



Journal of International Business, Innovation and Strategic Management

2022: 6 (2): 1 - 15

ISSN: 2617-1805

**STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS AND SERVICE DELIVERY IN MERU COUNTY GOVERNMENT, KENYA**

Nancy Kainda\* & Dr. Jane Njoroge<sup>1</sup>

\* & <sup>1</sup> Department of Public Policy and Administration, Kenyatta University, Kenya

Corresponding Author Email: [nancykainda@gmail.com](mailto:nancykainda@gmail.com)

**To Cite this Article:**

Kainda, N. & Njoroge, J. (2022). Stakeholder Consultations and Service Delivery in Meru County Government, Kenya. *Journal of International Business, Innovation and Strategic Management*, 6 (2), 1 - 15

**ABSTRACT**

The importance of public engagement in improving service quality has been recognized. Just as many studies focused on performance change and its impact on performance, there is a gap in research into how engagement by citizens affects the provision of services. This study aimed at closing this gap by establishing the effect of stakeholder consultations on service delivery in Meru County Government anchoring on the Citizen Participation. A descriptive research design was used to achieve the objective of the analysis. The study targeted members of county assembly, management staff, supervisors, junior staff and ward support staff who totaled to 150. A recommended sample size of 30% equivalent to 45 respondents was adopted. This sample was proportionately distributed then sampled through stratified random methods. The primary data used in the study was collected through a structured questionnaire then analyzed through a Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 24 to obtain descriptive (Percentage, Frequency, Mean and Standard deviation) as well as inferential statistics (regression analysis). The study findings indicated that Stakeholder's Consultations has a positive and significant effect on public service delivery in Meru ( $\beta = 0.416$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ) implying that a positive change in the unit of stakeholder's consultations can result to a significant improvement in Public Service Delivery in Meru County.



Based on this, it is recommended that there is need for the directors of communication in various counties to consider that stakeholder's consultation is held to ensure there that there is improved responsiveness of citizen. The study suggests that the systems in the County should enable the members of public to be involved in county affairs. Stakeholder should involve development of constructive, productive relationships with members of public over the long term.

**Key Words:** *Stakeholder Consultations, Service Delivery, Devolved Government Units, Kenya*

## **BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

The constitution is a treaty between government and citizens in democracy, says Moseti (2010), which decides how it is governed. This emphasis on citizens is also primarily expressed in the government structure in the country concerned. Public participation is one of the main principles of democracy. According to Mdunyelwa (2008) public participation is the mechanism by which people who are potentially influenced or involved in a decision are sought and facilitated. Public participatory principles state that those affected by a decision are entitled to take part in decision-making. This means the commitment of the public to the decision (Moseti, 2010). The aim of public participation, according to Moseti (2010), is to foster accountability, open government and develop ownership of development decisions and projects. Public involvement allows people to participate more closely in decision-making processes that influence local communities. It helps people understand the functioning of the government. UN HABITAT (2004) adds that public engagement provides the public with the chance to control the development programs and projects and engage in them.

The relation between public engagement and accountability is obvious. Well-developed public involvement initiatives create trust, encourage transparency, reinforce stakeholder engagement in enhanced governance and reduce corruption potentials. It seeks to close the divide between government, civil society, the private and public sectors. Public involvement also creates an agreement on the local situation, goals and programmes (Moseti 2010). The involvement of the public ranges from knowledge exchange to active citizen engagement in project and service implementation and management (UN HABITAT 2004). The instruments for establishing various kinds of engagement include consultations of stakeholders and public hearings, as well as neighbourhood watchdogs. The common thread of the different instruments is the local government's commitment to sharing knowledge and to involve the community in an open dialogue. The voices of the public should not only be heard, but also expressed in decisions about growth, so that the government is accountable to the population. There are already processes in operation, according to Moseti (2010). For example, at the government meetings, there are public hearings at which people can vote on the local government policy. Other important mechanisms of public engagement, such as study circles, citizen advisory councils, government contract committees, public meetings and public oversight groups, which minimize corruption and make transparent.

The County Government Laws of Kenya includes Section 91 of the County Government Act to allow the County government to encourage the creation of citizens' participation structures. These are: ICT related platforms; city council meetings; preparation and validation of a budget; advisory boards: advertisement of jobs, appointments, procurement and other public interest important public notifications; construction project sites; participation routes for representatives of the nations, including but not limited to members of the National Assembly, Senates. This right is guaranteed by the fourth schedule in the Constitution, County Government Act 2012 and Public Finance Law 2012. The Kenyan system of devolved management guarantees public involvement (The Constitution of Kenya, 2010). The Constitution mandates county governments to provide sufficient basic services to residents, such as water, primary education, welfare and agricultural, financial and sanitary facilities. It has been entrusted with ensuring that the public engage in the County government's decision-making and planning processes.



Section 91 of the County Government Act allows the county government to promote the development of citizenship systems, including: networks focused on information media technologies; city hall meetings; budget planning and a validity process; notice boards. There is a direct connection between public engagement and accountability. Well-developed public participation mechanisms create trust, encourage transparency, enhance the stakeholder engagement for better governance, and restrict corruption potentials. Public engagement supports openness, transparency and accountability (Moseti, 2010). The goal of public engagement is to bridge the divide between government, civil society, the private sector and the general public and to establish a shared understanding of local conditions, goals and programs. Enhance public engagement through: ensuring the quality and effective delivery of services for Residents by the County Governments; enhance the effectiveness of public employees; reduce dependency upon the creditorship; promote accountability and transparency in service delivery and public resource utilization; reduce bureaucracy and ineffective procedures (Mdunyelwa, 2008).

### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Service delivery is key to county governments performance. Meru county government have declined their service delivery index according to a survey done by Ipsos (2019). The survey was focused on the assessment of public engagement, market ease and entrepreneurship status, human development metrics, timely delivery, comfort facilities, service provider availability and environmental patterns in counties. The responsibility for delivering a range of services within the region of competence lies with Meru County. Meru County aims to provide quality services that are accessible, affordable and sustainable. Meru County aims at increasing community involvement and building a safe environment for political, social and economic growth by engaging a committed and empowered team. It has a vision to be the country of choice to invest, work and live in order to achieve this vision and goal.

Moreover, under section 92 of the County Government Act, the Governor shall apply to the county Assembly an annual report on citizen involvement in county government affairs. The Constitution is undermined by any failure by the county government to comply with those duties. However, there is no study that analyzes the question of public participation and its impact on the delivery of services in Meru County. This study attempted to address this void by analyzing the impact of public engagement on Meru County Government service delivery. Public involvement in improving service quality is crucial (Letsoalo, 2007). Before research, performance improvement based primarily. In Kenya Electricity Generating Company Ltd., Kasyoki and George (2013) analyzed the success management of employee motivation. The issues of performance of public institutions in the Kenya transportation sector were discussed by Korir, Rotich, and Bengat (2015). This study therefore brings together the methods, contexts and concepts found in the studies. This study sought to fill the gap by evaluating the effect public participation in the provision of services in the administration of Meru County. The specific concept interrogated was the effect of stakeholder consultations on public service delivery in the devolved unit.

### **OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY**

The study established the effect of stakeholder consultations on the provision of services in the Government of Meru County



## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Citizen Participation Theory

The study is anchored on the Citizen Participation Theory, propounded in the year 1986 by Lyndon. According to the theory, citizen participation is a practice that offers common citizens an opportunity to engage in transparent decisions. It can be traced to ancient Greece and Colonial New England from the beginnings of citizen participation. Administrative processes and methodology were structured to facilitate the involvement of the public before the 1960s. The program was organized in the middle of the 1960s with President Lyndon B Johnson's Great Society. Citizen participation is a way to ensure that people have a direct say in the decisions they make. The terms "subject" and "open," as well as cooperation and association are commonly interchanged. While the two are mostly used to portray a procedure in which nationals have influence in decisions on open-air policy, both have particular implications and have little understanding of the procedure that they try to describe. The word Invest in residents has grown, according to Brandsen, Dekker and Evers (2010), and its relationship with transparent fundamental leadership, without a shared understanding of its value or effects.

Many offices or individuals ignore or limit citizen involvement in the preparation of programs, saying it is too costly and time-consuming to cooperate. In response to a successful response to a proposed venture or activity, on the other hand, several national interest initiatives are launched. A successful instinctive association program, on the other hand, can provide significant benefits. According to Kooiman (2003), there are five benefits of local investment in the planning process: Information and opinions on open issues; public support for making decisions; avoidance of lengthy conflicts and costly postponements; reservoir of positive attitudes that can be applied to future decisions; and spirit of involvement and trust between the office and the general public. The direct or indirect involvement of interested stakeholders in decision-making about policies, plans, or programs in which they have an interest is referred to as public participation in project performance (Crosby & Bryson, 2005). Decision makers can engage through their public involvement with federal agencies, political officials, non-profit organizations and trade groups that are developing or implementing public programs and policies.

Cheema and Rondinelli (2007) argued that while involvement in management is more narrowly described as a form of government when it can be confined to discrete activities, for example a hall meeting or a citizen survey, or characterized by procedures (including the hosting of committee consultations or other forms of consultations). Azfar et al. (1999) argued in democracy citizens are seen as important parties involved directly and indirectly by elected representatives to shape, enact and implement their laws and policies. Bryson (2004) established that public participation in democracy is also an integral part of public relations. Since, however, government output has been greater than this relationship in depth and need for public involvement (Osborne, 2010). Despite extensive public participation expectancy in governance, its implementation is covered by realistic and theoretical debates. Key questions include: what makes public participation valid and useful; relations between diversity and represented and included; The essence and the proper function of different kinds of expertise and experience and the difficulty of developing well-adapted participation processes.



It also addresses the following questions: This theory guided this study to understand how to participate in finance through an evaluation of the success of the top-down approach, whether public participation increases the acceptance and efficiency of the theory of service delivery. Greening and Grey (1994) argue that they ought not know their rights and responsibilities solely, nor should they know the channels by which they may practice them if devolution is to be successful citizens politically.

## **STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIONS AND SERVICE DELIVERY**

Public participation is a deliberative mechanism that involves interested or affected individuals, civil society groups prior to the decision-making of the political system, according to the European Institute for Public Participation (2008). According to Cohen and Rung (2004) Public participation acknowledges the plurality of objectives and values and encourages collective solution of problems in the pursuit of more legitimate policies. In decisions where there are clear conflicting interests, public participation matters most, but social cohesion or resource contribution needs a collective response (European Institute for Public Participation 2009) Public participation, according to Contandriopoulos (2004), is a highly context-driven social and political method. Abelson and Gauvin (2006) argued that it is debatable that it can be incorporated into communities through technocratic means and planned, enforced and then tested with techniques.

The amount of time, resources, and energy that governments in OECD countries invest in engaging people and civil society in public decision-making versus the amount of attention they pay to assessing the efficacy and impact of such initiatives has been noted in studies of international public participation activity (OEDD, 2005). According to Pope (2000), citizen engagement will help the poor move from being passive recipients of services to producers of those services, allowing them to benefit both economically and socially by participating in governance. According to Pope (2000), a well-informed citizenry that is conscious of its rights and secure in asserting them is a necessary cornerstone for a national integrity framework. A population that is disengaged from government creates fertile ground for widespread corruption, fraud, and mismanagement. People who participate in government are given knowledge and the resources they need to create their future path.

The County Government Act, Section 91, allows the county government to assist in the development of mechanisms for citizen participation. These include: ICT-based platforms; town hall meetings; budget planning and approval for a; bulletin boards: advertising employment, assignments, acquisition, grants, and other critical public announcements; construction project sites; avenues for people's representatives to participate. Since it requires the use of institutionalized control by the state to ensure the efficient management of development capital, service delivery is political. The relationships between stakeholders and the distribution and use of power and power networks with legal distribution and production of resources are involved. Creation and politics of inclusive and sustainable growth are therefore related to delivery (McLennan, 2007). One challenge to public involvement is when local leaders meet in the boardroom, decide on the construction of a building, compile a paper, allocate money, etc. Community organizations must be involved in the transition of expertise and ownership by local citizens, ranging from the planning to execution and the assessment phase of a specific project.



Creighton (2005) describes the advantages of public engagement as an improvement in decision quality; minimizing costs and delay; creating trust and making it easier to deliver. According to Masango (2002) there are two key advantages of public participation of democratic political processes: that is, participation contributes to better policy results; and secondly, participation helps the public to build capacity to improve their lives. In order to initiate and enforce informed decisions, public engagement offers useful input on local people needs and desires of public authorities. It provides a forum for expressing public concern in order to influence public officials to take a specific course of thinking. The general public is informed, active and educated by public participation (Hanyane, 2005). Public participation is essential as it consolidates the political convictions, traditions and values which the majority of the public in a democratic state does not observe. The public participation duty is to keep the broader public aware of the consequences of a decision in order to determine whether to participate in the public participation process.

The public is not responsible. Second, the program of public participation must be highly visible and widely available so that they have a clear understanding of how and when it can be carried out, should they wish to participate. Many difficulties lie in translating the idea of public engagement into the difficult reality of daily contact with the state, corporations and the public. Often rapid decisions are necessary and are based on the latest science and technical knowledge available according to Creighton (2005). Chapter Eleven of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 highlights the aims, values and strands of the government of the country in particular. The paper highlights the importance of counties in achieving good governance, effective service for people, economic and social stability. Autonomous support and efficient delivery of services in the county government are known as main elements of the overall performance of a new government system.

The World Bank (2012) recognizes that only if options are converted into expenses can public engagement be meaningful. External pressure must correspond to the pressure for improvement in the public service, requiring a public trusting of their relationship with the public service and a public who understands the performance expectations that this service sets itself. In the absence of which it would be difficult to distribute resources effectively, government should be able to collect information on electoral preference. Public engagement is an essential element of the 2030 vision, according to Barasa and Eising (2012). This is because the social and economic foundations of the transfer are vital cornerstones. The budgeting, execution and monitoring as well as the assessment aspects of construction projects involve reliable and improved consulting and knowledge sharing processes. An organization not only owns the organization and therefore it is necessary to develop and the more it is, the newer ideas and inventions are received. interactions between the organization and other stakeholders.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

To achieve the objective, this study adopted a descriptive research design. The focus of this study was the county government of Meru which is one of Kenya's 47 counties. The county has 9 Sub Counties split into 48 wards. The target population of the study was the Members of county assembly, Management staff, Supervisors, Junior staff and Ward support staff who totaled to 150 as broken down in Table 1.



**Table 1: Target Population**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Members of county assembly	25	17
Management staff	10	7
Supervisors	15	10
Junior staff	60	40
Ward support staff	40	27
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

To determine the sample size, a 30% proportion recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (2013) was adopted. This included 45 respondents who were proportionately stratified, then randomly sampled. The main data collection instrument adopted by the study was a structured questionnaire which was suitable in extracting quantitative data that could be used for testing relationships between the study variables. The quantitative data extracted was edited, coded and analyzed using a statistical software for social sciences after it has been collected. Both descriptive (Percentage, Frequency, Mean and Standard deviation) as well as inferential statistics (regression analysis) were conducted on the data to achieve the study objective. The regression model took the following format:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \varepsilon$$

Where Y is the dependent variable (Service Delivery in Meru County),  $X_1$  is Stakeholder's Consultation,  $\varepsilon$  is the error term which is assumed to be normally distributed with mean zero and constant variance,  $\beta_0$  is the constant while and  $\beta_1$  is the parameter to be estimated.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Response Rate

The study targeted 45 respondents from Meru County government who comprised of the members of county assembly, management staff, supervisors, junior staff and ward support staff. These were issued with a questionnaire and out of the number, a total of 34 responded as shown in Table 2. This gave a response rate of 76%. The minority (24%) were the respondents who filled their questionnaires partially, wrongly as well as those who never responded at all. More than 70 per cent of the response rate is an excellent response, according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), and hence 76% in the current study was satisfactory.



**Table 2: Response Rate**

Departments	Sample	Response per Strata		Percentage Response
Members of county assembly	8	6	75	17.65
Management staff	3	3	100	8.82
Supervisors	4	3	75	8.82
Junior staff	18	12	66.67	35.29
Ward support staff	12	10	83.33	29.42
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>75.56</b>	<b>100</b>

### Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive findings were used to establish the mean and standard deviation of the responses on the Likert scales used in the study. A scale of 1 to 5 was used in the study. Quantification of Likert scale categories was done by assigning numerical values to the various categories in order to facilitate statistical representation of data. The data was analysed using SPSS version 24 using frequency and percentage tables and it is from those the recommendations were derived. The mean and standard deviation of the responses is presented in this section per variable.

### Descriptive Analysis of Public Service Delivery in Meru County

The respondents rated statements on service delivery in Meru County on a Five Point Likert Scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. The equivalent mean score for agree and strongly agree was 3.5 to 5 on the continuous likert scale; ( $3.5 \leq S.D / D < 5.0$ ) while the scores for moderate score has equivalent score of 2.5 and 3.4. Finally, the score for disagree and strongly disagree had equivalent mean score of; ( $0 \leq S.A / A < 2.4$ ). Equally, standard deviation of  $> 5$  indicated that there was significant difference on the impacts of variables on the study participants. The results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Descriptive Analysis of Public Service Delivery in Meru County**

Statements	Mean	Stdev.
The service is offered efficiently in the county	3.999	1.102
Citizens meet the service providers at the convenience of their locality	3.163	1.311
The services offered such as water, fundings, roads and security meet the expectations of the citizen	4.176	1.111
The service providers are available most of the time for assistance	4.571	.8113
There is timely delivery of county service	4.777	.8878
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.032</b>	<b>.1.112</b>





The results in table 3 showed that the service is offered efficiently in the county as indicated by a mean of 3.999 and standard deviation of 1.102. The results showed that citizen moderately meet the service providers at the convenience of their locality, as shown by an average of 3.163 and a standard deviation of 1.311. The services offered such as water, funding, roads and security meets the expectations of the citizen as demonstrated by an average of 4.176 and a standard deviation of 1.111. The service providers are available most of the time for assistance (Mean=4.5710, Standard deviation=0.8113). An average of 4.777 and a standard deviation of 0.8878 showed that, there is timely delivery of county service.

Devolution provides an opportunity to rationalize the service delivery framework in Kenya for increased efficiency and accountability. This will be achieved by making counties the hub for organizing services at the local level (Khaunya, Wawire & Chepng'eno, 2015). A report by KPMG (2014) states that the success of devolution of services in Kenya depends to a great extent on the presence of an enabling environment, an environment that is marked by the will and commitment of all stakeholders.

### Descriptive Analysis of Stakeholder’s Consultations in Meru County

The respondents also rated statements on Stakeholder’s Consultations in Meru County on a Five Point Likert Scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree. Stakeholder consultation involves the development of constructive, productive relationships over the long term. It results in a relationship of mutual benefit; it enables the county to identify trends and emerging challenges which are currently or will in the future impact on its operations. The results are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Descriptive Analysis of Stakeholder’s Consultations in Meru County**

Statements	Mean	Stdev.
Meru County has processes in place for stakeholder meetings.	4.122	1.232
At Meru County, stakeholder consultations offered a forum for developing long-term objectives.	4.443	1.323
In Meru County, stakeholder consultations have proven to be successful in preventing corruption.	3.453	.9455
Meru County has developed open decision-making practices as a result of stakeholder consultations.	4.717	1.112
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.122</b>	<b>1.231</b>

The study results presented that Meru County has processes in place for stakeholder meetings as indicated high mean of 4.122 and standard deviation=1.232. The results indicated that at Meru County, stakeholder consultations offered a forum for developing long-term objectives (Mean=4.443, standard deviation=1.323). It was presented In Meru County; stakeholder consultations have not effectively proven to be successful in preventing corruption as presented by a mean of 3.453 and a standard deviation of 0.9455. Majority of the employees reported that Meru County has developed open decision-making practices as a result of stakeholder consultations (mean=4.717, standard deviation=1.112).



Public services, in particular, have embraced the approach, seeking involvement of the public in the development and shaping of future services to particular communities; an acknowledgement of the need to involve service users in service development, review and policy making. Thus, consultation has become a requirement in the successful development of public policy and service. However, its use is not confined to the public and “not for profit” sector. Stakeholder consultation should serve as a basis for defining long-term priorities for the County's good governance. Mosesti (2010) argued that the citizens' consultative councils are normally organized around particular questions such as economic growth or housing. Citizen Consultative Boards consist of community volunteers who provide input and suggestions to the County Governments concerning local issues. Citizen advisory boards can provide valuable safeguards from corruption and help to develop open decision-making processes. Section 11 of the Laws of Kenya, No.1A of the 2015 Public Service Act requires stakeholders’ involvement and participation in promoting public service standards and principles.

**Regression Analysis**

A regression analysis was used to establish the effect of Stakeholder’s Consultations on public service delivery in Meru County. In a regression analysis, the results show the model summary, ANOVA and model coefficients. The model summary presented the coefficient of determination (R-Square) which explained the degree to which the independent variable (Stakeholder’s Consultations) explains the variations in the dependent variable (Public Service Delivery). The results are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: Regression Model Summary**

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.556	0.31	0.306	0.17287

The study results showed that Stakeholder’s Consultations has a positive strong correlation with public service delivery (R = 0.556). This implies that an increase in Stakeholder’s Consultations is strongly associated with an improvement in public service delivery in Meru County. The results further showed that up to 31% of the variations in public service delivery in Meru County can be explained by stakeholders’ consultations. This implies that Stakeholder’s Consultations contributes strongly towards public service delivery however other significant factors were not exhaustively factored in the model. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to establish the model fitness. The ANOVA model results for model fitness was presented in Table 6.

**Table 6: ANOVA**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2.507	1	2.507	14.356	0.000
Residual	5.588	32	0.175		
Total	8.095	33			



The ANOVA results in Table 6 indicated that the regression model to predict the effect of Stakeholder’s Consultations on public service delivery in Meru County was a good fit (Sig < 0.05). This shows that the regression model was suitable in the prediction and any conclusions based on the results was statistically acceptable. The regression model coefficients were also established and presented in Table 7. The model coefficients showed the nature and magnitude of the relationship between Stakeholder’s Consultations and public service delivery in Meru County.

**Table 7: Regression Model Coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.011	0.144		13.996	0.000
Stakeholder’s Consultations	0.416	0.045	0.556	9.244	0.000
Dependent Variable: Public Service Delivery in Meru County					
Predictors: (Constant), Stakeholder’s Consultations					

**Substituted Coefficients**

*Public Service Delivery in Meru County = 2.011 + 0.416 Stakeholder’s Consultations*

The results in table 7 indicated holding stakeholder’s consultations, the value of service delivery would be 2.011 ( $\beta_0 = 2.011$ ). This was positive to imply that public service delivery was well off even before Stakeholder’s Consultations. Based on the model coefficient, it was indicated that Stakeholder’s Consultations has a positive and significant effect on public service delivery in Meru ( $\beta = 0.416$ ;  $P < 0.05$ ). This implies that a positive change in the unit of stakeholder’s consultations can result to a significant improvement in Public Service Delivery in Meru County by up to 0.416%. This is consistent with the results by Mosesti (2010) that public involvement and participation was essential in promoting public service standards and principles which enhanced delivery.

**CONCLUSION**

The study concluded that indeed Meru County has processes in place for stakeholder meetings. Stakeholder consultations offered a forum for developing long-term objectives. However, stakeholder consultations have not effectively proven to be successful in preventing corruption. Majority of the employees reported that Meru County has developed open decision-making practices. Public services, in particular, have embraced the approach, seeking involvement of the public in the development and shaping of future services to particular communities; an acknowledgement of the need to involve service users in service development, review and policy making.

The study further concluded that there was a positive and significant effect of stakeholder’s consultation on service delivery. The study concluded that stakeholder’s consultation are major contributors to the improved service delivery. Through stakeholder’s consultations, the county will get valuable safeguards from corruption and help to develop open decision-making processes. Stakeholder’s consultations and participation help in promoting public service standards and principles.



## POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

There is need for the directors of communication in various counties to consider that stakeholder's consultation is held to ensure there that there is improved responsiveness of citizen. The study suggests that the systems in the County should enable the members of public to be involved in county affairs. Stakeholder should involve development of constructive, productive relationships with members of public over the long term.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Nancy Kainda wrote the concept paper as well as the research paper. She sought permissions from relevant institutions and collected, cleaned and analyzed the data under the guidance and supervision of Dr. Jane Njoroge. Dr. Jane Njoroge further proofread the final work to ensure it was in line with academic standards before sharing for publication.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I express my most sincere appreciation to all who assisted me to improve this document. I recognize my supervisor Dr. Jane Njoroge for her guidance, advice and concern which resulted to production of this paper. I also wish to recognize my family for their emotional and financial support. In addition, I acknowledge my friends and classmates who participated in the discussions and for sharing their experiences that led me to finalize the entire paper.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this Manuscript. In addition, the ethical issues; including plagiarism, informed consent, misconduct, data fabrication and/ or falsification, double publication and/or submission, redundancy has been completely observed by the authors.

## REFERENCES

- Abelson, J., & Gauvin, F. P. (2006). *Assessing the impacts of public participation: Concepts, evidence and policy implications*. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Azfar, O. (1999). Conditions for effective decentralized governance: A synthesis of research findings.
- Barasa, T., & Eising, W. (2012). *Reforming Local Authorities for Better Service Delivery in Developing Countries. Lessons from RPRLGSP in Kenya, Nairobi: Institute for Policy Research*.
- Brandsen, T., Dekker, P., & Evers, A. W. M. (2010). *Civicness in the governance and delivery of social services*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Bryson, J. M. (2004). Designing public participation processes. *Public administration review*, 73(1), 23-34.
- Cheema, G. S., & Rondinelli, D. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Decentralizing governance: emerging concepts and practices*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Cohen, J. & Rung, A. (2004). Deliberation et action Publique. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 10(4), 147-210.
- Common Wealth Secretariat (2002). *Current good practices and new developments in public sector service management*. The Commonwealth of Nations.
- Contandriopoulos, D. (2004). A sociological perspective on public participation in health care. *Social Science & Medicine*, 58(2), 321-330.



- Creighton, J. L. (2005). What water managers need to know about public participation: one US practitioner's perspective. *Water policy*, 7(3), 269-278.
- Crosby, B. C. & Bryson, J. M. (2005). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world* (Vol. 264). John Wiley & Sons.
- European Institute for Public Participation (2008). Public Participation in Europe: An international perspective. [https://www.partizipation.at/fileadmin/media\\_data](https://www.partizipation.at/fileadmin/media_data)
- Greening, J. & Grey, K. (1994). Public participation, civic capacity, and climate change adaptation in cities. *Urban climate*, 14, 52-67.
- Hanyane, B. (2005). Defining the concept of civic interest in post-apartheid South Africa: A question of administrative philosophy in the making. *Politeia*, 24(2), 255-270.
- Human Rights Law in Africa, E. African Charter for Popular Participation in Development and Transformation. *Human Rights Law in Africa Online*, 1(1), 787-795.
- IPSOS (2019). Public Service Delivery Survey Results.
- Kasyoki, F. K., & George, G. E. (2013). Analysis of Performance Management on Employee Motivation: A case of Kenya Electricity Generating Company Limited. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(21), 2222-1905.
- Khaunya, M. F., & Wawire, B. P. (2015). Devolved governance in Kenya; is it a false start in democratic decentralization for development?
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance*. Sage.
- Korir, S. C., Rotich, J., & Bengat, J. K. (2015). *Performance management and public service delivery in Kenya*. Unpublished Masters Project, University of Embu, Kenya
- KPMG (2014). Are Kenyans' dissatisfaction with devolution justified?
- Lennan, A. M. (2007). Unmasking delivery: revealing the politics. *Progress in Development Studies*, 7(1), 5-20.
- Letsoalo, M. P. (2007). Impact of performance management on service delivery in the South African public service. *Journal of public administration*, 47(si-1), 299-310.
- Mdunyelwe, L. (2008). *Public Participation in Local Government: Its impact on Service Delivery*. Conference Proceedings International Research Group Programme, South Africa.
- Moseti, Y. (2010). Public participation for sustainable development in local cities. In *46 th ISOCARP Congress, Kenya*.
- Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). Research methodology. Qualitative and Quantitative Methods. *Social Science Research: Theory and Principles*. Acts Press.
- Naylor, L. A., Kippen, H., Coombes, M. A., Horton, B., MacArthur, M., & Jackson, N. (2017). Greening the Grey: a framework for integrated green grey infrastructure (IGGI).
- OECD (2005). *Evaluating Public Participation in Policy Making*. OECD Publications.
- Osborne, S. P. (2010). Delivering public services: time for a new theory?
- Pope, J. (2000). *Confronting Corrupt. The elements of National Integrity System*. Germany: Transparency International.
- Republic of Kenya (2013). *The constitution of Kenya: 2010*. Chief Registrar of the Judiciary.
- UN HABITAT (2004). *Urban Governance toolkit series. Waterlod Park Master plan (n.d) Public Participation key ideas, frameworks, and theory and practice*. University of Waterloo. London
- World Bank. (2012). *Devolution without Disruptions Pathways to a successful New Kenya*. Poverty Reduction Economic Management unit Africa Region Kenya.

#### **COPYRIGHTS**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author (s), with publication rights granted to JIBISM Journal. This is an open -access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

