWDs lamented that:

*We are forced to sit at the very back of the town hall. The CBP is only discussed at the town hall I don’t think it comes to the sub-county. So when we are at the back, only a few copies are also brought and the able bodied scramble for them. Us we cannot struggle that way [A formerly employed PWD narrates during an FDG held at Chemelil Sugar Chief’s Camp, 9<sup>th</sup> May 2023].*

**Table 4.17: Participation of PWDs in the County Budget Proposal**

<b>25. Have you participated in the county budget proposal?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	10	5	5	5
	No	190	95	95	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

### 4.3.7 Awareness of County Appropriation Act

The study then examined the levels of awareness of the PWDs of the budget appropriation Act. As table 4.18 below shows, the status of awareness of this piece of legal framework was more or less the same as the CBP. Only 5% knew of it, moreover, based on physical analysis of the questionnaires, the same PWDs who were aware of the CBP and had participated in it were the same who were aware of the CAA. Their characteristics in terms of socio-demographic variables was that they had college and university education and were formerly employed. This further shows that those empowered PWDs were able to follow through county processes.

**Table 4.18: Awareness of County Budget Appropriation Act (CBAA)**

<b>26. Are you aware of what the budget appropriation Act is?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	10	5	5	5
	No	190	95	95	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

This budget document, also referred to as the enacted budget, is the official legal instrument that becomes law and serves as the framework for implementation during the upcoming fiscal year. It holds significant importance as the definitive law of the land, providing the fundamental information required for any analysis carried out throughout the budgetary period. Essentially, it forms the baseline against which the implementation phase of the budget is monitored and assessed.

Going beyond the survey, the researcher attempted to qualitative (through open ended survey questions) examine if the PWDs who had participated in the CBP and were aware of the appropriation acts understood the boundaries between the two. The researcher found that this even this more enlightened category of PWDs were not aware of the boundaries between these two documents. All of them perceived that the “appropriation act preceded the CBP” which was the exact reverse in reality. Understanding the distinctions between the budget proposal and the appropriation acts is crucial, as the latter reflects the modifications introduced by the legislature to the executive's initial budget proposal and so PWDs can effectively engage even at this level by asking questions as whether these additions are appropriate or not. This comprehension helps to grasp the actual budgetary allocations and priorities that have been approved and ratified by

the legislative body, shaping the course of public expenditures and fiscal activities for the specified fiscal year. A key informant interviewee from United Persons with Disability Kenya (UPD-K) asserted that the confusion the PWDs had was basically due to the lack of the political class and those in the administrative wings at social departments to empower the PWDs for effective participation. He asserted:

*We the PWDs wish to be part and parcel of the processes. But this as much our responsibility as it is for those political leaders and the people they have put in the social departments to push for our rights – key being inclusion in budgeting processes. We cannot effectively involve in this if measures are not put in place to educate us on the process from first stage to the last. We have to understanding the county budgeting calendar to keep vigil of what times we need to participate [Disability Leader from UPD-K, Key Informant Interview, 15<sup>th</sup> May 2023].*

#### 4.3.8 Awareness of County Budget Implementation Reports

Once the budget proposal is ready and is effectively legalized through the budget appropriation act, implementation begins. The counties and the Controller of Budget and the national government generate and release quarterly reports, as mandated by the Constitution (Article 228). The PWDs as well as other components of public have a right to follow through the implementation of the county budget and keep the implementers on watch especially on issues that touch on PWDs. The study, however, established that this perhaps the level where participation is lowest. As table 4.17 summarizes, none of the rural-based PWDs were aware of the existence of the County Budget Implementation Report (CBIR). See summary below.

**Table 4.19: Awareness of County Budget Implementation Reports**

<b>28. Are you aware of the County budget Implementation Reports?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	0	0	0	0
	No	200	100	100	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

The need for awareness of the CBIR owes to their significance in the process, especially at the implementation stage. These reports serve to update and inform stakeholders about the current state of affairs, encompassing actual revenues and expenditures compared to the original targets set in the budget, recent economic developments like growth and inflation, financial strategies to



manage the budget deficit, and the status of public debt (IBP Kenya, 2022). The significance of these reports lies in their ability to offer detailed insights into the progress of budget implementation throughout the budgetary year. By presenting periodic assessments of revenue and expenditure trends up to the present date, they provide a comprehensive understanding of any noteworthy deviations from anticipated expectations. This facilitates a proactive approach to address any issues in the execution of the budget before the year comes to a close, aligning with the principles set forth in the Public Finance Management Act of 2012, Section 101 (GoK, 2012). Furthermore, these reports play a critical role in offering timely and regular information to policymakers, the press, and the public. Interviewing the County Director for Finance, he asserted that:

*Such transparency allows for prompt identification and resolution of challenges that may arise during the budget execution process, promoting fiscal responsibility and effective governance. The availability of this valuable data enables stakeholders to make informed decisions, make necessary adjustments, and ensure efficient utilization of resources in accordance with the budgetary plans, thereby contributing to sound financial management and accountability within the county and national administration. This is impossible if the public especially the vulnerable such as PWDs don't follow-up with the process [County Director for Finance and Administration, 2nd May 2023].*

#### 4.3.9 Awareness of County Budget Review and Outlook Papers (CBROP)

The study also sought to understand the state of PWDs awareness of yet another important policy document – the CBROP. As table below summarizes, only 19 out of 200 (9%) of the PWDs sampled were aware of the CBROP. This however is higher than those aware of the CBIR, CBAA, CBP, and even the CFSP. This signifies a trend whereby participation could be somewhat easier or emphasized at the beginning, and lower during implementation.

**Table 4.20: Awareness of County Budget Review and Outlook Papers (CBROP)**

<b>30. Do you know or have you ever heard of what the county budget review and outlook paper looks like?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	19	9	9	9
	No	181	91	91	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

The study found that once the fiscal year (FY) ends, a new one starts. The CBROP serves as a comprehensive review of the actual fiscal performance of the previous financial year while also updating the economic and financial forecast information in comparison to the County Fiscal Strategy Paper (CFSP) (see e.g., IBP-Kenya, 2022 for similar procedure). This paper spans two critical stages: the formulation stage, as it examines past performance, and the evaluation stage, as it outlines the outlook for the forthcoming year. Its importance lies in providing essential performance information that allows the government, the public, and other stakeholders to actively engage in the next fiscal year's budget cycle from an informed standpoint. For PWDs, this is of immense value. A PWDs researcher with affiliations to Lenard Cheshire – a PWD programming organization with offices in Kisumu – elaborated on what value awareness and involvement in the CBROP has to PWDs.

*Most of the times, PWDs projects are not implemented or halfway done. Worse, without any explanations. If PWDs can get involved in the CBROP, they can then ask difficult questions to policy makers and implementers on why and push them to complete stalled projects in the previous FY (PWD Research Expert – Leonard Cheshire, 4<sup>th</sup> May 20023).*

The County Budget Review and Outlook Paper (CBROP) further plays a significant role by offering provisional sector ceilings for each sector, enabling informed sector hearings that subsequently lead to the preparation and approval of the CFSP (GoK, 2012). In essence, it operates akin to a draft version of the CFSP, empowering various sectors to develop well-grounded proposals for the upcoming year's budget. This aligns with the provisions of the Public Finance Management Act (Section 117), which seeks to facilitate a well-informed and participatory budgetary process, fostering accountability and effective resource allocation at the county level.

Seeking to understand what value forecasting helps with in terms of stakeholders' engagement, the study sought for explanations from key sectorial policy makers such as the County-concerned policy maker on Social Services, Youth Gender and PWDs. The policymaker argued that;

*By analyzing past performance and providing projected data, the CBROP enables stakeholders to make informed decisions, improve financial planning, and ensure that budgetary priorities align with the county's long-term development objectives (Key Informant Interviewee – a Kisumu County policymaker from the department of Social Services, Youth, Gender, and PWDs, 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2023).*

In terms of participation in the CBROP the study established that almost similar number (20 PWDs/10%) as those aware reported to had participated in the CBROP further showing that there are some levels of participation in budgeting and planning at the initial stages.

**Table 4.21: Participation in County Budget Review and Outlook Papers (CBROP).**

<b>31. Do you know or have you ever heard of what the county of Kisumu Disability Act is about and/or read about it?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	20	10	10	10
	No	180	90	90	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

#### **4.3.10 Awareness of the County Audit Report**

Auditing or budget expenses evaluation is the last stage in county budgeting and planning processes. The document, issued annually by the country's Supreme Audit Institution, which is the Auditor-General, serves as an assessment of the government's year-end final accounts, gauging the effectiveness of utilizing public resources (Isaboke & Kwasira, 2016) The significance of the Audit Reports (AR) lies in providing the public with an independent and credible account of the accuracy of the government's financial reporting concerning revenue generation, such as taxes, and the allocation of public funds during the preceding year. Additionally, it verifies whether the government has adhered to financial management laws and regulations.

Isaboke & Kwasira, (2016) adds that the AR plays a pivotal role in completing the accountability loop, ensuring that at the onset of the year, when the legislature approves the budget outlining the government's intentions regarding taxation, borrowing, and expenditure of public funds, there is a subsequent need for credible assurance at the year-end. This assurance is required by both the legislature and the public to ascertain the accuracy of the government's account on the implementation of the budget, ensuring it was done lawfully at all stages. The AR, thus, becomes an essential instrument in ensuring transparency, trust, and accountability within the government's financial operations, safeguarding the prudent use of public funds for the betterment of society.

Awareness and participation of the PWDs, like other parts of the publics should be maximum here, because the AR is what reveals what happened and what did not happen, where monies were misappropriated and where monies were prudently put into their intended activities. Unfortunately, 0% of the PWDs were neither aware nor had interacted with the AR for Kisumu.

**Table 24: Awareness or and Participation in Audit Report Review Seminars**

<b>32. Have you interacted with any Audit Reports for Kisumu County since devolution, 2013 or participated in the review of any audit report review public seminars?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	0	0	0	0
	No	200	100	100	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

#### **4.4 Chapter Summary and Discussions**

##### **4.4.1 Summary**

This chapter examined the level of awareness of the PWDs on the county budgeting and planning policy and strategic papers. The study showed that there is a generally low levels of awareness and that there seems to be connection with the level of awareness and actual participation in planning and budgeting forums presented by these policies and legal documents. 85% did not know about the ADP, 87.5% did not know about the CBEF, 80% did not know about the Kisumu Disability Act, a whole 98% did not know about the CFSP and none had participated in it, 95% did not know about the County Budget Proposal, and had never read a copy of the same, 95% were not aware of the county appropriation act. No one was aware of the county budget implementation reports, 91% were not aware of the county budget review and outlook papers, while 90 had participated in it. Study revealed that none of the respondents were aware of the county budget reports.

##### **4.4.2 Discussions: Trends, Theoretical and Policy Implications**

The findings from this study reveal several notable trends regarding the awareness of policies, legislations, and structures for planning and budgeting in Kisumu County by Persons with Disabilities (PWDs). These trends shed light on the determinants of awareness and participation among PWDs, emphasizing the need for more targeted and inclusive approaches to budgeting and planning. These trend also enable us to make sense of the findings in the broader scope of

the theory adopted. One prominent trend that emerges from the study is the strong association between education and awareness of budgetary instruments. Specifically, those with higher levels of education, such as college or university graduates, demonstrated higher awareness of these documents compared to those with little or no formal education. For example, as highlighted in the findings, all PWDs with college or university education were aware of the Kisumu County Disability Act (KCDA), the County Fiscal Strategy Paper (CFSP), and other policy documents. In contrast, PWDs with lower educational attainment exhibited significantly lower levels of awareness.

The educational divide highlights the need for educational support for PWDs, both children and adults, to enhance their awareness of budgetary processes and instruments. The findings emphasize that education equips PWDs with the knowledge and skills to engage effectively in the planning and budgeting process. Policies should focus on ensuring that PWDs have access to quality education and training programs that are tailored to their specific needs, thus enabling them to actively participate in the decision-making processes.

The study also identifies a trend where formally employed PWDs are more aware and involved in the planning and budgeting processes. This group often resides or work in urban areas, such as towns, and possesses a deeper understanding of the importance of attending public meetings and participating in decision-making. Moreover, they have the necessary resources, such as transportation fare, to attend such meetings, unlike unemployed PWDs who may face financial barriers. This trend suggests the significance of targeting PWDs in rural areas who are not employed. They represent a segment of the PWD community that is not actively participating but could benefit from further engagement. It also underscores the need to address the financial barriers faced by unemployed PWDs, especially in rural areas, to ensure their inclusion in the planning and budgeting processes.

**Thirdly**, the study reveals a concerning trend where awareness and involvement of PWDs decrease as the budgeting and planning process progresses from formulation to implementation and evaluation/auditing. Specific examples from the findings demonstrate this trend, such as the decline in awareness of County Budget Implementation Reports (CBIR) and County Audit Reports (AR). This highlights that PWDs are more engaged in the initial stages, such as the

formulation of budget proposals, but their involvement wanes during the critical stages of implementation and auditing. This trend emphasizes the need for continuous, targeted inclusion of PWDs across all stages of planning and budgeting. Policies and initiatives should be designed to maintain PWDs' involvement throughout the entire process. For example, PWDs should be provided with accessible formats of audit reports and opportunities to participate in the evaluation and auditing of budget implementation. This inclusivity is crucial to ensure accountability, transparency, and the realization of PWDs' rights to be actively involved in the budgeting process.

#### **4.4.2.1 Theoretical Implications**

These findings are a rich ground to argue that current models adopted for disability empowerment in the county are traditional: medical and charity-based models, as opposed to genuine empowerment-based social model. The medical model often characterizes PWDs as individuals defined primarily by their impairments. In this model, the emphasis is placed on "fixing" or "treating" the individual's impairments, which can lead to an underestimation of their capabilities and a focus on their limitations. The medical model tends to disregard the societal factors and barriers that prevent PWDs from fully participating in social and economic life, which includes their exclusion from budgetary processes. As a result, PWDs are frequently perceived as recipients of charity or medical intervention rather than active, empowered participants in the development of their county.

The charity model, with its well-intentioned but often patronizing approach, has been a prevalent paradigm for addressing the needs of PWDs (Marks, 1997). While charitable efforts have provided support to PWDs, these efforts can inadvertently perpetuate a paternalistic view of PWDs as objects of pity or recipients of goodwill as the interviews revealed. The charity model often fails to acknowledge the capabilities and potential of PWDs, focusing primarily on alleviating their suffering rather than empowering them. This approach can undermine the agency and self-determination of PWDs and inhibit their ability to actively engage in planning and budgeting processes. Indeed, it appears to have been the sole reason behind the trends observed, since the county government has to provide the charity such as transport fairs and accommodation for PWDs to attend such meetings, instead of building the economic capacity of the PWDs to engage effectively in development processes as equal players. The critique of the

current approaches based on the social model of disability reveals the underlying reasons for the low levels of awareness and inclusion of PWDs in planning and budgeting processes. When society predominantly adopts medical or charity models, PWDs are often marginalized and excluded from active participation. They are seen as passive recipients rather than as equal citizens capable of contributing to the development of their county. This exclusion extends to the budgetary processes, where their voices are inadequately represented.

Reframing policies and practices based on the social model of disability entails acknowledging PWDs' capabilities, rights, and contributions as equal citizens. Instead of framing PWDs as objects of charity or individuals defined solely by their impairments, the social model underscores the importance of removing societal and environmental barriers that limit their opportunities for engagement. Empowerment through education, tailored support, and skill-building initiatives is central to the social model. By equipping PWDs with the knowledge and skills required for active participation in budgetary processes, these individuals can become valuable contributors to their county's development.

#### **4.4.2.2 Policy Implications**

The trends identified in this study have several important policy implications:

- **Educational Support:** Policymakers should prioritize educational programs and initiatives that are tailored to the needs of PWDs. This includes not only children but also adults who may have missed out on educational opportunities. Such programs should be designed to enhance awareness of budgetary processes, empower PWDs with the necessary knowledge, and improve their participation in decision-making.
- **Inclusive Employment Policies:** Policymakers should promote policies that encourage the employment of PWDs, especially in urban areas. This would not only improve their socio-economic status but also increase their awareness of and involvement in the budgeting and planning processes. In addition, measures should be taken to address financial barriers faced by unemployed PWDs, particularly in rural areas.
- **Targeted Inclusion:** Budgeting and planning authorities should focus on targeting PWDs at all stages of the process. This includes providing accessible versions of audit reports and actively involving PWDs in the evaluation and auditing of budget implementation. Such targeted inclusion is essential for ensuring transparency and accountability.

**CHAPTER FIVE**  
**THE STRUCTURES EMPLOYED TO ENHANCE RURAL-BASED PEOPLE WITH**  
**DISABILITIES PARTICIPATION IN COUNTY PLANNING AND BUDGETING**  
**PROCESSES IN, KISUMU COUNTY**

**5.1 Introduction**

This chapter explored the structures employed by the Government of Kisumu to enhance inclusion of PWDs from rural-areas into county planning and budgeting. The aim is to establish what avenues are used to facilitate PWDs inclusion into planning and budgeting in Kisumu County. These structures were not fully a function of the government but also non-government actors, as well those of the PWDs themselves. As the study adopted a sequential mixed methods design beginning with qualitative, the researcher was able to establish these framework, and redefine the tool accordingly based on what is going on as learnt from policy makers and PWDs themselves from the selected wards. The structures employed by the county as found out in this study included: These involved those that bring participation close to the PWDs such as the Kisumu County Village Council Units; through budget specific structures where different representatives of the public meet such as the CBEF, through largely informal disability structures such as disability groups and PWDs grassroots leadership; through establishment of county-level formalized PWDs offices such as the Office of the County PWDs focal person/Governors advisor on PWDs matters, County Ministry of Social Services...and Disability, among others; through the involvement of the PWDs in monitoring and evaluation of county projects implemented as a result of the planning and budgeting; and finally motivating PWDs participation by implementing projects suggested by them. These are examined as below.

**5.2 Inclusion through Kisumu County Village Council Units**

As shown in the table below, 35% of the respondents agreed that Village Council Units were operational in their villages while 65% still did not know what the KCVCU were and that they had never heard of it. The study sought for the explanations of these findings through FGDs and KIIs. It was established that despite the VCU having been launched in 2020, and the Act having been passed in 2015, only a few wards of the in Muhoroni were having these VCUs as operational. This ward included Miwani, and Chemelil Koru while all the other three seemed not have operationalized the VCUs based on the respondents as regards the VCUs facilitating their participation. However, when an additional open-ended query was posted to the participants who



knew about the VCUs whether they had participated in County planning and budgeting, most (90%) respondents explained that though they had participated in county issues, the specific issues on planning and budgeting were not a common agenda. One PWD said:

*I started attending all VCU in my village we discuss issues on development but planning and budgeting no [One Care-taker from Chemelil Koru, 14<sup>th</sup> May 2023].*

This shows that the VCU has not been fully implemented but most importantly that even at its current pace of implementation in Muhorori sub-County, planning and budgeting issues are yet to be implemented. Another possible interpretation of this finding could be that if at all the VCU is working across board, then not for PWDs. This conclusion is however difficult to arrive at especially because this study only involved PWDs and not able bodied people.

**Table 5.1: Participation through the Kisumu County Village Council Units**

**24. Do you understand what the Kisumu County VSU are?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	70	35.0	35.0	35.0
Valid No	130	65.0	65.0	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Source: Field Data (2023).**

**5.3 Inclusion through the County Budget and Economic Forum**

The CBEF is another important structure for participation and through which the PWDs can influence the agenda in Government. As shown in the table 16 below, majority 175(87.5%) had not participated in CBEF and only 25(12.5%) had participated in it. However, since the CBEF was only a structure for the participation of the different parts of the public through their representatives, the researcher sought to understand why about 13% said they had participated in it. It was found that the type of participation implied was indirect participation through their leaders at that forum – the county disability focal person, also doubling in Kisumu as the county advisor on disability issues.

A possible interpretation on this finding is that this could be as a result of most PWDs being not so aggressive when it comes to such matters, reason being they are usually represented by their

leaders who many a times do not bring them feedback. One policy maker however argued that the PWDs were equally represented and that their issues were taken of. He asserted as follows:

We don't deny PWDs any chance at the CBEF. They have a very committed leader at the CBEF who represent them [Policy Maker County Government of Kisumu, 4<sup>th</sup> May 2023].

This was the opposite of nearly all PWDs who participated in the FGDs who felt that the representative at the CBEF were actually not their elected or endorsed leader and that such a hand was only out them to get their salaries and favors from the politicians who appeared them. The SPSS analysis is presented in table 5.2 below.

**Table 5.2: Participation through the CBEF**

<b>16. Do you in county planning and budgeting through the CBEF is?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	25	12.5	12.5	12.5
	No	175	87.5	87.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

#### **5.4 Inclusion through Grass-roots leadership**

The study found that grassroots leadership for the PWDs at the groups' level is critical as they serve as the linkages between the geographically and economically isolated PWDs with not only the county government processes but also with development partners from Civil Society Organizations. In deed during the survey, as shown in table 17 below, most PWDS 150(75%) felt that their leaders at grass-root level have worked for their inclusion as a least only 25%) were having an unfavorable opinion. Following from the interviews, PWDs leaders have really worked hard to better things at grass-root level, however, not all have been achieved for various reasons; PWDs themselves have not been cooperative, called for any meeting they want to be facilitated. Number two, the leaders themselves have found it hard to facilitate themselves, coordination is still poor as well.

Three main thematic areas emerged during the interviews as regards the grass-roots PWDs leadership: their roles, capacities to present, and their quest for members' interest versus self-interest. Three roles are played by grass-roots PWD leadership. First, they call for meetings and keep data related to the groups' activities. Second, they serve as the community gate-keepers and

play a key role in deciding which development partners or individual persons can have access to the community of PWDs. Secondly, they represent the persons with disabilities at County development forums and the PWDs expect them to bring back synthesized feedback – which this study established is not the case with 5 out of six Ward-level PWDs groups.

Concerning the PWDs leaders' capacity to present their members, the FGDs revealed that most of the representatives were unable to play their role as effective representatives because they; a) had low levels of education, b) were rendered incapacitated because by the very mechanisms of participation in county planning and budgeting which did not provide clear pre-communicated modes of demobilization of the PWDs coming on board to participated. Another layer of incapacitation was the notion that some PWDs who were visually impaired were unable to effectively participate because they were not provided with visual aids such as braille. Lastly, another issue related to PWDs grassroots leadership was the notion that some of them actually were pursuing self-interest at the expense of those they represented. One FGD at Chemelil Sugar asserted that:

*...Most of the leaders forget about the group and pursue their own interests. They don't want the donors to reach the ground and when they go to the county meetings and just take the bribes given by organizers and fail to raise the serious issues affecting the PWDs which should be included in the budgeting documents... (PWD at FGD 4, Chemelil Sugar, May 2023).*

### **5.5 Inclusion through Formal PWDs Offices Created at the County to promote inclusion into planning and budgeting**

The Kisumu County Government has established institutionalized offices for PWD and related issues. The County has among her other ministries, the ministry of Social Services, Youth, Gender and Disability. The County has formalized the Office of the County Focal Person for PWDs and who doubles as the Governor's advisor on PWDs issues. The County has Disability Act, which has established a Disability Board and a County Disability Policy which have legalized these formal offices for the PWDs (Kisumu County Government, 2015; 2016; 2018). Therefore, it is expected that these offices work to enhance the inclusion of the PWDs into county planning and budgeting – a key development process that when well managed through equal and equitable representation of the PWDs, can lead to the formulation of budgeting and planning policies for implementation of PWDs-needed projects.

However, as indicated in the table 5.3 below, majority of participants 175(87.5%) thought that the Formal PWDS representation at key decision-making in Kisumu County do not in any way enhance their inclusion compared to only 25(12.5%) who were opposed to this. SPSS analysis summarizes this quantitatively as below.

**Table: 5.3: Does Formal Offices for the PWDs enhance their inclusion into County Planning and Budgeting?**

<b>31. Do you think Formal PWDs Offices created by Kisumu County at key decision-making in Kisumu County enhances your inclusion into planning and budgeting?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Yes	25	12.5	12.5	12.5
	No	175	87.5	87.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

One PWD from Miwani FGD argued that such leaders cannot support their inclusion because of self-interest, they are politically (not professionally) appointed and that they also lacked capacity to present the PWD as a cohort of the public as can be done for example by the members from the NGOs.

*They only care about themselves; they hardly even share with rest of us. Once their personal needs are catered for, they sit back at watch. Also, they cannot serve as because they appointed by the politicians not the PWDs whom they represent. Most of them have low level of education like me, yet they are called advisors. It just a waste of time (PWD at Miwani FGD, June 16<sup>th</sup> 2023).*

The self-interest perspective was evident in their a follow up questionnaire quiz. As shown in the table 20 below, only 25(12.5%) of the participants felt that the leaders have pushed for their presence in public participation as opposed to majority who felt that they only serve those who appointed them. This is because based on the interviews conducted during the study, the leaders only serve those who appointed for the sake of being reappointed. In so doing, the rest of the PWDs are completely left out, or so the study participants thought. Table 5.4 helped shows this quantitatively as below.

**Table 5.4: Doe the Formalized Offices of the PWDs serve the PWDs interests?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	They have pushed for our presence in public participation	25	12.5	12.5	12.5
	The leaders serve those who have appointed them not us	175	87.5	87.5	100.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Source: Field Data (2023).

### 5.6 Inclusion through Monitoring and Evaluation of the implementation of the Budget Process

Monitoring and evaluation is a key part of the so-called new public administration. Involving vulnerable people such as the PWDs at this stage is a key part of good governance (Word Bank, 1997) and should be encouraged. However, Kisumu County seems not to have understood the criticality of this level of participation as regards PWDs and their affairs as a vulnerable people’s community. As summarized in table 5.5 below, none 200(100%) of the participants have ever engaged in monitoring and evaluation in Kisumu County.

**Table 5.5: Participation of PWDs in monitoring and evaluation of county budgeting and planning processes**

<b>27. Have you ever been engaged in monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of Kisumu County budgeting commitments?</b>					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	200	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data (2023)

This finding is consistent with an earlier finding which established that awareness and participation of PWDs at the implementation and evaluation or auditing stages is extremely very low; this sort of running in contrast to some elements of participation at the formulation stages. A PWD programmer from UPD-K explained that the lack of participation of PWDs in county M&E of its projects is one major reason disability projects remain under and or unimplemented and life is just normal every fiscal year.

## 5.7 Promoting Disability Persons Inclusion in planning and budgeting Processes through inclusion of their relevant project

One way the County Governments can encourage the participation of the PWDs is through ensuring that progress is made in terms of inclusion of PWD-related projects and their actual implementation. Failure to only serve to discourage not just PWDs participation but also the participation of other sects of the public as Opondo (2017) and Wacera (2016) found out in Nairobi and Nyandarua counties respectively.

As shown in table 5.6 below, a majority of the respondents 135(67.5%) thought that the suggestions they have made have never been implemented as only 25(12.5%) thought that their views have been implemented. Most PWDs had a feeling that their views do not count. During forums and conferences, there is usually one or two representatives who are given only one opportunity to talk, as you know you cannot say everything within a period usually timed, a lot is left out.

*At the end of forum, they just take pictures to blind people that indeed we were there, well represented and our views will be surely presented. But that usually is not the case. Our views are left in the room. (PWDs leader, Muhoroni-Koru FGD, 17<sup>th</sup> June 2023).*

**Table 5.6: Does the County Implement your PWDs suggested Projects?**

28. If yes in 26 above, to what extent do you think suggestions you made have been implemented?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	40	20.0	20.0	20.0
	No	135	67.5	67.5	87.5
	3	25	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

**Source: Field Data (2023).**

## 5.8 Chapter Summary and Discussions

### 5.8.1 Summary

This chapter examined the structures used by the County Government of Kisumu in enhancing the inclusion of the PWDs in county planning and budgeting. These structures involved those that bring participation close to the PWDs such as the Kisumu County Village Council Units; through budget specific structures where different representatives of the public meet such as the CBEF, through largely informal disability structures such as disability groups and PWDs

grassroots leadership; through establishment of county-level formalized PWDs offices such as the Office of the County PWDs focal person/Governors advisor on PWDs matters, County Ministry of Social Services...and Disability, among others; through the involvement of the PWDs in monitoring and evaluation of county projects implemented as a result of the planning and budgeting; and finally motivating PWDs participation by implementing projects suggested by them.

Overall, the utility of these structures by Kisumu County is perceived as very ineffective in realizing the inclusion of PWDs in county budgeting and planning processes. The VCU, is yet to be operationalized in all wards in Muhoroni sub-County and still only 35% have participated in it, though again not on budgeting and planning matters. This signifies that planning and budgeting has not been mainstreamed into this new structure for promoting community participation. The CBEF though the main platform for the public, including PWDs to participate in planning and budgeting processes, is not friendly for PWDs as only 12.5% have participated in it, but indirectly though this participation does not translate to PWDs projects being implemented as table 22 above shows. The grassroots structures especially through the leaders of PWDs groups are viewed widely (75%) as an avenue to remedy the low participation of PWDs. However, issues about incapacitation within and from the external environment, the manner of their roles, and the quest for their selfish interests at the expense of the PWDs community expense hinder their effective role as the linkage between the PWDs and the external world. The same challenges face PWDs representing their community members at the county level, leading to even a lower rating (12.5%) on the formal offices established at the county-level to enhance PWDs participation. M&E on the other hand is a no-go zone for the PWDs. All the study respondents reported to have not been systematically involved in M&E of the county projects. This points to the explanations as to why PWDs-relevant projects remain unbudgeted for or unplanned for as a PWD leader from UPDK explained. Generally, Kisumu County Government is yet to take seriously the inclusion of rural-based PWDs in the county planning and budgeting processes. The chapter has showcased why things need to change, if PWDs are not to be left behind.

### **5.8.2 Discussion: Trends and Theoretical and Policy Implications**

The first significant trend emerging from this chapter is the limited implementation of structures aimed at enhancing the inclusion of persons with disabilities (PWDs) in county planning and budgeting processes in Kisumu County. It is evident that these structures have not been fully functional, as indicated by the low knowledge and participation rates among the respondents. Specifically, the Kisumu County Village Council Units (VCUs), the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF), and formal PWD offices have not been effectively utilized to facilitate PWDs' inclusion, hence participation in these crucial decision-making processes.

This trend raises questions about the county's commitment to ensuring PWDs' participation. While there are structures in place, their inadequate implementation signifies a persistent societal barrier that hinders PWDs from actively engaging in the processes of county planning and budgeting, as envisaged by the social model of disability. This underscores a theoretical shortcoming in the application of the social model, as the model's central tenet of removing societal barriers to inclusion has not been fully realized in this context.

In light of this trend, several critical policy implications must be considered. Firstly, there is a pressing need to strengthen the implementation of these inclusive structures. Priority should be given to ensuring that the VCUs, CBEF, and formal PWD offices are fully operational, providing PWDs with equal access to county planning and budgeting processes. Secondly, sensitization and awareness campaigns are essential. These campaigns should educate both PWDs and the general public about the existence and significance of these structures, fostering active participation and engagement. Lastly, accessibility and training are key components of enhancing PWDs' participation. The county authorities should guarantee that these structures are accessible to all PWDs, irrespective of their disabilities, and provide the necessary training and support for their effective involvement.

The second significant trend is the glaring absence of PWDs in the monitoring and evaluation of the county's budget implementation. Despite the importance of PWD involvement in these stages, not a single participant in the study reported any engagement in monitoring and evaluation processes. This disconcerting trend highlights a significant gap in involving PWDs in



the governance and oversight of budget utilization, denying them a crucial role in ensuring their specific needs are met.

From a theoretical perspective, this trend reflects a theoretical shortcoming in the application of the social model of disability, which underscores the importance of facilitating the participation of PWDs in all decision-making processes, including the evaluation of services and programs that directly affect them. The absence of PWD participation at the monitoring and evaluation stage represents a failure to address the systemic barriers within this process.

To address this trend, there are several critical policy implications. Firstly, the county authorities should establish mechanisms that ensure PWDs are actively involved in monitoring and evaluating the implementation of budget commitments. These mechanisms could include the formation of PWD-focused monitoring committees. Secondly, as with other structures, accessibility and training must be a priority. The county should guarantee that monitoring and evaluation processes are accessible to all PWDs and provide necessary training and support to empower them in these roles.

The third significant trend is the perception among PWDs that their suggestions for projects are not being implemented. This trend is deeply concerning, as it indicates that PWDs' input may not be adequately considered in the planning and budgeting processes. Despite their valuable insights and recommendations, it appears that their ideas remain largely unimplemented.

From a theoretical perspective, the failure to implement PWD-suggested projects represents a deficiency in applying the social model of disability. The social model emphasizes the need for full participation and the incorporation of PWDs' perspectives into decision-making processes. The current lack of project implementation indicates that these unique perspectives are not being fully considered, thereby undermining the principles of the social model.

Addressing this trend requires several key policy implications. Firstly, the county should prioritize the implementation of projects suggested by PWDs to ensure their unique needs and perspectives are integrated into county planning and budgeting. Secondly, accountability mechanisms must be established to ensure that PWD-suggested projects are tracked and implemented as planned. This built transparency and trust within the PWD community. Lastly,

regular feedback channels should be established to provide PWDs with updates on the status of their project suggestions, thereby enhancing transparency and fostering a sense of inclusion and participation.

In conclusion, this chapter expands the first chapter's findings by building further on how awareness is intricately linked to inclusion through structures established. It shows that addressing these identified trends and implementing the suggested policy implications is vital to align with the social model of disability and create a more inclusive and equitable county planning and budgeting process in Kisumu County. This, in turn, lead to a substantial improvement in the lives of PWDs in the region, ensuring their voices are not just heard but acted upon in decision-making processes.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **EFFECTIVENESS OF THE METHODS OF MOBILIZATION OF RURAL-BASED PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES INTO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESSES IN KISUMU COUNTY**

#### **6.1 Introduction**

This chapter builds on the last two chapters by examining the effectiveness of the methods used to recruit the rural-based PWDs into County budgeting and planning. It seeks to explore whether the strategies used to recruit PWDs into participation are perceived by them to have enhanced their participation, enabling the researcher to make discussions about strengths and/or weaknesses of such strategies. It thus links awareness of PWDs of policies and legislations, the structures put in place to ensure their inclusion, with their actual participation upon being mobilized, specially the mobilization and participation dynamics. Communication is a key part of public participation as has been shown by studies prior to this (TISA, n.d.). To unravel whether the methods of recruitment into public participation concerned with budgeting and planning at Kisumu County, the following recruitment avenues were found: local political leadership, chiefs and assistant chiefs, use of WhatsApp, TV, Radio, NGOs doing programs within the rural areas. The chapter presents an analysis of extent of effect the salient challenges to mobilization strategies affect inclusion of PWDs into county planning and budgeting in Kisumu.

#### **6.2 Political Leadership as Mobilization Strategy**

During the study a key mobilization strategy that came out was the local political leadership. Especially through the Members of County Assembly (MCAs) and the Members of Parliament (MPs). To quantitatively gauge role of this avenue for mobilization, the study asked the respondents to rate the effectiveness in terms of disseminating information about public participation in regards to county budgeting and planning processes. As summarized in table 30 below, most participants 105(52.5%) felt that this strategy of political leadership representation is least effective as opposed to 95(47.5%) who thought otherwise.

**Table 6.1: Effectiveness of Local Political Leadership as Mobilization Strategy**

<b>23. How effective is the strategy of local political leadership as mobilization strategy of PWDs into the planning and budgeting in Kisumu County?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Not effective at all (0%)	95	47.5	47.5	47.5
	Somewhat effective (25%)	105	52.5	52.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

This could mean that political leadership do not have the PWDs at heart. Most PWDs expressed that political leader usually are after their own gain, they do not come on the ground to get the views of the PWDs themselves, they depend on information of whoever they have selected, whom they can manipulate as they want. One female PWD lamented that:

*Politicians will only choose sycophants they know like their ideas but will never take time to ensure that PWDs are represented by ward by villages. First of all, they don't like to choose PWDs and secondly if they do, they choose those who have joined politics who will not be objective to discuss PWDs issues at budget making tables (PWD Person responding to an open-ended Survey Question, 17 May 2023).*

Moreover, when the researcher sought for further explanations through key informant and FGDs, a running theme/concern from the FGDs with PWDs was that most PWDs felt that the political leaders are not elected from among themselves and that if genuine PWDs could be elected into political positions they would help them recruit more PWDs into such public participation for a, because they have lived experiences. A PWD Leader enlightened the researcher on this issue of local political leadership as follows:

*The leaders are picked in a very bias way, sometimes no official communications during the election, you are just surprised that this person have been chosen to represent you. In such cases, you don't know the leader likewise the leader doesn't know you. Such leaders, may not even have the knowledge of what is happening on the ground. They hardly come on the ground to know of the real situation. (KII PWD leader, 16<sup>th</sup> April,2023).*

Generally, the political leaders a key challenge for disseminating information about participation in county planning and budgeting processes, like other development processes, to PWDs like other members of the public. This means that if political leaders hoard such information or recruit only those that they deem not to be against them, genuine PWDs participation is hampered either way.

### 6.3 Utility of Radio

The study also found that radio plays an important role for passing information to the public. However, as indicated in table 6.2 below, the majority of the rural-based PWDs 150(75%) PWDs rated medium of radio as not effective as a means of passing information on planning and budgeting while least number of 50(25%) thought supported the radio idea.

**Table 6.2: Effectiveness of radio as a means of mobilizing rural-based PWD into planning and budgeting fora**

<b>41. Rate the effectiveness of radio as means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting.</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Not effective at all (0%)	50	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Somewhat effective (25%)	150	75.0	75.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data*

Making sense based on the interviews conducted, this group backed up their arguments that radio is a poor means as it does not reach all. First, this means limits those with hearing impairments as they will not hear anything. Even with the hearing aid, this still is a challenge since these gadgets are very expensive and maintaining them is equally expensive. They also insinuated that the aids are not even easy to use.

This indicates that not all can afford them, hence a good number is left out when this means is used. Secondly, not all of them are having radios, this means, information passed through radios will not reach all, and by the time it gets to them, the message maybe shall have been distorted. Though not all had the same opinion, some thought that radio is somewhat effective. They supported their stand that radios have most if not all stations with local dialect where all tribes can listen and understand. This group also had a belief that majority can afford these radios and that they can be used in villages where there is no electricity as some use batteries. Therefore, the likelihood that a PWDs support radio as a means to mobilization depended on one's type of disability and also once possession of a radio gadget with those who possessed radios saying that they heard about the announcements about participation.

Yet still, possession of radio or not being in a hearing-impaired individual was not all in terms of PWDs participation. The study still found that one may hear the information but had no fare to the destination of participation or if politicians are the ones giving the directions on who should attend, they will likely choose that they like. This means that successful mobilization of PWDs is not a straightforward issue.

#### 6.4 Utility and Effectiveness of WhatsApp

As indicated in table 6.3 below, the study also explored the use of new media as a means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting, in this case, it was narrowed specifically to the use of WhatsApp – one of the most common platforms of passing information. Even though it is a means believed to be used by most people, it was not the obvious case for PWDs as per the study findings. Most participants 175(87.5%) felt that WhatsApp is not effective, as 25(12.5%) had a favorable opinion. Basing on arguments from the FGD interviews conducted, WhatsApp is an application only available on smartphones. First, it is obvious that those without phones completely and those with non-digital phones will not access the intended information. Secondly, the optically challenged too reported that they cannot use this means as they will not be able to read or write/respond on any information passed through this platform. Thirdly, most respondents averred this is an expensive means as you have to have bundles to be able to get this information.

**Table 6.3: Effectiveness of WhatsApp as means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting**

<b>42. Rate the effectiveness of WhatsApp as means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting</b>		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Not effective at all (0%)	175	87.5	87.5	87.5
	Least Effective (25%)	25	12.5	12.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

Moreover, those who did had an unfavorable opinion on the smartphones asserted that the digital phones are too are expensive to acquire, hence not effective. 12.5% though had a different stand as they felt it was somewhat effective. WhatsApp can reach a large number of people at once,

where a group is formed and people are added to the group, when information is passed, large number can be reached, and they can instantly give feedback which reaches all members of the group. Indeed, a few PWDs especially their leaders and also the formally employed had smartphones and argued that once information was shared, they were able to get it. This explains a finding already made in objective one – that those who were formerly employed had a higher likelihood of participation in county planning and budgeting than their informally and non-employed counterparts.

### 6.5 Utility and Effectiveness of Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs

In Kenya’s model of governance, the chiefs and assistant chiefs play a very critical role in facilitating nearly all governance endeavors at the local levels – sub-location and location levels. Indeed, previous studies (Institute for Social Accountability, 2020) show that local gate-keepers should be treated as key actors in public participation as they hold the key to inclusion of the vulnerable communities. Against this backdrop, the study examined the utility and effectiveness of the chiefs and assistant chiefs to understand their effectiveness as mobilizers of the PWDs on planning and budgeting. As table 6.4 below shows, the majority 95(47%) stood that it was not effective, moderately effective were 60(30%) and those who thought it was least effective were 45(23%).

**Table 6.4: Effectiveness of Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs as a Means for Mobilizing Persons with Disability.**

<b>43. Rate the effectiveness of Chiefs as a means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting.</b>		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not effective at all (0%)	45	22.5	22.5	22.5
	Not effective (25%)	95	47.5	47.5	70.0
	Moderately effective (50%)	60	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	200	100.0	100.0	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

Chiefs and assistant chiefs are a key aspect in the villages in putting words across and making sure it gets to all the intended individuals. The study though revealed that this is not always a given case. Based on the analysis of interview results of this study, Chiefs are not doing that,

most of the time, they assume pick their relatives to go the public participation forums especially if it is expected that something will come out of the participation in terms of reimbursement. It was noted by the FGDs participants for example, that most of the time, public participation which is shared specifically through the chiefs and assistant chiefs and which requires a specific number will not even reach the PWDs, rather relatives of these authorities will be chosen and counted as representing the PWDs. However, a few respondents also revealed that in the cases where the chiefs and assistant chiefs reached out to the rural-based PWDs, it was not, only the leaders who were selected and the grassroots leadership often failed to truncate the information gained downwards. Looked alongside the already argued out findings- that PWDs are kept off genuine discussion during their attendance of the public meetings through such strategies as letting them sit at the back and letting sycophants occupy front sits – this further corroborates why grassroots PWDs leadership was ranked as ineffective.

#### **6.6 Utility and Effectiveness of Television-based Communication (TV) as a Means for Mobilizing Persons with Disability**

TV is a key development communication channel and previous studies highlight that though it is underutilized in the context of public participation, it remains a good platform for reaching a wide spectrum of the public (Hassan, 2019). Mitra, S., & Vick B. (2013) particularly enforce the view that to sustainably raise the PWDs out of poverty in a developing country context, they must be reached enmass which means development should be properly communicated through channels that directly and broadly access them. However, TV though is a channel for mass communicating the county development-oriented information remains a largely unavailable to the rural-based PWDS. As summarized in table 6.5 below, this study also investigated the use of TV sets on mobilization. Most participants 130(65.0%) thought that it is not effective at all, 55(27.5%) thought is least effective while only 15(7.5%) perceived this channel as being moderately effective. The summary is as below.



**Table 6.5: Effectiveness of TV-based communication as a Means for Mobilizing Persons with Disability**

<b>45. Rate the effectiveness of TV as means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting.</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Not effective at all (0%)	130	65.0	65.0	65.0
	Least Effective (25%)	55	27.5	27.5	92.5
	Moderately effective (50%)	15	7.5	7.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: field Data (2023)*

TV sets are gadgets used to pass information among other things. Speaking to the interviewees, most of them argued that most people still do not own this machine as it is expensive and needs electricity to operate which is still not in some villages and nearly all the homes of rural-based PWDs. TVs too have not launched all languages, so some individuals who do not have formal education and their language is not there yet will not find it useful.

### **6.7 Utility and Effectiveness of Non-Governmental Organizations**

The study established that the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) sector also play a key role in relaying information to the rural-based PWDs. PWDs gave two main NGOs actively involved in Muhoroni sub-County namely KAFEADO, UPDK, Leonard Cheshire. KAFEADO stands for Kenya Female Advisory Organization, UPDK stand for United Persons with Disabilities of Kenya which is DPO with offices in Kisumu as in other counties. As the table below shows, most PWDs actually viewed NGOs in the best way in terms of effectiveness more than all other mobilization avenues, as evident with a whopping 140(70%) reporting that it was very effective. The table below summarizes this information.

**Table 6.6: Effectiveness of NGOs as means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting**

<b>46. Rate the effectiveness of NGOs as means of passing information to PWDs on planning and budgeting.</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Not Effective at all (0%)	15	7.5	7.5	7.5
	Least Effective (25%)	45	22.5	22.5	30.0
	Very Effective (100%)	140	70.0	70.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Source: field Data (2023)*

When this interesting finding was corroborated with interview results, three strategies NGOs use that make them effective disseminators of public participation. First, they use both chiefs and grassroots leaders as well as support radio talk shows and adverts targeted specifically at the rural areas. Secondly, NGOs with programs in Muhoroni sub-County use the opportunities they have to provide services to educate PWDs on county budgeting processes including the budgeting cycle. Thirdly, NGOs do not only pass information to PWDs, they also help them through providing either a means of transport such as a hired or motorbike to carry PWDs to public participation venues. This, most PWDs said has helped them so much to keep informed on public participation concerning budgeting but also others.

### **6.8 Salient Challenges to Effective Mobilization**

A thematic issue that remained constant through the exploration of the questions asked under the third objective was the issue of the different dimensions of challenges that affect the strategies for mobilization. This last part of the last objective presents systematic analysis of findings from this sub-theme of challenges affecting mobilization strategies. The hugest or rather the challenge that was commonly stated by the PWDs related to facilitation into and out of public participation venues. The study found that all participants 200(100%) agreed to the fact that indeed facilitation financially to and from venues where public participation take place is key. Study revealed that the most PWDs have difficulty in moving about when called for any forum, they either need an assistant, or translator among others. When these are facilitated, they can easily move and attend such forums, nearly all PWDs interviewed and their leaders agreed that their inclusion fully depends on the facilitation in terms of transport reimbursement. For this reason, it is clear why NGOs that provide transport reimbursement and even food during their programs with PWDs are rated highly in terms of effectiveness.

Another salient area of challenge is the issue of time of communicating information about public participation on budgeting and planning for the county of Kisumu. As shown in table 50 below, most participants 170(85.0%) confirmed that information usually do not reach them on time, as a meager 30(15%) expressed a favorable opinion. Such information is usually passed through media or local administration and PWDs leaders. These are a challenge because first, not all are having radios, TVs, and WhatsApp if the information is communicated through such. So, if it is passed via these channels, it shall leave some out. The local administration has also failed, during

*Barazas*, they just talk without considering that some are hard to hear, and need a translator, so if this happens with any information on participation, a good number too will be left out. Finally, the PWDs too sometimes are called for meetings that they cannot attend as they are not facilitated, similarly sometimes even if they attend, and there's is no translator, they will leave the forum without anything on participation to pass along to his/her people. All these have contributed to the delay of such information.

***Disability-friendliness of Public Participation Venues***

As shown in Table 6.7 below, most participants felt that public participation forums are usually held in the least friendly locations 60(30.0%) least friendly with only 55(27.5%) participants feeling that they are friendly. Analyzing this, the study confirmed that indeed these places are usually unfriendly. First, forums are sometimes held in places with no ramps. As it is clear that a wheelchair cannot go up or down stairs, it is necessary that a ramp be in any public place for the PWDs with wheelchairs to access them easily, this is not the case. Secondly, the toilets are not friendly in some places. The physically challenged may find it difficult to use the normal toilets for able-bodied, hence they need to have their special type to ease their work. Thirdly, at the parking lot, the PWDs are still having a challenge as some places do not have reserved parking spots for them. The study established that as wherever PWDs made attempts to these meetings, they had to incur extra costs of hiring a *bodaboda* to help them access a PWD-friendly facility such as a latrine or toilet.

**Table 6.7: Friendliness of Locations and Amenities to PWDs during Public Participation**

**51. Are the locations where public participation is held disability friendly?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Most unfriendly	85	42.5	42.5	42.5
Least friendly	60	30.0	30.0	72.5
Friendly	55	27.5	27.5	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Source: Field Data (2023).**

***Time allowed for Discussions***

As Table 6.8 below shows, most participants 155(77.5%) felt that the time period is usually not enough for them to give their proper input as only 45(22.5%) thought otherwise. According to the interviews conducted, their major setback understood. As some of them do not have formal

education, they will need a longer time to read and understand, or sometimes even another person to clarify everything for them when they can give their views. Moreover, a braille copy is not usually provided to the visually impaired impeding their proper participation.

**Table 6.8: Time allowed for Discussions**

<b>52. Is the period when the budget document is presented and deliberations from the floor of the public participation attendees adequate for PWDs to give their proper input?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	No	155	77.5	77.5	77.5
	Somewhat	45	22.5	22.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

### ***Ease of Understanding the Budgeting Language***

As shown in table 6.9 below, most 110 (55%) participants felt that the language is usually difficult to understand as it is technical 55(27.5%). Only 35(17.5%) thought it was a bit technical and being moderately technical. Language is the basis of everything in terms of participation, everything should be presented in a language that all can understand. As per the study findings, this was not the case. Most interviewees said that usually the document is not toned down to a level they all can understand given that not all of them are learned. Secondly, sometimes there is no sign language translator for them to hear or those who are deaf, which means that they will not be a part of the participation. Thirdly, these facilitators are not presenting documents written in brails, hence the optically challenged can read and make an understanding out of them.

**Table 6.9: Level of Technicality of the Language Used**

<b>53. 53.Is the language adopted by facilitators of public participation in planning and budgeting appropriate to PWDs attending?</b>					
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>	<b>Cumulative Percent</b>
Valid	Very technical	110	55.0	55.0	55.0
	A bit technical	55	27.5	27.5	82.5
	Moderately technical	35	17.5	17.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

*Source: Field Data (2023)*

## **6.9 Chapter Summary and Discussions**

### **6.9.1 Summary**

This chapter examined the effectiveness of mobilization strategies used to communicate to and recruit PWDs from the Muhoroni sub-county into public participation for a concerned with planning and budgeting in Kisumu County Government. The study established that the six most used mobilization strategies are: local political leadership, radio, WhatsApp, Assistant Chiefs and Chiefs, Television, and NGOs. Generally, the study established through the survey and interviews that these mobilization avenues have worked to enhance the effective participation of PWDs in Kisumu County planning and budgeting. About 53% rated the effectiveness of local police leadership at only 25% and the major reason for this low rating was because the local leaders only communicated the information to their friends and sycophants who were mainly able-bodied people or PWDs grassroots leaders to serve the interests of PWD community hence did not voice the challenges of PWDs at such fora.

Secondly, radio was also rated by the majority to be effective up only 25%. Most said they did not think the county government was utilizing radio as an avenue as they rarely heard such announcements. Also, others said they did have radios, and still, the hearing impaired could not benefit from this avenue as they could not hear directly unless their caregivers told them after the news. WhatsApp was among the least-rated platforms for mobilization with the majority (150/75%) saying it was 0% or not effective at all. The main reason was the majority of the PWDs did not have the digital handsets which they said were very expensive. As a result, only a few of their leaders (4 of those we talked of) had such phones and could receive and disseminate the information downward. However even their leaders, who reported upon getting such information did not share with them up to the deepest parts of the village, hence only a few near the residences of the leaders and towns could hear such information.

Assistant chiefs and chiefs on their part were rated as ineffective by 69% of the participants. Major reasons stated by the respondents included the fact that chiefs and assistant chiefs only prioritized their relatives to go to these platforms especially once something was to be given as reimbursement. Television was also rated low with 130(65%) saying it was not effective at all. Only NGOs were rated as very effective by the majority 140 (70%). NGOs employed strategies

that included providing regular reimbursement, and using their programs as educative fora for PWDs on planning and budgeting processes. Finally, the study also established that these mobilizations were accompanied by certain salient challenges which were explored systematically. These included lack of facilitation to and from places of participation, and late communication of information about participation – leaving no space for planning on the part of the PWDs to attend. Another aspect of time was that less time was allowed for ventilation into the content of the information. The language used was also perceived as technical and not simplified for the consumption of the PWDs. Lastly, assistive devices were also not available at the places of participation

### **6.9.2 Discussions: Trends, Theoretical and Policy Implications**

One prevailing trend across all mobilization strategies is the perceived ineffectiveness of communication methods. Whether through local political leadership, radio, WhatsApp, or television, except the involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), PWDs often find these methods inadequate for reaching them with essential information about planning and budgeting processes. This trend highlights a critical need for improved, inclusive communication channels that accommodate the diverse needs and conditions of PWDs. From a theoretical perspective, it underlines the failure to apply the principles of the social model of disability, emphasizing the removal of barriers to participation.

Another central trend is the prevalence of exclusionary practices in the mobilization of PWDs. Across various strategies, PWDs encounter barriers that limit their meaningful participation. For instance, in the political leadership strategy, PWDs perceive politicians as more concerned with their interests than the needs of PWDs. Chiefs and assistant chiefs are often selective in choosing attendees for public participation forums, sometimes favoring their relatives over genuine PWDs. This pattern of exclusion illustrates a dissonance between the theoretical ideals of inclusivity and the practical application of mobilization strategies. To overcome these barriers, there's a pressing need for transparent and inclusive practices, that align with the social model of disability's principles.

Accessibility challenges significantly impede the effectiveness of mobilization strategies. These challenges encompass multiple dimensions, such as physical accessibility to participation

venues, financial barriers, and limitations associated with disability-friendly amenities. PWDs consistently face obstacles in terms of transport, language, and physical facilities. The data highlights the need for accessible transportation options, disability-friendly public spaces, and the provision of information in various formats, including braille and sign language. Theoretical underpinnings of this trend reflect a violation of the principle that participation should be accessible to all, regardless of their physical abilities.

The theoretical appraisal of these trends underscores the persistent gap between the conceptual frameworks of disability rights, as exemplified by the social model of disability, and the practical implementation of strategies aimed at involving PWDs in planning and budgeting processes. The social model of disability promotes inclusivity and the removal of barriers to facilitate participation. However, the data reveals shortcomings in the application of these principles.

The findings expose the failure to create communication methods that cater to the diverse needs of PWDs, violating the principles of universal design and accessibility advocated by the social model. Moreover, the prevalence of exclusionary practices perpetuates the marginalization of PWDs, contrary to the model's emphasis on equitable participation. Access barriers, whether related to physical spaces or economic limitations, further underscore the disconnect between theory and practice.

These trends hold significant policy implications. The ineffectiveness of mobilization strategies can lead to the continued underrepresentation of PWDs in decision-making processes, hindering the democratic principles of inclusivity and representation. To address these issues, there is an urgent need for political commitment to reform current mobilization practices. Political leaders must prioritize the needs and voices of PWDs and actively engage with them at the grassroots level. Policies should be implemented to ensure transparent and inclusive practices in the selection of attendees for public participation forums.

Furthermore, addressing accessibility challenges and ensuring that communication methods are genuinely inclusive are crucial political steps. This involves providing affordable hearing aids, facilitating access to digital devices, promoting the use of local dialects in information

dissemination, and delivering services in formats suitable for PWDs. Addressing these issues aligns with political principles of equality, social justice, and the rights of PWDs.

In summary, the findings reflect a pressing need for a paradigm shift in mobilization strategies that genuinely empower PWDs in the public participation process. This shift not only aligns with theoretical models of disability rights but also carries significant political implications for promoting equity, inclusion, and democratic representation for PWDs in Kisumu County's planning and budgeting processes.



## CHAPTER SEVEN

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 7.1 Introduction

In this final chapter, we consolidate the key findings from the preceding chapters and draw overarching conclusions about the participation of people with disabilities (PWDs) in county planning and budgeting processes in Kisumu County. The study aimed to explore the factors influencing the inclusion of rural-based PWDs in these processes and investigated their awareness of legal and policy provisions, strategies for enhancing participation, and the effectiveness of mobilization methods.

#### 7.2 Summary

In **Objective One** the study delved into PWDs' awareness of legal and policy provisions about county planning and budgeting processes. The study found a stark lack of awareness among PWDs about crucial policy documents and legislative frameworks, directly affecting their participation.

Through a comprehensive analysis of PWDs' awareness of county budgeting and planning policies, it becomes evident that there is a concerning lack of knowledge among the surveyed individuals. This lack of awareness appears to directly impact their participation in planning and budgeting forums. A vast majority of respondents were unfamiliar with essential policy documents and legislative frameworks, hindering their meaningful involvement in county development processes.

On **objective Two** the study examined the structures used by Kisumu County to facilitate the inclusion of PWDs in planning and budgeting processes. The study revealed deficiencies in the current approaches, leading to limited participation and impact. The examination of structures employed by the Kisumu County Government to promote the inclusion of PWDs in planning and budgeting revealed notable inefficiencies. While various avenues for participation exist, such as Village Council Units and formalized PWD offices, they have fallen short of ensuring robust engagement. The Community Budget and Economic Forums (CBEF), a primary platform for participation, suffers from limited accessibility and low participation rates among PWDs. Furthermore, formal structures meant to represent PWDs' interests have often been hindered by internal challenges, affecting their effectiveness.

In **Objective Three** the research explored the effectiveness of mobilization strategies used to engage PWDs in participation. The study highlighted a mix of successful and unsuccessful methods, influenced by factors such as resource availability and accessibility.

The study's assessment of mobilization strategies aimed at engaging PWDs in participation highlighted a mixed picture. While some approaches, notably those implemented by NGOs, have been relatively effective, others such as local political leadership and media channels have yielded inadequate results. Barriers including lack of resources, inadequate communication, and limited accessibility have hindered the potential impact of these strategies

## **7.3 Conclusion**

### **7.3.1 Main Conclusion**

The study has illuminated the multifaceted challenges and opportunities surrounding the participation of people with disabilities (PWDs) in county planning and budgeting processes in Kisumu County. Through a comprehensive examination of awareness levels, strategies for inclusion, and mobilization methods, this research underscores the critical need for systematic enhancements to ensure the meaningful involvement of PWDs in shaping county development. As Kisumu County strives for inclusivity, the recommendations drawn from the objectives collectively provide a roadmap for a more equitable and participatory future.

Therefore, this study has highlighted the pressing need to enhance the participation of people with disabilities in county planning and budgeting processes. The findings underscore the importance of awareness, effective strategies, and inclusive mobilization methods in ensuring meaningful involvement. By addressing the identified challenges and implementing the recommended measures, Kisumu County has the potential to establish a more inclusive and equitable development framework that empowers its PWD community.

As the journey towards inclusivity continues, we hope that this study contributes to a broader understanding of how marginalized groups can actively participate in shaping their communities' future.

**Objective One Conclusion:** The findings underscore the necessity of targeted awareness campaigns and accessible communication methods to ensure PWDs are informed about their rights, entitlements, and opportunities for engagement.

**Objective Two Conclusion:** The study's findings highlight the inadequacies of existing strategies and structures in fully engaging PWDs. There is a need to reevaluate and strengthen these mechanisms to foster a more inclusive approach.

**Objective Three Conclusion:** The study's findings underscore the importance of tailored and innovative mobilization strategies. The success of engagement efforts depends on addressing challenges like resource limitations and communication barriers.

Overall, this study signifies the pressing need to prioritize the inclusion of PWDs in Kisumu County's planning and budgeting processes. The multifaceted challenges identified can be transformed into opportunities for meaningful change through concerted efforts that prioritize awareness, accessible strategies, and tailored mobilization methods. By addressing these challenges head-on and implementing the recommendations provided, Kisumu County can take significant strides toward building an inclusive and participatory society that benefits all of its citizens, regardless of ability.

#### **7.4 Recommendations**

In line with the first study objective, the study recommends the: launch of comprehensive awareness campaigns that use accessible language and formats; collaboration of disability organizations to disseminate information and educate PWDs about their rights, and finally integration of awareness-building efforts into schools, community centers, and PWD-focused gatherings.

In regards to the second objective of the study, the study recommends that there is a need to: revamp the Community Budget and Economic Forums (CBEF) to be more accessible and participatory; enhance and formalize PWDs offices and structures to be more representative and responsive to PWDs' needs; collaborate with NGOs to identify innovative strategies and best practices for engaging PWDs effectively.

On the third study objective, the research recommends: collaboration with NGOs to refine mobilization strategies based on their experiences; prioritization of resources for accessible transportation and communication, especially for rural PWDs, and finally, development of partnerships with community leaders to strengthen mobilization efforts at the grassroots level.

### **7.5 Suggestions for Future Studies**

While this study has provided valuable insights, several avenues for future research remain unexplored such as an in-depth **Analysis of Policy Implementation**; this study has only scratched the surface of how disability policies experience implementation gaps. Future studies could delve deeper into the implementation of disability-related policies and legislations in Kisumu County, even selecting specific policies and examining them in detail. Such research could explore how well these policies are executed and whether specific barriers are hindering their effective implementation.

**Interplay of Intersectionality**; several signposts revealed in this study show the critical need for an intersectional analysis. Future studies could build on these signposts to investigate the intersectionality of disabilities with other factors such as gender, age, or socioeconomic status. Understanding how these multiple identities intersect and impact the participation of PWDs can provide a more nuanced view of their experiences, and suggest practical solutions to transition into a social model of disability in Kisumu County and beyond.

**Longitudinal Studies**; conduct longitudinal studies to track changes in awareness, accessibility, and participation over time. This approach would allow researchers to assess the long-term impact of policies and initiatives on the lives of PWDs in Kisumu County, as well as other counties.

**Comparative Analyses**; Conduct comparative analyses between different counties or regions in Kenya to determine variations in awareness, accessibility, and participation levels. This would provide valuable insights into the regional disparities in disability rights.

**Qualitative Inquiry into Mobilization Strategies**; Future research could employ qualitative methods to gain an in-depth understanding of the experiences, challenges, and successes of

PWDs regarding different mobilization strategies. This would help identify best practices and areas for improvement.

**Economic Barriers and Inclusion;** investigate the economic barriers faced by rural-based PWDs in Kisumu County and how these barriers affect their participation. Understanding the economic dynamics and employment opportunities for PWDs can lead to more targeted policy recommendations.

**Impact of Technological Advancements;** Explore how technological advancements, including assistive devices and digital communication, impact the awareness and participation of PWDs. Investigating the role of technology in bridging gaps can provide insights into innovative strategies for inclusion and pathways for more progressive policies.

## REFERENCES

- Anastasiou, D., & Kauffman, M.J. (2013). The Social Model of Disability: Dichotomy between Impairment and Disability. Retrieved from: at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249647375>.
- Ayiro, P.L. (2021). The Nature and Design of Mixed Methods Research. Inaugural Lecture, Daystar University, Nairobi Campus. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8z9Gae8l2vk>.
- Babbie, E.R. (2008). Research Methods for Social Work. Open Journal of Social Sciences, Vol.3 No.9, September 15, 2015.
- Bhattacharjee, A. (2012). *Social science research: Principles, methods, and practices*. Textbooks Collections. Retrieved from [https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/oa\\_textbooks/3](https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/oa_textbooks/3).
- Bolsoni-Silva, A. T., & Loureiro, S. R. (2015). Social skills of undergraduates without mental disorders: Academic and socio-demographic variables. *Psico-USF*, 20, 447-459.
- Cresswell, W.J. (2008). *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publishers. Retrieved from: <https://edge.sagepub.com/creswellrd5e>.
- Dirth, T. P., & Branscombe, N. R. (2017). Disability models affect disability policy support through awareness of structural discrimination. *Journal of Social Issues*, 73(2), 413–442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12224>
- Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (2022). FCDO Disability Inclusion and Rights Strategy 2022-2030 Building an Inclusive Future for All: A Sustainable Rights-Based Approach. Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office.
- Government of Kenya (2003). Kenya Persons with Disability Act. National Council on Law Exporting.
- Government of Kenya (2019). Kenya Population and Housing Census: Volume II: Distribution of Population by Administrative Units. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics.
- Government of Kenya (GoK) (2010). The Constitution of Kenya, 2010. National Council on Law Reporting.
- Government of Kenya (GoK) (2012). County Government Act, 2012. National Council on Law Reporting.
- Government of Kenya (GoK) (2012). County Governments Act, 2012. National Council on Law Reporting.

- Government of Kenya (GoK) (2012). The Public Finance Management Act, 2012. National Council on Law Reporting.
- Government of Kenya (GoK) (2021). Status Report on Disability Inclusion in Kenya, 2021: Implementation of Global Disability Commitments 2018. State Department of Social Protection, Senior Citizens Affairs and Special Programs.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. (2010) *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th Edition, Pearson, New York.
- Hasan, M.J. (2019). A Comparative evaluation of the implementation of public participation guidelines in Kenyan county governments. Retrieved from: <https://suplus.strathmore.edu/handle/11071/6726>.
- Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, J. H. (2016). Standardization and Harmonization of Socio-Demographic Variables (Version 2.0).
- Institute for Social Accountability (2020). Public Participation and Social Accountability in Kenyan Counties. Retrieved from: [https://www.africasvoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/AVF\\_CGHR\\_Siaya\\_social\\_accountability\\_pilot\\_study-final\\_report\\_Apr2020public.pdf](https://www.africasvoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/AVF_CGHR_Siaya_social_accountability_pilot_study-final_report_Apr2020public.pdf).
- Isaboke, E. M., &Kwasira, J. (2016). Assessment of budgeting process on the financial performance of county government of Nakuru, Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 4(5), 134-150.
- Kothari, C.R., (2004 2<sup>nd</sup>edn.). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- Marks, D. (1997). Models of disability. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 19(3), 85-91.
- Ministry of Economic Affairs (2015). Public Participation and County Information Dissemination Frameworks.
- Mitra, S., & Vick B. (2013). Disability and Poverty in Developing Countries: A Multidimensional Study. Retrieved from: [https://econpapers.repec.org/article/eeewdevel/v\\_3a41\\_3ay\\_3a2013\\_3ai\\_3ac\\_3ap\\_3a1-18.htm](https://econpapers.repec.org/article/eeewdevel/v_3a41_3ay_3a2013_3ai_3ac_3ap_3a1-18.htm).
- Mugenda, O. M., &Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative & qualitative approaches* (Vol. 2, No. 2). Nairobi: Acts Press.

- Network for Adolescents and Youths of Africa (NAYA) and NYARWEK Network (nd.). Budget Memorandum Regarding the Kisumu County Fiscal Strategy Paper 2019/2020. Presented to the Treasury and County Assembly of Kisumu.
- Opondo, W.A. (2017Thesis). Participation in County Budgeting Process in Nairobi County.
- Peters, S. J. (2007). “Education for All?”: A Historical Analysis of International Inclusive Education Policy and Individuals With Disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 18(2), 98-108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10442073070180020601>
- TISA (2018). Memorandum on the Final Draft County Integrated Development Plan CIDP) 2018-2022.
- TISA (nd.). A Tool for Public Participation in the Development of Nairobi City County CIDP 2018-2022.
- Trocaire Kenya (2019). County Integrated Development Plan & Citizen Participation.
- United Nations (UN). (2015). Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development A/RES/70/1. UN: New York.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2018). Disability and Development Report. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- Wacera, D. C. (2016Thesis). Citizen Participation & Budget Implementation in Nyandarua County.
- World Health Organization [WHO] & World Bank, (2011). World Report on Disability 2011. Retrieved from: <https://www.who.int/teams/noncommunicable-diseases/sensory-functions-disability-and-rehabilitation/world-report-on-disability>.



## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1: PARTICIPANT CONSENT AND INFORMATION FORM

My name is **Mohamed Ali** doing a Masters of Research and Public Policy (MRPP) at Maseno University. To complete my course, I must undertake research and write a master's dissertation.

This is why am undertaking entitled: **ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS INFLUENCING INCLUSION OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES IN COUNTY PLANNING AND BUDGETING: THE CASE OF MUHORONI SUB-COUNTY, KISUMU COUNTY**

I am hopeful that this study will generate important insights that will reveal opportunities and gaps in the manner of implementation of development projects in terms of their responsiveness to PWDs in so far as they participate in planning and budgeting processes. The objectives of this study are as follows:

#### **Specific Objectives**

- i) To determine the level of PWDs awareness of legal and policy provisions on public participation in planning and budgeting in Kisumu County;
- ii) To examine the strategies for enhancing rural-based PWDs' participation in county planning and budgeting processes in, Kisumu County;
- iii) To assess the effectiveness of the methods of mobilization of rural-based PWDs into public participation in planning and budgeting processes in Kisumu County.

If you agree, the interview will take about 45 minutes to 1 hour 30 minutes. I would appreciate it if you allow me (or my research assistant to fill in all the questions). There are no risks to taking part, and we hope that it will help community members who are women by highlighting important issues that they face.

One important thing to know is that we will keep the interview information confidential, this means not sharing your name or anything which would allow people to guess who has been interviewed (even our assistants helping us write up the interviews will not know). We will use the information to write reports, articles, and presentations, but no one will be able to know who has been interviewed.

You are free to refuse to take part in the research or refuse to answer a question, and you can stop the interview at any time and ask us not to use the information you have given. This is your right and you will not be affected negatively if you refuse. We are not conducting research for any organization or person or personal hidden motives. This is purely academic research and you can make references to any of the following persons who are the supervisors of the student. Maseno University Dean School of SDSS or Maseno University School of Graduate Studies, or even to the National Commission for Science and Technology (NACOSTI) to confirm the legality of this study as an academic work. The immediate contacts (supervisors) are as below.

**To Contact the supervisors:** If you have questions or concerns about this research, please contact reach out to Dr. Barack Calvince Omondi (barackcalvince@gmail.com), Dr. Jane Lusenaka (janelusenaka@gmail.com).

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: .....

Name-of-Research/Assistant

.....

## **APPENDIX 2: KEY INFORMANT AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS INTERVIEW GUIDES**

### **i) To determine the level of PWDs awareness of legal and policy provisions on public participation in planning and budgeting in Kisumu County**

- a) Do you think there is value in sensitizing PWDs on their rights to participate in county planning and budgeting?
- b) How do you sensitize them? Through what platforms? How often do you sensitize them?
- c) How do you particularly increase the inclusion of rural-based PWDs?
- d) What policies, legislations, and structures are in place to guide the process?
- e) Do you think their lack of awareness of these (named in d) is a hindrance to their successful participation in county budgeting and planning?

### **ii) To examine the strategies for enhancing rural-based PWDs participation in county planning and budgeting processes in Kisumu County**

- a) What approaches are in place to enhance the participation of PWDs in county planning and budgeting processes?
- b) How does the county ensure PWDs participate in ADP?
- c) How does the county ensure PWDs participate in CIDP?
- d) How does the county ensure PWDs participate in CBEF?
- e) How does the county ensure PWDs participate in VCU?
- f) What are the most pressing challenges to the successful sensitization of PWDs about the legal and policy frameworks on county planning and budgeting?
- g) How can these be remedied?

### **iii) To assess the effectiveness of the methods of mobilization of rural-based PWDs into public participation in planning and budgeting processes in Kisumu County**

- a) How can you gauge the use of local radio stations as a method of calling for the participation of the public, especially the PWDs cohort?

- b) How can you gauge the use of TV stations as a method of calling for the participation of the public, especially the PWDs cohort?
- c) How can you gauge the use of PWD leaders as a method of calling for the participation of the public, especially the PWD cohort?
- d) What are the most critical challenges hindering the successful participation of PWDs wherever they make it to a public forum:
  - 1. Technicality of the budgeting language?
  - 2. Lack of safe/PWDs-sensitive spaces?
  - 3. Cost of reimbursement?
  - 4. Representativeness?
  - 5. PWDs support technology: assistive devices.
- e) What opportunities are unexploited in terms of the techniques used to call for and facilitate PWDs' participation in county planning and budgeting?

#### APPENDIX 4: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

A) SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES		
1	Respondent name	
2	Gender	1. Male 2. Female
2	Name of ward	1. Muhoroni-Koru 2. Miwani 3. Masogo-Nyangoma 4. Ombeyi 5. Chemelil-Tamu
3	Type of disability	1. Physical 2. Hearing 3. Mental 4. Visual 5. Any other (specify)
4	Employment status	1. Not employed at all 2. House-wife 3. Juakali/informal Sector 4. Salaried but temporary 5. Salaried and permanent
5	Level of education	1. No formal education 2. Primary completed 3. Primary not completed 4. Secondary completed 5. Secondary not completed 6. College/university completed
<b>OBJECTIVE ONE:</b> To determine the level of PWDs awareness of legal and policy provisions on public participation in planning and budgeting in Kisumu County;		
6	Have you ever been involved in a county public sensitization event on the processes of planning?	1. Yes 2. No
7	Have you ever been involved in a county public sensitization event on the processes of budgeting?	1. Yes 2. No
8	Who sensitized you?	
9	Do you understand what ADP is?	1. Yes 2. No
10	Do you understand what CIDP is?	1. Yes 2. No
11	Do you understand what VSU	1. Yes 2. No
12	Do you understand what CBEF is?	1. Yes 2. No
13	Do you understand the process of	1. Yes

	budgeting in Kisumu County?	2. No
14	Have you ever been engaged in monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of ADP or CIDP in Kisumu County	1. Yes 2. No
<b>OBJECTIVE TWO:</b> To examine the strategies for enhancing rural-based PWDs' participation in county planning and budgeting processes in Kisumu County;		
22	Have you ever participated in a county planning and budgeting workshop?	1. Yes 2. No
24	Was your movement facilitated?	1. Yes 2. No
25	Was the meeting hall/venue PWD-enabled?	1. Yes 2. No
26	Please explain your answer in 25 above.	
27	How can you gauge the language used during the meetings?	1. Very understandable 2. Understandable 3. Moderately Understandable 4. Not Understandable 5. Not Understandable at all
28	How likely are you to want to be part of such meetings again?	1. Very likely 2. Likely 3. Moderately likely 4. Unlikely 5. Very unlikely
29	What are the key challenges that accompany how you are mobilized to participate in county planning and budgeting processes?	
30	What remedies or opportunities for change can you advise different stakeholders to pursue and improve your involvement in such processes?	
<b>OBJECTIVE THREE:</b> To the effectiveness of the methods of mobilization of rural-based PWDs into public participation in planning and budgeting processes in Kisumu County.		
30	Have you ever been mobilized to participate in county planning and budgeting?	1. Yes 2. No
31	How were you mobilized?	1. Radio 2. WhatsApp 3. Chief 4. Assistant Chief 5. PWDs Leader/Coordinator
31	Who mobilized you?	1. Chief

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Assistant Chief</li> <li>3. PWDs Leader/Coordinator</li> <li>4. NGO</li> <li>5. MjiKumi</li> <li>6. Any other (specify)</li> </ol>
32	How effective are these tools and people doing mobilization?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Very effective</li> <li>2. Effective</li> <li>3. Moderately effective</li> <li>4. Not effective</li> <li>5. Very ineffective</li> </ol>
33	Please discuss your answer in 32 above.	
34	What are the major challenges hindering your successful recruitment to participate in planning and budgeting in the county?	
35	Please suggest solutions to remedying these challenges	