

https://dspace.org/

Citizen participation in local policy making in Malawi

Malamulo, Terence Crayl

2013-06-03
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/12762

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Citizen Participation in Local Policy Making in Malawi

By Terence Crayl Malamulo (Student #: 568116)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of a Master of Management in Public Policy at the Graduate School of Public & Development Management.

University of Witwatersrand

Submitted: March 2012

Supervisor: Professor Anne McLennan

Declaration on plagiarism

I declare that this report is my own unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Management in Public Policy at the Graduate School of Public and Development Management in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other University.

Signature: _____ Date: 23rd March 2012

Terence C. Malamulo

Dedication

I dedicate this work to the people of Ngwenya and other people living in places deprived of their political rights to influence development and governance policies. I hope this work will help you stand and say enough is enough, and take action. I hope that someday democracy shall flourish; and that the local citizens shall determine services of their governments.

Acknowledgements

My sincerest gratitude goes to my supervisor and mentor, Professor Anne McLennan for walking with me in every step of this exciting project.

A million thanks to Nellie Kuthyola, my fiancée, for her tireless support. She was my pillar of administrative and moral support throughout this project that begun in February 2011. My gratitude also extends to John Hamilton and Chikumbutso Phambanisa Mkwamba, who significantly assisted me in meeting financial costs to execute this project; without them this project could have merely been a dream.

I am indebted to Ms Hilda Nkhata for the moral support; Linda Sendeza for the assistance on field situation analysis; and to Mrs Tina Bangula for helping with bookings and contacts of the participants for the interviews and providing me with a copy of the Lilongwe City Development Strategy (2009). I also extend my gratitude to the committee members of Ngwenya Community Development Committee and the staff members of Lilongwe City Council for giving me time for interviews for the study.

I am also thankful to Professor Edge Kanyongolo, John Hamilton, Dr Diana Cammack and Hosi John for the exclusive peer review engagements; and to all my classmates in the Research Proposal course for their constructive comments. I am highly indebted to all my coursework lecturers for their technical insights that helped me assemble a competitive arsenal to do this project.

Table of Contents

Declaration on plagiarism i

Dedication ii

Acknowledgements iii

Table of Contents iv

Abstract ix

List of Abbreviations x

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Introduction 3

1.2. Background and context: citizen participation in local policy making in Malawi 4

1.3. The national decentralization programme in Malawi 8

a) The programme as designed 8

b) The programme as implemented 9

1.4 Problem and Purpose Statement 10

1.5. Research Questions 10

a) Primary research question 10

b) Secondary research question 11

1.6. Significance of the Problem 11

1.7. Nature of the Study 11

1.8. Theoretical framework for the study 12

1.9. The Regulatory Framework for Citizen Participation in Malawi 13

1.9.1. The national framework 13

1.9.2. The international framework 14

1.10. Conceptualisation 14

1.11. Operationalization 16

1.12. Limitations of the research study 16

1.13. Overview of the research report 17

1.14. Conclusion 17
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 19
2.1. Introduction 19
2.2. Citizen participation, public accountability and public policy processes 19
2.2.1. Nature of citizen participation 20
2.2.2. Citizen participation in a democratic policy context 20
2.2.3. Policy planning and public accountability 21
2.3. Public accountability and democratic local governance 23
2.4. Decentralization and local accountability 24
2.4.1. The four forms of decentralization 24
2.4.2. The promises of decentralization 26
2.4.3. Decentralization challenges 27
2.5. The reality of decentralization in Malawi 28
2.5.1. Political variations in management of decentralization 29
2.5.2. Research study insight 32
2.6. Making citizen participation work 32
2.6.1. Towards a successful citizen participation programme 33
2.6.2. Nature of Participation forums 35
2.6.3. Citizen Participation, local policy and its promises 36
2.7. The evaluation framework for citizen participation in policy making 37
2.8. Conclusion 43
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 44
3.1. Introduction 44
3.2. Research design 44
3.3. Methodology 47
3.3.1. Sampling Frame 48
3.3.2. Data Collection 50

3.3.3. Data Analysis and judgement criteria 54
3.3.4. Validity and Reliability 62
3.5. Conclusion 63
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS 64
4.1. Introduction 64
4.2. Ngwenya Community 64
4.3. Lilongwe City Council 66
4.4. The Lilongwe City Development Strategy (CDS) 70
4.5. Citizen participation in the making of the Lilongwe CDS (2009) 71
4.5.2. Phase II: The development of the CDS 81
4.5.3. Phase III: Preparing for the implementation of the CDS 92
4.6. Conclusion 98
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OFRESEARCH FINDINGS 99
5.1 Introduction 99
5.2. Local participatory planning structures 100
5.2.1 Nature of the local participation structure 100
5.2.2. Source of issues for deliberations in local planning 101
5.2.3 Response of local plans to the citizens' demands 102
5.2.4. Equitable requirements of the local planning structures 104
5.2.5. Citizens decision making prerogatives in the local planning structures 105
5.2.6 Reporting channels on resolutions from the local planning structures 105
5.2.7 Overall performance of the local participatory structures in CDS making 106
5.3. The processes and practices in engaging the local citizens 106
5.3.1. Functional awareness 107
5.3.1.1. Citizens' awareness of the CDS making project 107
5.3.1.2. Citizens' awareness of the goals of their participation in the CDS making 108
5.3.1.3. Citizen's awareness of the consultative review workshops 109

5.3.1.4. Sub-overall performance of citizens' functional awareness to participate in CDS making 111
5.3.2. Engagement access and skills 111
5.3.2.1. Nature of access procedures 111
5.3.2.2. Citizens' skills development 112
5.3.2.3. Existing skills development programmes 113
5.3.2.4. Sub-overall performance of engagement access and skills 114
5.3.4. Defensible decision making processes 115
5.3.4.1. Allocative efficiency: how many citizens' demands feature in the CDS 115
5.3.4.2. Citizens' perception on responsiveness of the planning process 116
5.3.4.3. Policy issue setting and prioritization: the negotiation criteria 117
5.3.4.4. Existence of traceable plans: social contracts 117
5.3.4.5. Sub-overall performance of the defensive decision processes 118
5.3.5. Overall performance of processes and practices of citizens' engagement 118
5.4. The enforcement mechanisms 119
5.4.1. Legislation on local participatory decision making 119
5.4.2. Citizens' functions in the planning process: corporate mandate 120
5.4.3. Citizens' address and redress: a discretion or mandatory? 121
5.4.4. Remedies and sanctions in local policy making 122
5.4.5. Overall performance of enforcement mechanisms 124
5.5. The reality of citizen participation in the local policy planning- Lilongwe city 124
5.6. Recommendations: making citizen participation count in decentralization 132
5.6.1. Enforcing democratic accountability in practice 132
5.6.2. Increased civic awareness and active citizenship 134
5.6.3. Citizen based monitoring and evaluation of local government services 134
5.6.4. Mediation and litigation: review of the CDS and its implementation plan 135
5.6.5. Improve council's technical capacity on policy planning and social justice 136

5.6.6. Use of the researcher's evaluation framework as a checklist in local policy planning 136

5.7. Conclusion 137

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION OF THE RESEARCH REPORT 139

6.1. Introduction 139

6.1. Overview of the thesis 139

6.2. Main Findings 144

6.3. Implications of the findings 145

6.4. Directions for future research 149

6.5. Conclusion 149

CHAPTER 7: REFERENCES 151

ANNEX I: The Research Guiding Tool 163

ANNEX II: Questionnaires submitted to Local Government Official& UN Habitat 169

ANNEX III: List of the research participants 177

ANNEX IV: The MDGs 178

ANNEX V: Members of the Extended Taskforce 181

ANNEX VI: Sample matrix of a traceable local development plan 183

Abstract

In the last two decades, a number of discourses on democratic governance and development in the developing countries position citizen participation as a public accountability mechanism. Most countries have adopted decentralization governance reforms to enable local citizens to influence government policies and services. Literature on decentralization shows weak coherence on how public accountability works to achieve local development and democracy consolidation. Hence, the research study proposes a citizen participation model that should be used in investigating citizen based public accountability in policy making. The evaluation study intends to measure the extent to which citizen participation influences public accountability in local policy making in Malawi; using an evaluation framework based on the suggested citizen participation model. The evaluation investigated the influence of citizen participation in the making of the Lilongwe City Development Strategy (2009). It used qualitative research design and a case study of Ngwenya, a peri-urban area in Lilongwe City. The study used a clarificative evaluation approach. The study found that there is poor citizen participation to influence public accountability in local policy making in Malawi. The findings depict that the conceptualization of citizen participation model should underpin policy principles and associate laws to frame contextual base that helps decentralization benefits reach the local citizens. The report suggests that to improve public accountability through citizen participation primarily there should be: i) clear social, constitutional or political contracts between local government and citizens; ii) adherence to democratic governance; and iii) consistent alignment of programme implementation to assumed contexts in their design.

List of Abbreviations

AAC	Area Action Committees
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CDC	Community Development Committee
CDS	City Development Strategy
CONGOMA	Council for Non-Governmental Organizations in Malawi
CP	Citizen Participation
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DDC	District Development Committees
DFID	Department for International Development-United Kingdom
GIZ	*Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit*
HRCC	the Human Rights Consultative Committee
ICCPR	the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
UDHR	the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
IMF	the International Monetary Fund
JICA	Japanese International Corporation Agency
LGA	Local Government Act
MCP	Malawi Congress Party
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MGDS	Malawi Growth and Development Strategy
MGPDD	Malawi German Programme for Democracy and Decentralisation
MHRC	Malawi Human Rights Commission
MLGRD	Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
MP	Member of Parliament
NDP	National Decentralization Policy
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NORAD	the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

NSO	National Statistics Office
OPC	Office of the President and Cabinet
RNE	the Royal Norwegian Embassy
UDF	United Democratic Front
UN	United Nations
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UN Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
VAC	Village Action Committees

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Citizen participation can enhance public accountability in policy making (Bochel, 2006; Devas & Grant, 2003; Sharma, 2009). Ideally, governments are mandated to provide services for public interests and needs. The mandates are usually based on political, economic or constitutional contracts. Governments tend to use public policies to guide their mandate in servicing the public interest and needs (Bang & Esmark, 2009; Smit & Johnston, 1983). The provided services are meant for every citizen and the broader society regardless of the government's political system (Bang & Esmark, 2009; Samuel, 2007). Citizen participation in such services is generally considered a public accountability measure. The involvement of the citizens entails substantive engagement of citizens in decision making, setting policy priorities and actions, and monitoring and evaluation (Sharma, 2009:7; Van Meter, 1975:805). In such regard, it's considered that citizen participation enhances likelihood of the government to being able to comply with public interests and needs (Beierle & Cayford, 2002:14; Manor, 1999).

Although a government is meant to serve citizens and the broader society regardless of the type of political system (Bang & Esmark, 2009; Samuel, 2007), some types of political systems have demonstrated better comparative potential to be responsive and responsible to citizens' interests and needs within governance frameworks (Kendall, 2003:260; Sharma, 2009).Theoretically and in ideal states, democratic systems of government seem to have more opportunities to respond and be responsible to citizens' interests and needs. A democratic system of government is premised on popular participation in governance and the legitimating of a government (Inter-Parliamentary Union, 1998:5). Malena, Forster and Singh (2004) argued that a fundamental principle of democracy is that citizens have the right to demand accountability of their government and public actors have an obligation to account. Unlike other political systems of government, in a democracy citizen participation is a fundamental political right. Schmidt (2002:147) emphasized that the trademark of democratic regimes is government of the people by the people (or elected representatives of the people) and for the people; but the degree to which the trademark is reflected in practice varies from one democracy to the other. Ideally, in democratic governments, citizen participation is submerged in public services as an accountability remedy and a political right; and not a mere moral

discretion (Beris & Berthet, 2002; Bochel, 2006; Heller, 2009; Sharma, 2009:8; United Nations, 1966; World Bank, 2004:6). Therefore, in democratic states, citizen participation has the power to enhance public accountability of governments in policy making and implementation.

Since the early 1990s many African governments have adopted decentralization systems under the political wave of democratization (Cross & Kutengule, 2001; Leftwich, 2007). In most of the African countries, the democratization has been influenced by public demands for more transparent and accountable governments, improved public service delivery and good governance (Crook & Manor, 1998; Malena *et al.*, 2004). Alongside local political pressures, the United Nations (UN), the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and other aid organizations from the western donor community also pressed demands on governments. The two pressure fronts influenced the adoption of the democratic systems of governance. In many of the developing countries, the democratic changes came with a package of decentralisation reforms of the local government systems (Bovens, 2005; Crook & Manor 1998; Goodwill-Gill, 2006:12; Stanley, 2003: 7).

Within this analytical framework of local governance reforms, a common argument is that decentralised local government systems render the local governments more accountable to the local citizens (Chinsinga, 2005:529; Malena *et al.*, 2004; Heller, 2009; Hussein, 2003; Stanley, 2003: 7; Sharma, 2009:10). Ideally, public accountability is reflected through government's response to the local popular needs with compliance to the specified governance framework of the local government system. Laurian and Shaw (2008) argue that citizen participation is a significant element of participatory democracy as it promotes transparent, inclusive, and fair decision-making processes that entails some degree of power sharing between government agencies and members of the public. Citizen participation in policy making tends to lead to improved service delivery and promotion of democracy (Heller, 2009; Malena e*t al.*, 2004:4; McLennan, 2007). However, evidence from a number of countries shows that decentralization does not automatically result in policy outcomes that reflect the needs and priorities of local

citizens which in turn tend to yield poor progress in poverty reduction initiatives (Devas & Grant, 2003; Francis & James, 2003:326).

Malawi is one of the developing countries that have showed that decentralization does not automatically result in decisions that reflect public interests and needs (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), 2010:29). Malawi is in Sub Saharan region of Africa. It adopted democracy and decentralization policy in 1994 and 1998, respectively (Patel, Tambulasi, Molande & Mpesi, 2007:7; Cross & Kutengule, 2001:7). The Malawi's transition to democracy was a result of the 1990s democratization waves that hit the Southern Africa (Cross & Kutengule, 2001:7).In Malawi decentralization has proved not an easy route to raise citizen based accountability. To pinpoint how the components of decentralization programmes interplay to influence public accountability as a whole or on component based requires a systematic evaluation (Laurian & Shaw, 2008:14; Owen, 2007; United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), 2007).

This evaluation research assesses the extent to which citizen participation in Malawi has influence in upholding public accountability in the policy and delivery plan making at the local government level. The evaluation study will contribute to development of planning and evaluation methods for improving the decentralization programme on addressing local citizens' demands and needs.

1.1. Introduction

The first part of this chapter shows that citizen participation has power to influence public accountability in policy making. It explores the context of government systems in which citizen participation works better as a public accountability mechanism. The chapter highlights outcome limitations of citizen participation in upholding public accountability across different governments in the world. It argues that governance context matters with regard to the power of citizen participation to influence public accountability in local development planning.

In the subsequent sections, there is a discussion on the problem background and context that informed this research study. In such regard, the chapter

discusses the background and context of citizen participation in Malawi which highlighted the driving factors to the current decentralization system as guided by the Local Government Act (LGA) (1998). The description of the citizen participation programme component focuses on how the intended design is supposed to be implemented towards the goals of poverty reduction and deepening democracy. It gives the purpose and objectives of the evaluation research study. The chapter provides the description of citizen participation component in the decentralization programme.

The chapter also discusses the theoretical framework underlying this evaluation study. It further discusses the Regulatory framework that supports citizen participation in local policy making in Malawi. Then it argues for applicable meanings of citizen participation and public accountability as used in this research study. Finally the chapter discusses limitations of the study and provides an overview of this research report

1.2. Background and context: citizen participation in local policy making in Malawi

In May 1994, Malawi's political system transitioned from a one party system to multiparty democracy. This change of government system paved the way for national local governance reform (Kaunda, 1999). An important driving factor to this peaceful revolution was public demand for an accountable and transparent government. The demand for accountability and responsiveness of the government was to ensure protection of political and other human rights and alleviation of escalating poverty levels nation-wide (Patel *et al.,* 2007). World Bank donors also supported the demands for public accountability as part of democratization of the government system through aid conditions (Cross & Kutengule, 2001:8; Kaunda, 1999). Grounded on the driving factors for the multiparty democracy, the democratic era promised avenues of good governance, focused on citizen participation in policy making and development (Kaunda, 1999).

Prior to 1994, during the years of Malawi Congress Party authoritarian rule, citizen participation in policy making at the local government level yielded little influence on government policy issues (Kaunda, 1999; Patel *et al.*,

2007). Meanwhile, in 1964 the Malawi Congress Party (MCP) government under the leadership of Dr Hastings Kamuzu Banda had introduced local government participation structures for policy and decision making (Chiweza, 2005). Local participation consisted of a district council and the public representatives in the council were locally elected by the local citizens through universal adult suffrage on a multiparty basis (Cammack, Mutebi & Kanyongolo, 2006). The elected representatives led the district council in policy and decision making.

However, the arrangement on the elected representatives at the council was short-lived as it only existed for 2 years. In 1966, the MCP government made an amendment to the Local Government Ordinance (1953) that removed the authority of district councils to make policies and rules (Cammack *et al.*, 2006). The new local government system gave powers to Dr. Banda to choose local councillors from a list of nominated MCP members (*ibid*). This amendment was done along the new constitution of 1966. Malawi was declared a one party state under this 1966Republic of Malawi Constitution (Act No. 23 of 1966) (Kaunda, 1999:583). The new arrangement of instituting the local councillors made the councillors have more allegiance to MCP party interests than the local citizens' interests and needs (*ibid.*).

Meanwhile, the Government implemented a top-bottom approach to policy making and established a network of development committees which became the main channel for central government resources: the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD), Malawi German Programme for Democracy and Decentralisation (MGPDD) & the Royal Norwegian Embassy (RNE), 2005:19). The established development committees were District Development Committees (DDCs), Area Action Committees (AACs) and Village Action Committees (VACs).

The established development committees did not have statutory, corporate and executive power status of local government authority structures (Chinsinga, 2005:534; MLGRD *et al.*, 2005:19). Much more, the AACs and the VACs were networks of the party machinery at sub-district level and

reporting to the District Development Committee (Chinsinga, 2005). The District Development Committee was comprised of the District Commissioner as chairman, Traditional Chiefs, Local Officials, Party Representatives, local Members of Parliament and a number of other appointed representatives. In essence, these new development networks reported to the Office of the President and Cabinet (MLGRD et al., 2005:19). Chinsinga (2005:533) infers "the major criticisms of DDCs were that: 1) they were hardly serious forums; 2) they met irregularly; and 3) they merely produced a series of wish lists for development projects. These could only be implemented if they were in line with the priorities of the *central ministries*. Consequently, the MCP government had deprived citizens of their opportunity to access information, voice their needs and participate in the policy making and implementation (Cammack *et al.*, 2006). The 1966 local government amendment eroded the role of citizens in the creation of policies.

The MCP Government's centralized approach to governance and policy making ensured that the party kept control of political power and national unity in the country (Kaunda, 1999). This situation is in line with Bates' (1981) argument that governments make choices among policy options based on political utility of the selected option rather than citizen's good. In the case of Malawi, the *centralized policy-making* approach limited government's opportunity to tap public policy from raised popular interests and demands as individuals could not debate or oppose the central government's policies (Kaunda, 1999:584; Laurian & Shaw, 2008). As time passed, the MCP increasingly became detached from citizens' voices and scrutiny. The government failed to recognize and respond to emerging public concerns in welfare and governance areas such as respect for human rights, education, poverty eradication and health (Kaunda, 1999; Patel et al., 2007). The aforementioned political and economic challenges precipitated the public demand to end the one party regime system and to establish a democracy in 1993.

Alongside local demands for a democratic government system, the donor community (such as United States of America, the World Bank and the United Nations) pressed aid conditions for political and governance structural adjustments (Chinsinga, 2005: 533; Cross & Kutengule, 2001; Kaunda, 1999:589). The donor countries and the World Bank significantly reduced bilateral assistance and development aid respectively. Changes in aid affected Malawi's economy and pushed it into stagflation (Kalipeni, 1996). The economic situation challenged the credibility of the autocratic MCP regime. The World Bank and the United Nations pressed for governance reforms to address national and local economic woes without which non-humanitarian support to the country would be suspended (Chinsinga, 2005; Kalipeni, 1996; Kaunda, 1999).

Malawi achieved democratic governance in 1994 under the leadership of the United Democratic Front (UDF) party. The local government reform was part of the wider national governance reform agenda to promote democracy and development (Patel *et al.*, 2007; Kaunda, 1999). The reform had a given legal provision in the democratic constitution of Malawi (1995). However, in the first four years of UDF leadership, the government failed to review and enact the new Local Government System. Malawi government has not given reasons for the delay to enact the Act (Kaunda, 1999:591). However, some scholars such as Kaunda (1999) attribute the delay to government's enactment of decentralized local government as a threat to legitimacy in politically hostile local communities. This is because the UDF government had fewer constituents than the opposition parties, with MCP having the majority.

The Local Government Act (LGA) was adopted in 1998. It entrenches the National Decentralization Policy (NDP). The local government reform was to facilitate the establishment of public participation empowerment mechanisms and procedures in policy making and development and in the consolidation of democracy (MLGRD *et al.*, 2005; Tambulasi, 2009).

1.3. The national decentralization programme in Malawi

This section gives a description of the decentralization programme in Malawi as an *operationalization* tool of local government services. The section is divided into two parts: a) the programme as designed and b) the programme as has been implemented.

a) The programme as designed

The NDP (1998) aims to (i) improve service delivery to citizens and (ii) strengthen democracy at grassroots level. The LGA (1998) is the overarching legislation for the decentralization reforms. It guides that all the objectives of the local government programmes are to be framed on furthering constitutional order based on democratic principles, accountability, local transparency and participation of the people in decision-making government and development processes. The values apply to all other components of the decentralization programme. The decentralization policy is premised on the principle of *mphamvu ku anthu* (power to the people) to ensure public accountability in the democratic Malawi (MLGRD *et al.*, 2005).

The formulation of local government policies hinges on citizen participation through direct and representative democracy. In decentralization, the elected local representatives are the policy makers at the assembly level. The administrative officers are policy implementers as agreed by the elected representatives of the people (Local Government Act, 1998). The administrative officers also facilitate policy making as technical experts (Local Government Act, 1998).The Local Government Act (1998) guarantees representative and direct popular participation in the development planning processat the local government level.Each local government authority is required to establish popular participation structures for local citizens' participation in development planning decision making (NDP, 1998).

b) The programme as implemented

The decentralization programme came into operation in November 2000 (Cammack *et al*., 2006). That is when the first and only local democratic government elections were held to date (December 2011). The terms of office of the councilors elected in 2000 expired in 2005. Since then, the government has not called for local government elections and local governments have been operating without elected representatives who constitute the political arm of local government. Meanwhile, the local administrative government officers also have the constitutional mandate to be accountable to the public in the policy making (Bovens, 2005:8; Constitution of the Republic of Malawi, 1995).

There have been some constitutional amendments affecting the political representative arm of the local government system. A major amendment is the one that conferred the president with the prerogative to schedule local government elections (LGA, 2010 amendment bill). A number of scholars claim that president Bingu Wa Mutharika's failure to call for local government as fear of losing political control since the ruling party seems to have shaky support on the ground (Cammack*et al.*, 2006; Patel *et al.*, 2007). In another amendment the assemblies were renamed to councils in 2010 (LGA amendment 2010).

Most of the reports on decentralization in Malawi indicate that systematic efforts to address public accountability have been more on the local assemblies' supply side. Such efforts include staff trainings, administrative rules and procedures, political checks and balances through the councilors and financial regulations. Generally, the reports also indicate that instances of citizen participation have been limited to implementation of development programmes and planning of small projects, which have been spearheaded by the donor community or civil society organizations (Chinsinga, 2008; Chiweza, 2005; MLGRD *et al.*, 2005).

1.4 Problem and Purpose Statement

In the LGA (1998), citizen participation was instituted to enhance government's public accountability in policy and decision making in order to achieve good governance and improve development (Chiweza, 2005; Hussein, 2003; LGA, 1998). However, a number of research reports over the last decade indicate challenges related to accountability: increased cases of corruption; favouritism in allocation of resources; bureaucrats misallocation of resources; government's non-compliance with local governance rules and laws; and lack of responsiveness of local governments signalled by more disparities between the local assembly services and community needs (Chinsinga, 2008; Hussein, 2003; Ferguson & Mulwafu, 2004; NORAD, 2010; Patel *et al*., 2007; Tambulasi, 2010; Tambulasi & Kayuni, 2007:65).. Since dissolution of the local assemblies in 2005, there has been no systematic research study undertaken to determine the extent of citizen participation's influence on the city development strategy adopted in 2009. Literature, in Malawi and beyond, shows that there is no evaluation framework for citizen based accountability in local policy making. The established knowledge from this study would potentially improve citizen-based accountability which may lead to service delivery that works for the local citizens (NDP, 1998; Owen, 2007; Shah, 2006).

The purpose of this study is to establish the extent of citizen participation in the local development strategy (2009) as a mechanism of influencing public accountability in service delivery to the citizens of Ngwenya area, Lilongwe. The study also demonstrates how a new citizen based accountability evaluation framework works in investigating the influence of citizens in policy making.

1.5. Research Questions

This research study was guided by the following research questions:

a) Primary research question

To what extent does citizen participation support public accountability in the city development strategy making at the local council level?

b) Secondary research question

1) To what extent do the existing planning structures offer adequate space for citizen participation in city development strategy making?
2) To what extent do the processes and practices for citizen engagement provide an adequate base for responsiveness and transparency in the policy making?
3) To what extent do the enforcement mechanisms provide for demand and claiming opportunities for the local citizens' engagement?

1.6. Significance of the Problem

The history of the nature of citizen participation in local policy making in Malawi shows that inadequate citizen participation has previously created development disparities and governance discontent among citizens (Kaunda, 1999; Tambulasi, 2010). It's highly probable that the level of citizen participation in policy making can have a huge impact on the alignment of government priority areas relevant to citizens' demands. However, without a clear logic on how citizen participation interplays to influence public accountability decentralization will likely continue to bear less effective and relevant development outcomes. This study provides a foundation on how to plan citizen participation to in order to achieve public accountability in decentralization.

1.7. Nature of the Study

This study focuses on the role of governance in public policy making. It focuses on how public accountability can play out to make public policy work for citizens at the grass root level. The study examines the interactions between the local government and citizens in democracy. Furthermore, the research study explores the processes and practices of local policy making, its impact on nature of policy designed and citizen participation as one of the governance institutions in the institutional arrangements of the local assembly in policy making and service delivery.

1.8. Theoretical framework for the study

The research study is premised on new institutionalism theory and the non-decision making and decisional approach power models (Hall & Taylor, 2006;Ham & Hill, 1993; Lukes, 1993). The key institutions engaged in the local assembly system are the elected local government officers, the citizens and the administrative government officers. The institutional arrangements among these institutions influence the level of public accountability in policy making and implementation (De Mesquita, Morrow, Siverson & Smith, 2002; Shah, 2006).

The new institutionalism theory has three schools of thought, namely: sociological, rational and historical (Hall & Taylor, 2006). Sociological institutionalism informs that the establishment of some government institutions such as the local assemblies is based on the obligation of government to establish its social legitimacy. In regards to the interactions among the involved institutions at the local assembly, the rational choice approach informs that the involved institutions have fixed preferences that may compromise the common public interests (Hall & Taylor, 2006). As part of addressing this challenge of fixed preferences, the rational choice and sociological institutionalism approaches suggest that to increase accountability on public needs, the institution has to establish mechanisms to shape and enforce behaviour of the involved institutions for increased potential to achieve social outcomes (Hall and Taylor, 1996). Such mechanisms include the establishment of norms, provision of information, procedures and rules (Hall & Taylor, 1996). In regards to these established mechanisms, the historical institutionalism approach suggests that past socio-economic and political factors influence the nature of norms, procedures and rules (Barzelay & Gallego, 2005; Hall & Taylor, 2006).

In relation to different preferences among actors in an institution, Leftwich (2007) suggests that institutions are never neutral but can be influenced to be neutral through power distribution. Power distribution in institutions can be explained by the non-decision making and decisional approach power models. The non-decision making and decisional approach power models

suggest that the extent of power is reflected by the issues considered for decision making, the exact decisions made and tangible behaviours of the involved institutions (Ham & Hill, 1993; Leftwich, 2007; Lukes, 1993). In this context, power refers to the ability of one institution to make another institution do what it would not otherwise do (Ham & Hill, 1993). These models indicate that if citizens have power then their issues become policy issues and the responsible institution behaves accordingly to address these issues as public policy.

1.9. The Regulatory Framework for Citizen Participation in Malawi

Citizen participation in the local government system is regulated by the LGA (1998 and subsequent amendments); in conformity with the Constitution of the Republic of Malawi (1995). It is further supported by other international regulatory frameworks, namely: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (1966) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (1948). This section espouses the guidelines as legal stipulations that regulate citizen participation in policy making at the local government level.

1.9.1. The national framework

The LGA (1998) was enacted with respect to Section 146 of the Malawi constitution which provides for establishment of a local government system. Section 3 of the LGA, states that democratic principles, accountability, transparency and public participation in decision making shall be the rationale of all the objectives of local government. This stipulation guides on the expected nature of the local assembly arrangements and processes on policy making and service delivery. The NDP (1998) declares the provision of engaging popular participation in the governance and development of the local authority areas. This is in accord with the Constitution of Malawi, Section 40(1) (c) (1995) that states that every person shall have the right to participate in peaceful political activity intended to influence the composition and policies of the government. There is resonance between the Local Government Act (1998) and the Constitution's

political right stipulation on ensuring that local citizens participate in determining actions of the government.

1.9.2. The international framework

The ICCPR (1966) and UDHR (1948) are the key international legal documents of reference regulating citizen participation. The ICCPR (Article 25) and UDHR (article 21) have a similar stipulation that states the will of the people shall be the basis of authority of a government. In addition it states that every person has a right and should have the opportunity to, directly or through a chosen representative, take part in public affairs or government activities. The Government of Malawi is a party to the convention and the declaration. Hence, it is obliged by Article 2 of the ICCPR to be consistent with the conventions' stipulated human rights. So far, Malawi, through the constitution, has been consistent with the stipulations in the ICCPR (Article 25) and UDHR (Article 21).

1.10. Conceptualisation

This research study revolves around the diversely defined concepts of citizen participation and public accountability (Bovens, 2006; Laurian & Shaw 2008:3; Morrissey, 2000; Sharma, 2009:6). In this regard, the study conceptualizes specific meanings to the concepts of citizen participation, citizens' demands and public accountability in relation to the Malawi decentralization policy goals framing this study (Bovens, 2006; Laurian & Shaw, 2008).

1.10.1. Citizen participation and citizens' demands

Citizen participation is the involvement of local citizens that influences policy decisions and actions of government in public affairs (Bochel, 2006; Constitution of the Republic of Malawi, 1995; MLGRD *et al.*,, 2005; Neuman, 2010:182; Rowe& Frewer, 2004). Citizen involvement is constituted by: (i) functional awareness of subject issues by the citizens; (ii) availability of citizen access and skills enhancement activities; (iii) existence of supportive legal provisions on citizen's functions and roles; (iv) existence of policy

demand structures; and (v) existence of defensible decision making processes (Arnstein, 1969; Behn, 2001; Bochel, 2006; Graham & Phillips, 1998: 6; Neuman, 2010:203; Rowe& Frewer, 2004; Schroth, 2010). Hence, substantive citizen participation depends on good performance of citizen participation all these five dimensions.

Citizens' demands are a set of needs and interests that the local citizens request for and are willing to accept from an agency at various progressive levels (Arnstein, 1969; Calitz &Siebrits, 2008; Hyden, 2007; LGA, 1998; Ribot, 1999). This concept recognises that development is progressive and that there are limited resources to be used to address needs and interests. For instance, if a local council develops a development plan that captures needs and interests of a particular community without citizens requesting for them, then those needs and interests don't qualify to be called citizen's demands. Hence, there is a difference between citizens' demands and the public interests and needs.

1.10.2. Public accountability

Public accountability refers to a state in which activities and resources in the public sector are being managed responsively and transparently with respect to entrusted responsibility by the particular entrusted persons or institutions (Behn, 2001; Bovens, 2006; Dowdle, 2006; Neuman, 2010:182). This entrusted responsibility entails duty or performance agreement. It may include facilitation of policy formulation, coordination of policy implementation and management. The responsibility can be formal or informal and is executed within particular values, operation rules, procedures and standards (Behn, 2001; Bovens, 2006).

An example of an institution with trusted responsibility to the public is a local council. A local council is mandated to facilitate effective and efficient ways to address citizen's interests and needs with a focus on citizen participation in decision making and services (LGA,

1998). The responsibility can be assumed based on constitutional or political or social contract obligations.

The provided concepts of citizen participation, citizens' demand and public accountability will guide the operationalization of this study.

1.11. Operationalization

In assessing citizen participation in the making of the Lilongwe city development strategy the research study concentrated only on the following phases in policy process: problems identification, agenda setting; policy adoption; budgeting; and implementation plan (Anderson, 2011). This research suggested a specific evaluation framework of citizen participation in policy making with the objective of upholding public accountability (Graham & Phillips, 1998; NDP, 1998; Yang & Callahan, 2011). The suggested evaluation framework guided the research in the actual evidence to be gathered. The same evaluation framework was used as a primary tool in the analysis of the findings.

1.12. Limitations of the research study

The research study focused on the component of citizen participation from the policy formulation stage to the delivery commitment stage. The research study examined the process of policy making in the formulation of the five-year Lilongwe city development strategy, 2010 – 2015. The research only considered popular citizen participation in a formal local government system. It did not explore citizen participation in the actual delivery of the policy services due to the nature of the identified problem. The research did not explore other public accountability measures such as the calibre of executive staff of local assemblies, the formal fiscal mechanisms, the administrative mechanisms, the political mechanisms and the local assembly resources capacity. The research did not determine the quality of public choices or the quality of the policy outcomes. The study results out of this research cannot be immediately generalized as the prevailing case of citizen participation in policy making in entire Malawi.

1.13. Overview of the research report

The thesis is composed of six chapters. This first chapter provides the introduction to the overall research work conducted. It primarily provides the research problem and purpose statement; the background and context of citizen participation in the local government of Malawi; and the theoretical benchmark informing the study. Chapter two is a discussion based on an extensive literature review. The chapter examines the theoretical and practical benefits and linkages of citizen participation, public accountability, democratic local governance and its evaluation. The discussion in this second chapter identified the areas of citizen participation and public accountability concepts that are in line with this evaluation research.

Chapter three discusses the research design and methodology that was utilized in the evaluation study. Chapter four presents the research findings. Chapter five builds on the research findings; it discusses the research findings and provides interpretations. Finally chapter six captures conclusions out of the discussion of chapter five. Critically, this chapter discusses the implications of the main findings, provides recommendations and draws conclusions of the research. It also points out the main limitations of the study and possible areas for further research.

1.14. Conclusion

This chapter has argued that citizen participation has the power to influence public accountability in the policy formulation process. It has depicted that citizen participation as a public accountability mechanism works better in democratic government systems. However, the discussion in the chapter has pointed out that the nature and arrangements of citizen participation bring variations on the potential to achieve public accountability.The chapter depicts that despite claims of citizen participation in the local government assemblies in Malawi, there are challenges related to public accountability. The captured challenges have necessitated the evaluation research study on citizen participation as a mechanism of upholding public accountability.

The research aims to determine the extent to which citizen participation influences public accountability in the local development policy planning at

the local government level. In such regard, the chapter provided background and context of citizen participation in Malawi which highlighted the driving factors to the current decentralization system as guided by the LGA (1998). Then, the chapter provided the description for the decentralization programme. The description of the decentralization programme focused on how the intended design is supposed to be towards the goals of poverty reduction and deepening democracy.

This chapter detailed the theoretical framework underlying this evaluation study. The theoretical framework is constituted of new institutionalism theory and the non-decision making and decisional approach power models. There are constitution and legislative frameworks that support citizen participation in policy making at the local government level in Malawi. The chapter discussed what the meanings and implications of these constitutional provisions. The chapter also provided a conceptualization of citizen participation and public accountability based on the literature perspective that citizen participation and public accountability hold diverse meanings. The meanings highlighted in the conceptualization are the ones applicable in this evaluation research study. The main limitations of the study are that it focused only on citizen participation as a public accountability measure and that its results will not be immediately generalized since the research is a case study.

Finally the chapter provided an overview of the evaluation research report. The report consists of the following six chapters: I) Introduction, 2) Literature review, 3) Research design and Methodology, 4) Research findings, 5) Analysis of findings and interpretations, and 6) Conclusion. This chapter provided an introduction of the research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

Literature on citizen participation and governance provides the linkages between participation and public accountability in policy making (O'Neill, Foresti & Hudson, 2007). There are varied views on the conceptual meaning of public accountability and citizen participation. The two concepts are more contested in policy planning and evaluation perspectives (Bovens, 2006; Rosener, 1978; Yang & Callahan, 2005:193). Particularly, it usually holds because governments are governed on will and trust of the people and accountability is a constitutional and/or political obligation. Meanwhile, there is wider recognition that citizen participation is a functional element of public accountability in policy making at the local government level (Kaunda, 1999; O'Neill *et al.*, 2007). The perspective is that applying citizen participation as a public accountability mechanism commonly works in democratic systems of government.

This chapter mainly explores the linkages between citizen participation, public accountability and evaluation in policy making at local government level. It aims to discuss public accountability in the context of democratic local governance. The chapter also discusses the theoretical rationale of decentralization and its links to local accountability. The chapter explores the relevant experiences of the decentralization programme in Malawi with a bearing on the nature of citizen participation and public accountability. Furthermore, the chapter discusses the nature of the governance system in practice in the claimed democratic state of Malawi. Then, the chapter discusses the factors that make citizen participation work, with a main discussion on forms of participation. Finally, the chapter argues for a citizen participation model that is applied in the evaluation framework for this research study.

2.2. Citizen participation, public accountability and public policy processes

Public accountability in policy making and management is one of the central themes in local democratic governance (Adams, 2007:3; Golubovic,

2010:38; Phillips & Orsini, 2002:1). It is commonly considered to be a measure of adherence and responsiveness of government to the public demands and interests (Kamarck, 2007:27; Laurian & Shaw, 2008). Hence, in a democracy, citizen participation is considered one of key mechanisms of advancing public accountability.

The concept of citizen participation has several contested theoretical and practical meanings as demonstrated in a number of literatures on public policy and governance. The contestation is grounded on the view that citizen participation is implemented for diverse objectives. Hence diverse models of citizen participation exist.

2.2.1. Nature of citizen participation

The diverse characteristics of citizen participation are influenced by the underlying objective(s). Some of examples of objectives of citizen participation include holding government accountable, information sharing, policy legitimization, determining community demands and priorities, developing programmes and policy alternatives, negotiating budgets, evaluating programs, building and achieving democracy (Graham & Phillips, 1998;Phillips & Orsini, 2002:1; Yang & Callahan, 2005). On the objective of holding government accountable, a range of literature supports the notion that citizen participation is a mechanism for upholding public accountability in the policy making process (Adams, 2007:3; Friedman, 2006; Laurian & Shaw, 2008; Yang and Callahan, 2005: 197). The common argument supporting this notion is that involving the citizens in the public policy processes raises the opportunity for the citizens to press their demands and ensure that these demands become part of the public policy processes (Friedman, 2006; Laurian & Shaw, 2008).

2.2.2. Citizen participation in a democratic policy context

Public policy processes can be clustered into the following components: policy making, policy implementation and policy evaluation (Gumede, 2010). In the public policy processes, each

component may take one or multiple objectives of citizen participation (Adams, 2007:18; Phillips & Orsini, 2002:2; Graham & Phillips, 1998). For instance in the policy making component processes, citizen participation can intend to determine citizens' demands; and also to simply inform the citizen of policy alternatives being arranged to address their demands.

The new institutionalism theory gives an insight that the success of citizen participation is also dependent on power relations between government and the citizens, and the process and governing procedural policies and legislations for the public policy processes (Hall & Taylor, 2006). At times, one or more objectives of citizen participation may frame the entire policy making process as regulatory objective (Adams, 2007:18; Graham & Orsini, 2002.2; Graham & Phillips, 1998). In many democracies, citizen participation is a spanning objective in public policy processes to ensure democratic accountability.

2.2.3. Policy planning and public accountability

Dunn (1994:15) states that policy making process is a series of interdependent phases arrayed through time. While Dye (in Howlett, Ramesh & Perl, 2009:4) defines public policy as anything that government chooses to do or not to do. The two definitions show that policy is about decisions on what should be done and not done, typical of a world of limited resources. A number of literature show different demarcations on phases that occur in policy making (De Coning, 2006:3; Gumede, 2010:169; Phillips & Orsini, 2002:15). Anderson (2011) suggests the following policy making phases: formation- problems, agendas and policy formulation; adoption; budgeting; implementation; impact- evaluation.

The formation phase of the policy involves the initial identification and definition of policy problems; and then the task of agenda setting which involves bringing the policy issue to the public forum for policy making as a priority to be addressed among other policy

problems (Anderson, 2011). The policy formulation stage involves defining policy goals, objectives and developing alternative options for delivering the objectives and policy instruments for addressing the identified policy problem (*ibid.*). The policy adoption phase involves the enactment of the policy alongside any other legislation, regulations, funding, and strategies such as dialogue and advocacy required to implement the policy (De Coning, 2006). From a policy making perspective, the phases of implementation and impact assessment involve making the implementation plans and strategizing on performance assessment arrangements (Dunn, 1994:15; Macintosh, 2004:3). The policy making process is not linear but an iterative process (Phillips & Orsini, 2005:15).

Practically, the public policy making component is probably the most important component in the policy processes to advance the public accountability agenda. This is because the public policy making process sets the substantive benchmark for holding government accountable (Gumede, 2010; De Coning, 2006). These plans declare what the government is committed to do for specific public, on specific issues, within a specified period of time and amount of resource (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33; De Coning, 2006:13). To a higher extent, the level of citizen participation is measured by the responsiveness of the initiative to their demands and interests, which has a bearing on other phases (Morrell, 2005:51; Pateman, 1970). The nature and level of citizen participation at the initial stage of the policy cycle will, to some extent, influence future participation in subsequent stages or other future similar initiatives (Arnstein, 1969; De Coning, 2006: 19). Therefore, the policy planning stage is highly critical in advancing public accountability in poverty reduction or improved service delivery.

A large amount of literature shows that citizen participation can bring about public accountability in the public policy making process (Cornwall& Gaventa, 2001; Friedman, 2006:19; Graham & Orsini, 2002:8; Yang &

Callahan, 2005:194). However, there is little consensus on the theoretical frameworks that explain how citizen participation brings about public accountability (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006; Arnstein, 1969). In a number of policy making initiatives, public accountability is considered more as a means to achieve other policy objectives such as poverty reduction and democracy (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006; Arnstein, 1969; Laurian & Shaw, 2008; O'Neill *et al.*, 2007:9; Phillips & Orsini, 2002: 8).

2.3. Public accountability and democratic local governance

A relevant debate to this study, among some scholars, is differentiating between government accountability and government responsiveness (Malena*et al.*, 2004; Gibson, Lacy, & Dougherty, 2005). Learning from Malena, *et al.*'s, (2004) observation on the difference between public accountability and government responsiveness, government responsiveness refers to whether governments respond to citizens' expressed needs and interests; and public accountability as to whether citizens are able to hold governments to their promises.

Ideally, the promises that government makes in local democratic governance provide a basis of public accountability (Devas & Grant, 2003; Malena *et al.*, 2004). Likewise, in principle the promises emanate from the people's interests and needs and are captured as specific or general public policy (Devas & Grant, 2003; Malena *et al.*, 2004; OECD, 2001). In a democracy, the will and scope of governance is entrusted by the people on the principle that government shall serve the public interests in an efficient, effective and fair manner based on government's compliance with specified rules and laws (Arnstein, 1969:216; Malena *et al.*, 2004; Sharma, 2009:8; OECD, 2001:19; Yilmaz, Beris,& Serrano-Berthet, 2008). Therefore, this study argues that responsiveness of government is merely an attribute of public accountability.

In a functioning democracy, citizen participation at local government level provides opportunity for citizens to monitor and control government conduct. Such opportunity prevents monopolies and abuses of power and raises the bar of public accountability (Bovens, 2005:7; Gibson*et al.*,

2005:3; Graham & Phillips, 1998; OECD, 2001:19; O'Neill *et al.*, 2007:11; Yang & Callahan, 2005:191). As such, public accountability should be considered as a goaland a means of achieving development and democratic goals. To that respect, public accountability should undergird all local government activities in policy making, implementation and evaluation (Graham & Phillips, 1998.2; Gibson*et al.*, 2005:2). It is expected of governments to be accountable to the interests and needs of the citizens (Gibson *et al.*, 2005:3; Malena e*t al.*, 2004; Sharma, 2009:13). For instance, the key assumption of democratic decentralized local governance systems is that local government policies and actions will reflect the needs and priorities of the local citizens and that the people will be able to hold the government accountable (Devas & Grant, 2003).

2.4. Decentralization and local accountability

Decentralisation refers to the transfer of central state assets and powers to local government representatives, local administrative branches of central government, non-state organisations or private individuals and corporations (Ribot, 1999:27). There are three dimensions of decentralization: 1) political, 2) administrative and 3) fiscal (Tambulasi & Kayuni, 2007:164; Rees & Hossain, 2010). Advocates of decentralization, such as Manor (1999), argue that if decentralization is to have desired significance in development and democracy consolidation it must involve all the three aforementioned types. This research paper agrees with this argument mainly because the process of policy making involves all these three dimensions. Likely, leaving out one of the three dimensions may limit local citizens' ability to secure government's commitment in planning and allocating necessary resources for service delivery.

2.4.1. The four forms of decentralization

Decentralization can take the following four forms: 1) deconcentration, 2) delegation, 3) devolution and 4) privatization (Rees & Hossain, 2010:4; Tambulasi & Kayuni, 2007:164).

In deconcentration form of decentralization, the powers and responsibilities of decision making are distributed to appointees of

the central government at the local branches in order to bring government and its services closer to the local people; but these appointees who exercise the power are accountable to their superior. For example, the Ministry of Health may simply give the responsibility of administration or financial management to a district health office but not give the responsibility of administrative policy making or financial planning. Another indication of deconcentration is when powers are transferred to lower-level actors who are accountable to their superiors in a hierarchy. These lower-level actors may be the elected or appointed public officials.

The delegation form of decentralization entails the transfer of responsibilities for decision making and the administration of public functions to semi-autonomous institutions. These institutions are partially controlled by the central government but they are accountable towards the central government (Manor, 1999).

The devolution form of decentralization, also called political decentralization, is when political powers are transferred to the local citizens, representatives of the people and institutions of the government at the local level that are accountable to the people in their jurisdiction in order to make decisions and provide services closer to the local people. Devolution involves creation of autonomous structures and procedures of local decision making among the local actors on resource allocation and development planning (Tambulasi & Kayuni, 20007:165). In addition, on the characteristics of devolution, the study agrees with Ribot's (1999) argument that when powers are transferred to lower- level actors who are downwardly accountable, even when they are appointed, the reform is tantamount to political decentralization. Political decentralization is also intended to support consolidation of democracy by giving the local citizens more powers in the policy processes on issues that affect their needs and interests (Tambulasi & Kayuni, 20007:165). Devolution is considered to be the most

complete form of decentralization due to its nature of transferring the authority of decision making.

The privatization form of decentralization is when government transfers some of its responsibilities to private organizations and/or voluntary organizations (Rees & Hossain, 2010:4). However, other decentralization advocates such as Manor (1999), argue that privatisation is not genuine decentralization because it does not transfer the decision making powers to the people but rather between the government and another entity with crude public interest.

2.4.2. The promises of decentralization

Democratic local governance reforms on decentralization are justified on the premises of increased efficiency of services, effectiveness of policies and programs, equity, greater local citizen participation, improving local democracy and responsiveness of government to citizens and public accountability (Crook, 2003; Manor 1999; Ribot, 1999; Smith 1985). Justifications for decentralization vary from one context to the other and overtime. Overall, decentralization has been propelled by and advanced to address political and economic challenges (Manor, 1999; Smith, 1985). In some contexts, these rationales have been advanced simultaneously, in others one has been more emphasized than the other. However, in recent years decentralization in many countries has been motivated by political factors (Manor, 1999).

There is a theoretical assumption that greater public participation in public decision making is a positive good in itself or that it can improve efficiency, equity, development, and resource management (Ribot, 1999). Decentralization is considered to give opportunity for greater public participation through institutional reforms on local decision making powers (Crook, 2003:1; OECD, 2001:20; Ribot, 1999). It is argued that the greater public participation leads to high potential for increased government accountability which then yields effective government services to the public (Cornwall & Gaventa,

2001:31; Crook, 2003:1; OECD, 2001:20; Ribot, 1999). Therefore decentralization is regarded as a strategy of governance that strengthens local accountability through transfer of administrative and/or political powers closer to those who are affected by the exercise of these powers. Learning from the New Institutionalism Theory (Hall & Taylor, 2006), studying public accountability in decentralization requires critical analysis of power relations, the processes and structures of demand and reporting between the local citizens and the public institutions or officials; and the actual impact of the structures (Leftwich, 2007; Ribot, 1999).

There is general consensus that decentralization provides opportunities to achieve local accountability. Critical to success of decentralization in poverty reduction and democracy is local citizen participation that influences the upholding of local accountability (Crook, 2003). Ribot (1999) states that if powers are decentralized to actors who are not accountable to their constituents, or who are accountable only to themselves or to superior authorities within the structure of the government, then decentralization will likely not accomplish its stated aims. Actors should be held downwardly accountable to local citizens, not just for elected representatives such as councillors but even the civil servants as public officials at the local level.

2.4.3. Decentralization challenges

The literature also shows that unsatisfactory results of decentralization in many developing countries are due to inadequate capacity, insufficient fiscal decentralization and lack of accountability to the citizens (Crook & Manor, 1998; Francis & James, 2003; Johnson, 2002). In literature, accountability appears as the most problematic to achieving the promises of decentralization in most developing countries (Blair, 2000; Francis & James, 2003:326; Global Forum on Local Development Report, 2010). Substantive citizen participation is essential for downward

accountability in ensuring that the government officials, elected and bureaucrats are responsive and responsible to the public demands.

2.5. The reality of decentralization in Malawi

In the specific case of Malawi, literature on decentralization indicates that from the year 2000, citizen participation has been a driving principle in decision and policy making inthe local government system (Chiweza, 2005; Ferguson & Mulwafu, 2004; Hussein, 2003). With respect to that principle, the decentralization programme is promoted as 'power to the people' programme. In 2000, the local government assemblies, particularly the district assemblies, introduced village development committees, aerial development committees and the district executive committees (Chiweza, 2005). These committees intended to provide opportunity for the expression and representation of popular citizen opinion at different policy making levels (Hussein, 2003; Kaunda, 1995; Tambulasi & Kayuni, 2007). However, the effectiveness of the established local assembly participatory system to facilitate citizen participation for upholding government's public accountability was questionable (Chiweza, 2005). For instance, there are observations that the deliberations at the local assemblies rarely represented the concerns of diverse constituents; and that the assembly development plans did not reflect the realities of the communities (Chinsinga, 2008; Ferguson & Mulwafu, 2004).

Meanwhile, literature covering the period between 2000 and 2006 indicates that public participation at the local level is more of a moral discretion paradigm (Hussein, 2003; Martin, 1994). This implies that local citizens are involved primarily for the sake of being recognized by the government. In that regard, citizens have no provision to intervene on how local governments should discharge their responsibilities. The constrained opportunity to intervene has been highlighted by dormancy of many local participatory structures and lack of systematic training on citizen roles and processes in the engagement with the assembly participatory structures (Chinsinga, 2008; Holvoet & Renard, 2007; Hussein, 2003).

On other institutional mechanisms in support of citizen participation, the literature shows that the absence of local councilors has created a gap between the assembly authorities and the citizens at the assembly level (Tambulasi, 2009; Chinsinga, 2008). Furthermore, there have been cases of conflicting roles and functions among actors at the local assembly level including cases of mismanagement and misappropriation of public funds (Ferguson & Mulwafu, 2004; Tambulasi, 2010). In a similar discussion, Sharma (2009:10) cautions that decentralization in itself can create as many challenges for the exercise of voice as it purports to solve. This raises concerns for *clarificative* evaluation in the programme design and implementation to monitor that decentralization solves more problems intended that it creates.

In regards to conflicting roles and functions, citizen participation has been compromised due to poor interface of duties on policy making and service delivery among the relevant actors at assembly level from village to council level (Chinsinga, 2008; Tambulasi, 2009; Tambulasi & Kayuni, 2007). However in this debate, the literature lacks evidence on the roles and responsibilities of citizens; process linkages on policy making among the three levels of citizen participation in the local assembly structure; and the participatory practices to ensure that the local assemblies execute policy making and service delivery as expected.

In regards to representative democracy at the local level, there was an argument that in Malawi was not ready, in 2000, for decentralization because political parties operate top-bottom on issues concerning the public (Cross & Kutengule, 2001). In addition, in most local assemblies there is no evidence of any traceable mechanisms for reporting grievances on planning and services delivered. These observations defy the set up prospect of citizen participation for public accountability in policy making.

2.5.1. Political variations in management of decentralization

Recent reports on politics and governance categorize Malawi as a neo-patrimonial state (Booth *et. al.*, 2006:9; Cammack, 2007). This is contrary to the open and democratic governance system envisaged

by the Constitution of the Republic of Malawi (1995) in framing the national decentralization policy. As part of the envisaged democratic governance reforms, the constitution of Malawi (1995) provides for a democratic local government system. In 1998, the democratic local government system was enacted through the LGA which enshrines the NDP. The aims of the national decentralization policy are to help in poverty reduction and promoting local democracy. Clearly, how democracy prevails in Malawi will affect the delivery of the promises of decentralization.

Generally, neo-patrimonial states are characterized by the following: the state acting as an instrument of serving interests of particular groups and individuals in disregard of explicit objectives and legal rules of governance; and the decision making terrain being more pivoted on a single person rather than rules and public interests dominate in passing policy choices, widely known as the big boss syndrome (Booth *et al.*, 2006:9; Cammack, 2006). Booth et al. (2006:9) argue that:

> "In formal political contexts, the big man syndrome is associated with 'presidentialism'. This is a pattern in which the patronage powers of the head of state are so great that they effectively neutralise the independent effectiveness of other political and state institutions, including political parties, parliament, the judiciary and the security services."

In a neo-patrimonial state, parliaments are usually weak to provide checks and balances. As such, parliaments rarely initiate or reject legislations or policies raised by the president or their respective political leadership because of upward accountability rather than the down-ward accountability (Cammack, 2007). An example of promoting *presidentialism* in local government system in Malawi is conferring the president constitutional powers to schedule local government elections (effect 2010 by LGA amendment). This has so far proved to be detrimental to democracy as the president has not called for the elections, reportedly because of low local support (Patel *et al.*, 2007; Tambulasi, 2010).

A neo-patrimonial governance system has more restraining implications towards poverty reduction and promotion of democracy. One critical implication of the neo-patrimonial system in development and governance perspective is that the public officials are constrained to formulate and carry out policies in accordance with the public interest (Booth *et al.*, 2006). Considering this implication at the local government level, it means local citizens are unlikely to decide on development plans and services but rather some non-formal system will decide their interests. Another implication is that usually the government will paralyze the rule of law and also violate human rights in succumbing to 'the big bosses' just to ensure the private interests of some leaders or political party rule. In neo-patrimonial states, leaders or ruling parties commonly subvert compliance with the law for political or private gains. From old patrimonial systems of governance, to the new patrimonial systems such gains usually skew towards aiming to maintain political control.

The fundamental characteristics between democratic and neo-patrimonial are different and provide diverse opportunities in local policy making. Neo-patrimonial states are more likely to face an uphill task to achieve public accountability than democratic states.Neo-patrimonial states are not regarded as developmental states (Cammack, 2007:2). Some key features of a developmental state are: ability of the state to implement policies it adopts; committed leadership and vision; policies and programmes are premised for highest probable performance; availability of institutions that facilitate and ensure policy achievement; meritocratic civil service to ensure translation of policy and programme goals (Habisso, 2010; Netshitenzhe, 2011; Gumede, 2007; Ghani, Lockhart & Carnahan, 2005).

2.5.2. Research study insight

There is no literature of a systematic study conducted on assessing citizen participation in local policy making in urban local governments. An evaluation research on determining citizen participation's influence on local policy making and delivery will help to ascertain the relevance of the decentralization institutions in upholding accountability; and the efficacy of the policy making operations to enable decentralization achieve its promises.

2.6. Making citizen participation work

This research supports the argument that citizen participation influences public accountability in policy making, which in turn leads to successful democratic governance and poverty reduction (Laurian & Shaw, 2008; Malena *et al.*, 2004;Sharma, 2009:13).In practice there are a number of factors that interplay for the success and failure of citizen participation (Laurian & Shaw, 2008; Malena *et al.*, 2004; Sharma, 2009:13).Some of the factors are: who and what brings about the beginning of participation, reliability and nature of information, representativeness of the participants, participation interactions and processes, power dynamics, participation outcomes and distribution of knowledge of the issues of deliberation (Golubovic, 2010; Graham & Phillips, 1998.2; Laurian & Shaw, 2008; OECD, 2001; Sharma, 2009; Yang & Callahan, 2005:193; Wang, 2001). Therefore in conceptualising citizen participation these factors should be critically analysed and considered in relation to the intended objective of citizen participation and the associate governance context (Rosener, 1978; Graham & Phillips, 1998.2; Yang & Callahan, 2011).

Arnstein (1969) provides a typology of citizen participation which offers a highly informative framework for discussing the nature of citizen participation. Arnstein's (1969:217) citizen participation typology framework has eight levels of citizen participation. The first two levels at the bottom are manipulation and therapy and are classified as non-participation type (*ibid.*). In the non-participation class, the real objective is for power-holders to educate or cure the participants (*ibid.*). Therapy

assumes that citizens are powerless and only subject to being restored on visible effects without being part of ascertaining the restoration and addressing the challenges that brought about the need for restoration. While in the manipulation level, the citizens are engaged as rubber stamps of other actors in an event (*ibid.*). The citizens hold the rubber stamp but the administrators tactfully control them on where to stamp.

The middle class of participation is classified as tokenism (Arnstein, 1969). It entails informing, consultation and placation (*ibid.*).These forms of participation lack follow through of voices of the participants, the power-holders retain right to decide (*ibid*). The top class of the citizen participation ladder is classified as citizen power; it entails partnership, delegated power and citizen power. In this top class of citizen participation citizens can enter into power negotiate and engage in tradeoffs with traditional power-holders (Arnstein, 1969). Clearly, meaningful citizen participation should be centered on power relations.

In Arnstein's (1969) citizen participation typology, there is no the specific elements that model citizen participation interplay to achieve a specific class of citizen participation. Making citizen participation work requires breaking-down specific considerations/ elements that interplay to yield a specific class with respect to Arnstein's (1969) suggested typology of citizen participation ladder. Learning from Arnstein's (1969) discussion on the citizen participation ladder, emphasis of citizen participation has been on methodological approach and single unit analysis such as information sharing and the participation structures (OECD, 2001). However, a number of literature show that citizen participation has several factors at interplay to yield the specific desirable citizen participation type. Hence, this study supports a continuum approach to analyzing citizen participation.

2.6.1. Towards a successful citizen participation programme

In considering citizen participation for the objective of advancing public accountability in the policy making, asuccessful citizen participation programme should be well organized, constructive, systematic and legally binding to have chances of achieving positive impact (Golubovic, 2010;

Malena *et al.*, 2004). Well-organized citizen participation entails facilitation of information sharing between the institutions and actors involved in decision making. The information should be objective, reliable, and up to date and user friendly to those involved (OECD, 2001:11; Malena *et al.*, 2004; Phillips & Orsini, 2002:9). For example, when dealing with local citizens who can barely read, it is inappropriate to design leaflets or pamphlets as information dissemination tool since it bars their chances of learning.

In addition, there should also be clear goals and rules that govern the interactions and processes in the exercise of participation (OECD, 2001:11; Yang & Callahan, 2005; Phillips & Orsini, 2002:9). These goals and rules should define the bounds and exact intents of the participation exercise to ascertain a concrete potential base of accountability and transparency in the decision making processes (OECD, 2001:11; Malena *et al.*, 2004). The processes of citizen participation should be open to public scrutiny to ensure transparency (OECD, 2001:1; Phillips & Orsini, 2002:9). At the same-time, the results of a citizen participation process should demonstrate the strength of citizens' voice (Arnstein, 1969; Malena *et al.*, 2004).

However, often in democratic politics the dependent factors of citizen participation don't play out quite like this due to unlevelled interplay of power factors and policy making interest among involved actors or institutions. For example, many governments in developing countries despite being democratic are reported to have imbalances on information sharing, setting participatory structures and mechanisms of accountability (World Bank, 2004; King, Feltey & Susel, 1998:137; Laurian & Shaw, 2008). Most of these governments release generic information on citizen participation that is not user friendly to the task at hand (Agrawal & Ribot, 1999; OECD, 2001). They also don't set supporting legal sanctions of ensuring public accountability in order to still maintain control of things over the citizens, and also avert local accountability (Agrawal & Ribot, 1999; OECD, 2001). Also, due to limited time of office, many democratic governments are interested in achieving substantive policy objectives which

overrides citizen participation in achieving the substantive policies (Crook, 2003:1; Church *et al.*, 2002:26).

2.6.2. Nature of Participation forums

In many decentralization programmes less emphasis has been put on improving citizen participation as an accountability measure compared to the concentration given to improving the government institution as a supply side of governance (Malena *et al.*, 2004; Malawi Decentralized Governance Programme, 2002). Malena *et al.* (2004) cite that the supply side accountability efforts include improved methods of political checks and balances, administrative rules and procedures, auditing requirements and formal law enforcement agencies like courts and the police. In many developing countries, decentralization programmes have emphasized on elections for local government representatives who form part of the government. Little has been done to empower the local citizens to be able to hold the local representatives accountable, both the elected and appointed officials (Devas & Grant, 2003).

In a democracy, deliberative mechanisms are often considered appropriate to enhance meaningful participation in policy making based on the objective of consensus in building citizens' demands and priorities (Laurian & Shaw, 2008; OECD, 2001:4; Sharma, 2009:13). There is an argument that deliberative forms of participation provide a complete base for establishing local needs and preferences without impartiality. It is perceived that deliberative participation is subjected to a reasoned discussion process that allows for clarification and modification of arguments/ of views, purification of stand, educating people (Devas &Grant, 2003; Gargarella, 1998:261;Muers, 2004:36). In addition, learning from Muers (2004:36), deliberative features in democratic systems are that the deliberative mechanisms should allow analysis of demands and needs, no restrictions on opportunity to participate, only reasoned argument has power judged by consensus and any reasonable discourse is agreeable in the forum. It is important to note that deliberative forums are also open to manipulation depending on the requisite information shared, roles and responsibility

dynamics, rules and procedures associated with the deliberation (Muers, 2004;King *et al.*, 1998).

The deliberative features should be considered in citizen participation forums, particularly in democratic governance, because of the participation fairness and transparency features of the deliberation forums. For example, public meetings can be organized in a deliberative way and are the most common form of participation. How influential the public meetings are beyond information sharing depends on the associate rules, procedures and processes of consolidating the meeting resolutions (Laurian& Shaw, 2008). The same variation factors apply to other forms of participation such as citizen juries, conferences, referenda, public opinion survey, presentation, community protests, citizen advisory committees, radio listening clubs, focus group discussions and public hearings (Laurian & Shaw, 2008; Rowe & Frewer, 2000; Yang & Callahan, 2005:194).

Citizen participation emphasis should be given to the development of elements that make it work with respect to its specified objective(s). In democratic decentralization, the dimensions of citizen participation model applied should necessitate that these forums of citizen participation should primarily reflect citizens' interests and needs (Devas & Grant, 2003; Laurian & Shaw, 2008:14; Malena *et al.*, 2004).

2.6.3. Citizen Participation, local policy and its promises

A significant attribute of local public policies is that they are mainly intended to address the welfare of the specific concerned citizens (Dunn, 1994). Gumede (2010:166) indicates that there is always a possibility that a proposed policy solution does not address the identified public issue or has unintended consequences. An example of such a policy solution could be citizen participation as a public accountability regulatory mechanism in the local policy making process. In line with Gumede's (2010) claim, evidence shows that in many cases citizen participation in policy making has not yielded the expected results in poverty reduction and governance in many developing countries (World Bank, 2004;King*et al.*, 1998:137;

O'Neill*et al.*, 2007). In many developing countries citizen participation initiatives in policy making have been empty practices of participation because of having no real power needed to affect the expected outcomes of the participation exercise (World Bank, 2004;King, et al., 1998:137; O'Neill *et al.*, 2007).

It is imperative to improve citizen participation initiatives in order to address other promises of decentralization. Citizen participation should be subjected to evaluation to determine its success, both as intended and unintended consequences, to explain why, and to use this information to assist in the design and improvement of programs and policies (Davidson, 2005; Phillips & Orsini, 2002:21). Among other forms of evaluation, clarificative evaluation helps to assess the unexplained logic between objectives and outcomes of a settled programme (Owen, 2007).The purpose of clarificative evaluation is to help government agencies strengthen their efforts to have improved public programmes by understanding how various components of the particular programme logic work (Forss, 2005:4; Owen, 2007).

2.7. The evaluation framework for citizen participation in policy making

There is wider recognition that there are challenges in evaluating citizen participation and public accountability (Arnstein, 1969; O'Neill *et al.*, 2007). The challenges emanate from the diverse theoretical concepts and practical perspectives of citizen participation and public accountability (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006; Davidson, 2005). The contentions surrounding the concepts have given rise to different approaches and frameworks of evaluation (Shadish, Cook & Leviton, 1991; Owen 2007). There is no ideal evaluation framework that assists in analysis of citizen participation nor is there a framework for evaluation of citizen participation for public accountability in policy making (Abelson & Gauvin (2006:2; O'Neill *et al.*, 2007). This study proposes a citizen participation model to be used in evaluating citizen participation in policy making.

The literature indicates that the evaluation criteria selected should be based on the original theoretical rationale of the programme or be negotiated as agreeable by the evaluation commissioners (Muers, 2004:35; Patton, 2002; Yang & Callahan, 2005). Another consideration should be background knowledge of the evaluand. Such background knowledge can include history on cultural, politics and economics, of which without this background the meaning of the evaluation from policy analysis perspective is an empty word (Dunn, 1994; Klein & Marmor 2006:908). In this section, the chapter discusses the five elements of the proposed citizen participation model. The model is the analytical basis for the evaluation framework of citizen participation in policy making employed in this study.

The proposed evaluative framework has five dimensions: opportunity demand structures, functional awareness, engagement access and skills, supportive legal provisions, and defensible decision making process (Arnstein, 1969; Behn, 2001; Foucalt, 1980; Laurian & Shaw, 2008:297; Leftwich, 2007; OECD, 2001:12; Rowe & Frewer, 2000). This evaluative framework covers for process and outcome based evaluation aspects. This is in recognition of Rowe and Frewer (2000) suggestions that the influence of citizen participation should be measured by the output of the exercise in form of genuine impact on the policy. It also recognizes that in a democracy citizen participation is an end in itself and means to achieving specified ends (Golubovic, 2010). Hence, using process and outcome approach to assessing citizen participation increases the accuracy of the results (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006:12; Dunn, 2004). The proposed model of analysing citizen participation recognizes that the political or governance context in which a programme happens is a critical sub-aspect in the analysis of impact and recommendations for improving citizen participation (McLennan, 2007:6). The following discussion gives an insight into the five elements of the proposed citizen participation model:

1) Opportunity demand structures

In citizen participation there should be government and local citizen structures that provide opportunity for citizens to press their demands;

follow through their demands and accessible channels for feedback on their demands (Behn, 2001; Macintosh, 2004:2; OECD, 2001:12; Rowe & Frewer, 2000:17; Stewart & Gelberd, 1976). These structures should provide for equitable access for the local citizens to press their demands and follow through their inputs in the deliberations; and should represent the views of the majority of the local citizen in the specific community (Arnstein, 1969:217; Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33; Riot, 1999:56). These structures should be recognised and accepted by the local actors involved in the policy making; and should have clear stipulations on their powers in the policy making process (Francis & James, 2003:326; Ribot, 1999:29). For example these structures could be established by the local government or even by the local citizens but with either party accepting legitimacy of the participatory structure. The established structures should have locally accountable representation and be granted real powers of decision making over critical areas such as the community development priority areas (Ribot, 1999:29) Another element that should be considered in the evaluation of these structures is on their response to the citizens' inputs as outcomes of all the deliberations in the process of policy making (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33).

2) Functional awareness

Functional awareness entails provision of information that will necessitate requisite knowledge for the citizen to be able to act out of that knowledge throughout the policy making process (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006:10; Arnstein, 1969:219; Forss, 2005:51; Foucalt, 1980; Macintosh, 2004:2).Such information should raise awareness on the process of the specific policy or strategy being formulated. The citizens should know all the stages of policy making and what is expected of their contribution among other actors at each stage of the policy making process (Forss, 2005:51; Ribot, 1999:55; Stewart & Gelberd, 1976). The stipulation of what is expected of them gives citizens a sense of responsibility to contribute appropriately. The citizens should also be aware of the participatory mechanisms set in place for the specific

policy making exercise (Arnstein, 1969:217; Rowe & Frewer, 2000:17); and specifically on their rights, responsibilities and options with respect to how they can get involved in the policy making through these set participatory mechanisms (Arnstein, 1969:19; Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33; Forss, 2005:51; Stewart & Gelberd, 1976). Robino (2009:278), in her research on citizen participation and decentralization in South Africa, argued that lack of information and awareness on constitutional rights on citizen participation and high degrees of illiteracy prevent citizens from participating in local governance in South Africa. Probably the most powerful means of increasing the voice of poor citizens in policy making is providing better information (World development report, 2004:8).

3) Engagement access and skills

The selected citizen participation mechanisms should provide for equal accessibility procedures among the local citizens (Arnsetin, 1969:217; Macintosh, 2004:2; Laurian & Shaw, 2008:297). Equal accessibility entails conditions on who participates, how they are selected to participate and what are their entrusted powers by the communities (Arnstein, 1969:220; Macintosh, 2004:6). This determines legitimacy of participation of the citizens as decision makers.

Democratically, a preferable mode of selecting participants to the participatory structures is local elections facilitated by organized groups, government officials or community at large (Arnstein, 1969:220; Church *et al.*, 2002:16). Accessibility includes the opportunity to raise agenda for the participation exercise and policy alternatives (Stewart & Gelberd, 1976). For appropriate engagement in the policy making processes, local citizens should receive specific training to curtail for skills and knowledge applicable in the exercise of contributing to the policy making (Arnstein, 1969:217; Church *et. al.*, 2002:20). Government or concerned agency facilitating the policy making process should provide for training that offers the relevant and appropriate skills

in a participation exercise (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33; Stewart & Gelberd, 1976).

4) Supportive legal provisions

These provisions should facilitate compliance of the involved actors to agreed resolutions in all the processes of policy making (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33; Laurian & Shaw, 2008:297). Citizen participation should have an enabling legislation that provides for participatory decision making (The Department for International Development (DFID), 2000; GTZ, 2006:8; Macintosh, 2004:2; UN Habitat, 2004:9). In addition, there should be clear stipulations of powers and functions of the citizens, the government officials and any other actor involved in the policy making processes (Arnstein, 1969:217; Behn, 2001; Rowe & Frewer, 2000:17; Laurian & Shaw, 2008:297). The distribution of roles and responsibilities demonstrate the extent of power distribution among the involved actors (Arnstein, 1969:221; Ribot, 1999). There should also be stipulations that ensure address and redress of the citizens' demands and needs targeting the government officials and the representatives of the local citizens (Arnstein, 1969:220; Behn, 2001; Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33).

There should be well-known relevant sanctions or penalties for any breach of these stipulations or provisions supported by independent justice institutions such as the courts (Behn, 2001; Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:30). De Coning (2006:19) on discussing nature and role of public policy states that good public policies have attributes such as clear benefits resulting from compliance with a policy as well as effective enforceability and sanctions or penalties linked to noncompliance with a policy. Citizen participation as a regulatory policy should be subjected to similar enforcement arrangements. Without sanctions it's improbable to enforce the office bearers to stick to their responsibilities; this renders a situation of empty attempt in holding official accountable (Behn, 2000; Church *et al.*, 2000:26; Newell & Wheeler, 2006).

5) **Defensible decision making processes**

The process of policy making is marked with interrelated decision blocks, the series of decisions made determine the final product called the policy document. It is appropriate to ensure that from start to end of the policy making process the mode of decision making should be defendable with respect to information sharing, distribution of roles, processes of addressing impasses and deciding priority issues, the legal provision or the decentralization principles as regulatory mechanisms (Abelson & Gauvin, 2006:5; Arnstein, 1969:221; Laurian & Shaw, 2008:297). In ensuring responsiveness and responsibility, there should be bilateral agreed processes between the local citizens and local government, which are not open to unilateral change. There should be traceable action plans for all decision making forums so that the citizens can be able to objectively hold the government accountable to their inputs into the policy making process and expected actions from government (Behn, 2001).

In addition, the measure of negotiation criteria on the policy issue prioritization should provide for citizens higher influence on setting the agenda and the policy decisions (Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33). Another aspect of consideration for defensible decision making process is citizens perception on whether the policy making process was responsive to their expectations. Finally, the agreed policy document should reflect response to citizens needs and provide for measures that determine citizens ability to hold the government accountable beyond the policy making stage, thus in the implementation phase (Arnstein, 1969:217; Behn, 2001; Cornwall & Gaventa, 2001:33; Forss, 2005:51).

The discussion on these five dimensions of citizen participation lays the arguments towards the citizen participation concept adopted in this research. The same discussion supports the concrete evaluation framework suggested for use in analysis of citizen participation in this evaluation research.

2.8. Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated linkages concerning citizen participation, public accountability and evaluation in policy making processes as a regulatory mechanism at local government level. A common perspective is that citizen participation is a form of political balance and check system. Then the chapter discussed the linkages between democratic governance and public accountability. The discussion indicates that a democratic system of government provides opportunity for substantive citizen participation due to its principles of power to the people. The chapter also discussed decentralization and its linkages to promoting local accountability. Then, the chapter explored the relevant experiences of the decentralization programme in Malawi with a bearing on the associate state of public accountability. In Malawi, a number of initiatives have taken place under the National Decentralization Programme. There seem to be more problems in the decentralization programme than the programme initially intended to address. Furthermore, little is known on the influence of citizen participation in policy making, especially in the urban areas. The gap provides an opportunity for research.

Finally the chapter has discussed some factors that make citizen participation work. The discussion highlighted the deliberative nature of participation forums and other factors that are critical in realizing meaningful participation. It also highlighted the critical role evaluation in citizen participation projects that it helps to ascertain what works, how and why. In addition, the chapter suggested a process-outcome based evaluation framework for citizen participation in policy making.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses the design of this research study. It explores the applicable study approach to the situational nature of policy making in the local government system in Malawi. The chapter also explains the methodology of research applied in this study. Under methodology, the chapter discusses operationalization of the research, sampling, data collection, analysis and validity and reliability of the research study.

3.2. Research design

This is a descriptive qualitative research study. The literature review on citizen participation in governance suggests the contextual nature of citizen participation as more of a constructed social reality. The meaning of citizen participation is considered different from one context to another and that it is used with different objectives (Laurian & Shaw, 2008). This research study explores citizen participation in the context of democratic local governance in Malawi. It is based on the objective of influencing public accountability. The relevance of the constructed meaning of citizen participation is more based on the LGA (1998) and the history of Malawi's democracy (Neuman, 2010:13; Yang & Callahan, 2005). Hence, the research adopted a specific construct of citizen participation in the context of a decentralized local government system in local policy making. The research primarily describes the extent of citizen participation in local policy making in Malawi as a public accountability tool in democratic governance. In addition, the research will provide explanations on how particular dimensions of citizen participation achieve public accountability. Therefore, it sufficed to adopt the descriptive qualitative research study (Neuman, 2010:34).

This research study design followed the nonlinear path of conducting research (Neuman, 2010:152). The nonlinear path strategy was incorporated in the research design to enable the researcher to be flexible in the research design and methodology.

The research design adopted a case study approach. This is due to the nature of the objectives of this research which seek to provide more insightful understanding of the values, attitudes and perceptions underlying the nature of citizen participation in the making of local policy involving peri-urban context (Adams, 2007:4; Hakim, 2000; Laurian & Shaw, 2008:15; Merriam, 1998). In regards to the purpose of the research, Laurian and Shaw (2008:15) states that case studies are better suited to answer specific questions about the evaluation of participation. Therefore, the case study is considered to provide a better comprehensive insight of issue being studied (Laurian & Shaw, 2008:15).

A situational study perspective on citizen participation and policy making provided more insight based on the applied contextual and eclectic methods and techniques. One argument supporting this approach is that policy making processes vary from one city assembly to another; more hinged on socio-economic status and political factors that affect governance practices (Laurian & Shaw, 2008). In Malawi's case, any approach in the policy making is expected to follow the same rationale as indicated in the LGA (1998). The LGA (1998) only provides the underlying rationale and not pre-determined governance structures and processes of policy making.

The research looked at citizen participation as a mechanism of enhancing public accountability among other mechanisms such as elected councillors, administrative procedural arrangements and local fiscal policy arrangements. Given three months duration to conduct the research, the researcher selected a special case of Ngwenya, a peri-urban area among other areas in the urban assembly of Lilongwe for research feasibility. The selection is valid because despite political influences, citizen participation is also affected by socio-economic status of which commonly the peri-urban citizens are considered vulnerable; this is due to the levels of bargaining power and the community shared interests. The application of the case study design was financially less costly than a study of several mechanisms or several areas to conduct the research (Merriam, 1998). Generally, the selection of the case study approach provided more chances of dependable

and credible approach to the study; and even utility of the study results. Figure 1 below gives a summary illustration of the research design for this study:

Figure 1: An illustration of a qualitative-nonlinear research design



3.3. Methodology

The study applied the evaluation research method of inquiry. Neuman (2010:26) informs that evaluation research is applied research in which one tries to determine how well a program, or policy is working or reaching its goals and objectives. The evaluand in this evaluation research study is the decentralization program component of citizen participation in policy making. The evaluationwas conducted at the end of the policy formulation to establish the level of influence of citizen participationin the making of the Lilongwecity development strategy(Chinsinga, 2008; Hakim, 2000; Owen, 2007).

A clarificative evaluation approach was selected among other forms of evaluation namely as monitoring, interactive, proactive, and impact (Owen, 2007). The evaluative inquiry within each of these forms is dependent on purpose of the inquiry and the stage of a programme. The selection of clarificative evaluation approach was due to its orientation on making explicit the logic of citizen participation in local policy making towards public accountability (Owen, 2007). The decentralization programme in Malawi claims a focus on giving policy making powers to the people to promote public accountability. However, contention exists on how the participation of the people in the policy making should be implemented to promote public accountability. Hence, the clarificative form of evaluative enquiry was selected due to its orientation on defining the logic of the program.

The specific evaluative inquiry used under the clarificative form of evaluation was the logic development approach. The logic development approach was applied because this study was informed by challenges of public accountability despite the existence of citizen participation as a mechanism of enhancing public accountability (Owen, 2007). Hence, the study traced the nature of interventions of citizen participation in the policy making processes. The research traced citizen participation in the policy making phases as the intervention that translates the objective of enhanced

public accountability. The research on citizen participation followed through the respective selected policy phases referred to in chapter two.

The subsequent parts in this section discuss the methods and instruments that the research study utilized in stages of sampling, data collection, data analysis and ensuring validity and reliability of the results.

3.3.1. Sampling Frame

The research was conducted in Ngwenya, a peri-urban area, in Lilongwe city. The selection of this area was based on purposive sampling. The key factors of consideration were increasing poverty in the Ngwenya area among other peri-urban areas in the Lilongwe city council (Creswell, 1994; National Statistics Office (NSO), 2009; NSO, 2007); communities with citizens relatively vulnerable to have unaccountable voices due to low socio-economic status; and easy accessibility to these areas compared to the other 27 local assemblies and similarly to the other peri-urban area in Lilongwe city (Neuman, 2010:222).

The research used purposive sampling in determining the data sources. This is because the required data was more of descriptive purposes. Furthermore the data required intended to answer the situational research questions could only be sourced from specific documents that are reliable, up to date and relevant (Neuman, 2010:222).The identified data sources were policy and legal documents; and individuals from the main local governance and development agencies. The used policy related documents were the city development strategy (2010), community development committee minutes (dated: 4 & 28 April 2010), and the UN Habitat Lilongwe profile report (2011).

The individuals interviewed in sourcing the data were from the department of planning and development of the Lilongwe City Assembly, The CDS unit of the Lilongwe city council, the M & E unit of the Lilongwe City Assembly, the Roads Department of

Lilongwe City Assembly, the Ngwenya Community Development Committee, representative of Ngwenya citizen activists, Community based organizations, United Nations Habitat Programme, the Member of Parliament for the Lilongwe City South Constituency, Block leaders of Ngwenya (Adams, 2007:17; UNDP, 2009:11). This wider inclusive approach helped in building the validity of the sourced data. The use of more than one source of data combined with various types of indicators, such as the process and outcomes indicators as selected in this research, is recommendable as a strategy to help provide sufficient and reliable information on complex phenomena of local governance research studies (UNDP, 2009:28)

Lilongwe City: the Context of Ngwenya Location

Lilongwe is the capital city and the largest of the four cities in Malawi. It became the administrative city of Malawi in 1975. The relocation of government offices in 2005 from all other districts to Lilongwe has further accelerated the ever increasing urbanization rate since 1975. As of 2008, the population of Lilongwe was 669,021 with an annual growth rate of 4.3% between 1998 and 2008. Approximately 76% of the city's population lives in informal settlements. The poverty rate is about 25% plus another portion of 9% of ultra-poor (NSO, 2008). Notable major factors to address the current development challenges faced in Lilongwe include improved governance, revenue collection and management capacity. Generally, one of the raised possible strategies to address these challenges is advancement of good governance principles that include transparency and accountability, civic engagement and citizenship.

Just as all other districts in the country the Lilongwe city operates within the Local Government Act of 1998. UN Habitat (2011:8) states that civic participation is low with the absence of the elected councillors. Furthermore, it states that corrupt practices, poor

accountability and transparency have resulted into poor governance and consequently led to inadequate service delivery.

3.3.2. Data Collection

The research used primary and secondary data. The use of the two forms of data was a complimentary approach to the research questions. This is because not all the research questions could be answered solely by primary data or secondary data. The primary data approach provided the opportunity for an in-depth search for the required information. It was more contextual in this case study approach to the research. While some data required out of some of the research questions was reliable and accurate through other already established data sources such as local government policy documents and reports; some data was not readily available. An instance of questions that could not be answered with the readily available policy documents and reports include those that establish how the process of the CDS making practically unfolded. The complimentary approach of using primary and secondary data collection approach intended to improve accuracy of the collected data.

In the primary data collection, the research utilized interviews, focus group discussions and questionnaires. The interviews conducted were informant interviews. The questions used in the interviews were open ended. Some of the questions were asked in the same wording and order among all the interviewees with some adaptations on other interviewees (Annex I. Column Three- shows the investigative questions used in the interviews). The interviews were conducted on a one to one basis and only two were done using focus groups. In both cases the researcher was the interviewer.

The one-to-one interviews were conducted with an officer in the City Development Strategy (CDS) Unit for Lilongwe City Assembly (Interview1), the Deputy Director of Planning for Lilongwe City Assembly (Interview 2), the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer for

Lilongwe City Assembly (Interview 3), Acting Director of Planning and Development who in turn referred the researcher to the CDS Coordinator for accurate information (Interview 4), Senior Block Leader (aka Senior Chief) (Interview 5) for Ngwenya and Member of Parliament for Lilongwe City South West (Interview 6).

The focus group interviews were conducted with three officers of Lilongwe city council Operations Branch (Focus Group Interview 1) and with the Secretary and Committee member of the Ngwenya Community Development Committee (CDC) (Focus Group Interview 2). Another method used in the data collection was a questionnaire with open ended questions. The questionnaire was given to the CDS Coordinator in the Lilongwe council and a UN Habitat Programme Officer for Malawi (Annex II are the two questionnaires used, respectively). However, the former responded to the issues in the questionnaire in an unstructured way while the latter did not submit back the completed questionnaire to the researcher.

Originally, focus group discussions and the questionnaires were not part of the initial plan of data collection tools. In the process of conducting the research, it emerged that some participants preferred to be interviewed in groups as they work in teams. Hence, interviews based on focus groups were considered dependable and credible; and others preferred a questionnaire. The researcher was flexible to consider the emerging issues in practice without compromising the nature of required data to be collected (Maxwell, 2005; Merriam, 1998; Neuman, 2010:152).

A significant challenge was getting hold of the CDS Manager to respond to the interview call up. He requested for a questionnaire but was still hesitant to answer the questionnaire in its structured form (The interview questionnaire was sent to the interviewee by e-mail). Through stories from the interviewees, the researcher used a path dependency type of narrative inquiry to extrapolate the actual

sequence of policy making processes (Neuman, 2010:474). These techniques of data collection helped to establish an in-depth probe for detailed information on beliefs, behaviours and attitudes on the research thematic issues (Merriam, 1998; Neuman, 2010).

In the secondary data collection, the research used the method of document analysis. The document analysis used a questionnaire to guide in the collection of the relevant data. Then the researcher used content analysis to extrapolate the actual relevant data from the selected documents. The documents used were: the Lilongwe City Development Strategy (CDS) (2009), the LGA (1998), the NDP (1998), the Constitution of the Republic of Malawi (1995), Water and Sanitation in Urban Malawi (Manda, 2009), the Malawi Decentralized Governance Programme (2002), UN Habitat Lilongwe City Profile (2011), the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (2006), and Ngwenya CDC's Minutes for April 2010. Some challenges to the secondary data were the problem of accessing and retrieving some of the required documents. For instance, documents such as minutes for the public consultative meetings in the CDS process were irretrievable, and the Lilongwe City council annual business plan for 2010-2011; the same case as for Ngwenya CDC minutes for 2009. This consequently called for increased diversity and number of research participants from local leaders and groups that were part of the CDS process.

This research suggested an evaluation framework that was used in the primary and secondary data collection on citizen participation in the CDS and delivery plan making. This evaluation framework for citizen participation in policy making was based on the objective of public accountability in democratic context. It considered that citizen participation is a continuous iterative intervention throughout with the policy process (Yang & Callahan, 2011). The evaluation framework is based on lessons drawn on how to make citizen participation work discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2.5. The same

evaluation framework guided the data collection exercise and was used in the analysis of the evaluation research findings. Table 1, below, shows the suggested evaluation framework:

Table1.Evaluation Framework: criteria and standards for analysing the level of influence of citizen participation in policy making

Criteria Component No.	**Standards**
1. Defensible decision making processes	i. Allocative efficiency against citizen priorities ii. Citizens' perception on responsiveness of the plan process iii. Measure of negotiation criteria on policy issue prioritization iv. Existence of traceable action plans for all decision making forums
2. Supportive binding provisions	i. Presence of enabling legislation on participatory decision making ii. Stipulations of powers and functions of the citizens and the government officers in all the policy processes iii. Stipulations on address and redress of community decisions iv. Availability of sanctions/penalties for breach of obligations
3. Engagement access and skills	i. Accessibility procedures to the existing structures ii. Proportion of people benefited from skill trainings iii. Number of existing skill development activities by government
4. Functional awareness	i. Citizens' awareness of the city development strategy processes ii. Citizens' awareness of the goals of the participation programme iii. Citizens' awareness on possible participatory mechanisms (includes how citizens are involved)
5. Opportunity demand structures	i. Constitutional set up of local participatory structures ii. Source of the issues of deliberation/ agenda setting iii. Responsiveness to the citizens' input iv. Presence of citizens' decisions binding forums in all policy phases v. Availability of accessible feedback channels on adopted decisions

Source: Author's own conceptualisation, 2011

3.3.3. Data Analysis and judgement criteria

Data analysis was done by pattern development and explanation building from the collected data (Neuman, 2010; Tellis, 1997:12). This arrangement was to match the policy making processes and the sequential nature of the referred concept of citizen participation in

this research. The research used the following techniques of data analysis: casing, coding, narrative analysis and discourse analysis (Merriam, 1998; Tellis, 1997:12).

The casing method involved creating a case based on the theoretical framework underlying the research. It helped to create interdependence between the collected data and researcher's own ideas. This is attributed to the methods approach of bringing together the data collected and the selected theoretical framework in making a case (Neuman, 2010:460).

The research also used the coding technique to create themes on the collected data. The coded themes were raised on the characteristics of the concepts captured in the conceptualization section (Merriam, 1998). The narrative analysis followed the path dependency approach in order to establish explanation components (Neuman, 2010:476). This technique helped to show how choices of one phase limit or shape other future options (Merriam, 2002; Neuman, 2010:476). In the explanation developed, the paper started with an outcome and then showed how the outcome came about from a sequence of prior events. The analysis also helped to establish the established community priorities against actual commitments by the assembly within the first year of the 5 year commitment.

Discourse analysis used several bodies of texts to focus the selected text in historical and social context perspectives (Phillips & Hardy, 2002). Hence this technique helped to establish a contextual understanding of the documents understudy. For example, government reports may be politically biased hence compromise the social reality. The use of discourse analysis helps to locate reliable convergence of the collected data.

3.3.3.1. The judgment criteria

The analysis of the findings used the Evaluation judgment criteria, table 2. Based on the operational principles of the decentralization

program in Malawi; in this evaluation research, good citizen participation is the involvement of local citizens that influences policy decisions and actions of the government in public affairs. Good citizen participation should be continuous and sustainable throughout an intervention. The judgment criteria is drawn from the NDP (1998), the provided background to decentralization programme in Malawi, the established regulatory framework of citizen participation in chapter one; and the reviewed literature in Chapter two.

The recommended citizen participation is the one that scores good or very good across all the five dimensions because it satisfactorily enables continuity, predictability and sustainability of power to influence public accountability. In order to ascertain a judgment of worthiness of citizen participation, the evaluation study will use specific indicators of the proposed citizen participation model for the evaluation as captured in table 2 (Author's own conceptualization).

Table 2: Evaluation's judgement criteria

Defensible decision making processes criteria	**Standard performance indicators for Defensible decision making processes standards**			
	Good	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Very Poor - Absent**
i. Allocative efficiency against citizen priorities	Community demands appear at above 60%	Community demands appear between 60% and 40%	Community demands appear between 40% and 20%	Community demands appear below 20%
ii. Citizens' perception on responsiveness of the planning process	60% of the citizens regard government as responsive.	60%-40% of the citizens regard government as responsive	40%-20% of the citizens regard government as responsive	Below 20% regard government as responsive
iii. Negotiation criteria on policy issue prioritization	Consensus building; any changes on priority agreed plans are justified in writing and approved by the citizens.	Consensus building; any changes on priority agreed plans justified in writing but not approved by the citizens	No local consensus; government prioritizes and gives the priorities to the local citizens	Government does the prioritization and also does not even inform the local citizens
iv. Traceable action plans for all decision making forums (traceable by local citizens)	At least 70% of resolutions in the policy making blocks are traceable by the citizens	Only about 50% of the plans in the policy making block are traceable by the local citizens	Less than 40% of the blocks have traceable actions plans	Less than 20% of the resolutions are traceable by the local citizens

Supportive binding provisions criteria	Standard performance levels and indicators for supportive binding provisions standards			
	Good	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Very Poor - Absent**
i. Legislation on participatory decision making	Legislation is in place; known by the local citizens	Legislation is in place; partially known by local citizens	Legislation available but not known by the locals	Legislation not available
ii. Stipulation of powers and functions of the citizens and the government officers in all the policy processes	Citizens are decision makers; government is mandated to abide by the local citizens decisions; and citizens are aware	Citizens and government share decision making responsibility.	Citizens partially aware of key stipulations of their functions against those of the council	Citizens not aware of any stipulations on their powers and functions; against those of government
iii. Address and redress stipulations of community decisions	Stipulations on local redress; and known by the citizens	Citizens are aware of either address or redress stipulations	Citizens are aware of either address or redress stipulations	Citizens not aware of any address ad redress stipulations
iv. Sanctions and remedies for breach of obligations	Available provisions for sanctions/penalties for breach of obligations; exercised so by local citizens	Citizens aware of remedial rights and how to seek remedy	Citizens partially aware of remedial rights	Citizens not aware of enforcement provisions

Engagement access and skills criteria	Standard performance levels and indicators for the engagement access and skills standards			
	Good	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Very poor – Absent**
i. Accessibility requirements to the set participatory structures	Popular participation	Use of traditional leaders as default representatives	Use of government appointed local representatives	No any representative involved
ii. Proportion of people benefited from skill trainings	At least 60% of the involved locals benefit from skill development	Beneficiaries between 60% and 40%	Beneficiaries between 40% and 20%	Beneficiaries below 20%
iii. Existing skills development activities by the government	At least one skills development activity reaching to at least 60% of the locals	At least one skills development reaching out to at least 40% of representatives	At least one skills development reaching out to at least 20% of representatives	No any skill development done by government

Functional awareness criteria	Standard performance levels and indicators for functional awareness standards			
	Good	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Very poor – Absent**
i. Awareness of the city development strategy processes	Citizens aware of all processes; notified by government	Citizens/representatives know at least half of the processes	Citizens aware of at least ¼ of the processes	Citizens not aware of any process
ii. Awareness of the goals of the participation programme	Citizens aware of their constitutional rights associated to participation; and goal of their participation	Citizens aware of the objectives of their participation in the policy planning	Citizens aware of their role to participate as part of decentralization.	Citizens not aware of the objectives of their participation
iii. Awareness on possible participatory mechanisms	Citizens aware of the participatory structures; notified by government	Citizens aware of at least half of the participatory structures	Citizens aware of at least ¼ of the participatory structures used	Citizens not aware the participatory structures

Opportunity demands structures criteria	**Standard performance levels and indicators for the opportunity demand structures and standards**			
	Good	**Fair**	**Poor**	**Very poor – Absent**
i. Constitutional set up of local participatory structures	i. Government set participatory structure; and controlled by local citizens	i. Government set participatory structure and controlled by government	i. Structure set not linked to government office of planning	i. No local citizen participation structure set
ii. Source of issues of deliberation/ agenda setting	From local citizens and by deliberative means	From government approved by local citizens	From government with local citizens direct involvement	Citizens do not give issues of deliberations
iii. Responsiveness to citizens' input	Local issues considered greater than 60%	Issues considered fall between 40% and 60%	Issues considered fall between 40% and 20%	Issues considered fall below 20%
iv. Binding forums for citizens' decisions in all policy phases	Decisions made by the local citizens through democratic popular processes	Decision making equally shared between citizens and government	Decision making by government with local citizens' consultation	Decision by government with no local consultation
v. Accessible feedback channels on adopted decisions	Interactive feedback channels to the local citizens	One way channel specific to the local citizens	One way channel, not specific to local citizens	No any feedback channel established

3.3.4. Validity and Reliability

The credibility of the inferences drawn and approaches employed in this research study are influenced by validity and reliability. In this research validity implies the level of accuracy achieved by the research (Creswell & Miller, 2000); while, reliability of the research is the measure of the dependability of the research (Neuman, 2010:196). It should be noted that the constructs used in the research and the methodology are more critical as a process of establishing accurate and consistent interpretations and conclusions. Hence this research study applied various strategies across the phases of the research in order to ensure validity and reliability for credible findings (Neuman, 2010:196).

Firstly, the use of a case study approach in this research was part of triangulation to ensure accuracy of results (Tellis, 1997:2). Furthermore, the research collected data from at least 3 credible sources towards each of the investigative questions under study as part of triangulation (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Neuman, 2010:149). In the triangulation exercise the task was to establish plausible information through a search for convergence in the collected data (Creswell & Miller, 2000: 126). Furthermore, the research utilized at least two methods of data collection to cross check any variations in the collected data (Creswell & Miller, 2000: 126). Any differences in the collected data for any single question was a source of more probing to achieve convergence in establishing plausible information.

The study constantly checkedthe relation between the theories and constructs underlying the research against the data that was collected (Neuman, 2010:188). For example, the constructed meaning of citizen participation is well grounded in the rationale and constitution stipulations of the constitution of Malawi and furthermore in the principles of decentralization policy in Malawi. Such an approach helps to build credibility of the research in the social reality perspective (Creswell & Miller, 2000:124). These constant checks for the linkages between

theories, constructs and collected data were intended to contribute to accuracy and credibility of the research findings.

To ensure dependability of results, the research used comparatively more relevant approaches in the research design and methodology (Neuman, 2010:196). This is evidenced through the deep discussion on validating the employed approaches and methodology. Along this arrangement, the establishment of particularly precise constructs for citizen participation, citizens' demand and public accountability was strategized to achieve measurement of the correct dimensions of the evaluand (Neuman, 2010:197). Another technique that was used in building validity and reliability of the research was good data processing to avoid a status of missing data and to maintain a chain of evidence (Neuman, 2010:204;Tellis, 1997:9). In such regard the researcher used voice recorders alongside the instant note taking during the interviews and focus group discussions. Another approach was the use of thick, rich descriptions of the research methodology and place of the research (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

3.5. Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that the research study is primarily descriptive. It specifically uses the case study design approach due to the situational nature of policy making in the local government system in Malawi. It further depicts that throughout the processes, the research employed a nonlinear path of conducting research for easy fine tuning of constructs, approaches and methods.

Furthermore, the chapter has depicted and argued on why the research utilized the evaluation research approach. Furthermore, it argued on why specifically the research followed the clarificative form of evaluation among other forms of evaluation namely proactive or monitoring or impact or interactive. Typical of many research steps, the chapter then discusses sampling, data collection, data analysis and issues related to validity and reliability to ensure credibility of the research study.

CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter will present the findings of the research in four main sections based on the collected data. The collected data has been compiled using pattern and explanation building. Using a combination of these approaches to data analysis, this chapter will provide a description of Ngwenya area, Lilongwe city council and the Lilongwe City Development Strategy (CDS). Finally, the chapter shall present the findings on citizen participation in the CDS. The findings on citizen participation have been presented with respect to the CDS making stages. These findings lay the basis of discussion in chapter five.

4.2. Ngwenya Community

Ngwenya is one of the informal settlements in the peri-urban area of the city of Lilongwe. It is located in the South West Constituency of the Lilongwe city. Ngwenya is well-known for its quarry mine as one of the many economic activities conducted in the area. However, the quarry mine was closed in 2009. But to date, some locals still earn their living through small scale quarry activities. Ngwenya has a population of about 23,944 (CDS, 2009:14).

Ngwenya is a low income area (Manda, 2009). Most of the people ply small businesses within the area and in Lilongwe town. The area is challenged with inaccessible roads, access to tapped safe and affordable water supply, sanitation and hygiene and health centres (ibid). The people in Ngwenya at large use water kiosks constructed through a WaterAid supported project in the area (Manda, 2009). The area does not have a public health centre despite being far from Bwaila and Kamuzu Central Hospital and considering the prevailing large population in the area. Another human development challenge is poor access to quality secondary education. Ngwenya does not have any secondary education centre like other peri-urban areas in the city (Focus Group Interview 2). Ngwenya has a primary school named Ngwenya. Ngwenya primary school is probably the most populous school in Lilongwe city with about ten thousand learners. Some other pertinent problems across Lilongwe city include: housing, waste management and poor governance of public infrastructures and services.

In governance and development issues related to Lilongwe City Council, the people in the area are represented by block leaders; elected councillors; a Member of Parliament (MP); and a Community Development Committee (CDC). At the moment the area does not have elected councillor since Councillors elections have not taken place in the whole country since 2005 (Cammack, 2012). In the2010 LGA amendment, MPs have been given voting powers when the next City assembly seats. Currently, Mr W.J. Adams Vinandi is the MP for Ngwenya area, since May 2009. The MP belongs to the ruling party, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP).

4.2.1. The Ngwenya Community Development Committee

The Ngwenya Community Development Committee (CDC) is part of the city council planning structure (Interviews 1, 3 & 7). It was established in 2000 by the City council as part of decentralization requirements. The CDC is a democratic popular participatory mechanism linking the local citizens and the City Assembly in development and governance (Interviews 2, 5 & 6). The CDC is a binding forum for the local citizens on development plans for Ngwenya. The CDC membership is by democratic elections conducted every two years; and the decisions made are based on democratic principle of 'majority rule'. The elections for CDC membership are facilitated by the city council.

The CDC membership is comprised of Chairperson and Vice; Secretary and Vice; Treasurer; and nine committee members (Focus Group Interview 2). Mr Katalama is the current chairperson for the Ngwenya CDC (ibid). The Chiefs and MP for the area do not vote; and only citizens above 18 years participate in the vote (ibid). The current CDC was elected in end January 2010 (ibid). There were allegations that during the elections some cheating was done by letting illegible voters based on area to vote (ibid). Unfortunately, there were indications that the candidate who lost on the chairmanship of the CDC was a preference of some of the council officials (ibid). Of which the controversial results had rendered the council in a position to rarely take up issues raised by the CDC (ibid). Another consideration of unfavourable support from the council is that the

current CDC has not received training from the council on the pretext of lack of finances (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 3).

The CDC mainly coordinates development activities (Focus Group Interview 2, Interview 2; Interview 3; Interview 5). The CDC has nine subcommittees equivalent to the nine directorates of the city assembly. The mobilization of the local citizens is mainly done through meetings that are called by the block leaders. The meetings have no definite times that they are held; rather they are arranged when there is an issue to be addressed. Unfortunately the CDC rarely conducts meetings on providing feedback to the community. The CDC takes people's demands to the city council. The CDC Chairperson represents the community at the City council. In an interview about the roles and responsibilities of the CDC, Senior Chief Kapapa said "CDC is like a child of to the community, we send the CDC to represent the community in council meetings". The CDC does not make independent decisions or plans without the local citizens' approval with the block leader as a convener of such meetings.

4.3. Lilongwe City Council

The Lilongwe city council is a local government authority. Before 2010, based on the LGA (1998) the councils were being referred to as assemblies (Cammack, 2010). The city assembly is meant to serve the local communities in reducing poverty and promoting democracy consolidation (LGA, 1998). The council was supposed to have two arms of governance: the legislative arm which comprises of councillors and the administrative arm comprises of civil servants (LGA, 1998). Figure 1.1, below, shows an overview of the city assembly governance structure. At the centre of power in policy making are the local citizens. The local citizens are expected to entrust the powers of approving local policies to a locally elected councillors. However, in 2009 the councillors were not in place. Hence, the administrative arm was challenged to direct interact/ facilitate the local development planning with the local citizens based on democratic governance as guided by the LGA (1998). Figure 2 shows an outline of relations in policy making between the local citizens and the secretariat.

Figure 1.1: An overview of Lilongwe City Assembly Governance Structure



Source: Author's own conceptualization

4.3.1. Powers of the City Assembly

The political arm, comprised of locally elected councillors, is constitutionally entrusted with legislative powers; while the administrative arm is to implement the resolutions as approved by the councillors (Constitution of the Republic of Malawi, 1995: Section 147 (3); LGA, 1998). However, the legislative/political arm has been absent since 2005 because the DPP Government has not called for the local councillors elections. In 2010, the City Assembly was renamed to City council through a LGA amendment (Cammack, 2012). Meanwhile the city council

is headed by the Chief Executive Officer who is appointed by the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development as head of the council's secretariat. In the absence of the councillors, the Chief Executive Officer reports to the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (CDS, 2009).

4.3.2. Functions of the city council

The Lilongwe city council as a local government has the following functions as contained in Section 6(1) of the LGA (1998):

(a) to make policy and decisions on local governance and development for the local government area;

(b) to consolidate and promote local democratic institutions and democratic participation;

(c) to promote infrastructural and economic development through the formulation, approval and execution of district development plans;

(d) to mobilize resources within the local government area for governance and development;

(e) to maintain peace and security in the local government area in conjunction with the Malawi Police Service;

(f) to make by-laws for the good governance of the local government area;

(g) to appoint, develop, promote and discipline its staff;

(h) to co-operate with other Assemblies in order to learn from their experiences and exchange ideas; and

(I) to perform other functions including the registration of births and deaths and participate in the delivery of essential local services.

In addition to the aforementioned functions, Section 6 (2) of LGA (1998) provides a stipulation of additional functions captured in Second Schedule of the LGA (1998). Section 9.1 of the NDP (1998) affirms that the council has been charged with the overall development of the city; of which in the process of city's development work the council is required to provide for

local people's participation in the formulation and implementation of the district development plan.

4.3.4. Fiscal Overview of Lilongwe City Council

The Lilongwe CDS (2009) indicates that out of the 100% revenue of the council, 98% is locally generated in the city and only 2% is financed by the National Government. The local revenue is largely from property rates and a small percentage of about 3% from fees and charges from the Lilongwe city council owned commercial properties. In general, about 81% of the revenue is allocated to operations and 18% is spent on salaries (CDS, 2009: 35). There are many reports of that show lack of external audited accounts between 2003 and 2008 (op.cit). This is marked by issues such as poor record keeping, corruption, and low quality in the finance department (ibid). This background contributed to the contextual framework in the planning of the CDS.

4.3.5. Policy making and local accountability status: 2005- 2009

In the absence of local councillors, the administrative arm of the local government designs and makes decisions on development policies and plans in consultation with the local citizens (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 2;Interview 6; CDS, 2009). The policies are drafted by respective directorates and consolidated into one policy document which is approved by the management team of the council (Interviews 2; Interview 6; CDS, 2009). There are claims that the drafting process of the policies is done in consultation with CDCs and political forums comprised of MPs and block leaders (Interview 1; Interview 3). The management team is comprised of the chief executive officer, directors and deputy directors of the nine departments. In principle, the local government is supposedly to consult the block leaders (well known as chiefs by the local citizens), the MPs, the local citizens, special interest groups and other stakeholders identified; at large the decision making powers are given to the local citizens (NDP, 1998).

The city council has reported that the absence of the political arms has rendered them unable to amend bylaws, make legally binding decisions and that the council's directorates are no longer accountable because of absence of standing committees. In addition, the situation has contributed to little or no public participation on local government matters and little or no local accountability (CDS, 2009:32). The Lilongwe CDS (2009:27) states that there has been a reduction in service delivery at the local council due to the challenges related to local accountability.

4.4. The Lilongwe City Development Strategy (CDS)

The Lilongwe city development strategy is a five-year master development plan. It is intended to assist the council in prioritising development activities, guide the budgeting and capital programmes and improving access to services of the Lilongwe city council from the year 2010 to 2015 (Interview 1; CDS, 2009:4). While achieving these goals the plan will address issues of equity, equality and importantly increasing the council's accountability to the local communities (CDS, 2009:4).Currently, the Lilongwe CDS (2009) is in its second year of implementation.

The CDS is intended to address particular development challenges found in the city of Lilongwe (CDS, 2009:6). It stipulates the key decisions on what should be prioritised in order to accelerate growth, reduce poverty, build sustainable settlements and empower communities. It was designed to address long term, medium term and short term strategic development needs of the council (Interviews 1; Interview 2; CDS, 2009). In summing up on the role of the CDS, Kelvin Mmangisa, the Chief Executive of Lilongwe city council said that the CDS will improve access to services while addressing issues of equity and equality (CDS, 2009:4).

The CDS policy making and delivery plan extends annually through development of the city council business plan (CDS, 2009:137). The business plan, also called the score-card by the Lilongwe city council, is a strategic document for annual planning. The CDS (2009:143) declares that the plan must be based on the

activities contained in the CDS, including an indication of the capital projects to be completed, the responsible department or agency and the expected outputs.

The CDS intends to contribute to achievement of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (MGDS) (2006) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); and to act as an investment tool (Interview 1; CDS, 2009:6). The MGDS is a Malawi Government's five year national policy that was formulated in 2006. The overall objective of the MGDS (2006) is to reduce poverty through sustained economic growth and infrastructure development. The MGDS (2006) stipulates the following six priority areas: 1) agriculture and food security; 2) irrigation and water development; 3) infrastructure development; 4) energy generation and supply; 5) integrated rural development; and 6) HIV and AIDS prevention and management. Malawi is also a signatory to the United Nations Millennium Declaration. Consequently, the development planning also considers the MDGs as priority goals to address poverty and development needs across education, health, gender equality, environment, global partnership. For a detailed overview of the MDGs, refer to Annex IV.

4.5. Citizen participation in the making of the Lilongwe CDS (2009)

The Lilongwe CDS making process ran from November 2008 to February 2010. The CDS making was divided into three phases. The entire process was facilitated by a Taskforce and an Extended Taskforce under the authority of the Lilongwe city council secretariat (Interview 1; CDS, 2009:11).

The Taskforce comprised of all the 9 heads of the Lilongwe city council directorates, Japanese International Corporation Agency (JICA), *Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit*(GIZ), UN Habitat, Malawi Local Government Association (MALGA), Office of the President and Cabinet (OPC), Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, Ministry of Lands, Actionaid, Water Aid and Malawi Institute for Physical Planners (CDS, 2009:144). The Taskforce solicited information required in each phase of the CDS process and drafted all sections of the CDS for stakeholder consultation workshops (Interview 1; CDS, 2009:11). While the Extended Taskforce included representatives from the relevant government ministries, state organizations, the NGOs and CBO

sectors and business representatives. For a complete list of participants in the Extended Taskforce, refer to Annex V. The Chief Executive Officer of Lilongwe city council chaired the Extended Taskforce (CDS, 2009:144). The main function of the Extended Taskforce was verifying, adding and modifying the contents developed at each stage of the CDS making process (Interview 1; CDS, 2009:11). This main function was executed in consultation with the Taskforce

The Lilongwe city council has a constitutional mandate to provide services based on community needs and challenges through the decentralization policy guides (Interview 1; Interview 2; CDS, 2009:18). The local government policy, such as the CDS, is a government declaration on identified objects and series of actions to be taken in addressing the people's demands and needs (Interviews 1; Interview 2; CDS, 2009). To track down the nature and extent of citizen participation in entire process of making of the CDS the research utilized an explanation building data analysis approach.

Based on the evaluation framework suggested in this research study in chapter two, section 5, and summarized in operational form in chapter three, section 2, citizen participation is comprised of functional awareness, opportunity demand structures, engagement, supportive binding provisions and defensible decision making processes. The subsequent sections use the evaluation framework in presenting detailed findings on citizen participation in all actual stages of policy making across the three phases of the CDS making.

4.5.1 Phase I: The preparation for CDS making

This section presents the findings on citizen participation in the preparatory phase of the CDS making. The preparatory phase was the first phase in the CDS making and delivery plan process. The interventions in this phase helped to establish the basic information towards understanding and categorising the critical issues of the Lilongwe city council (Interview 1; CDS, 2009:11). The intervention-pack comprised of assessment on institutional analysis, stakeholder and donor analysis, and information audit; and a review workshop of the assessment report (CDS, 2009:103).

In the assessment intervention, the institutional analysis identified several shortfalls in the operational structure of the assembly. The shortfalls were the absence of local councillors; majority of the senior management positions were filled by staff in acting capacity; financial system and procedures were seriously strained; and lack of equipment in many directorates (CDS, 2009:25). The assessment exercise was done by an external consultant and supervised by the Taskforce (CDS, 2009:11). Another activity under this phase was a review workshop of the report developed by the consultant (*ibid*.).

The subsequent five tables show the findings on how citizen participation unfolded in assessment exercise and the review of the consultant reports. The tables are on functional awareness, structures of opportunity and demand, engagement access and skills, binding decision supportive provisions, and defensible decision making process (as discussed in chapter 2, section 5).Each table presents a dimension of citizen participation as suggested by evaluation framework for this research.

4.4.1.1. Functional awareness among the local Citizens in assessing state of their community and reviewing the consultant report

This sub-section gives the findings on the extent to which the citizens were aware of the preparatory phase of the CDS making, goals of their participation and the participatory mechanism put in place.

Table 3(a): Results on functional awareness of the local citizens

Standard	Findings on functional awareness in phase 1
i. Citizens' awareness of the preparatory phase	100% of the collected data indicate that the citizens of Ngwenya were not aware of the CDS making process (Interview 1; Interview 5; Interview 6; Interview 7; Focus Group Interview 2). For example: The Ngwenya CDC was completely unaware of the CDS despite being a formal local planning structure for the Lilongwe city council.
ii. Citizens' Awareness of the goals of the citizen participation in CDS	The citizens expressed ignorance of the goals of their participation in the CDS. The council did not reach the citizens with information about the exercise and reasons of citizens' involvement. However, the citizens expressed knowledge that they are supposed to press development demands to the council.(Interview 1; Interview 3;Interview 5; Focus Group Interview 2).
iii. Citizens' awareness on possible participatory mechanisms at local level (rules, binding laws, representative channels)	The citizens were not aware of any participatory mechanism in the assessment and review of the state of the city report as a benchmark for CDS formulation. Expressing ignorance, Mr Yohane Gama, a committee member of the CDC and personal constituency assistant to the MP said "I have been with the MP since May 2009 but I don't have any information on how Ngwenya citizens could get involved and I even doubt if the MP knows about this CDS because he could have shared it with me". (Interviews 1; Interview 3;Interview 5; Interview 7; Focus Group Interview 2).

4.4.1.2. Opportunity-demand structuresin assessing state of their community and reviewing the consultant report

This second sub-section gives the findings on the extent to which the citizens were accorded appropriate participatory structures to facilitate their demands into the policy making process.

Table 3(b): Results on opportunity-demand structures for the local citizens

Standard	**Findings on opportunity demand structures in phase I**
i. Set-up orientation of the local participatory structures	The council organizeda stakeholderconsultative workshop which unfortunately did not bring in any local representation based on democratic governance(CDS, 2009:11; Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 2, 3 & 7).
ii. Source of issues of deliberation/ agenda setting	The issues of deliberation were predetermined by the Taskforce based on the report of the hired external consultancy. The citizens' demands were not sought to the workshop (CDS, 2009; Focus Group Discussion 2).
iii. Response to the citizens' input	The consultative workshops as participatory mechanisms did no show responsive to the inputs organized by the Ngwenya citizens (Interviews 1, 6 & 7; Focus Group Interview 2). Explaining on the exclusion of the local citizens, Mr Kalimujiso Banda, the CDS Manager for Lilongwecity council said "Ngwenya, just like other individual communities, was not contacted for their inputs into CDS because the CDS is NOT a community development strategy but a City Development Strategy. The City Assembly gathered inputs on public demands through Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) such as Council for Non-Governmental Organizations in Malawi (CONGOMA) and generalized the inputs categories and action plans". As of April 2010 reports show that CSOs and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) were not accountable to the CDC but worked in isolation to the CDC which is umbrella structure

Standard	Findings on opportunity demand structures in phase I
	for local development (Focus Group Interview 2; CDC Meeting Minutes, April 2010). As of 2008, the already lined up demands for Ngwenya were establishing of a secondary education centre, a clinic, a modern market place (Interview 5; Focus Group Discussion 2; Minutes for Ngwenya CDC, May 2010).
iv. Presence of citizens' decision making forums in the preparatory phase	There was no forum for the local citizens to make decisions as required by the decentralization policy. The Taskforces made binding decisions with exclusion of local citizens who by virtue of being residents of Lilongwe cityhold primary vested interest in the development of their area and the city at large(Interview 1; Interview3; Focus Group Discussion 2; CDS, 2009:11).
v. Availability of accessible feedback channels on adopted decisions	There was no feedback channel that was established to inform the citizens resolutions passed in the stakeholder consultative workshops (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 5; Interview 6; CDS, 2009).

4.4.1.3. Engagement: citizens equal access and supporting skills in the assessment of the state of their community and reviewing the consultant report

This third sub-section gives the findings on the extent to which the citizens were accorded opportunity of skills development, open and competitive access in getting involved in the policy making process.

Table 3(c): Results on engagement potentials of the local citizens

Standard	Findings on engagement access and skills in phase I
i. Accessibility procedures to the existing structures	The participation was solely by city council's appointment. There was no open call for citizens to be considered for representation of their areas. The CDC as an access point for the locals in the city planning structure was excluded in this process.No popular representation mode of participation was opened to the local citizens (Interview 1; Interview 5; Interview 6; Interview 7; Focus Group Interview 2).
ii. Proportion of people benefited from skill trainings	No Ngwenya citizens who were trained on specific skills to facilitate their relevant participation in the tasks under this phase (Focus Group Discussion 2; Interview 1, 5 & 7). Comparatively, the Lilongwecity council received mentorship from the City of Johannesburg to facilitate its responsibilities on development of the CDS (CDS, 2009:7; Interview 1).
iii. Number of existing skills development activities provided by government	The council did not do any skill development activities targeting the Ngwenya citizens (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 2; Interview 3; Interview 5). Since 2010 the CDC has not received orientation training on its roles in the council planning structure (Group Interview 2; Interview 3). Commenting on why the training has not taken place, Mr Brighton Nkhata, Secretary for Ngwenya CDC said "Over the past year and months we have pressed for reasons but the City Assembly's behaviour is dubious, it has alleged the failure to do the training to lack of funds. It could be an issue of local politics at play" (Focus Group Interview 2).

4.4.1.4. Supportive binding provisions in the assessment of state of their community and reviewing the consultant report

This fourth sub-section gives the findings on the extent to which citizens' involvement in the assessment of the state of their community was supported by legal provisions.

Table 3(d): Results on supportive binding provisions for the local citizens' engagement and demands

Standard	**Findings on supportive binding provisions in phase I**
i. Presence of enabling legislation on participatory decision making in the policy formulation	Supporting legislation include: NDP (1998) under the LGA (1998), Constitution of the Republic of Malawi (1995). Section 9.1 guides that the council is required to provide for local people's participation in the decision making processes in the development planning (LGA, 1998). The citizens were not aware of the LGA stipulations supporting their involvement in the CDC planning as a justice requirement (Interview 2).
ii. Stipulations of powers and functions of the citizens and the government officers in all the policy processes	Citizens expressed ignorance of their powers in decision making process. They said that the MP and the council decided on what should happen in development. There are general legal stipulations of the powers and functions of the local government to formulate local development policy; the secretariat is mandated to implement policies decided by the local councillors who are democratically elected representatives of the people (Interview, 2; NDP, 1998: Section 6). Described function of the citizens is to participate in the local development policy formulation (NDP, 1998: Section 9(1)).
iii. Stipulations on address and redress of community decisions	There were no specific address and redress stipulations following the LGA stipulation that the council planning system takes form of democratic governance. Normally the CDC provided the address and redress link between the citizens and the council. However, the CDC was off the loop in this planning exercise. The citizens were ignorant of the CDS as the council did not inform them about it (Interviews 1;

Standard	Findings on supportive binding provisions in phase I
	Interview 2; Interview 3; Interview 4; Interview 5; Interview 6; Interview 7). Commenting on the lack of redress mechanisms, Kamela, Deputy Director of Planning for City Assembly said "the councillors were the opportunity channel for the citizens to get feedback on what agreed decisions beyond the community level, of course it depended on diligence of the councillors to follow through the decisions".
iv. Availability of sanctions for breach of obligations	The local citizen did not seek remedy or sanctions for their violated entitlement to get involved in defining their own development challenges and needs. There are constitutional provisions for court remedy/ redress in case of infringement or violation of the right to political participation in government affairs (Constitution of Republic of Malawi, 1995: Section 46 (2)). The respondents attributed the passiveness of the local citizens to a lack of information on the existence that the project was taking place and their rights to participate (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 2; Interview 3; Interview 5; Interview 6). In such regard, Mr Adams Vinandi, MP, said "People know their rights in a very limited way. The city assembly does not tell people what their rights are hence people are at bay to exercise their critical rights and responsibilities. There is need for more information sharing with the local citizens". This implies the council was out of order by failing to provide necessary information to the local citizens for exercise of their right to participation in the formulation of the CDS (Constitution of Malawi, 1995; LGA, 1998).

4.4.1.5. Defensible decision making processes in the assessment of state of their community and reviewing the consultant report

This fifth sub-section gives the findings on the extent to which the decision making processes and procedures in the CDS making reflected accountability to the local citizens, transparency and democratic principles.

Table 3(e): Results on defensible decision making provisions advanced

Standard	Findings on defensible decision making processes in phase I
i. Allocative efficiency against citizen priorities	There was no procedure to exclusively indicate the demands by Ngwenya citizens taken on board in the CDS at Phase 1 (Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview 7; CDS, 2009).
ii. Citizens' perception on responsiveness of the plan process	About 90% of the respondents indicated that the planning process was not responsive to the citizens' needs and expectations (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 2, 3, 5 & 6). In addition, the CDS does not commit specific action plan for individual local communities (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 7; CDS, 2009).
iii. Measure of negotiation criteria on setting the policy issues and prioritization	In Phase 1, the Taskforce decided on priority issues to be in the CDS. Then the consultative workshops provided inputs on the issues drafted by the Taskforce. There was no democratic consensus building emerging from the local citizens on needs and challenges to be prioritised (Interview 1; CDS, 2009:11).
iv. Existence of traceable action plans for all decision making forums	There were no traceable action plans on agreed policy issues binding the Ngwenya citizens and the city council under this CDS phase (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview 7)

4.5.1.6. Summary of the Preparatory phase

The preceding five sub-sections have presented the findings on citizen participation in the preparatory phase of the CDS making. The findings were presented against the five criteria of citizen participation evaluation: functional awareness, opportunity-demand structures, engagement access

and supporting skills, supportive binding provisions, and defensible decision making processes. The findings have captured how each of the five standards of citizen participation as a public accountability mechanism unfolded in the preparatory phase.

4.5.2. Phase II: The development of the CDS

This section presents the findings on citizen participation in Phase II of the CDS making process. Phase II was mainly about development of vision, goals, objectives and operational interventions as pillars of the intended development strategy for the City Assembly.

The following key blocks were used to arrive at the Lilongwe City Development Strategy (CDS, 2009:10): the identification of the city's key development challenges and opportunities; the strategic planning process and the preparation of the vision, goals and objectives linked to a consultative process; the preparation of priority actions and indicative costing linked to a consultative process; and the institutionalisation process plan to integrate the action plans into the city's routine operating procedures and systems. The results presented below are on each of these blocks within this phase because forms of participation differ depending on the issue at hand (CDS, 2009:11; Interview 1).

4.5.2.1 Identification of the city's key development challenges and opportunities

This subsection presents the findings on how citizen participation unfolded in the intervention of identifying the City's key development challenges and opportunities. The results have been singly presented across the five components of citizen participation evaluation criteria:

4.5.2.1. A) Functional awareness among the local citizens in declaring main development opportunities and challenges

Table 4(a) below shows the results on functional awareness of the local citizens in declaring key development opportunities and challenges.

Standard	Findings on functional awareness
i. Citizens' awareness of the processes of this formulation stage in the CDS making	Ngwenya citizens were not aware of the exercises done on identifying their key development challenges and opportunities (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 5).
ii. Citizens' awareness of participation goals at this stage	Ngwenya citizens were not aware of the goals of the exercise on identifying their problems and opportunities towards the CDS (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 5).
iii. Citizens' awareness on possible participatory mechanisms at local level	Ngwenya citizens were not aware of the utilized stakeholder consultative workshop in affirming the consolidated problems and opportunities of the city by the consultant. In addition, the council did not docitizen awareness activities on the process of identifying the key development challenges and opportunities (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 3 & 5).

4.5.2.1. B) Opportunity demand structures

Table 4(b) below shows the results on opportunity-demand structures for the local citizens in declaring key development challenges and opportunities.

Standard	Findings on opportunity demand structures
i. Set-up orientation of the local participatory structures	The city council held consultative review workshop. The workshop did not account for popular representation or link to the CDC of Ngwenya (Interview 1; CDS, 2009:11; NDP, 1998).
ii. Source of issues of deliberation/ agenda setting	The Taskforce organized the agenda for the workshops without solicitation of views of the local citizens on issues to be deliberated.
iii. Response to the citizens' input	No citizens' demands were captured into the policy forum because the citizens' had no opportunity to submit their demands. Mr Yohane Gama, a Committee member for Ngwenya CDC, said "We know that in development activities of the council we are supposed to identify our community challenges".(Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 5 & 7).
iv. Level of equitable participatory requirements	The consultative review workshop was not open, transparent and competitive for the local citizens (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 1 & 7).
v. Presence of citizens' decisions making forums in all policy phases	There were no citizen forums to make any form of decisions on identified community challenges and opportunities (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 7; CDS, 2009).
vi. Availability of accessible feedback channels	No feedback channels were available to the citizens on resolutions reached in the consultative workshop (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 1, 3, 5 & 7).

4.5.2.1. C) Engagement access and skills

Table 4(c) below shows the results on local citizens' engagement through equal access and their supporting skills in declaring key development challenges and opportunities.

Standard	Findings
i. Accessibility procedures to the existing structures	Access procedure to the consultative workshop was by city council's identification of participants to the workshops. This arrangement failed to provide for local popular participation (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1 & 7). *The weak link on local planning and citizen participation* Mr Kalimujiso Banda, the CDS Manager for Lilongwe city council claimed "When formulating the CDS, all poor sections were represented by a NGO body (CONGOMA, and other individual CSOs). In certain cases only community leaders were invited. Remember that the CDS is a city development strategy NOT community development strategy". In case of Ngwenya Community, no local leader attended the workshops (Interview 5). The Ngwenya CDC does not have representative working linkages with CONGOMA (Focus Group Interview 2).
ii. Proportion of people benefited from skill trainings	No any Ngwenya citizen, including the CDC, attended a training related to skill building on problem and opportunity identification (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 5).
iii. Number of existing skill development activities by government	There were no skills development activities targeting the local citizens organized by the council (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 1 & 3).

4.5.2.1. D) Supportive binding provisions

Table 4(d) shows the results on supportive binding provisions for local citizens' engagement and inputs in declaring key development challenges and opportunities.

Standard	Findings
i. Presence of enabling legislation on participatory decision making	The LGA (1998) guarantees for popular participation in the City's development policy formulation. The CDS formulation is subject to this provision.
ii. Stipulations of powers and functions of the citizens and the government officers in the exercise	There were no specific stipulations on powers and functions of the citizens in the process (Focus Group Interview 2; CDS, 2009). However, the NDP (1998) guarantees that the local citizens have the power to decide the policy content through popular participation.
iii. Stipulations on address and redress of community decisions	There were no specific stipulations on taking on board citizens demands nor on providing feedback on these demands after other consultative forums (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 6 & 7; CDS, 2009)
iv. Availability of sanctions for breach of obligations	No sanctions were taken by the people of Ngwenya for not being involved in this exercise (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 3 & 5)

4.5.2.1. E) Defensible decision making processes

Table 4(e) below shows the results on defensible decision making processes for consolidating the local citizens' demands in declaring key development challenges and opportunities.

Standard	Findings
i. Allocative efficiency against citizen priorities	There was no documentation to exclusively indicate the demands by Ngwenya citizens taken on board at this stage in the CDS at Phase II (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1 & 7; CDS, 2009)
ii. Citizens' perception on the responsiveness of	About 100% of the respondents indicated that the problems and opportunity identification exercise poorly addressed their expectations

Standard	Findings
the plan process	(Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 5 & 6). The CDS does not commit specific action plan for individual local communities.
iii. Measure of negotiation criteria on policy issue prioritization	In Phase II, among policy issues raised, the Taskforce decided on priority issues to be in the CDS (CDS, 2009). Ms Mercy Mpakule said "Many times technical people decided on priorities and much more the consensus was through linking the CDS issues with the MGDS".
iv. Existence of traceable action plans for decisions made	There were no Ngwenya community traceable plans on raised challenges and opportunities (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 1 & 7; CDS, 2009).

4.5.2.2. The preparation of the vision, goals and objectives linked to a consultative process

This section presents the findings on the performance of citizen participation in the second stage of Phase II in the CDS making based on the five dimensions of the evaluation criteria. This stage also included consultation and participation in the strategic planning process.

Table 5 below shows the results on citizen participation in setting the vision, goals, objectives and actions for the CDS

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation in preparation of vision, goals, objectives and strategic plan
Functional awareness	The citizens were not aware of this activity. They were also not informed of goals of their participation and the participatory mechanisms in setting the vision, goals and objectives of the CDS (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 5 & 6).

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	**Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation in preparation of vision, goals, objectives and strategic plan**
Opportunity-demand structures	The council used a consultative stakeholder workshop to confirm the vision, goals and objectives. The citizens did not input on issues to be considered as part of the agenda. The council through the Taskforce determined the issues of deliberation. Resolutions in this workshop were open to change by the Extended taskforce. While, citizens didn't participate, nor did they get any feedback (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; CDS, 2009:11).
Engagement: equal access; and supporting skills	The council selected stakeholders to attend the workshops. The CDC was not among the invited stakeholders. The Ngwenya citizens did not receive any skill building training to support their participation in this exercise nor was there any relevant training offered by the council before this project (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; CDS, 2009).
Supportive binding provisions	The LGA (1998) guarantees for popular participation in the City's development planning. There were no specific stipulations on functions of the citizens in the process. The LGA (1998) guarantees that people have the power to decide development goals and activities for their area. The council is supposed to set address and redress structures (LGA, 1998). The Ngwenya citizens also did not pursue enforcement of their entitlement to participate in the local development planning process (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview 5; Interview 6).
Defensible decision making processes	Community demands failed to enter the consultative workshops. About 80% of the respondents indicated that the problems and opportunity identification exercise failed to capture citizens' demands and give traceable action plans (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 3; Interview 6; Interview 7)

4.5.2.3 The preparation of priority actions and the proposed implementation plan

This section presents the findings on citizen participation in the third stage of Phase II in the CDS making process. The main task at this stage was declaring priority actions based on the goals, objectives and interventions developed in stage two of Phase II. Table 6 shows how citizen participation unfolded at this stage with respect to the five dimensions of citizen participation evaluation framework.

Table 6 below gives the results on citizen participation in setting priority actions and implementation plan

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	**Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation on preparation of priority action and proposed implementation plan**
Functional awareness	The citizens were not aware of the priority action setting intervention. At the same time no deliberate effort was done by the Assembly to inform citizens of Ngwenya on the exercise(Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 3, 5 & 6). Mr Kapapa, a Senior Chief (Block leader) for Ngwenya, the official mediator between the CDC and the local citizens said "that there is such an intervention going on, I was not told. Of course I heard it from the grapevine that the assembly was in a process of completing a development strategy; as citizens of Ngwenya we were not aware if we were supposed to participate in the exercise".
Opportunity-demand structures	The council used a consultative stakeholder workshop to map out the drafted priority actions and indicative costing. There was no participatory link between the workshop and the CDC. The issues deliberated at the workshops were predetermined by the Taskforce with no citizen involvement. The stakeholder consultative workshop resolutions were open to modification by the Extended Taskforce. The citizens did not have any feedback on the passed priority actions and costing projections.(Focus Group Interview 2; CDS, 2009)

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	**Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation on preparation of priority action and proposed implementation plan**
Engagement access and skills	The access procedure to the stakeholders' workshop was by City assembly's identification of participants. Not one of Ngwenya community attended training related to skill building on priority setting and costing. There were no skills development activities done by the government that targeted the local citizens not in the CDC. (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview 5; Interview 6; CDS, 2009)
Supportive binding provisions	The LGA (1998) guarantees for popular participation in the City's development policy formulation. The CDS formulation is subject to this provision. There were no specific stipulations on powers and functions of the citizens in the process. However, the NDP (1998) guarantees that people have the power to decide the policy content. There were no specific stipulations on taking on board citizens demands and providing feedback on these demands after other consultative forum. No sanctions were taken by the people of Ngwenya for not being involved in this exercise. (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview 5; Interview 6).
Defensible decision making processes	There was no documentation to exclusively indicate the demands by Ngwenya citizens were taken on board in the CDS at Phase 1. About 82% of the respondents indicated that the priority setting and costing poorly addressed their expectations. The CDS does not commit specifically on what shall be prioritized and when for each local community such as Ngwenya. In Phase II, among policy issues raised, the Taskforce decided on priority issues to be in the CDS. There were no Ngwenya-City assembly traceable plans on raised priority issues and cost expected.(Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview5; Interview 6; CDS, 2009)

4.5.2.4. The institutionalisation process plan to integrate the action plans into the city's routine operating procedures and systems

This section presents the findings on citizen participation in the fourth stage of Phase II in the CDS making. This was the last stage for stakeholder engagement before the Taskforce Team finalised the CDS (CDS, 2009:11). Table 7 shows how citizen participation occurred at this stage of making the CDS.

Table 7 below shows the results on citizen participation in the process of institutionalisation of action plans

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	**Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation in the institutionalization plan of the CDS**
Functional awareness	The citizens were not aware of the institutionalization process of the action plans. No deliberate effort was done by the Assembly to inform citizens of Ngwenya on the exercise. The citizens were not aware on the goals of this exercise The citizens were not aware of the stakeholders' workshop that was conducted to consult on the integration of the action plans. (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 3; Interview 5; Interviews 6)
Opportunity demand structures	A consultative stakeholder workshop was used to confirm the drafted integrated action plan for institutionalisation of the CDS into council's routine operations (CDS, 2009) Procedure in the participation exercise failed to link the inputs of Ngwenya citizens' into the routine operations of the Assembly. The integration plan did not specifically solicit Ngwenya citizens' inputs towards the integrated plan. (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 5; CDS, 2009) The integrated action plans were predetermined by the Taskforce (Interview 1; CDS, 2009). The public consultative workshop resolutions were not binding as the Extended Taskforce could do

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation in the institutionalization plan of the CDS
	modifications without consultations with the local citizens (CDS, 2009). The citizens did not have any feedback on the passed integrated action plans (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 5; Interview 6).
Engagement: equal access; and supporting skills	Access procedure to the stakeholders' workshop was by City assembly's selection of participants. None of the Ngwenya citizens attended any training related to skill building on priority setting and costing. There were no skill development activities done by the government that target the local citizens not in CDC (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 1, 3, 5 & 6).
Supportive binding provisions	The LGA (1998) guarantees for popular participation in the City's development policy formulation. The CDS formulation is subject to this provision. There were no specific stipulations on powers and functions of the citizens in the process. However, the NDP (1998) guarantees that people have the power to decide the policy content There were no specific stipulations on taking on board citizens demands and providing feedback on these demands after other consultative forums No sanctions were taken by the people of Ngwenya for not being involved in this exercise (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3;Interview 5; Interview 6; CDS, 2009)
Defensible decision making processes	There was no documentation to exclusively indicate the demands by Ngwenya citizens taken on board at this fourth stage in the CDS making at Phase II. About 100% of the respondents indicated that the priority setting failed to address the citizens' demands. The CDS does not commit specifically on what shall be prioritized and when for each local community such as Ngwenya. In Phase II, among policy issues raised, the

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation in the institutionalization plan of the CDS
	Taskforce decided on priority issues to be in the CDS. There were no Ngwenyan traceable plans on raised priority issues and cost expected in the city council development plans (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview 5; Interview 6; CDS, 2009)

4.5.2.5. Summary on citizen participation in Phase II of development of the CDS

The preceding four subsections have demonstrated how citizen participation actually occurred in Phase II of the CDS making. The results have been depicted across four stages that comprised Phase II, namely: identification of the city's key development challenges and opportunities; preparation of the vision, goals and objectives linked to a consultative process; preparation of priority actions and the proposed implementation plan; and institutionalisation process plan to integrate the action plans into the city's routine operating procedures and systems. In none of them were the citizens or traditional leaders of the area involved or informed.

4.5.3. Phase III: Preparing for the implementation of the CDS

Phase III was about preparing for implementation of the CDS and the delivery arrangements for 2010-2011 Business Plan. The main activities were finalisation of the CDS, identifying champions of the CDS, setting legacy projects and the operationalization arrangements of the CDS such as the annual business plans and cost estimation; and finally the approval of the CDS by the Minister of Local Government and Rural Development (CDS, 2009:139). This section presents the findings on how citizen participation unfolded in the overall process of preparing for implementation of the CDS; and the delivery arrangement of 2010-2011 business plans. The overall findings presentation approach is because the activities in this phase were happening at same time except for the final approval of the CDS. Table 8 presents the detailed findings.

Table 8 below gives the results on citizen participation in preparing the implementation plan of the CDS

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	**Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation**
Functional awareness	Ngwenya citizens were not aware of the exercise of preparing for the implementation of the CDS and its approval event; including the planning of the 2010-2011 business plans reaching to their community. Ngwenya citizens were not informed of their participation goals in the CDS final implementation plan and the annual business planning process. Ngwenya citizens were not aware of active participatory mechanisms applied in this phase. Also, the Ngwenya citizens were not aware on how they could get involved in the Assembly's implementation planning. (Focus Group Interview 2; Interviews 5 & 6)
Opportunitydemand structures	There was no local citizen participatory mechanism that provided inputs towards the CDS implementation planning and review of the CDS final document that was submitted for approval to the Minister of Local Government and Rural Development. *Source of the issues for deliberations* There is no specific public participatory space raised to be used further as part of the strategic implementation plan of the CDS. The CDCs are the default participatory structures in the process. In this exercise, the Ngwenya CDC was not given any mandate towards the CDS implementation planning for short and long term arrangements. *Response to citizens' demands* The used procedure in finalising the CDS failed to account for Ngwenya citizens' inputs because it did not specifically solicit Ngwenya citizens'

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation
Opportunity-demand structures*(continuation)*	inputs towards the implementation arrangements and the 2010-2011 assembly's business plan. On the annual business plan arrangements, each of the assembly's departments makes its own specific plans to address the community needs and interests in line with the CDS. "In this arrangement the departments consult the CDCs with predetermined set of priority issues and interests", said Kamela, deputy director of Planning in the City Assembly. But the Ngwenya CDC was not consulted in the planning of development activities to happen in their community. *Citizens' decision making forum* There was no citizen participation binding forum for the Ngwenya community regarding the plans to be implemented by the Assembly under the CDS in the 5 year plan and the annual business plan for 2010-2011. A consultative workshop was used to confirm the CDS final draft document. The consultative workshops were conducted by the Taskforce. The workshops did not provide the citizens other formal or non-formal participatory spaces to check and demand for final issues to be adopted in the CDS. The workshop resolutions were not binding as the Extended Taskforce could do modifications. The citizens did not have any feedback on the passed resolutions e.g. the resolutions were not sent back to CDCs.
Opportunity-demand structures*(continuation)*	*Availability of feedback channels* The final CDS was not shared to the Ngwenya citizens. Similarly, the 2010- 2011 Annual business plan used top operational activities to the communities was not shared to the Ngwenya citizens as a feedback to the series of activities that happened from Phase I to Phase III. (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1;

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	**Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation**
	Interview 3; Interview 5; Interview 6; CDS, 2009; LGA, 1998)
Engagement access and skills	There was no local citizen participation access to review the final CDS and Annual business plan for their area. No citizen from Ngwenya attended a skills building related training on strategic planning and the implementation of the issues to be addressed in the CDS. There were no skill development activities done by the government that target the local citizens not in CDC.(Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview 5; Interview 6)
Supportive binding provisions	Section 9.1 of the NDP (1998) guarantees for popular participation in the formulation of the City's development plan. The CDS formulation is subject to this provision. In furtherance of constitutional order, the right to participation is protected by the Constitution of the Republic of Malawi in Section 43, as Administrative Justice provision, which states that (a) "[e]very person shall have the right to lawful and procedurally fair administrative action, which is justifiable in relation to reasons given where his or her rights, freedoms, legitimate expectations or interests are affected or threatened"; (b) "[e]very person shall have the right to by furnished with reasons in writing for administrative action where his or her rights, freedoms, legitimate expectations or interest are affected". *Powers and functions of citizens: address and redress* There were no specific stipulations on powers and functions of the citizens in the process. However, the NDP (1998) guarantees that people have the power to decide on what development should take place in their area as part of

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation
Supportive binding provisions*(continuation)*	consolidating democracy. There were no specific stipulations on taking on board citizens' demands and providing feedback on these demands before final approval of the CDS. However, the nature of the LGA (1998) in Section 3 provides for this. *Remedy or sanctions provisions* No sanctions were taken by the people of Ngwenya for not being involved in the exercise of declaring development policy of their area in 5 year terms and the 2010 -2011 business plan (Focus Group Interview 2; Interview 1; Interview 3; Interview 5; Interview 6; CDS, 2009). The Ngwenya CDC failed to make the Assembly address or support their interests and demands. As observed, "the CDC has set secondary school, clinic and modern market since 2006 but nothing has been done to date rather other development projects such as road construction are done now and again" said Mr Brighton Nkhata, Secretary for the Ngwenya CDC. Commenting on the issue of sanctions/ penalties and responsibility of local citizens, Mr Kamela, Deputy Director of Planning and Development for City Assembly said "When we talk of good governance, the citizens are supposed to know what the good governance is all about. For example, how much money is being used and for what. I don't know of local citizens holding the government accountable at the assembly level; since I came to the assembly not even a single person has come to demand what my office has done or plans to do".

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	**Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation**
Defensible decision making processes Defensible decision making processes*(continuation 2)*	The interests and needs of Ngwenya citizens that were considered in the CDS cannot be exclusively defined as the CDS did not break the priorities and actions against respective areas in the city council. The extent to which the Ngwenya citizens inputs were considered into overall CDS cannot be concluded because the CDS fails to express what will be done in Ngwenya in the 5 year term of the CDS. As for the 2010- 2011 Business Plan, the outcomes indicate that none of the priority development activities demanded by Ngwenya were addressed appropriately i.e. they were not done and no reason was given to the failure to address them. The response to people's inputs as demands and needs is very poor. For example since 2008 the area has demanded for a market infrastructure (just like other areas such as area 23, Kawale and Mchesi), clinic and a secondary education institution but this has not been captured as part of the city council's plans, as of December 2011. *Issues' prioritization: negotiation criteria* The criteria used on policy issues prioritization were not based on democratic popular participation principles; the management team of the City Assembly deliberates and approves the priority issues to be addressed. The deliberations are on predetermined plans by the respective assembly directorates. Of which there is no evidence that the departments did not consult Ngwenya CDC in the planning processes. Evidence simply shows that the Assembly directorates determine what activities to be done and the costing. Ngwenya citizens expressed dissatisfaction with the responsiveness nature of the CDS implementation arrangements and the 2010 to

Citizen participation component/ Evaluation criteria	Findings on the set component standards of citizen participation
	2011 business plan. *Traceable action plans* There was no traceable action plan against the final CDS between Ngwenya and the City Assembly. The final CDS action plans do not show an overview of what will be done in Ngwenya for the next 5 years (CDS, 2009:111). While for the 2010- 2011 Annual business plan, City Assembly and Ngwenya did not hold a bilateral traceable action plan.

4.5.3.1. Summary of results on citizen participation in Phase III Preparing for implementation of the CDS

In summary, table 8 has broken down the detailed findings on citizen participation in Phase III. Phase III was the closure of the project on the CDS making and its delivery plan. The CDS is a culmination of series of consultative workshops done the Taskforce. From the Taskforce, the CDS issues were reviewed passed by the Extended Taskforce and they were finally approved by the Minister of Local Government and Rural Development. Throughout this phase, local citizen participation was not accounted for.

4.6. Conclusion

This chapter has presented the findings of the research based on the collected data. The findings presented have been compiled using pattern and explanation building. The chapter has presented the actual description of Ngwenya area and Lilongwe city council to provide the context on which citizen participation occurs. Then the chapter presented findings on the description of the approved CDS. Finally, the chapter presented the findings on citizen participation in the CDS making and its delivery plan. The findings on citizen participation have been presented with respect to the CDS making stages. These findings lay the basis of analysis and interpretations presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OFRESEARCH FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter five discusses the extent to which local citizen participation influenced public accountability in the making of the Lilongwe City Development Strategy (2009). The reviewed literature showed that there is consensus on the discourse that achieving public accountability can successfully facilitate alignment of government's services with community needs and interests; and reduce cases of corruption and mismanagement of resource allocation in service delivery. To find out the extent to which citizen participation influenced public accountability, this chapter lays out three sub-evaluations based on the three secondary research questions that guided this study. The three sub-evaluations are on 1) local participatory structures, 2) processes and practices of engagement, and 3) the enforcement mechanisms of the involvement. The analysis in these three sub-evaluations is based on the judgement criteria framework established in Chapter three. The fourth section of this chapter provides the overall analysis and interpretation of how local citizen participation fared in support of public accountability at the local assembly level. The discussion in the overall analysis is guided by a citizen participation model presented below:

$CP = A_{L1}LPS + A_{L2}PPE + A_{L3}EM$ (Author's own conceptualisation)

Where:

i) CP is Citizen Participation

ii) A_{L1} is citizens' level of awareness of the Local Participation Structure (LPS)

iii) A_{L2} is citizens' level of awareness of the Processes and Practices of Engagement (PPE). The processes and practices of engagement consist of functional awareness, engagement access and skills, and defensible decision making route.

iv) A_{L3} is citizens' level of awareness of the Enforcement Mechanisms (EM)

Critically, if A_{L1}, A_{L2} and $A_{L3} = 0$ then CP = 0= Absent/ Null

Otherwise, CP can score very poor, poor, fair or good

5.2. Local participatory planning structures

This section assesses the extent to which the utilized participation structures in the making of the CDS contributed to citizen participation that influences public accountability. To achieve good citizen participation, the local participation structure should provide empowering space for the local citizens in their interactions with the local government. In Malawi, the participation structures are supposed to provide the local citizens with the opportunity to decide and express their interests and needs. At the same time, such structures should allow local citizens to follow through their demands with the city council. The analysis of the local participation structures utilized the opportunity demand structures judgement criteria presented in chapter three. The areas of analysis are nature of established local participation structures, source of issues of deliberation, level of citizens' input, participatory requirements, decision making mandate and redress channels.

5.2.1 Nature of the local participation structure

The first area of analysis of the local participation structure is the nature of the established participatory structure. In each of the five stages of making of the CDS, the City Council instituted a stakeholders' consultative workshop. The workshops were conducted at council level. There was no other public participation space rather than these five workshops. Unfortunately, the local citizens were not included to participate in the stakeholder' consultative workshops. With respect to the required popular participation structure, the stakeholders' review workshops failed to provide a link of local popular involvement space in the CDS making process. The exclusion of popular involvement spaces such as the CDC is considerably deliberate as the council deemed that the plan was for city development rather than community development. One wonders, is it not the city is made up of communities? Surely it is. Other organizations such as Cities Alliance (www.citiesalliance.org/ca/cds) also recognise that the local citizens have primary vested interest in the development of their city and deserve space to get involved in the planning.

The nature of the workshops do not correspond to the rationale of decentralization that citizens are empowered to interact and efficiently and effectively press their demands to local government in local policy development policy making. The city council failed to execute its bureaucratic discretional responsibility of creating popular citizen involvement spaces as required by the NDP (1998). The absence of local involvement spaces denied the citizens their entitlement to engage in local policy making for their area and the city at large. The nature of the workshops defies the principle provisions of the NDP (1998) on local citizen participation in development planning. Based on the judgement criteria, the standard of the nature of the local participatory structure scored a zero (was absent) to serve demands of the local citizens as required by the LGA (1998).

5.2.2. Source of issues for deliberations in local planning

The second standard of opportunity demand structure is the source of issues for the conducted deliberations in the stakeholder review workshops. In all the workshops held, the agenda was predetermined by the Taskforce which was predominantly comprised of city council technocrats. No block leaders or CDC representation was included in the Taskforce. It shows that many times the city council management team decided on issues for deliberation in the workshops. A practice skewed towards centralization, masked as decentralized planning. The arrangement of predetermined issues without local citizen involvement in the entire planning process defeats the purpose of decentralized government in local policy planning. The exclusion of local citizens' demands to enter into the policy making space is an act of disempowering local citizens' potential to influence policy direction.

The predetermined arrangement of setting policy issues depict that the council had more influence than the local citizens. The exclusion of local demands also denied the citizens an opportunity of establishing a popular social benchmark to monitor council's responsiveness and transparency over popular demands in the planning of the CDS. Furthermore, the

absence of citizens' contributions in the planning process depicts failure of the council to honour its responsibility of creating opportunity for citizens to set and shape the development plans for their area and the entire city.

One would argue that the council had limited resources to solicit a consolidated agenda from the local citizens. It is definitely possible; but in that case the council was supposed to communicate with the local citizens about the limitation. In addition, with respect to the default setting of council's local planning structure, the Ngwenya CDC could have been the provider of issues of deliberation on behalf of the local citizens. Contrary to the expectation, the Ngwenya CDC was also not consulted throughout the five stages of making of the CDS. This implies that, the voice of the local citizens was absent in the shaping of the agenda in the making of the CDS.

These findings reveal a top down approach in setting issues of deliberation in local policy making process. This defies the principle of giving power to the people in the decentralized development planning in Malawi. The practice exhibited poor response and responsibility of the council over the citizens' entitlement for an enabling space to set and shape their own local development plans. Hence, the evaluative judgement criteria on the standard of source of issues for the deliberations in opportunity demand structure scored very poor.

5.2.3 Response of local plans to the citizens' demands

The third evaluative standard was the level of response the citizens' input throughout the CDS making process. The research findings show that the arrangement of capturing needs and interests of the city in the CDS making failed to account for citizens' demands. The city council did not engage local citizens to contribute in identifying the city's specific challenges and needs and actions of addressing the needs. Previous findings show that the preferences of the citizens were absent in the policy planning process. The failure of the city council to provide space for gathering citizens' demands based on popular democracy failed to

establish a platform of soliciting citizens' inputs throughout the stages of making of the CDS.

This evaluation recognises that the stakeholder review workshops could have curtailed for local citizen involvement. However, the local citizens' representation on development was not part of the invited or actual participants for the review workshops; an example of the limitation of planning with no popular voice is evidenced in the Lilongwe city council's annual business plan for 2010- 2011 (drawn from the five year term CDS). The business plan revealed more incongruity between the City Council planned activities for the Ngwenya area and the local citizens' demands set under the CDC. The needs of the citizens on establishment of secondary school appeared in the CDS; modern market; and construction of clinic; but none of these issues were addressed by the council. In addition, the council never informed the local citizens about the development plans to be served in Ngwenya area.

Although the council captured the construction of secondary schools and clinic in the CDS, this cannot be considered responsive to the local citizens' demands. This is a null and void mark of congruency because the citizens were excluded in the consolidation of the development plans; contrary to the required decentralized planning. There was also an indication that the city council could not delineate the demands that the citizens of Ngwenya raised towards the making of the CDS. These observations indicate that the established participatory structures in the planning of the CDS and its implementation plan lacked a practice of fairness and justice to the local citizens' demands. The city council failed to set the precondition of responsiveness which is making sure that the community demands are explicitly known in the processes of policy making; hence, on the evaluative judgement criteria on standard of responsiveness to citizens input, the review workshops scored very poor.

5.2.4. Equitable requirements of the local planning structures

The fourth evaluative standard of opportunity demand structures was the participatory requirements. The research findings indicate that in all the stages of making the CDS and its implementation plan, the participation structures had no equitable local involvement requirements. The findings show that there was no local citizen from Ngwenya who represented the Ngwenya community in all the conducted review. In all the five stakeholders' consultative workshops conducted, the city council unilaterally appointed the participants. The appointment procedure is contrary to popular representation where the community elects its own representative(s). In default terms, the CDC is the popularly elected local citizens' body that was supposed to be part of the review workshops.

However, the CDC was not invited in all the stages, not even in confirming the annual implementation planning arrangements. The reviewed literature showed that without popular representation in the established participatory structures, chances are high that there will be deviated transparency and weak influence of the council's responsiveness to local demands. This is because the participants tend to side with the city council rather than the local citizens due to mobilized attitude bias consolidated by the council through the labelled 'discretional invitation'.

The failure to apply equitable participatory requirements based on popular democracy principles fuels cases of corruptibility of the participants. This creates a high likelihood of lack of the citizens' responsibility to stand for popular demands in the deliberations taking place in these participation structures. On top of that, learning from the fundamentals of democracy; the practice of discretion invitation rather than an entitlement creates poor enabling provisions for the participants to hold the council responsible for its actions. The citizens of Ngwenya community were denied their popular participation entitlement throughout the CDS planning process. The evaluative standard of participatory requirements was not transparent and was purely a choice of the City Council, hence it scored very poor.

5.2.5. Citizens decision making prerogatives in the local planning structures

The fifth evaluative standard of opportunity demand structures is the decision making mandate of the established participatory channels. The essence of providing for local participation spaces is for the City Council to facilitate the processes of giving powers of decision making in development to the citizens (NDP, 1998). In such respect, the citizens are supposed to determine and shape the policy agenda, goals and action plans. However, the research findings showed that the Ngwenya citizens did not have any participation space throughout the CDS making process. The event that the local citizens had not been entrusted with the responsibility to decide on their own or to share the decision making role with the council on what development should happen in their area depicts a mobilization of bias by the council on determining the nature of the CDS. Throughout the CDS and 2010 - 2011 Annual Business Plan formulation, the utilized review workshops did not provide autonomous or shared mandates for the local citizens to influence the resolutions on the captured development issues that affect them based on popular democracy. Hence, on the evaluative standard criteria of opportunity demand structures, the standard of mandate of decision making scored very poor.

5.2.6 Reporting channels on resolutions from the local planning structures

The sixth evaluative standard of opportunity demand structures is the redress channels on adopted decisions in the stakeholder review workshops. The research findings reveal that there was no feedback given to the Ngwenya citizens throughout the CDS making process. Such a trend continued in the July 2010 - June 2011 business plan. Based on the judgement criteria, an ideal redress channel could have been an interactive forum where government officials or community representatives could deliberate with the community members on the resolutions reached throughout the policy making blocks. Unfortunately, there was not even one way channel for feedback.

There was a revelation that at the time of conducting this research the Ngwenya CDC did not know about the existence of the CDS until the time of the interviews under this research. The reviewed literature on decentralization and accountability informs that in the absence of redress channels to the community by the designated representatives or officials, it is more likely that the council not be responsive and transparent to the local demands. At each of the policy making stage, a redress should be considered as an act of transparency and affirms the considerations given to the citizens demands. In this case, the established participatory structures failed to account for any shared solid base on redress to the local citizens on the way forward over their demands. Therefore, on the evaluative standard criteria of redress channels, the established participatory structures were null.

5.2.7 Overall performance of the local participatory structures in CDS making

Generally, based on the evaluation judgement criteria; the local participation structures as part of citizen participation for public accountability scored very poor. The established participation structures in the making of the CDS failed to provide democratic participatory space to bring the decision making powers to the local citizens. The stakeholder review workshops failed to provide for deliberative source of policy issues, opportunity to check the citizens' input, democratically equitable and equal participatory requirements, opportunity for the citizens' own choices on path of development and provision of feedback. On top of these shortfalls, local citizens were not aware of the stakeholder review workshops that were conducted. Thus, to say A_{L1} was equal to zero. The established participatory structures for the CDS making performed very poorly in support of need to have the city council's responsiveness and responsibility to the local demands.

5.3. The processes and practices in engaging the local citizens

This section reveals the extent to which the processes and practices for citizen engagement in the participation structures provided for responsiveness and

transparency to the public in the making of the CDS. Essentially such processes and practices should enable empowerment of the locals through transparency, rule of law, predictable standards and respect human rights. The analysis in this section is based on the three dimensions of citizen participation that constitute processes and practices for citizen engagement as captured in the judgment criteria in Chapter 3: functional awareness, engagement access and skills, and defensible decision making process.

5.3.1. Functional awareness

This sub-section discusses the extent to which the raised awareness among citizens influenced responsiveness, transparency and responsibility of the council in the making of the CDS. The analysis in this discussion is based on the three standards of functional awareness among the citizens: awareness of the CDS planning processes, awareness of associate human rights and responsibilities, awareness of possible participatory mechanisms.

5.3.1.1. Citizens' awareness of the CDS making project

One of the three evaluative standards of functional awareness is citizens' awareness of the CDS planning processes. The research findings show that the citizens were not aware of the entire CDS planning processes. The CDC, which is the local leadership for the citizens on local development planning, became aware of the existence of the Lilongwe CDS at the time of interviews for this research. The research findings show that the council did not take deliberate steps to inform the citizens about the making of the CDS. The lack of awareness of the CDS planning processes rendered the citizens incapacitated to contribute and monitor the activities of the council in the making of the CDS.

The council's act of failing to facilitate the awareness depicts a mobilization of bias as it denies the citizens' involvement requisite opportunity. The absence of the required information among the local citizens demonstrates some irresponsibility of the local government on addressing citizens' entitlements and reporting to

the local citizen. These findings contradict the supposedly citizen involvement in local development planning in Malawi (NDP, 1998). Invoking Section 37 of the Constitution of Malawi which states:

> "Subject to any Act of Parliament, every person shall have the right of access to all information held by the State or any of its organs at any level of Government in so far as such information is required for the exercise of his rights. Subject to any Act of Parliament, every person shall have the right of access to all information held by the State or any of its organs at any level of Government in so far as such information is required for the exercise of his rights".

The above quoted stipulation is in line with the Local Government Act section 42 (1) which states:

> "The Assembly shall arrange for the publications within its area, of information related to local government, and shall make or assist in making arrangements whereby the public may readily obtain, either at premises specially maintained for the purpose or otherwise, information concerning the services available within the area of the Assembly".

Hence, the citizens deserved to be well informed of all the CDS making processes to enable them exercise their right to participation. The development planning event is one of the services offered by the council in line with Section 9.1 of the National Decentralization Policy. Based on the judgement criteria for this evaluation, the evaluative standard criteria of citizens' awareness of the CDS planning processes scored very poor.

5.3.1.2. Citizens' awareness of the goals of their participation in the CDS making

The second evaluative standard of functional awareness is citizens' awareness of associate human rights and responsibilities supporting the right to participation in local development planning. The citizens had very limited knowledge of their constitutional rights and responsibilities on interacting with the city council on

the making of development plans for their community. The knowledge of human rights and associate responsibilities that the citizens expressed was more on their responsibility to participate in the implementation of the council's development projects in their area.

The research findings show that the City Council did not provide information on the citizens' rights and responsibilities in the CDS making project. Local citizens were denied their right to access useful information and right to influence the City Council in policy planning on issues that affect them based on popular democracy as guided by the NDP (1998). The local citizens failed to claim for their rights and responsibilities because of lack of information. The council had an advantage over the citizens to control the proceedings in CDS making process since lack of information reduces bargaining power for one's rights and responsibilities as entitlements. The lack of awareness on rights and responsibilities contributed to poor response and responsibility of the council on setting the appropriate spaces and activities to involve the local citizens. Therefore, the evaluative standard criteria of awareness of associate human rights and responsibilities scored very poor.

5.3.1.3. Citizen's awareness of the consultative review workshops

The third evaluative standard of functional awareness is citizens' awareness of possible participatory mechanisms at the local level. The local citizens lacked knowledge of any possible participatory mechanisms in the CDS planning exercise apart from using the omitted CDC in the planning process of the CDS. The research findings reveals that the citizens were not informed of the established stakeholder review workshops as general participatory planning structures for the CDS.

There was a claim that the citizens were represented by the MP for the area, Mr Vinandi, who merely participated in one review

workshop. Informed by the LGA, Section 5(1) (b) (1998), the MPs were ex-officio members at the council level with no default powers of representing the citizens in the local development planning (This is before the 2010 Local Government amendment). In addition, the citizens were not alerted or consulted of the MP's participation in the exercise. Therefore, the MP's participation in the review workshop cannot be considered a representation of the local citizens.

Another claim that emerged was that the citizens were involved in the CDS planning through a representation of NGOs lead by CONGOMA. However, there was a disjoint between CONGOMA and local citizens of Ngwenya which failed to support the claim that CONGOMA represented the local citizens. In addition based on popular democracy, CONGOMA was not the people's choice and people did not know the involvement of CONGOMA in the CDS making. The third claim was that the citizens participated through block leaders (traditional leaders). However, the research findings show that the block leaders were completely unaware of the CDS planning exercise. In the event that the block leaders were part of the CDS making, their participation could have not been a popular representation based on democracy.

The citizens' lack of awareness made them fail to submit their demands for consideration in the CDS planning. It also made the citizens unable to follow up on the proceedings of the planning process, especially regarding their area. Such developments show lack of transparency and responsibility by the council. The lack of transparency opens up an environment that favours corruption and mismanagement of plans and resources such as finances. Hence, based on the judgement criteria the evaluative standard of local citizens' awareness of possible participatory mechanisms scored very poor.

5.3.1.4. Sub-overall performance of citizens' functional awareness to participate in CDS making

In general, the functional awareness in the processes and practices of engagement of providing a supportive base for responsiveness and transparency in the making of the CDS scored very poor. This is mainly because the local citizens were ignorant of any process and practice to support their engagement due to the city council's failure to take deliberate steps to act on the required information as required by the Local Government Act (198) and Constitution of Malawi

5.3.2. Engagement access and skills

This sub-section discusses the extent to which the engagement access and skills among the citizens influenced responsiveness and responsibility of the council in the making of the CDS. The analysis in this discussion is based on the following three standards: nature of the access procedures of the established participatory structures, proportion of citizens that benefitted from relevant skill development training and the number of citizens that benefitted from already existing skill development activities.

5.3.2.1. Nature of access procedures

The first evaluative standard of engagement access and skills is the nature of access procedures to the established participatory structures in the making of the CDS. The exclusive citizen participation opportunity in the CDS planning was through popular representation in the conducted stakeholder review workshops. Nevertheless, the city council appointed the participants for these workshops. This is contrary to bottom-top selection of representatives as assumed by popular democracy theory, where the local citizens are supposed to be entrusted to select their own representative.

The series of the review workshops failed to account for popular representation mechanism in the CDS making. The access to the review workshops was by city council appointment of participants

as stakeholders in the development of the council. This procedure failed to account for a popular representation of Ngwenya CDS; for example, in similar programme in Sobral, Brazil, on defining public policies based on citizen participation (Simielli, 2008:14), the selection of representatives by the community from among the community members was also considered a form of great popular articulation and participation. The participation by appointment administered by the administrative arm of the Local Council renders unfavourable condition for reporting by the local representative. Another instance is that none of the claimed local representatives of Ngwenya community reported back to the Ngwenya citizens on resolutions of the review workshops.

Another access procedure indicator is citizens' awareness of their roles and responsibilities in the development planning. The research findings show that the citizens were not aware of their powers and role in all the policy phases. With undefined or unknown roles and responsibilities, the citizens were disadvantaged to take up their responsibilities under their entitlement on local participation. Likely, the council worked against the ignorance of the people to further its agenda rather than what is of social interest. Based on the evaluative judgment criteria for engagement access and skills, the standard of procedures of access to the established participatory structures scored very poor.

5.3.2.2. Citizens' skills development

The second evaluative standard of engagement access and skills is proportion of citizens that benefitted from specific skill development trainings required in the planning of the CDS. The CDS was a special project as it set new direction for development of Lilongwe city. This required aligning participation abilities of the actors involved with respect to expected roles and responsibilities to ensure appropriate involvement; for example, the Lilongwe city council received a mentorship support on how to

develop the CDS from the city of Johannesburg (South Africa). The mentorship was to help Lilongwe city council to raise its capacity to establish a standard city development strategy (CDS, 2009:7). However, the council did not plan or administer any specific skill development activity for the citizens.

In line with equity and equality to access deliberations in the participation forums, the local citizens' representation in the process was also supposed to receive skill training required for their contributions in the making of the CDS; examples of such required skills are negotiation and bargaining in building consensus. Negotiation skills can involve use of numbers (discrepancies in popular demands) to depict criticalness of demand by the locals. The lack of skills development exercises had the potential to limit the ability of the representatives of the citizens to influence the other actors in the deliberations spanning the entire process of the CDS making. Hence, the judgment criteria for the evaluative standard of proportion of citizens that benefitted from specific skill development trainings required for the CDS making and its implementation plan scored very poor.

5.3.2.3. Existing skills development programmes

The final evaluative standard of engagement access and skills is the number of existing skill development activities by the city council. In the absence of specific skills development training for the CDS making exercise, the already existing skills development training programmes could have possibly been an alternative platform for consideration in assessing the possibility of citizens/ representatives being in possession of required skills in the policy making. The research findings show that the city council does not have its own programme on local community participation skills for development planning. Hence by default, the citizens were doubtfully empowered to take up their expected roles and responsibilities in the processes of local development policy

planning. Therefore, based on the judgment criteria for this evaluation, the standard of the existing skill development activities by the city council scored null.

5.3.2.4. Sub-overall performance of engagement access and skills

In general, the engagement access and skills among the citizens influenced responsiveness and responsibility of the council in the making of the CDS scored very poor. This is mainly because the local citizens were ignorant of equity and equality factors in getting involved in participatory structures and that the city council failed to take deliberate steps to enact the required skills for the citizens to exercise their participation entitlement.

5.3.4. Defensible decision making processes

This sub-section shows the extent to which the applied decision making processes in the stages of making of the CDS accounts to responsiveness and responsibility over the citizens' demands. The analysis is on the following four standards: allocative efficiency of the city council against the citizens' priorities, the perception of the citizens' on the responsiveness of the planning process, the measure of the negotiation criteria on policy issue prioritization in the making of the CDS and the existence of traceable plans.

5.3.4.1. Allocative efficiency: how many citizens' demands feature in the CDS

The first evaluative standard of defensible decision making processes is the allocative efficiency of the CDS against the demanded citizens' priorities. The reviewed literature on decentralization informed that bringing local policy planning closer to the people fosters congruency between the planned supply by the City Council and the demanded services by the Ngwenya Community. The CDS is supposed to reflect the demands of the citizens in each community as Ngwenya. The research findings show that across all the stages in the making of the CDS there was no mechanism to exclusively account for the demands of the Ngwenya citizens.

The applied approach failed to establish a measurement depicting consideration accorded to local citizens. Hence, the applied approach in the decision blocks in the making of the CD does not support provisional base to monitor responsiveness of the government in implementation of the CDS. Another shortfall is lack of allocation of financial costs in the expected development plans. The absence of the Ngwenya citizen inputs throughout the planning stages displays a poor execution of responsibility by the council. Hence, the evaluative standard of allocative efficiency of the citizen priorities in the CDS scored very poor.

5.3.4.2. Citizens' perception on responsiveness of the planning process

The second evaluative standard of defensible decision making processes is the citizens' perception on responsiveness of the planning process. The research findings show that the local citizens perceived the council as not being responsive in its planning process. A large sample of the respondents indicated that the CDC was not supposed to be the appropriate channel to involve the local citizens in the planning process. However, the CDC was omitted in the participatory structures of the CDS making.

An example depicting poor responsiveness of the council was demonstrated in the 2010 - 2011 annual business plan for the CDS. The council only planned for construction of a bridge between communities of Ngwenya and Chipasula. Yet the local citizens of Ngwenya neither had the bridge on their demand priority list nor did the council consult them about the bridge. In addition, the bridge construction was the only development projects that the city council supplied to Ngwenya community. Unfortunately no justifications were provided to the citizens on the bridge construction project. This brings into question the responsiveness of the local government planning and service delivery practices.

The negative perceptions among the citizens tend to erode their trust on the legitimacy of the decision making processes. When citizens have low trust, they are likely to have low interest to engage with the council in making sure that the council does what it is supposed to do. Therefore, the evaluative standard of the citizens' perceptions on the responsiveness of the planning process standard scored very poor.

5.3.4.3. Policy issue setting and prioritization: the negotiation criteria

The third evaluative standard of defensible decision making processes is the measure of negotiation criteria on policy issue prioritization in the making of the CDS. With respect to popular democracy, a good defendable measure of negotiation criteria on policy issue prioritization was supposed to be by consensus built among the citizens. Any changes to the prioritized items were to be approved by the community and not the council. In addition, based on Section 10 (4) NDP, (1998), the prioritization of the competing policy demands should also be reflected upon the availability of resources and time to address them. There was no mechanism of soliciting the local citizens' development priorities to be included in the CDS. Instead, the Taskforce decided on priorities to be addressed by the CDS.

While in the CDS annual delivery planning, the management of the city council decided on priorities for the city including Ngwenya community without involving the local citizens in the decision making processes. The local citizens were deprived of their entitlement to decide and make priorities on the development issues for their area. As a result the local citizens had no opportunity to influence the development plans. Without considering the local demands, the city council demonstrated poor handling of its responsibility on providing for local citizens voice in the decision making. As informed by the reviewed literature, the city council is likely to be unresponsive institution to the local development governance expectations. Hence, the evaluative standard of measure of negotiation on policy issue prioritization scored very poor.

5.3.4.4. Existence of traceable plans: social contracts

The fourth evaluative standard of defensible decision making processes is the existence of traceable plans. In order to follow through the decisions made on the development plans, there is a

need for existence of traceable plans. The traceable plans for all the decision making forums summarise the deliberated and adopted issues as resolutions with clear stipulations on the way forward which includes responsibilities, duration and expected costs. In the CDS making process, there were no traceable plans showing the deliberations and decisions on development plans made between the local citizens and the City Council. The final CDS document did not explicitly account for the development issues to be addressed in Ngwenya. The annual business plan (2010) drawn as operationalization of the CDS also failed to put in place a traceable action plan that the Ngwenya community could follow through the operations and services of the City Council in their area.

In the CDS making, without a traceable action plan there was no provisional social base for the local citizens to bring the council to book on its responsiveness and responsibility to local citizens' demands. Hence, the evaluative standard of the existence of traceable plans scored poor.

5.3.4.5. Sub-overall performance of the defensive decision processes

In general, the criteria of defensible decision making scored poor. The mechanisms utilized in compiling objectives and activities for the CDS were not compliant with the expected procedures in popular participatory processes of policy making. Similarly, the perceptions of the local citizens were very negative (poor) due to their non-participation. The exercised participation in this case can be equated to the therapy class of Arnstein's (1969) typology of citizen participation.

5.3.5. Overall performance of processes and practices of citizens' engagement

In general, this section on the processes and practices for the citizens' engagement in the participation structures as a mechanism of providing a supportive base for responsiveness and transparency of the council in the

making of the CDS scored very poor. This is mainly because the local citizens were ignorant of any process and practice to support their engagement in the context that the council did not share the information about the project. The very poor score is also attributed to the absence of provisions for popular representation access and the skills development trainings; and poor defensible decision making arrangements. The city council's failure to take deliberate steps to enact the required processes and practices as mandated by the constitution of Malawi through the NDP (1998) depict a high mobilization of bias that the council will have more influence than the citizens.

5.4. The enforcement mechanisms

This section discusses the extent to which the established participatory structures, processes and practices were guaranteed and claimable in the planning of the CDS. The analysis is on the standards that ensure that citizen involvement is enforceable. The analysis uses the supportive binding provisions criteria as described in the Judgement criteria framework for the evaluation of citizen participation in local policy making (Chapter 3). In the subsequent discussions, the analysis is focused on the nature of legislation, stipulation of functions of citizens and the council, stipulations of addressing and redressing community demands, and sanctions or penalties for the breach of obligations in the planning of the CDS.

5.4.1. Legislation on local participatory decision making

The first evaluative standard of the supportive binding provisions is the nature of legislation on participatory decision making in the making of the CDS and its implementation. The local policy planning process is pillared on the LGA (1998) guided by the NDP. This has also been provided for in the Constitution of Malawi (1995) in section 40(1) (c) that the local citizens have the right to participate in the policy making as a political activity that influences the development plans of the government. Section 40(1) (c) of the constitution of Malawi (1995) is more supported for at the local government level through the LGA (1998). The LGA informs that the rationale of the decision making process should be built on the

principle of citizen participation. The NDP (1998) in Section 9.1 indicates that the planning process of development planning shall engage the local citizens. In this policy provision, the city Council is required to provide for the local citizens' participation.

Although the NDP (1998) does not specify the process and practices of decision making in the development planning, the NDP (1998) underlying principles give powers of decision making to the citizens at local level. Therefore, the process of decision making in the development planning processes is supposedly to be based on local democratic consensus measures. The research did not find any local legislation document that provides standard operating procedures in decision making involving popular participation. Instead, the Council used its administrative discretion to establish the processes and procedures for decision making in the CDS planning. The act of discretion brings in complexities for the local citizens to do objective monitoring of government responsibilities in the processes of policy making. This is because the limits of responsibilities tend to fade in the pretext of convenient arrangements which builds inconsistencies in operating procedures. The standard of the nature of the legislation on participatory decision making in the planning of the CDS scored fair.

5.4.2. Citizens' functions in the planning process: corporate mandate

Another evaluative standard of supportive binding provisions is the stipulation of functions of the citizens and the council in the development planning exercise. There were stipulations of functions of the government officers in the planning of development policy captured in LGA (1998) and the NDP (1998). Primarily, the administrative arm of the council is supposed to merely facilitate and provide technical guidance in the development planning at the local government level. There were no clear stipulations on the powers and functions of the local citizens in the process of formulating the CDS and its implementation plan. Based on the operational principle of the decentralization programme in Malawi, the

powers of policy making have been given to the people through representative democracy and popular participation.

Meanwhile, the participation of the local citizens in the policy making through councillors has been paralyzed due to the absence of the local councillors as government has not called for the Local Government Elections since 2005. In the absence of the councillors, the local citizens make decisions on development issues that concern them through the CDC by their constitutional entitlement for participatory decision making. However, in the CDS planning the citizens did not play any role. The CDS is a product of a series of decisions made by the city council technical persons in consultation with other stakeholders but excluding the popular representation of Ngwenya. The research data indicates that the final decision on the CDS was unilaterally determined by the technical officers for Lilongwe city council.

The city council defied its role of facilitation and assumed the role of decision making in the development planning. This defiance shows some irresponsiveness and poor responsibility of the council that can be partly attributed to the citizens' lack of knowledge on functions of the council. To another extent, this defiance can be attributed to the tendency of centralization of local government services by the national government. The 2010 LGA amendment, which removed the function of policy making from the council, supports the argument that the government of Malawi is evolving to centralization in policy making. Informed by the reviewed literature, lack of knowledge among the citizens yields a low sense of responsibility to pursue the relevant functions on ensuring that the local government operates and provides services as required by the people and the LGA (1998). Hence, by the evaluative criteria, the evaluative standard of stipulation of functions scored very poor.

5.4.3. Citizens' address and redress: a discretion or mandatory?

The third evaluative standard of supportive binding provisions is the stipulations of address and redress of the citizens' demands. The NDP

(1998) provides the stipulation that the City Council should consult on development activities to be facilitated in Ngwenya community based on popular democracy. However, during the planning of the CDS, there were no binding stipulations summoning the responsible officers from the City Council or the Ngwenya Community to provide feedback to the local citizens. The reviewed literature informs that in popular democratic participation, spaces of address and redress of citizens' demands should be explicitly stated and be of interactive format. Neither the city council had any of the other claimed local citizen representatives, such as the MP and CONGOMA provided feedback to the citizens on the decisions reached at any stage of the CDS making. The failure to report to the local citizens throughout the planning process reveals that the council is not locally responsible but rather only execute upward responsibility.

The absence of the legal stipulations on the redress reduced citizens' ability to seek for redress. It also reduces independent commitment of the council to honour its responsibility of reporting to the local citizens. In the absence of feedback at each stage of the planning process, it makes it hard for the citizens to follow up in the subsequent processes. Therefore, the evaluative standard of stipulation of address and redress arrangements scored poor.

5.4.4. Remedies and sanctions in local policy making

The fourth evaluative standard of supportive binding provisions is the sanctions or penalties for breach of obligations on the local development planning exercise among the involved actors. There were provisions for sanctions or penalties for a failed obligation by the City Council. For example, the council was obligated by the NDP Section 9.1 to provide for local participation in the development planning but it did not do so. This obligation was in furtherance of the constitutional order; part of it is the respect and promotion of political rights under the bill of rights in Section 40(1) (c) of the constitution of the republic Malawi. The constitution of Malawi, in Section 43 under administrative justice provision states

"Every person shall have the right to -

a. lawful and procedurally fair administrative action, which is justifiable in relation to reasons given where his or her rights, freedoms, legitimate expectations or interests are affected or threatened; and
b. be furnished with reasons in writing for administrative action where his or her rights, freedoms, legitimate expectations or interests if those interests are known."

Furthermore, Section 46 of the constitution of the republic Malawi provides stipulations on enforcement mechanisms applicable to the right to participation in the local development planning. It states:

"1. Save in so far as it may be authorized to do so by this Constitution, the National Assembly or any subordinate legislative authority shall not make any law, and the executive and the agencies of Government shall not take any action which abolishes or abridges the fundamental rights and freedoms conferred by this Chapter, and any law or action in contravention thereof shall, to the extent of the contravention, be invalid.

2. Any person who claims that a fundamental right or freedom guaranteed by this Constitution has been infringed or threatened shall be entitled -
    a. to make application to a competent court to enforce or protect such a right or freedom; and
    b. To make application to the Ombudsman or the Human Rights Commission in order to secure such assistance or advice as he or she may reasonably require.
3. Where a court referred to in subsection (2) (a) finds that rights or freedoms conferred by this Constitution have been unlawfully denied or violated, it shall have the power to make any orders that are necessary and appropriate to secure the enjoyment of those rights and freedoms and where a court finds that a threat exists to such rights or freedoms, it shall have the power to make any orders necessary and appropriate to prevent those rights and freedoms from being unlawfully denied or violated.
4. A court referred to in subsection (2) (a) shall have the power to award compensation to any person whose rights or freedoms have been unlawfully denied or violated where it considers it to be appropriate in the circumstances of a particular case.
5. The law shall prescribe criminal penalties for violations of those non-derogable rights listed in subsection 44 (1)."

Therefore, the research argues that the city council failed its obligation to adequately provide space and information for local citizen participation in the making of the CDS. In addition the council did not furnish any reasons

to the local citizens on their violated right to participate in the making of the CDS. Yet no sanctions or penalties or litigations were pursued by the local citizens or other stakeholders in the decentralization support initiatives against the city council's actions.

The research findings also showed that the citizens lacked knowledge of the constitutional provisions on enforcement of their right to participation in the local development planning. Failure to enforce the responsibility of the council will likely yield complacency among the city council staff members geared in the development planning services. This complacency, may lead to poor responsiveness of the council to the local citizens' demands; low transparency of the city council in decision making on development plans; poor management of plans and associate financial resources concerning community development. Therefore, the evaluative standard of sanctions or penalties for the breach of obligations scored very poor.

5.4.5. Overall performance of enforcement mechanisms

In overall, the supportive legal provisions as part of citizen participation for public accountability rated very poor. There is evidence that there are legal provisions to ensure that good citizen participation is guaranteed and claimable. However, the local citizens were not aware of the existence of the supportive legal provisions. Hence, the findings infer that there were no supportive legal provisions (Constitution of the republic of Malawi, 1995: Section 37; LGA, 1998: Section 3 and 42(1) of the First Schedule).

5.5. The reality of citizen participation in the local policy planning- Lilongwe city

In this section, the report gives the overall rating on the extent to which citizen participation influenced public accountability in the making of the Lilongwe CDS. Based on the model of citizen participation applied in this research, the extent to which citizen participation supports public accountability in the making of the CDS depends on the performance level of citizen participation structures, the process and practices for citizen engagement and enforcement mechanisms put in place. The performance levels of the three dependent factors have been

established in the previous three sections based on the Judgement Criteria for the Evaluation, presented in Chapter three.

5.5.1. Inappropriate local participatory structure

The participatory structures that were used in the making of the CDS were generally rated very poor. The participatory structures used throughout the process were stakeholder consultative workshops, and the taskforce committee. The workshops and the taskforce committees failed to create space for local citizen representation. In addition, the workshops failed to create mechanisms to facilitate a down - top approach in local development planning as required by the NDP (1998). Subsequently, the local citizens did not have a participatory platform to deliver their demands in the CDS making decision processes. The council failed to exercise required transparency by informing the local citizens about the CDS Project (LGA, 1998). The citizens were then deprived of the opportunity to set a social contractual objective base to ascertain government's responsiveness, transparency and responsibility to the citizens based on the CDS.

The council poorly used its discretional responsibility of providing for appropriate mechanisms to take the local citizens on board in the decision making in the CDS making (NDP, Section 9.1, 1998). Empirically, the council showed some lack of local accountability as expected in the decentralization system in Malawi. To an extent, with respect to the presence of established regulatory policy and an active parliament not intervening in the matter; it provides evidence of neo-patrimonial tendencies of centralization and failure of the government to implement its own policies as per set rules and laws in development planning and local governance.

The participatory spaces in policy making are an important resource in the exercise of power (Leftwich, 2007). Hence, denying the citizens an entry into the participatory spaces throughout the planning stages zeroed out their potential to influence the responsibility, transparency and

responsiveness of the council to their demands and the LGA (1998). Similar to results of past local development efforts in Malawi, the absence of the locally demanded development needs will likely create gaps between what the council will supply and what the citizens want and are willing to support. In the same line, inequalities in the development of the city will likely persist. Therefore, it suffices to conclude that the established participatory structures performed very poor to influence responsiveness and responsibility of the council on local demands based on the LGA (1998).

5.5.2. Poor-corresponding processes and practices for citizen engagement

Although the established participatory structures in the making of the CDS performed very poor, the citizen participation model utilized in this research depicts that the established processes and practices for engagement of the citizens would still have helped in creating the required base for public accountability; for instance, through successful functional awareness, the citizens could have been empowered with some sense of responsibility over the CDS planning. With that, likely they could have been able to follow up with the council on their participation entitlement in the local development plan. Likewise, through the engagement skills development, the citizens could have likely had an added advantage to pursue their participation entitlement to decide the development policy at council level. However, the processes and practices of citizen engagement applied in the making of the CDS also performed very poor.

The processes and practices of engagement failed to give power to the local citizens through provision of necessary information and skills to engage with the City Council in the making of the CDS. Such information includes: the plan of stages for the CDS planning; the applicable human rights and responsibilities supporting the citizen participation entitlement; the schedule and resolutions all stages of the CDS and the specific roles of the citizens in the planning project.

In support of the need of capacity building for one to exercise his or her right, other research in China and Kenya, on Participatory Budgeting and Participatory Planning on transforming lives and local governance concluded that timely capacity building of local participants is an important factor for successful participation in the policy making processes (Jiagang, 2008:20; Chege, 2008:42). Similarly, the constitution of Malawi in Section 13 (m) and Section 37 guides on the need for information and skills to promote the right of citizens to determine local development policies as enacted by the LGA (1998).

A critical revelation is that the citizens, including the CDC, did not know about the making and even existence of the CDS. The council totally conducted its business in a non-transparent manner to the local citizens throughout the project. To that respect, the city council is considered to have failed to appropriately discharge its duties on development planning based on local demand in the decentralized local governance system; for example, the citizens were not part of the Taskforce teams that predetermined priority issues to be addressed by the CDS. This is contrary to the notion of taking policy planning power from the central government to the local government. It is a sign of centralization tendencies in policy planning.

Prima facie, the citizens of Ngwenya were again deprived of the opportunity to define and articulate development goals, priorities and activities of development set for their community and the city at large. In addition, due to a lack of knowledge of the CDS making and poor interpretation of discretional exercise in the local development planning the citizens did not conduct any checks on the council's performance.

There are more chances that the challenge of disparities between the local council services and community needs will likely continue. Also, there may be increased development inequalities in Ngwenya against other places in the city of Lilongwe will continue due to the exclusion of the local citizens in the local planning (About CDS, 2012). Furthermore, in

the case where citizens are ignorant of the law, their rights and responsibilities in development planning, the council will likely be more inconsistent in complying with required local planning procedures and standards. Consequently, local governance will likely fail as a catalyst for improving local development and democracy.

Therefore, it suffices to conclude that the established processes and practices of the citizens' engagement in the making of the CDS failed to influence responsibility, responsiveness and transparency of the council to the local demands based on the principles of LGA (1998).

5.5.3. Masked enforcement mechanisms

The preceding discussions demonstrate that the participatory structures, the processes and practices of engagement played out contrary to the principle of power to the people in decentralized local development planning. This resonates with the assumption laid in this study that there is a need for enforcement measures to bring and maintain expected order in the interactions among institutions involved in policy making. Otherwise dysfunctions are likely bound to happen due to mobilization of bias; for example with the absence of the citizens' demands in the local plans, it is likely that the plans will fail to address the people's needs and interests in development. The enforcement measures provide mechanisms of seeking and maintaining specific standard operating procedures in the participatory structures and the processes and practices of citizens' engagement.

In the making of the Lilongwe CDS, there were legal stipulations supporting citizen participation entitlement. Some of the stipulations, as captured in chapter four, are Section 9.1 of the NDP (1998), Section 3 in the First Schedule of the LGA (1998) and Sections 40 (1) (1), 13(m), 13(o), 46:(1) and (2) of the Constitution of the Republic of Malawi (1995). However, the enforcement mechanisms to support involvement of the citizens to influence the responsiveness, transparency and responsibility of the Council in the CDS making performed very poor.

The processes and practices in the making of the CDS failed to exhibit respect for the right of citizens to participate in the local development planning. The City council took planning action that shuttered down local participation entitlement for the citizens of Ngwenya. The conduct of the council is contrary to Section 15 (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Malawi which states:

> "The human rights and freedoms enshrined in this Chapter shall be respected and upheld by the executive, legislature and judiciary and all organs of the Government and its agencies and, where applicable to them, by all natural and legal persons in Malawi and shall be enforceable in the manner prescribed in this Chapter."

However, no sanctions, penalties, litigation or any form of redress was pursued against the city council's inconsistent conduct with constitutional principles regarding citizen participation in local development planning.

Another path of enforcing the council's public accountability is through social contracts. In regards to social contractual basis between the council and the local citizens, the CDS is supposedly to serve as a service delivery contract. A well designed contract should be able to set objective benchmarks for monitoring and evaluation of conduct or performance in the service delivery (Behn, 2001; Owen, 2006). The Lilongwe CDS lacks elements of traceability arrangements to the development of Ngwenya community. The CDS does not have stipulations on the development priorities and plans for Ngwenya community with projected time and resource allocation. Worse still, the CDS's existence was only introduced to the Ngwenya CDC through this research (as of at the time of data collection). Yet alone, the CDC made its own development plans based on the citizens' demands that appear to be contrary to what the council had planned to supply; for example, in 2010 - 2011, the council delivered a bridge project which was contrary to the demands set by the citizens of Ngwenya. However, the citizens did not know about the council's development plans for their area. This shows that chances are high that there will be continued disparities in development services at local

government level if the local development plans do not build from citizens' demands.

In accord with the literature reviewed, the absence of traceability arrangements constrained the citizens' ability to ensure that the council really implemented the agreed development plans such as the CDS; within an agreed governance framework. At the same time, the citizens' lack of knowledge of the provisions of redress when council violates their rights or social contract acted to their disadvantage. They could not demand for what was outside their knowledge.

Due to the citizens' ignorance of the enforcement mechanisms, particularly with respect to the constitutional provisions, the research argues that there were weak enforcement mechanisms for the citizens to push for enforcement of their participation in the CDS planning. Hence, I classify the enforcement mechanisms as masked since the citizens' don't say their actual nature. Section 42 (1) of the LGA (1998) states:

> "the assembly shall arrange for the publications within its area, of information related to local government, and shall make or assist in making arrangements whereby the public may readily obtain, either at premises specially maintained for the purpose or otherwise, information concerning the services available within the area of the Assembly."

This stipulation links with the principles of the LGA (1998) services that have to transparent and democratic. However, evidence from this research show that to a large extent responsibility of citizens presupposes information and skill availability. Without information the citizens will ramble on their responsibilities, and likely fail to execute responsibilities appropriately.

The city council demonstrated poor responsibility on the requirement to provide for citizens involvement throughout the planning process and governing within the constitutional values as guided by the LGA (1998). With poor enforcement mechanisms the council will likely continue to flout expected standard procedures of governance in local development

planning. It also means that chances are low that the council shall succumb to the principle of power to the people in deciding development plans for the city, with or without the elected representatives. Therefore, it also suffices to conclude that the enforcement mechanisms also performed very poor to ensure responsiveness and responsibility of the council over citizens demands and the LGA (1998) in the CDS making.

Each of the three independent factors of assessing citizen participation for upholding public accountability performed very poor. It therefore suffices to infer that in Lilongwe city citizen participation is very poor to influence public accountability in the making of the City Development Strategy.

The research findings show that the planning system does not provide evidence of building congruency between community demands and city council services. The council is answerable to the MLGRD with no local accountability. The total absence of knowledge about the CDS planning project by the local citizens evidently reveals that there was no local citizen participation in the making of the Lilongwe CDS. It suffices to conclude that deconcentration is taking place in the local governance system of the city council. This is contrary to the envisaged devolution form decentralized governance system in Malawi.

The findings also depict a highly probable reason on why decentralization doesn't bear the public benefits among many communities in Malawi. The LGA (1998) in Section 3 guides that the development planning at the local government level shall be based on democratic principles, accountability, transparency and participation of the people in decision making. It is these same principles that the decentralization programme is planted on. Yet during the CDS planning there were tendencies of centralization by sources of development planning and approval, and lack of local accountability; and the disregard of explicit objectives and legal rules of governance point out to neo-patrimonial practices at the local government level. To a higher extent neo-patrimonial style of governance is failing and will fail decentralization promises of efficiently and effectively addressing the needs of the poor in development; for example, the council failed to plan the CDS based on citizens' demands. Rather the council claimed to have

planned based on city's needs and challenges. The claimed needs and challenges that set a platform for the council's planning do not qualify as citizens demands because they were not requested by the citizens based on participatory democracy framework. At large this will fuel the disparities in development address on what the council supplies against what the citizens actually need and are willing to accept at various progressive levels as a development process. To a higher extent, in Malawi, deconcentration highly reduces chances of attaining decentralization promises on poverty reduction and democracy consolidation.

5.6. Recommendations: making citizen participation count in decentralization

This section provides the recommendations on improving citizen participation component in decentralization program. The recommendations draw on the analysis of the evaluation findings and interpretations presented in chapter six of the thesis. The recommendations addresses the second aim of the research study stated in Chapter one. Generally, the established recommendations are intended to improve citizen participation in policy making to ensure public accountability towards poverty reduction and good governance. Two key contexts underlie the recommendations raised in this section: Malawi as constitutionally democratic and Malawi as a neo-patrimonial state. Hence, learning from Blair (2000:32), for accountability to be effective, several instruments have to take root and succeed. Below are six key recommendations workable by government, the local citizens, human rights defenders, CSOs and Donors:

5.6.1. Enforcing democratic accountability in practice

In order to make citizen participation work development planning based on the principle of power to the people there is a need to bring back democracy (Global Forum on Local Development Report, 2010). The starting point in democracy is power to the people and rule of law and respect for human rights. Through democratic accountability local government representatives, either elected or appointed exercise downward accountability (Gaventa & Valderrama, 1999). In such a democratic context, applying the proposed citizen participation model will help to make sure that development plans reflect the demands and priorities of the people and local democracy shall flourish.

However, establishing rule of law and giving power to the people seems to be very inconsistent in Malawi. Rule of law and citizen power have also proved to be hard to achieve in many other developing countries globally. There is a need to establish eclectic mechanisms that will establish democracy in a self-sustaining manner. The key idea in such campaign is to take real power into the hands of the people. To bring back democracy, the study suggests the following:

a) The local councils should be given autonomous powers to plan and execute their duties based on consultations with the people. In such consultations, the will of the people either through representative or direct democracy shall determine way forward of governance and development issues for their areas (Fung, 2004).
b) The local councils should not report to the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development but to the parliament since it is the parliament that entrusts the local councils with specific responsibilities on public service at the local level.
c) Changes in LGA that interfere with citizens entitlements on participation in development and governance should only be passed with a referendum conducted locally at council level. It is possible to do such referenda through the CDCs as the referenda process is similar to the way the local citizens decide on priority issues at the CDC level (Global Forum on Local Development Report, 2010:66).
d) The appointed heads of the local councils should be appointed by Public Affairs Committee to limit mobilization of bias in running the councils with prejudice or party appeasement.
e) The mandate to call for Local Government elections should be entrusted in the Local Government and not any institution such as the Presidency or the parliament. In order to let democracy root, change in elections date should only be done subject to a referendum.
f) The recall provision on underperforming MPs should be brought back into the constitution of the Republic of Malawi. The essence is that the MPs should be accountable, viewed to perform with respect to their entrusted constituency mandate and not political party wishes.

g) A national campaign on voting for a government that shall respect rule of law by opening up critical policy decisions for referendum and recall provisions of politicians who don't deliver with respect to agreed terms with their constituents (Cameron, 2010).

5.6.2. Increased civic awareness and active citizenship

The research findings suggest that the exercise of holding government accountable is presupposed by access to information and transparent procedures of council's services. Similarly, Francis and James (2003: 326) argued that politicians or administrators can only be held to account by a citizenry that is active and informed. There should be increased civic awareness in urban areas connecting residents with their democratic citizenship mandates in development and governance of the cities. Knowledge of human rights is very important in seeking accountability (Newell & Wheeler, 2006). It is evident that the council ignores its mandate on promoting civic awareness as guided by the LGA (1998) and the constitution of the republic of Malawi (1995).

The CSOs, political parties and donors should strategically intervene to ensure that local citizens are well informed of their civic duties. Well informed citizens are likely to be active in public affairs and hence have increased potential to hold government accountable. The information to be included in such campaigns should include: citizens' rights and responsibilities, responsibilities of the council, good citizenship in democratic society, how to work with the council, financial plans and expenditure reports of the council in a layman friendly manner. The expectation is that an informed citizen is better off to understand the council's intentions, required resource and limitations to address specific development needs. A practical tool of civic awareness content is the citizen participation model used in this study.

5.6.3. Citizen based monitoring and evaluation of local government services

The council should adopt a traceable plan for the development strategy. The plan should provide objective bases to reflect council's response to

various community demands in the city with a clear indication of financial commitment. This plan is in line with Newell and Wheeler's (2006) that creating accountability is about construction of a grammar of conduct and performance and the standards used to asses them. An example of a traceable action plan as accountability enforcement mechanism is presented in Annex VI.

In complimentary to the down - top approach in policy planning, the local communities should establish a public institution that engage in community based monitoring and evaluation of the local councils development and governance services. Such a body should be purely accountable to the local citizens of a city with no partisan memberships. Such an independent institution could be coordinated in collaboration with other human rights watchdogs to support social justice in development and governance.

5.6.4. Mediation and litigation: review of the CDS and its implementation plan

The local citizens and the Lilongwe council should enter into mediation as part of mid-term CDS review to affirm that there are not disparities in the community demands against council services in the remaining years of the CDS implementation. In the case that the council is not willing to enter into mediation, the local citizens should seek for litigation measures to make sure that their entitlement to participate in decision making in the local development plan is respected as declared in Section 9.1 of the NDP (1998). The council is mandated by the constitution of the republic of Malawi to provide for this popular participation right in formulation of its policies. Some organizations that may provide litigation support are Malawi Human Rights Commission (MHRC) and the Human Rights Consultative Committee (HRCC).

There should also be a change in the planning arrangements for the annual business plans, from a top - down to a down - top approach. In such regard, the CDCs should be entrusted with the task of submitting development plans of which the city assembly will include in the CDS and

form a CDS based on local development plans. Such approach will also set a benchmark for local accountability. The city assembly will require strategic planning skills to merge such specific plans and negotiate for prioritization based on democratic governance principles. The essence of the change in planning approach, mediation and litigation is to establish a review of the CDS that will help to affirm alignment of development plans of the council with respect to addressing local interests and needs as promised by the decentralization policy in Malawi.

5.6.5. Improve council's technical capacity on policy planning and social justice

The technical capacity may be substantive or ethical procedures. The findings of study indicate that some of the officers at the council have poor understanding of the decentralization planning and democracy; for example, in one of the interrogations, one of the officers responsible for management of the CDS argued that local citizens were not engaged in the formulation of the CDS because the CDS is a city and not community development plan; yet alone a city is constituted by communities; and that the City council declared in the CDS that development activities in Lilongwe city will be implemented based on the CDS. Secondly, it is evident from the findings that the council flouted many constitutional values in the processes and practices of formulating the CDS contrary to the legal requirement as stated in LGA (1998). If these flouts were deliberate then the council has no respect of rule of law; if these flouts were an issue of technical oversight then council should seriously consider improving its technical capacity on ability to initiate measures that respect and promote social justice in local policy making; if these flouts were orders from above, then neo-patrimonial style of governance is evidently affecting the implementation of decentralization.

5.6.6. Use of the researcher's evaluation framework as a checklist in local policy planning

Citizen participation is at the centre and a driving factor in ensuring poverty reduction and promotion of democracy, the CSOs and donors can

promote this by doing counterchecks of government actions based on the established evaluation framework as a checklist. Donors can make it a requirement that a policy formulation plan should meet at least fair score on this checklist to be considered for funding. Such measures will be a good tool of balance and check that will help ensure that the basic assumptions underlying the success of citizen participation in practice in the decentralization programme.

In a similar discussion on improving development at local government, the Global Forum on Local Development Report (2010:9) called for development partners to ensure that aid modalities originally meant to align and harmonise external assistance with national sector policies do not reinforce centralizing tendencies. The evaluation framework utilized in this research can be adapted as a checklist. It can help in making sure that citizen participation works with respect to promoting public accountability and supporting poverty reduction and consolidation of democracy in Malawi.

In short, on the mid and long term planning; the city council should utilize the established evaluation framework as a checklist on popular participation in the local development planning processes as guided by the national decentralization policy of Malawi. The use of this checklist will help in ascertaining creation of meaningful local citizens' participation in local development planning. It will also help to ensure that the council does the required administrative justice as mandated by the constitution of Malawi and well guided by section 3 of the LGA (1998).

5.7. Conclusion

The chapter has demonstrated that citizen participation is very poor to influence public accountability in the making of the City Development Strategy and its implementation plans in Lilongwe city. The analysis yielding this result used the citizen participation model formula:

$$CP = A_{L1}LPS + A_{L2}PPE + A_{L3}EM$$ (Author's own conceptualisation)

Where: CP is Citizen Participation

A_{L1} is citizens' level of awareness of the Local Participation Structure(LPS)

A_{L2} is citizens' level of awareness of the Processes and Practices of Engagement (PPE).

A_{L3} is citizens' level of awareness of the Enforcement Mechanisms EM)

Critically, if A_{L1}, A_{L2} and A_{L3} = 0 then CP = 0

Firstly, the chapter provided a sub-evaluation of local participatory structures. Then it provided sub-evaluations for processes and practices of engagement and for the enforcement mechanisms. The results are as summarised in table 9 below.

Table 9: A summary of the sub-evaluations and main evaluation finding

	Knowledge Level	Overall standard performance	Judgment rating
Local Participatory Structures	0	Absent	0
Process and practices of citizens engagement	0	Absent	0
Enforcement mechanisms	0	Absent	0
Citizen participation			0

The table above indicates that the value judgement for the citizen participation in the local policy making was zero. The last section in this chapter concluded that citizen participation was absent in the making of the CDS (2009) hence failed to influence citizen based accountability. The chapter also provided an insight that in Malawi, deconcentration and some neo-patrimonial practices in governance constrained the decentralization programme to achieve its promises. The chapter also has provided recommendations on how to make citizen participation work towards local accountability.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION OF THE RESEARCH REPORT

6.1. Introduction

This evaluation study has demonstrated how the citizen based accountability evaluation framework. The evaluation showed that citizen participation in Malawi was unable to influence public accountability in the formulation of the Lilongwe city development strategy (2009). The finding also revealed that the government is failing to implement its own policies towards decentralized local development planning. Evidence suggests that this failure is because the policies were envisioned for a democratic Malawi but in practice Malawi is a neo-patrimonial state. Chapter six provides a synopsis of the entire research study. The first section of the subsequent sections provides a general overview of the thesis. In the overview of the thesis, the section gives snapshots on background and context and conceptual framework of the research, literature reviewed, research design and methodology, research findings, analysis and interpretations of the research findings. Then the other subsequent four sections present a summary of the research findings, the implications of the research findings and the directions for future research.

6.1. Overview of the thesis

Citizen participation can enhance public accountability in policy making. The increased need for governments to achieve public accountability in governance and development is more politically and economically motivated. The research recognised that public accountability in democratic government systems with respect to decentralization theory has a high potential to support poverty reduction and consolidation of democracy. Due to limitations of representative democracy to hold governments accountable in many countries, popular citizen participation has been introduced as a regulatory remedy in the promotion of public accountability at local government level.

However, evidence from some countries show that citizen participation does not automatically yield policy decisions that demonstrate good responsiveness and responsibility of the government on the local citizens' demands. This evaluation research assessed the extent to which citizen participation in Malawi has influence in upholding public accountability in the policy making at the local

government level. The evaluation study also intended to contribute to strategizing on improving public accountability through citizen participation in the service delivery systems of the local government. The evaluation study used the Lilongwe city development strategy to assess the influence of citizen participation in policy making.

Chapter 1 provided an introduction and the conceptual framework for the research study. It discussed citizen participation as a regulatory mechanism that can foster public accountability of government in policy making and implementation. In Malawi citizen participation in policy making was established as part of political and economic governance reforms under the new local government system. Citizen participation in local development planning was formally declared under the decentralization policy.

The local citizens are entitled to decide on their own on the development issues that affect them. Such an arrangement was perceived to lead to responsiveness and responsibility of local governments to the local interests and needs. The research problem captured that despite a decade of decentralization in Malawi, there was incongruity between local government services, poor fiscal discipline and increased cases of corruption in the management of local resources for development. In that regard, the primary research question was: to what extent does citizen participation influence public accountability in the city development strategy making at the local assembly level?

In order to answer the research questions, the thesis presented evidence from a case study of Ngwenya community, a peri-urban area in Lilongwe. The research did not explore other public accountability mechanisms nor did it determine the quality of public choices or quality of the policy outcomes based on citizen engagement.

The New Institutionalism theory and the power of models of non-decision making and decisional approach provided the theoretical framework for the study. The theoretical framework helped the researcher to unpack units of study and develop the research questions for the evaluation study. The main theoretical premise was that institutions are never neutral but can be influenced to be neutral; and that

institutional arrangements among actors in decision or policy making institutions demonstrate the influence of the involved actors in the processes and final outcomes; power analysis is vital in understanding accountability. Citizen participation in the local government system of Malawi is regulated by the LGA (1998) which entrenches the National Decentralization Policy (NDP), in conformity with the Constitution of the Republic of Malawi (1995), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) (1966) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) (1948).

The research study defined citizen participation as the involvement of local citizens that influences policy decisions, actions and promote social legitimacy of the government in public affairs. Citizen involvement is constituted by: (i) functional awareness of subject issues by the citizens; (ii) availability of citizen access and skills enhancement activities; (iii) existence of supportive legal provisions on citizen's functions and roles; (iv) existence of policy demand structures; and (v) existence of defensible decision making processes. Public accountability referred to a state in which activities and resources in the public sector are being managed responsively and transparently with respect to entrusted responsibility by the particular entrusted persons or institutions. The concepts of citizen participation and public accountability helped in guiding the analysis and interpretation of research findings in Chapters four and five.

Chapter 2 of the thesis comprised the literature review. It explored the linkages between citizen participation, public accountability and evaluation in policy making at local government level. The reviewed literature demonstrated that there are different meanings of citizen participation. Differences in the nature of citizen participation are more propelled by the rationale and objectives of the referred citizen participation. The literature reviewed affirmed that citizen participation is a mechanism that allows local citizens to engage with government on their demands and interests. The participation can either be direct, representative or through hybrid means such as CSO and CBOs.

The thesis also argued that practically in advancing public accountability, the public policy making component is probably the most important component

among the other two phases in the policy cycle. The policy making component provides benchmark of tracking accountability and also sets the pulse of public participation in implementation and evaluation policy cycles components. Often times, good citizen participation motivates the local communities to engage in the subsequent policy processes in the other policy cycle components.

The literature reviewed also revealed that there is little consensus on the theoretical frameworks that explain how citizen participation brings about public accountability. There is a general consensus that decentralization can provide opportunities to achieve local accountability. The decentralization theory indicates that decentralised local government systems create opportunities for engagement between government and the citizens on policy and decision making at the local level. Theoretically, citizen participation that ably influences the upholding of local public accountability is significant to the success of decentralization towards poverty reduction and democracy. In practice decentralization doesn't always yield its expected results.

The reviewed literature also showed that citizen participation should be subjected to evaluation to determine what was achieved, both as intended and unintended consequences, to explain why, and to use this information to assist in the design and improvement of programs and policies. The reviewed literature on citizen participation and decentralization in Malawi indicated that there is no literature of a systematic study on assessing citizen participation in policy making in the political context of 2006 to October 2011. During this period the local government operated with only the administrative arm almost similar operational case to the one party system of government prior to 1994.

Chapter 2 also provided substantiation of the proposed citizen participation model for public accountability as presented in chapter one. Finally it argued for a new evaluation framework for citizen participation in policy making that can be applied in democratic local government systems and even adapted for non-democratic decentralized government systems. The evaluation framework has five dimensions: opportunity demand structures, functional awareness, engagement access and skills, supportive legal provisions, and defensible decision

making process. This research utilized this evaluation framework for citizen participation in data collection and presentation and to derive the judgement criteria for the evaluation in chapter three. In general, the arguments and definitions developed in Chapter two provided an analytical framework for better understanding of the facts and theory related to evaluation of citizen participation and public accountability in local policy making.

Chapter 3 of the thesis discussed the research design and methodology utilized in the research. The research study was primarily descriptive and utilized the case study design approach. The study utilized a nonlinear approach in research management that helped in fine tuning of utilized constructs, data collection tools and analysis. Chapter three argued for the appropriateness of the utilized clarificative form of evaluation in this evaluation research study. The clarificative evaluation builds on the already established fact that decentralization in Malawi poorly supports poverty reduction and democracy consolidation. The interest was to open the development process of the policies that intend to reduce poverty and encourage democracy.

Chapter 3 also detailed the methods utilized to answer the research questions: sampling, data collection, data analysis and issues related to validity and reliability to ensure credibility of the research study. The chapter also included a general description of Lilongwe which provided a current context of the Ngwenya community with respect to political, social and economic dimensions. The chapter illustrated the Evaluation Framework for citizen participation which guided the process of data collection and presentation of findings. Then it also established the Evaluation Judgement Criteria for Citizen Participation utilized in the analysis of findings and making interpretations in chapter five. The thesis utilized triangulation throughout the chapters in collecting and analysing data for reliable arguments and assumptions due to the contention that exists on concepts of citizen participation, public accountability and evaluation required triangulation.

Chapter 4 presented the findings from the collected data. The chapter provided a description of Ngwenya area as an informal settlement in the city of Lilongwe; Lilongwe City Assembly and the Lilongwe City Development Strategy. Then the

chapter provided detailed findings on citizen participation across the three phases that prevailed in the formulation of the CDS. The framework for presentation of the findings was guided by the Evaluation Framework for Citizen Participation presented in chapter three (Section 3.2.2).

Chapter 5 provided a comprehensive analysis and judgement of the research findings on citizen participation in local policy making in Malawi. The chapter provided an in-depth assessment of the local participation structures, processes and practices of engaging the citizens and enforcement mechanisms of participation. The analysis in this section was primarily based on Evaluation judgement Criteria for Citizen Participation.

Chapter 6 has drawn a synopsis of chapters one to six. It also provides a summary on the main findings of the study, implications of the findings to practice and theory, recommendations and directions for future research. The transferability of the implications and recommendations considered in this chapter are limited to cases with similar assumptions and context as premised in this research.

6.2. Main Findings

The research found that citizen participation is very poor to influence public accountability in the formulation of local development policy in Lilongwe city. In specific terms, there was no local citizen participation in the formulation of the CDS and its implementation plan. The council failed to implement its own procedural policies that render it accountable to the local citizens rather the central government or politicians. The primary finding was based on an analysis of three sub-evaluation findings derived from the .three secondary evaluation questions. The three sub-evaluation findings are:

1) There were no local citizen participation structures to provide for popular decision making in the formulation of the CDS. Based on the opportunity demand structures, the local citizen participation structures scored ‘very poor’. The established participation structures were stakeholder workshops which failed to provide for equitable access to the local citizens; and to provide for local accountability of the representatives and government officials through the adopted local demands and resolutions and provision of

feedback. The analysis showed that the established participation structures failed to provide for the local citizens to contribute in the decision making in the development planning. Much more the citizens were not aware and not informed of the established structures.

2) There were no processes and practices established for local citizen engagement in the formulation of the CDS. In reference to the evaluation judgement criteria, the processes and practices for local citizen participation engagement in the established participation structures utilized in the formulation of the CDS scored very poor. Evidence shows that the local citizens were completely unaware of the CDS making project; they were unaware of their constitutional rights to participation and other laws that protect their right to participation; and there were no measures to trace the council's transparency and accountability to the citizens of Ngwenya. Critically, the city council failed its responsibility to establish the required processes and practices to engage the local citizens in the review workshops.

3) There were no enforcement mechanisms applied in the formulation of the CDS. The evaluation judgement criteria on enforcement mechanisms for local involvement structures, and processes and practices scored very poor. This was so because the local citizens expressed ignorance on the existence of supportive legal provisions. Of which the research findings also showed that there were legal provisions to ensure meaningful citizen participation through requirement provisions and provisions that support enforcement of the requirement of citizen participation in local policy making.Also that the local council failed its mandate to make available the information on the supportive legal provisions to the local community and really the local citizen expressed ignorance on existence of supportive legal provisions.

6.3. Implications of the findings

This section discusses six implications of the evaluation findings. The implications are increased development disparities and a narrow catch of beneficiaries of the CDS, failed good governance, a weak 'human rights watchdog' arm on urban development planning, poor strategic planning of a city

development strategy marked as pro-poor, the New Institutionalism theory and studies of public accountability, and the new evaluation framework for citizen participation. Below are the implications:

1) Increased development disparities and narrow catch of beneficiaries of the CDS

   The absence of local accountability depicts a top-down approach to local development planning contrary to the expectations of CDS at international level that the CDS gives a chance to city residents to have a voice in planning for a city they want (www.citiesalliance.org). Since, the council is not accountable to the local citizens likely it will be less responsive, transparent and responsible over citizens' demands in the service delivery based on the CDS (Newell & Wheeler, 2006). The neglected communities such as Ngwenya will likely have more poverty challenges as they are less serviced by the council. Similarly, Lilongwe may face increased challenge of sustainable and equitable development due to lack of residents active participation (Global Forum on Local Development Report, 2010:17).

   The citizens in such neglected areas are likely to develop eroded trust of the council and fail to take up responsibility of developing their areas. For example, sanitation programmes are programmes that are more effective and efficient in terms of time and used resources with residents buy in. Without engaging the residents, they have a low sense of responsibility.

   Learning from the authoritarian regime of MCP where planning marginalized the citizens, chances are high that high incongruence on development services and needs emerge. Other practitioners and scholars such as the Cities Alliance (2012), United Nations Development Programme (2000), the UN Habitat (2004) and Bovens (2007:68) have emphasized on the need to engage local citizens in anti-poverty initiatives as the engagement processes can build strong citizen consensus and responsibility that leads to high support of good practices in development. Therefore, poor citizen participation will likely contribute to increased development disparities with few people feeling

the benefits of the CDS, likely informal settlements experiencing more woes due to inequalities in opportunities.

2) Failed good governance in local policy making

   Democratic governance is guiding governance mode for the decentralization programme in Malawi. In practice democratic local governance is generally identified by respect of human rights, rule of law, transparency, and people's power on determining how to be governed. The CDS formulation process shows that there is total violation of the local citizens rights associated to their participation in the planning project. Despite being guided by the NDP (1998) the secretariat failed to uphold the law provisions as a matter of administrative justice, on its responsibilities to provide for the local citizens' right to participation and associate applicable measures of public trust and good governance. These flouts unequivocally depict poor rule of law and failure to uphold transparency by executing a project without being accountable to the local citizens who hold vested interest in the development of the city by virtue of being residents. These indications depict that the governance applied in managing the CDS making project highly defied democratic principles. Lack of citizen participation inclusion renders more opportunities for corruption in allocation of resources and public service delivery; and also makes citizens not willing to participate in public affairs. Without local citizen participation, democracy consolidation is a non-starter as democracy needs citizen participation to survive (GTZ, 2006:8).

3) Weak 'human rights watchdog' arm on urban development planning

   The flouts depicted in bullet two above are enforceable by law. However, there are no reports indicating that anything has been done by people of interest in human rights promotion to rebuke the constructive abolition of local popular participation in the formulation of the local development plans. In democracy, the media, NGOs and Civil Society Organizations are supposedly to support in providing advocacy and promotion assistance in development that makes human rights flourish. Most of the claimed NGOs to have represented the local citizens' interests in the CDS making project had no local contacts for address or redress. As such it is evident that such

watchdogs were not engaged in community/ social mobilization. In addition there is no evidence that any organization tried to seek redress on behalf of the local citizens on the city council's violation of local citizens' political rights. For democracy to flourish, the human rights watchdogs should be vigilant in all public affairs ensuring that necessary democratic requirements are arranged and adhered to.

4) Poor strategic planning of an city development strategy marked as pro-poor

The absence of local citizen participation in the development of the CDS (2009) poor approach to project planning in the making of pro-poor development plans (The World bank 1993; UNESCO, 2000). Based on the expectations of the CDS as a long term development plans, the planning issues were supposed to evidently emanate from the residents/ the local citizens to build up more buy in. For example, the City council requires residents to exercise responsibility in protecting public facilities, to pay rents and other taxes, and keep their spaces with good hygiene. Failure to include the residents as primary stakeholders by their vested interest in their city renders low commitment to support the council's development initiatives. At the same time, if the council positions its plans based on public interests sourced with respect to democratic consensus chances are high for sustained support of the development plans by the residents and even donors since the issues on the ground shall be more congruent to issues expressed in the council's development plans. By not involving the Ngwenya residents in the CDS planning, the council management minimized its chances of establishing more social benefits, the reality at present, realistic future options, local applicable scenarios and creating local ownership which are fundamental in designing a sustainable poverty reduction plan.

5) The New Institutionalism theory and studies of Public accountability

The research analytical framework and the findings demonstrate that the propositions of the New Institutionalism theory help to understand how actors engage in the mobilization of bias. In the institutional arrangements of local policy making, local citizens were disadvantaged to participate due to lack of awareness. The city council had amassed more control to influence

the development plan of Ngwenya community and Lilongwe city at large. The evaluation shows that public accountability is more of an exercise of power. As informed by the rational choice and sociological institutionalism approaches, increasing public accountability on public needs requires establishment of norms, provision of information, procedures and rules as mechanism to shape and enforce behaviour of the involved institutions in policy making to achieve specific social outcomes (Hall & Taylor, 2006).

The findings of the research suggest that public participation is about power. It's either the citizens' influence or become influenced. Therefore public participation models/ frameworks should emphasize on unpacking the characteristics of participation that make it valuable in governance and development.

6) The new evaluation and planning framework for citizen participation
   The research processes suggest that the five dimensioned citizen participation model used in this evaluation can also be used in planning. It can be used a human rights approach or/and citizen based planning.

6.4. Directions for future research

The research findings and scope of this research study indicate directions for future research in the following areas:

1) Assessment of technical capacity of the city council staff
2) Assessment of the monitoring and evaluation system of the city council
3) Mid-term assessment of the level of public participation in the implementation of the CDS.
4) Relevance of the CDS to development of Lilongwe
5) The inter-governmental relations and effect on the nature of local policy
6) Assessing the predictive nature of the suggested citizen participation model for local policy making
7) Evaluation of relevance of the urban councils to modern society

6.5. Conclusion

This thesis sought to measure the extent of citizen participation in local policy making in Malawi. The assessment utilized clarificative evaluation. Ngwenya

community in Lilongwe was selected as an area to conduct a case study to assess the extent to which citizen participation influences public accountability in the planning of the CDS. The study established specific concepts of citizen participation and public accountability for operationalization of the research. The conceptualisation was informed by the reviewed literature. The conceptualisation provided insight into the establishment of an evaluation framework for citizen participation in local policy making. The evaluation framework guided the data collection exercise and was also used in the analysis of the research findings. In general, the study established that citizen participation is very poor as a mechanism of public accountability support in local policy making in Malawi. Deconcentration is in practice in the local governance system in Malawi which contradicts the underlying devolution form of decentralization hence defies the principle of power to the people in local governance.

This chapter of the evaluation report has given a synopsis of the previous five chapters of the thesis. The synopsis provided a recap of the context and background of citizen participation in Malawi; the legal and theoretical frameworks that assist to understand and assess citizen participation in policy making in; propositions, research questions and research design that framed the operationalization of the research. It further showed the linkages on the contents across the five chapters. Then, chapter 6 provided a summary of the main findings of the evaluation; the implications of the research findings; recommendations on the research findings; and prospects for future research.

The evaluation research study has established the extent of local citizen participation in support of public accountability; and established recommendations for improving citizen participation in Malawi. The research study has also established a new evaluation framework for assessing citizen participation in local policy making. The evaluation framework can also be adapted for cases of citizen participation in policy implementation government and in both democratic and non-democratic systems of government.

CHAPTER 7: REFERENCES

About CDS (n.d.) Retrieved January 02, 2012 from

http://www.citiesalliance.org/ca/about-cds

Adams, B.E. (2010). *Citizen lobbyists: local efforts to influence policy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press

Abelson, J. & Gauvin, F. (2006). *Assessing the Impacts of Public Participation: Concepts, Evidence and Policy Implications*. Research Report P|06 Public Involvement Network Canadian Policy Research Networks

Agrawal, A. & Ribot, J. (1999). Accountability in Decentralization: A Framework with South Asian and West African Cases.*The Journal of Developing Areas. Vol. 33* (4): 473-502. Retrieved November 29, 2011 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4192885

Anderson, J.E. (2011). *Public policy making: an introduction*. (7th edn.)Boston: Wadsworth Publication Company

Arnstein, S.R. (1969). Ladder of Citizen Participation. *JAIP, Vol. 35* (4): 216-224 Retrieved on September 9, 2011 from http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.pdf

Bang, H. & Esmark, A. (2009). Administrative Theory and Praxis. *Public Administration Theory Network, Vol.31* (1): 7-37

Barzelay, M. & Gallego, R. (2005). 'From "New Institutionalism" to "Institutional Processualism": Advancing knowledge about public management policy change'.*Governance. Vol. 19* (4): 531-557.

Behn, R.D. (2001). *Rethinking democratic accountability*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press

Beierle T.C., & Cayford, J. (2002). *Democracy in practice. Public participation in environmental decisions.* Washington, DC: Resources for the Future

Blair, H (2000). Participation and accountability at the periphery: democratic local governance in six countries. *World Development, Vol.* 28(1): 21-30. Retrieved December 6, 2011from http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic980025.files/Wk%205_Sept%2030th/Blair_2000_Local%20Governance%20in%20Six%20Countries.pdf

Bochel, C. (2006). New Labour, Participation and the Policy Process. *Public Policy and Administration, Vol. 21*(4)
Retrieved August 18, 2011 from: http://ppa.sagepub.com/content/21/4/10

Booth, D., Cammack, D., Harrigan, J., Kanyongolo, E., Mataure, M., & Ngwira, N. (2006). *Drivers of Change and Development in Malawi.* Working Paper 261.London: Overseas Development Institute

Bowen, G.A. (2007). An analysis of citizen participation in anti-poverty programmes. *Oxford University Press and Community Development Journal.*doi:10.1093/cdj/bsm011

Bovens, M. (2006). *Analysing and assessing public accountability. A conceptual framework.* European Governance Papers (EUROGOV) No. C-06-01
Retrieved November 24, 2011 from http://www.connex-network.org/eurogov/pdf/egp-connex-C-06-01.pdf

Bovens, M (2005). *Evaluating public accountability*. Paper International Research Colloquium Accountable Governance, Queens University Belfast

Burki, S., Perry, G. & Dillinger, W. (1999). *Beyond the Center: Decentralizing the State* [online]. Washington: World Bank. Available from: <www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/LearningProgram/Decentralization/Beyondthecenter.pdf>.

Cammack, D. (2012). *Peri-urban governance and the delivery of public goods in Malawi, 2009-11: Research report.* Africa, Power and Politics. London: Overseas Development Institute

Cammack, D. (2007). The logic of African Neopatrimonialism: what role of donors? *Development Policy Review, Vol. 25*: 599- 614

Cammack, D., Mutebi, F., Kangyongolo, F. & O'Neil, T. (2006). *Neopatrimonial Politics, Decentralization and Local Government: Uganda and Malawi in 2006.* Working Paper No. 2 Good Governance, Aid Modalities and Poverty Reduction, Advisory Board for Irish Aid
Retrieved April 20, 2011 from
http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/4746.pdf

Chege, P. (2008). "Case Studies from Kenya, Participatory Planning: Transforming lives and local governance in Kitale, Kenya." In Kadalie R. (Ed.) *Community Participation and Public Service: Learning from Innovations*. Sao Paulo: Programa Gestao Publica e Cidadania

Chinsinga, B. (2005). District Assemblies in a fix: The Perils of the Politics of Capacity in the Political and Administrative Reforms in Malawi. *Development Southern Africa, Vol. 22* (4): 529-548. Retrieved on November 30, 2011from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03768350500322891

Chiweza, A. L. (2005). Participation: Reality or rhetoric in rural communities of Malawi. *Tanzanet Journal, Vol. 5*(1):1-8

Church, J., Saunders, D., Wanke, M., Pong, R., Spooner, C. & Dorgan, M. (2002). Citizen Participation in Health Decision-Making: Past Experience and

Future. *Journal of Public Health Policy. Vol. 23*(1). Retrieved November 29, 2011from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3343116?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Cornwall, A. & Gaventa, J. (2001) *From Users and Choosers to Makers and Shapers: Repositioning Participation in Social Policy*. IDS Working Paper 12.Brighton: IDS

Creswell, J.W. & Miller, D.L (2000) Determining validity in qualitative research. *Theory into practice, Vol. 39* (3)

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

Crook, R. C., & Manor, J. (1998). *Democracy and Decentralisation in South Asia and West Africa: Participation, Accountability and Performance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cross, S. & Kutengule, M. (2001). *Decentralization and Rural Livelihoods in Malawi.* LADDER Working Paper No.4. Retrieved on July 05, 2011 from http://www.odi.org.uk/work/projects/03-food-security-forum/docs/ladderwp4.pdf

Davidson, J. (2005). *Evaluation Methodology Basics: the Nuts and Bolts of Sound Evaluation,* Chapters 1-2. London: Sage publications

Devas, N. & Grant, U. (2003). Local government decision making- citizen participation and local accountability: Some evidence from Kenya and Uganda. *Public Administration & Development, Vol. 23* (4): 307-216

De Coning, C. (2006). *'the Nature and role of public policy"* in Cloete, F. ,Wissink, H & de Coning, C. (Eds.*). Improving Public Policy: From Theory to Practise*, (pp3-23).Pretoria: Van Schaiks Publishers

De Mesquita, B.B., Morrow, J.D., Siverson, R.M. & Smith, A. (2002). Political institutions, policy choice and the survival of leaders. *British Journal of Political Science, Vol. 32*: 559-590.

DFID (2000). *Realising human rights for poor people.* London: Department For International Development.

Dowdle, M. (2006). "Public Accountability: Conceptual, Historical, and Epistemic Mappings". In Dowdle, M. (ed.).*Public Accountability: Designs, Dilemmas and Experiences,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1-26

Dunn, W. N. (1994). *Public policy analysis: An introduction.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Edmonds, E. (1998). '*The Implications of Electoral Competition for Fiscal Decentralization and Subnational Autonomy in Mexico'* [online].Prepared for delivery at the 1998 meeting of the Latin American Studies Association, The

Palmer House Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, 24-26, September, 1998.Available form: <lasa.international.pitt.edu/LASA98/Edmonds.pdf>.

Calitz, E.&Siebrits, K. (2008). Fiscal Policy in Public Economics (4th Ed.)

Ferguson, A.E. & Mulwafu, W.O. (2004). .*Decentralization, Participation and Access to Water Resources in Malawi, Basis CRSP*

Forss, K. (2005). An Evaluation framework for information, consultation and public participation. In OECD (Ed.) *Evaluating public participation in policy making*.Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
Retrieved October 29, 2011 from Google books

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings. In Gordon, C. (Ed) Harvester: Brighton.

Francis, P. & James, R. (2003). Balancing Rural Poverty Reduction and Citizen Participation: The Contradictions of Uganda's Decentralization Program. *World Development, Vol. 31* (2): 325-336 Retrieved November 31, 2011 from http://courses.washington.edu/pbaf531/FrancisJames_UgandaContradictDecent.pdf

Friedman, S. (2006). *Participatory governance and citizen action in post-apartheid South Africa.* Decent Work Programme Discussion paper DP/164 Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies

Fung, A. (2004). *Empowered participation: reinventing urban democracy.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Gargarella, R. (1998). *Full representation, deliberation and impartiality* in "*Deliberative Democracy"*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Retrieved November 29, 2011 from Google books

Ghani, A., Lockhart, A. & Carnahan, M. (2005). *Closing the Sovereignty Gap: an Approach to State-Building.* Overseas Development Institute Working Paper UK Retrieved from http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/1819.pdf

Gibson, P.D, Lacy, D.P. & Dougherty M. (2005). Improving Performance and Accountability in Local Government with Citizen Participation**.** *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal Vol.10*(1).

Glicken, J. (2000). Getting Stakeholder Participation `Right': A Discussion of Participatory Processes and Possible Pitfalls. *Environmental Science & Policy, Vol. 3*: 305-310.

Global Forum on Local Development Report (2010). *Pursuing the MDGs through Local Government, Forum report* held from October 4-6. Kampala: Uganda

Golubovic, D. (2010). An Enabling Framework for Citizen Participation in Public Policy:An Outline of Some of the Major Issues Involved. *International Journal of Not-for-Profit Law. Vol. 12* (4): 38-53

Goodwin-Gill, G.S. (2006). *Free and Fair Elections* (New Expanded Edition) Geneva: Inter-Parliamentary Union

GTZ (2006). *Mainstreaming participation.Power distribution through citizen participation and good governance.* Eschborn: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH.
Retrieved on July 10, 2011 from http://www.giz.de/Themen/de/SID-99F25309-EFBDA273/dokumente/en-SVMP-Kambodscha.pdf

Graham, K.A., & Phillips, S.D. (1998). *Citizen engagement: lessons in participation from local government.*Toronto, Ontario: The Institute of Public Administration of Canada.
Retrievedon November30, 2011 from googlebooks.com

Gumede, V. (2010). *The state of human development in south Africa- South Africa as a Developmental state in the making*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg

Gumede, V. (2010). 'Policy Making in South Africa'.In Landsburg, C. & Venter, A. (Eds).*South African Government and Politics.*(4th edn.)Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers

Habisso, T. (2010). *The Challenges of Building a Democratic Developmental State.* Walta Information Center. Retrieved from http://www.waltainfo.com/index2.php?option=com_content&do_pdf=1&id=23155
Hall, P.A. & Taylor, R.C.R. (2006). Political Science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies, Vol. XLIV*: 936-957.

Ham, C. & Hill, M. (1993). *The policy process in the modern capitalist state* (2nd edn.).New York: Harvester/ Wheatsheaf

Heller, P. (2009). *Democratic deepening in India and South Africa*. Journal of Asian and African Studies. Vol. 44 (1): 123-149

Holvoet, N. & Renard, R. (2006). Monitoring and evaluation under the PRSP: Solid rock or quicksand? *Evaluation and Program Planning Vol. 30*

Howlett, M., Ramesh, M. & Perl, A. (2009). *Studying public policy: policy cycles and subsystems* (3rd edn.).Ontario: Oxford University Press

Hussein, M. (2003). Good Governance and Decentralization at the Local Level: The Case of Malawi. *Politeia, Vol. 22* (2)

Hyden, G. (2007). Governance and poverty reduction in Africa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Vol. 104 (43)*

Jiagang, C. (2008). "Participatory Budget in Xinhe, China".In Kadalie R. (Ed.) *Community Participation and Public Service: Learning from Innovations.* Sao Paulo: Programa Gestao Publica e Cidadania

Johnson, C. (2002). Local democracy, democratic decentralisation and rural development: theories, challenges and options for policy. *Development Policy Review, Vol. 19: 521–532.*

Kalipeni, E. (1996). Transition to democracy in Malawi: the role of internal and external forces.*21st Century Afro Review, Vol. 2 (2)*
Retrieved 18 November 2011 from https://netfiles.uiuc.edu/kalipeni/www/Kalipeni%201996%20Transition%20to%20Democracy%20MW.pdf

Kamarck, E. (2007). *The End of Government…as we know it: Making Public Policy work*(pp 123 -145).Colorado: Lynne Reinner Publishers

Kaunda, J.M. (1999). State Centralization and the Decline of Local Government in Malawi. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, Vol. 65: 579*
Retrieved April 20, 2011 from http://ras.sagepub.com/content/65/4/579

Kendall, J. (2003). *The voluntary sector: comparative perspectives in UK.*London, New York: Routledge

King, C.S., Feltey, K.M, & Susel, B.O. (1998). The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review. Vol. 58 (4): 317-326.*
Retrieved May 11, 2011 from http://links.jstor.org

Klein, R. & Marmor, T. R. (2006). Reflections on policy analysis: putting it together again. In Moran, M., Reid, M. & Goodin, R. E. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy.* Oxford University Press, Toronto, Canada.

Laurian, L. & Shaw, M.M. (2008). Evaluation of Public participation: the practices of certified planners.*Journal of Planning Education and Research Vol. 28: 293* Retrieved November 25, 2011 from http://jpe.sagepub.com/content/28/3/293

Leftwich, A. (2007). *Literature Review Essay: The Political Approach to Institutional formation, maintenance and change.* Discussion Paper Series. No. 14, IPPG, UK

Leong, H.K. (2000). Citizen Participation and Policy Making in Singapore: Conditions and Predicaments. *Asian Survey, Vol. 40(3): 436-45*

Lilongwe City Council (2009). *City Development Strategy: a shared future*

Litvack, J. & Seddon, J. (Eds.) (1999). *Decentralization Briefing Notes, Washington, D.C.:* World Bank Institute and PREM network. Retrieved June 06, 2011 from http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/8680/Decentralization%20Briefing%20Notes.pdf

Lukes, S. (1993). "Three distinctive views of power compared". In Hill, M. (Ed.) *The policy process: A reader*. New York: Harvester / Wheatsheaf.

Malawi Government. (1995). *The Constitution of the Republic of Malawi*. Zomba: Government Press

Malawi Government. (1998). *The Local Government Act.* Zomba: Government Press

Malawi Government. (1998). *The National Decentralization Policy*

Malawi National Statistical Office. (2007). *Welfare Monitoring Survey*

Malawi National Statistical Office. (2009). *Welfare Monitoring Survey*

Macintosh, A. (2004). Characterizing E-Participation in Policy-Making. *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences – 2004*

Malena, C., Forster, R. & Singh, J. (2004). *Social Accountability: An Introduction to the Concept and Emerging Practice.* Washington: The World Bank, Social Development Paper No. 76

Manda, M.A.Z. (2009). *Water and sanitation in urban Malawi: Can the Millennium Development Goals be met? A study of informal settlements in three cities.* Human Settlements Working Paper Series Theme: Water – 7

Manor, J. (1999). *The Political Economy Of Democratic Decentralisation.* Washington: World Bank

Martin, M.W. (1994). *Vicious giving: philanthropy, voluntary service and caring*. Indiana: Indiana University Press
Retrieved on December 11, 2011 from Google books

McLennan, A. (2007). Unmasking delivery: revealing the politics. *Progress in development studies, Vol. 7* (1): 5-20

McLennan, A. & Ngoma, W.Y. (2004). Quality governance for sustainable development? *Progress in Development Studies, Vol. 4*:279

Meriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*.San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Merriam, S.B (2002). *Qualitative research in practice*. An Francisco: Jossey-Bass publications

Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development. (2005). *Guide Book on Decentralization and Local Government in Malawi*

Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development, Malawi German Programme for Democracy and Decentralisation& the Royal Norwegian Embassy. (2005).*CapacityBuilding Strategy for Decentralization in Malawi: Report on Phase I of Capacity Assessment.*

Morell, M.E. (2005). Deliberation, Democratic Decision-Making and Internal Political Efficacy. *Political Behavior*, Vol. 27 (1): 49-69. Retrieved 29 September 2011 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4500184

Morrissey, J. (2000). Indicators of citizen participation: lessons from learning teams in rural EZ/EC communities. *Oxford University Press and Community Development Journal*

Muers, S. (2004).Deliberative Democracy and Urban Regeneration: Justification and Evaluation. *Public Policy and Administration, Vol.19*: 34
Retrieved October 31, 2011 from http://ppa.sagepub.com/content/19/4/34

Netshitenzhe, J. (2011, March). *A Developmental State: South Africa's developmental capacity*. Presentation Made for P&DM, University of Witwatersrand

Neuman, L.W. (2010). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (6th edn.). Boston: Pearson International

Newell, P. & Wheeler, J. (2006). R*ights, resources and the politics of accountability* (Vol. 3).London, New York: Zed Books

NORAD (2010). *Democracy Support through the United Nations Report 10/2010- Evaluation.* Oslo: Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

OECD (2001). *Engaging citizens in policy making: information, consultation and public participation.* Public Management Policy Brief

Owen, J.M. (2007). *Program evaluation: Forms and approaches,* Chapters 1 - 2(3rd edn.)New York; London: Guilford Press

O'Neill, T., Foresti, M. & Hudson, A. (2007). *Evaluation of Citizens' Voice and Accountability: Review of the Literature and Donor Approaches*. London: DFID.

Pahl-Wostl, C. (2002). Participative and Stakeholder-Based Policy Design, Evaluation and Modeling Processes. *Integrated Assessment, Vol. 3 (1):* 3 – 14 Retrieved September 5, 2011 from journals.sfu.ca/int_assess/index.php/iaj/article/download/200/151

Patel, N., Tambulasi, R., Molande, B. & Mpesi, A. (2007). *Consolidating Democratic Governance in Southern Africa: Malawi.* EISA Research Report No.33 Johannesburg: EISA

Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Patton, M.Q. (2002) Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) Checklist Retrieved November 14, 2011 from http://web.idrc.ca/uploads/user-S/10905198311Utilization_Focused_Evaluation.pdf

Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. (2002).*Discourse analysis: investigating processes of social construction.* Qualitative Research Methods. Series 50.Thousand Oaks, London, New Dehli: Sage publications

Phillips, S.D. & Orsini, M. (2002) *Mapping the Links: Citizen Involvement in Policy Processes.* Canadian Policy Research Networks Discussion Paper No. F|21

Rees, C.J. & Hossain, F. (2010). Perspectives on Decentralization and Local Governance in Developing and Transitional Countries. *International Journal of Public Administration, 33:12-13, 581-587.* Retrieved July 24, 2011from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2010.514459

Ribot, J.C. (1999). Decentralisation, Participation and Accountability in Sahelian Forestry: Legal Instruments of Political-Administrative Control. *Journal of the International African Institute,* Vol. 69(1): 23- 65. Retrieved July 29, 2011 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1161076?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Robino, C. (2009). *Citizen Participation, Decentralization and Inclusive development: A survey on citizen participation and decentralization in South Africa with specific reference to the Eastern Cape c.2005*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation

Rosener, J.B. (1978). Citizen Participation: Can We Measure Its Effectiveness? *Public Administration Review. Vol. 38*(5): 457-46. Retrieved September 29, 2011 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/975505?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Rowe, G. & Frewer, L.J. (2004). Evaluating Public Participation Exercises: a Research Agenda. *Science, Technology, & Human Values, Vol.*29 (4): 512–56.

Rowe, G. & Frewer, L.J. (2000). Public Participation Methods: A Framework for Evaluation. *Science Technology Human Values Vol.* 25(3)

Samuel, J. (2007). Public advocacy and people-centred advocacy: mobilizing for social change. *Development in Practice, Vol. 17* (4-5)

Schmidt, M.G. (2002). Political performance and types of democracy: findings from comparative studies. *European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 41: 47-168*
Retrieved 20 October 20, 2011 from http://www.pdfio.com/k-595773.html

Schroth, O. (2010). *From Information to participation: interactive landscape visualization as a tool for collaborative planning*. Accessed October 19, 2011 from Google books

Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation Thesaurus* (pp. 1-13)(4th edn.).Newbury Park.Calif.: London: Sage

Shah, A. (2006). *A practitioner's guide to intergovernmental fiscal transfers,*Policy Research Working Paper Series.4039, The World Bank.

Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., & Leviton, L.C. (1991).*Foundations of Program evaluation: Theories of practice*(Chapters 1-2).Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications - Chapters 1-2

Sharma, B. (2009) *Voice, Accountability and civic engagement: a conceptual overview*. UNDP Oslo Governance Centre Discussion Paper 14

Simielli, L.E.R (2008) "Sobral: Defining public policies with basis on citizen participation".In Kadalie R. (Ed.) *Community Participation and Public Service: Learning from Innovations.* Sao Paulo: Programa Gestao Publica e Cidadania

Smit, B. & Johnston, T. (1983).Public Policy Assessment: Evaluating Objectives of Resource Policies.*The Professional Geographer. Vol. 35(2): 172-178*. Retrieved October 26, 2011 fromhttp://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1983.00172.x

Stanley, J. (2003).*UNCDF: It's Niche in the Local Governance and Development.* A Paper Presented at the Africities Conference, December 2003. Retrieved November12, 2011 from
www.uncdf.org/english/local_development/documents_and_reports/thematic_papers/africities/joyce_stanley.pdf.

Stewart, T.R. & Gelberd, L. (1976). Analysis of judgmental policy: A new approach for citizen participation in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners. Vol. 42*: 33-41

Stoker, G. (1998). *Governance as theory: five propositions.* UNESCO, Oxford: Blackwell

Tambulasi, I.C. R & Kayuni, H.M (2007). Decentralization Opening a New Window for Corruption: An Accountability Assessment of Malawi's Four Years of Democratic Local Governance. *Journal of Asian and African Studies, Vol. 42*(2): 163–183

Tambulasi, R. I. C. (2009). Decentralization as a Breeding Ground for Conflicts: an Analysis of Institutional Conflicts in Malawi's Decentralized System.*JOAAG*, Vol. 4(2): 28-39. Retrieved July 07, 2011 from http://www.joaag.com/uploads/03_Tambulasi_4_2_.pdf

Tambulasi, R.I. (2010). Local government without governance: A new institutional perspective of local governance policy paralysis in Malawi.*Public Policy and Administration, Vol.26: 33*3.Retrieved September 16, 2011 from http://ppa.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/12/10/0952076710374915.full.pdf+html

Tellis, W. (1997). Application of a case study methodology. *The qualitative report. Vol. 3(5)* Retrieved September 22, 2011 from http://nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-3/tellis2.html

Tolbert, C.J. (2003). Direct Democracy and Institutional re-alignment in the American states. *Political Science. Vol.118 (3)*

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*

United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2007).*Public Governance Indicators: a literature review*.ST/ESA/PAD/SER.E/100

United Nations Development Programme.(2009). *A User's Guide to Measuring Local Governance*.Oslo: UNDP Oslo Governance Centre

UNDP (2000). *Overcoming Human Poverty: UNDP Poverty Report 2000*. New York: United Nations Development Programme

UNESCO (2000). *UNESCO's Strategy on Development and Poverty Eradication* (Report 160EX/13).Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

UN Habitat (2011). *Malawi: Lilongwe Urban Profile*.Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme. Retrieved December 28, 2011 from http://www.unhabitat.org

UN Habitat (2004). Dialogue on civil society's contribution to local urban governance. *Second Session of the World Urban Forum.Barcelona, 13-17 September. HSP/WUF/2/4*

Van Meter, E.C. (1975).Citizen Participation in the Policy Management Process. *Public Administration Review, Vol. 35*: 804-812

Weiss, C.H. (1998). *Evaluation* (2nd edn.).Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall

World Bank. (2004*). Overview World Development Report: Making Services Work for the Poor*. Washington DC: The World Bank

World Bank.(1993). *World Bank Poverty Reduction Handbook*. Washington, D.C: The World Bank

Yang, K. & Callahan, K. (2005). Assessing Citizen Involvement Efforts by Local Government.*Public Performance & Management Review. Vol. 29* (2): 191 – 216 Retrieved on October 02, 2011 from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20447586

Yilmaz, S., Beris, Y. & Serrano-Berthet, R. (2008). *Local Government Discretion and Accountability: A Diagnostic Framework for Local Governance*
Local Governance & Accountability Series Paper No. 113

York, A.S. & Itzhaky, H. (1991). *How can we Measure the Effects of Client Participation on the Effectiveness of Social Work Intervention?* Br. J. Social Wk. Vol. 21: 647-662. Retrieved 3 December from http://bjsw.oxfordjournals.org/

ANNEX I: The Research Guiding Tool

Research instrument: used in mapping data collection, the one-to-one interviews, data capture and analysis

Primary Research Question	**Secondary research questions**	**Evaluative criteria**	**Standards/ Put in Investigative Questions form**	**Data source**
To what extent does citizen participation support public accountability in the city development planning?	1. Do the existing structures offer space for citizen participation in district development plan making?	5. Structures that provide opportunity for demand	What are the local structures for citizen participation in the DDP making?	- DPD - CSO rep - Local committee representative - National Decentralisation Guide (2005) - City assembly participation committees
			Are the structures formal or informal?	- City assembly regulations - DC - Assembly regulations
			To what extent do the structures represent the views of the majority of the community? *(how is the representation done?)*	- Regulations on participation in the structures - CSO rep - Citizen reps

				- DPD
			Do the structures give opportunity for citizens to raise demands and seek redress? *(what is the role of local government? How did you find out)*	- Regulations on participation in the structures - CSO rep - Citizen reps - DPD
	2. Do the processes and practices for citizen engagement provide adequate base for responsiveness and transparency in the policy making?	4. Functional awareness	How many specific forums for raising awareness of the local participation in the local policy making?	- DPD - CSOs - District information plan and reports - Citizen reps
			How much do the citizens know on their rights in the exercise?	- Reports on information sharing with citizens - DPD - CSOs - Citizen reps

			How many two way information sharing spaces?	-DPD -Information sharing activity reports - Meeting minutes
		3. Engagement access and skills support	Do the citizens know their role and extent of contribution in the DPP making?	- Participation manuals - Participation regulations - Skill training reports - Annual reports - Project reports and minutes - CSO reps - DPD - Citizens
			How many participation skill trainings were conducted?	
			Do the citizens know the role of local government in the DPP making?	
		2.Binding/ Legally supportive provisions	What is the procedure for adoption of a policy issue/demand?	- Decentralization guide - Assembly participation procedures - CSOs

				- DPD - Citizen rep
			What is the process of reaching a consensus on a policy issue?	- Decentralization guide - Assembly participation procedures - CSOs - DPD - Citizen rep
			What procedure is used on policy issue prioritization?	- Decentralization guide - Assembly participation procedures - CSOs - DPD - DC - Citizen rep
			Do the citizen committees have enough powers to set policy issues? *(what mandate does your committee have?)*	- Decentralization guide - Assembly participation procedures - CSOs

				- DPD - Citizen rep
			What sanctions are there for government's failure to count for citizens' inputs? *(What if this….does not happen, what happens?)*	- Decentralization guide - Assembly participation procedures - CSOs - DPD - Citizen rep - Annual reports
	3. To what extent do the enforcement mechanisms provide for demand and claiming opportunities for the local citizens' engagement?	1. Defensible decision making mechanism	How many citizen inputs entered the category of policy issue? *(do a documentary analysis first)*	- Meeting minutes from all processes - Final DDP - CSO reps - Citizen reps - DPD
			What is the level of allocative efficiency on DDP against citizen priorities?	- Budget - Actual expenditure

			How were the justifications on any changes addressed to the public?	- Meeting minutes - CSO reps - Citizen reps
			Are there community traceable action plans?	- Meeting minutes - DDP - Task shared documents - CSO reps - Citizen reps
			What consequences emerged on government's status on responding to the community concerns?	- Annual reports - Citizen reps - CSO reps

ANNEX II: Questionnaires submitted to Local Government Official& UN Habitat

University of Witwatersrand
School of Public and Development Management, Johannesburg

An academic investigation on Citizen Participation in Local Policy Making in Malawi

Lilongwe City Development Strategy Coordinating Team (Council officers)

This research is being conducted by Terence Crayl Malamulo, a Malawian student at the University of Witwatersrand; as part of completion of his Masters of Management in Public Policy. The research is on how citizens in peri-urban areas participate in policy making processes based on case study of Ngwenya area in Lilongwe City, Malawi.

In case of ethical concerns please contact susan.booysen@wits.ac.za, in the office of Programme Coordination of the Master of Public Policy.

The information you are asked to provide in this questionnaire is required for academic research purposes only and will not be used to jeopardise your position or compromise in any way the integrity of your office, job or status. Any information that you will provide will be kept in strict confidence and used solely for the purpose of this study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Organization and department:.....……
…….
……
……
Position in the organization:……

The Questions:

1. What were the local participation structures for citizens of Ngwenya in the making of the CDS?
   _____
   _____
   _____
   _____
2. How was the representation done for the local participants to the participation structures?
   _____
   _____
   _____
3. Who represented Ngwenya in all the forums for the CDS making?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

4. What specific forums were done to raise awareness to the local citizens about the CDS making and their participation? When were they done?

_____
_____

5. What training (s) did the Ngwenya representatives in the CDS making receive prior to participating in the CDS making processes?

_____
_____
_____

6. What was the procedure of adopting an issue to be part of the policy agenda?

_____
_____
_____

7. What was a criterion was used in prioritization of policy issues for Ngwenya?

_____
_____
_____

8. How were the Taskforce and Extended Task force formed?

_____
_____
_____

9. What was the mandate of Task force?

_____
_____
_____

10. What was the mandate of the Extended Task force?

_____
_____
_____
_____

11. In your opinion, what mechanisms are in place through which citizens can use to control the activities of the municipality?

_____
_____
_____

12. What were the issues that the Citizens of Ngwenya demanded the government to do for them as part of the CDS between 2010 and 2015?

_____
_____
_____
_____

13. What was theCity Assembly action plan, within the CDS, for Ngwenya community interventions between July 2010 and June 2011?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

14. What activities did the City Assembly plan for Ngwenya area between July 2010 and June 2011?

_____
_____
_____
_____

15. What are the principles of policy making at the local government level?

_____
_____
_____

16. Do you think that the issues demanded by the citizens in the policy making process have binding authority for City Assembly? Please for any answer, provide an explanation.

_____
_____
_____

17. B) How do you rate the overall participation of Ngwenya citizens in all the CDS making processes? (Mark using an X in the applicable choice)
Phase 1

Absent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Phase 2:

Absent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Phase 3:

Absent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

B) Any comment on the overall rating of citizen participation inNgwenya?

_____

_____

_____

18. What legacy projects were set as part of phase 3 of the CDS making?

_____

_____

_____

_____

19. If you have any other documents or comments related to the CDS formulation that you would like to include here attach them or comment on next blank space

Thank you for your time in answering this questionnaire.

For any other comments

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

University of Witwatersrand
School of Public and Development Management, Johannesburg

An academic investigation on Citizen Participation in Local Policy Making in Malawi

Lilongwe City Development Strategy- Participating organization

This research is being conducted by Terence Crayl Malamulo, a Malawian student at the University of Witwatersrand; as part of completion of his Master's of Management in Public Policy. The research is on how citizens in peri-urban areas participate in policy making processes based on case study of Ngwenya area in Lilongwe City, Malawi.

In case of ethical concerns please contactanne.mclennan@wits.ac.za, Director of Research, Wits Graduate School of Public and Development Management.

The information you are asked to provide in this questionnaire is required for research purposes only and will not be used to expose your position or compromise in any way the integrity of your organization, office, job or status. Any information that you will provide will be kept in strict confidence and used solely for the purpose of this study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Organization and department:

.....……
……
……

Position in the organization:

……

The Questions:

1. Do you know any local participation structures that allowed for citizens' inputs into the CDS, in all its 3 phases? Yes/ No
   If **Yes,** Please give details below:

   _____
   _____

2. How did the local citizens participate in these participation structures?

   _____
   _____

3. Do you know if Ngwenya was locally represented in all the forums for the CDS making?

   _____
   _____
   _____

_____
_____

4. What specific forums were done to raise awareness to the local citizens about the CDS making and their participation? When were they done?

_____
_____

5. What was the procedure of adopting an issue to be part of the policy agenda?

_____
_____
_____

6. What was a criterion was used in prioritization of policy issues and plans in the CDS making?

_____
_____
_____

7. How were the Taskforce and Extended Task force formed?

_____
_____
_____

8. What was the mandate of Task force in the CDS processes?

_____
_____
_____

9. What was the mandate of the Extended Task force in the CDS processes?

_____
_____
_____
_____

10. In your opinion, what mechanisms are in place through which citizens can use to control the activities of the municipality based on the CDS?

_____
_____
_____

11. What were the issues that the Citizens of Ngwenya demanded the government to do for them as part of the CDS between 2010 and 2015?

_____
_____

_____

_____

12. What was the City Assembly's action plan, within the CDS, for Ngwenya community interventions between July 2010 and June 2011?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

13. Do you know if the City Assembly solicited Community based development plans for integration in the CDS operationalization plan? Yes / No
    Any relevant information please give below:

_____

_____

_____

_____

14. Do you think that the issues demanded by the citizens in the policy making process have binding authority for City Assembly? Please for any answer, provide an explanation.

_____

_____

_____

15. B) How do you rate the overall participation of Ngwenya citizens in all the CDS making processes? (Mark using an X in the applicable choice)
    Phase 1 (Preparatory phase)

Absent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Phase 2: (Actual policy formulation)

Absent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

Phase 3: (Approval and implementation plans)

Absent	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent

B) Any comment on the overall rating of citizen participation inNgwenya?

_____
_____
_____
_____

16. How many stakeholder workshops did you attend in the formulation process of the CDS?

_____
_____

17. What was the prevailing mandate of the stakeholder workshops?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

18. If you have any other documents or comments related to the CDS formulation that you would like to include here attach them or comment on page created space next section

Thank you for your time in answering this questionnaire.

For any other comments

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

ANNEX III: List of the research participants

A Table showing interviews conducted for data collection in the research

Index	**Designation of the Interviewee**	**Name of**	**Date and Venue**
Interview 1	CDS Management Unit Office - LilongweCity Assembly	Mr Kasamira	13 December 2011 Crossroads Total Filling Station
Interview 2	Deputy Director of Planning - LilongweCity Assembly	Mr Kamela	20 December 2011
Interview 3	Monitoring & Evaluation Officer - LilongweCity Assembly	Ms M. Mpakule	23 December 2011
Interview 4 (tossed the interview to interviewee 7	Acting Director of Planning and Development - LilongweCity Assembly	Mrs Kulemeka	23 December 2011
Interview 5	Senior Chief (Block leader) - Ngwenya	Mr Kapapa	06 January 2012 Ngwenya
Interview 6	Member of Parliament – LilongweCity South West	Mr Adams Vinandi	07 January 2012, Kalikuti hotel
Interview 7: Questionnaire	CDS Manager - LilongweCity Assembly	Mr Kalimujiso John Banda	24 January 2012 By E-mail
Focus Group Interview 1	Works Department	Mr Chizombwe,	21 December 2011 Area 4
Focus Group Interview 2	Ngwenya CDC representatives: The Secretary and Committee Member	Mr Brighton Nkhata Mr Yohane Gama	04 January 2012 Ngwenya

ANNEX IV: The MDGs

The eight Millennium Development Goals

(Copied from http://www.alliance2015.org/fileadmin/user_upload/MDGs.pdf)

Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger

Target 1: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day

Target 2: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger

Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education

Target 3: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women

Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and to all levels of education no later than 2015

Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and to all levels of education no later than 2015

Goal 4: Reduce child mortality

Target 5: Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate

Goal 5: Improve maternal health

Target 6: Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio

Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases

Target 7: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS

Target 8: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases

Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability

Target 9: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources

Target 10: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water

Target 11 By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers

Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development

Target 12: Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction – both nationally and internationally

Target 13: Address the special needs of the least developed countries Includes: tariff and quota free access for least developed countries' exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for HIPC and cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction

Target 14: Address the special needs of landlocked countries and Small Island developing States (through the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly)

Target 15: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term

Target 16: In co-operation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth

Target 17: In co-operation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable, essential drugs in developing countries

Target 18: In co-operation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications

ANNEX V: Members of the Extended Taskforce

Participants list for the Extended Taskforce (Lilongwe CDS, 2009:144)

No	Name of participating organization
1	The Chief executive- Lilongwe City Assembly- ***Chairman***
2	The Secretary – Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
3	The Director – Urban Development and Renewal
4	The Director- Local Government
5	The Director – Ministry of Education – Basic
6	The Chief executive – ESCOM
7	The Chief executive – Lilongwe Water Board
8	The Chief executive – Malawi Energy Regulatory Authority
9	The Chief executive – Roads Authority
10	The Chief executive – National Roads Safety Council of Malawi
11	The Chief executive – Airport Development Limited
12	The Chief executive – National Construction Council
13	The Chief executive – Malawi Telecommunications Limited
14	The Chief executive – ZAIN Malawi
15	The Chief executive – Telkom Networks Malawi
16	The Chief executive – TEVET
17	The Chief executive – Malawi Investment Promotion Agency
18	The Chief executive – MEDI
19	The Chief executive – Blantyre City Assembly
20	The Chief executive – Zomba City Assembly
21	The Chief executive – Mzuzu City Assembly
22	The Chief executive – MPICO
23	The Chief executive – Actionaid
24	The Chief executive –Council of Non-Governmental Organizations of Malawi
25	The Chief executive – Malawi Chamber of Trade Union
26	The Chief executive – Malawi Chamber of Commerce and Investment
27	The Chief executive – USAID
28	The Chief executive – UNDP
29	The Chief executive – European Union
30	The Chief executive – Total Malawi
31	The Chief executive – BP Malawi

32	The Chief executive – Petroda Malawi
33	The Director –Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development
34	The Director – Ministry of Gender and Social Welfare Services
35	The Director – Housing and Urban Services
36	The Director of Infrastructure, Ministry of Housing
37	The Director – Ministry of Transport and Public Works
38	The Regional Manager, Malawi Housing Corporation
39	The Director – Road Traffic Directorate
40	The Director – Ministry of Environmental Affairs
41	The Registrar – BundaCollege
42	Mr Sacraine - Crossroads hotel
43	Mr Mahomed Yusuf - Pacific Investments
44	Mr Satta - Star Advertising
45	The Chairman - Minbus Association of Malawi
46	The Chairman – Vendors Association
47	The Chairman – Occupation Certificate Committee
48	The General Manager – Limbe Leaf Tobacco Company
49	The General Manager – Alliance One
50	The General Manager – Auction Holdings Limited
51	The Director of Youth – Ministry of Youth
52	The Commisioner for Physical Planning
53	The President – Malawi Institute for Physical Planners
54	The Branch Manager – Standard Bank
55	The Branch Manager – NBS Bank
56	The Branch Manager – National Bank of Malawi
57	The Branch Manager – First Merchant Bank
58	The Branch Manager – Inde Bank
59	The Branch Manager – Malawi savings Bank
60	Members of LilongweTown Planning Committee

ANNEX VI: Sample matrix of a traceable local development plan

Assumptions: Council has a competent policy maker in participatory policy making; the National Development Goals are based on concrete local challenges and presented as a standard consensus (this requires social and economic modelling in planning)

This template will help local citizens and other stakeholders to objectively hold council accountable as a social contract obligation. The council is assumed to be a facilitator in policy making. The key element of local development negotiation at council level is modelling and civic education. Educated residents are easy to govern (Lord Henry Bougham, 2009: Retrieved from http://my.opera.com/mm9p/blog/show.dml/2980974).

Area	**Field of development**	**Selected priority objective (popular participation means)**	**City Council's Strategic Outcome(s)**	**Relevant National development goal(s)**	**Planned activity and estimated cost**			**Key Responsible Departments**
					Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	
City at large	Infrastructure Industry and trade	To improve roads in the city to address morning traffic congestions To improve conditions for industrialization	An accessible city Economic hub of Malawi	Goal 1 Goal 7	Four lane (Biwi – CC): Mk1 billion			Road works directorate
X_1	Health Education	To reduce malaria prevalence rate, under 5 To improve access to secondary education access	Educated residents	Goal 2	Construction of 8 blocks of forms 1 to 4 at Nsambidzi ground (Mk250,000,0000)	Maintenance of Kandiwo CDSS (Windows and floor)- K2, 000,000		Health directorate Education directorate- e.g. managing plans and budget