

Factors that Needs Improvement in Participatory Budgeting Projects to Achieve Community Development Goals in Port Loko District and City Council

D.E.M. Lavalie^{1*}, S. Subadra² and S. P. Sreekala³

¹Research Scholar, School of Business Management
Department of Business Management, Texila American University

²Department of Commerce, NKR Government Arts College for Women, Namakkal 637 001

³Associate Professor, KPR arts and Science College, Coimbatore

E-mail: demlavalie@gmail.com; dr.subadraphd@gmail.com; spsreekalaashok@gmail.com

*Corresponding author details: Daniel E.M. Lavalie; demlavalie@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to find out and recommend the factors that need improvement in the future implementation of participatory budgeting in Port Loko District and City Council in order to achieve community development goals. As our study is based on primary data, we collected 420 questionnaires to analyse our findings. A lot of factors were identified and analysed using Garret Ranking Techniques.

Keywords: local council; primary data; port Loko district and city council; participatory budgeting; Garrett ranking test

INTRODUCTION

The functions devolved to local councils according to (Commonwealth Governance) are primary and secondary health, primary and junior secondary educations, environmental health, agriculture extension services, rural water supply, waste management and community development. Again, in the Local Government (ACT, 2004) section 20 (1), local council is charged with the function of: A local council shall be the highest political authority in the locality and shall have legislative and executive powers to be exercised in accordance with this Act or any other enactment, and shall be responsible, generally for promoting the development of the locality and the welfare of the people in the locality with the resources at its disposal and with such resources and capacity as it can mobilise from the central government and its agencies, national and international organisations, and the private sector. (p.16)

These above functions delegated to councils do not go without problems and challenges ranging from late disbursement of funds, bureaucracy in the process, the Participatory Budgeting selection process, small own source revenue generation, to citizens' lack of trust in council for development project implementation. Participatory budgeting according to (LGA, 2020):

Participatory budgeting is a form of citizen participation in which citizens are involved in the process of deciding how public money is spent. Local people are often given a role in the scrutiny and monitoring of the process following the allocation of budgets.

Also, according to (EUKN), in Lisbon Participatory Budget, it defined participatory budgeting as:

"a way of including the citizens in the decision-making process of the city budget. It can imply, in some cities, a whole administrative structure feeding on grassroots democracy, which defines budget priorities for the local neighbourhood or district. In other cases, the city allocates part of the budget to projects which are decided by the citizens: the citizens can suggest projects, and then they can vote in their favourite ones"

These and many other functions need continuous improvements for the councils to effectively and efficiently deliver their services and work in the development of their locality. The objective of the study is to identify factors that needs improvements and recommends such factors to be improved on if participatory budgeting programmes wants to achieve community development goals. To achieve the above objectives Garrett ranking techniques was used to analyse the respondents' views from the administered questionnaire.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the study are:

- 1) To find the factors that needs improvement for effective and efficient participatory budgeting in the Port Loko District and City Council.
- 2) To recommend on the factors that need improvement for efficient and effective Participatory budgeting in the Port Loko District and City Councils to achieve future programme implementation that is fully participatory in nature.

METHODOLOGY

Garrett Ranking Techniques

This method of ranking was used to determine from the respondents the factors that needs improvements and recommends for such in the implementation of effective and efficient participatory budgeting in order to achieve community development goals.

According to (Rahman, 2011), Garrett technique is used by policy holders after ranking factors according to their magnitude. The order of the merit given by respondents was converted into ranks by using the formula below:

Formula

$$\text{Position} = \frac{100 (R_{ij} - 0.5) \text{ Percentage}}{N_j}$$

Where: R_{ij} = Rank given for the i^{th} variable by the j^{th} respondent

N_j = Number of variables ranked by the j^{th} respondent.

This technique according to (Rahman, 2011) again:

The percentage position of each rank thus obtained was converted in to scores by referring to the table given by Henry Garrett. Then for each factor the scores of individual respondents were added together and divided by the total number of respondents for who the scores were added. These mean scores for all the factors were arranged in the order of their ranks and inferences were drawn.

Port Loko District and City Council

The tables below show the ranks given to the factors to be improved on by Port Loko District and City Council if participatory budgeting wants to be fully effective and efficient for the achievement of community development goals in the future.

APPENDIX -B

TABLE 1: GARRETT'S RANKING TABLE

PERCENTAGE	SCORE	PERCENTAGE	SCORE
0.09	99	52.02	49
0.20	98	54.03	48
0.32	97	56.03	47
0.45	96	58.03	46
0.61	95	59.99	45
0.78	94	61.94	44
0.97	93	63.85	43
1.18	92	65.75	42
1.42	91	67.48	41
1.68	90	69.39	40
1.96	89	71.14	39
2.28	88	72.85	38
2.63	87	74.52	37
3.01	86	76.12	36
3.43	85	77.68	35
3.89	84	79.12	34
4.38	83	80.61	33
4.92	82	81.99	32
5.51	81	83.31	31
6.14	80	84.56	30

PERCENTAGE	SCORE	PERCENTAGE	SCORE
6.81	79	85.75	29
7.55	78	86.89	28
8.33	77	87.96	27
9.17	76	88.97	26
10.16	75	89.94	25
11.03	74	90.83	24
12.04	73	91.67	23
13.11	72	92.45	22
14.25	71	93.19	21
15.44	70	93.86	20
16.69	69	94.49	19
18.01	68	95.08	18
19.39	67	95.62	17
20.93	66	96.11	16
22.32	65	96.57	15
23.88	64	96.99	14
25.48	63	97.37	13
27.15	62	97.72	12
28.86	61	98.04	11
30.61	60	98.32	10
32.42	59	98.58	9
34.25	58	98.82	8
36.15	57	99.03	7
38.06	56	99.22	6
40.01	55	99.39	5
41.97	54	99.55	4
43.97	53	99.68	3
45.97	52	99.80	2
47.98	51	99.91	1
50.00	50	100.00	0

SOURCE: Henry, E. Garret's, Statistics in Psychology and Education, Feffer and Simans Private Limited, 1969, p.329.

FIRST SET OF FACTORS

TABLE 2: Determinant of participatory budgeting Factors

S.No	F1	F2	F3	F4	Total
1	49	205	98	68	420
2	61	85	97	177	420
3	78	61	196	85	420
4	232	69	29	90	420
Total	420	420	420	420	1680

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 3: Percentage Position Determination

Rank	Percentage= $100(R_{ij}-0.05)/N_j$	Garret Score
1	12.5	74
2	37.5	57
3	62.5	44
4	87.5	28

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 4: Garret Mean Score

S.No	F1		F2		F3		F4	
	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS
1	49	8.633333	205	36.11905	98	17.26667	68	11.98095
2	61	8.278571	85	11.53571	97	13.16429	177	24.02143
3	78	8.171429	61	6.390476	196	20.53333	85	8.904762
4	232	15.46667	69	4.6	29	1.933333	90	6
Total Garret Mean Score		40.55		58.64524		52.89762		50.90714

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 5: Factor Determinant of Participatory Budgeting to be improved on

Factor	Mean	Rank	
1	40.55	4	Availability of fund
2	58.645	1	Public participation
3	52.898	2	Citizens decides how funds are spent
4	50.907	3	Project implemented based on views of the voting public

Source: Primary Data

SECOND SET OF FACTORS

TABLE 6: Awareness and Public Participation Factor to be improved on

S.No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	Total
1	294	84	42	0	0	420
2	84	168	84	42	42	420
3	0	84	168	84	84	420
4	0	42	126	210	42	420
5	42	42	0	84	252	420
Total	420	420	420	420	420	2100

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 7: Percentage Position Determination

Rank	Percentage= $100(R_{ij}-0.05)/N_j$	Score
1	10	76
2	30	61
3	50	50
4	70	40
5	90	25

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 8: Garrett Mean Score

S.No	F1		F2		F3		F4		F5	
	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS
1	294	53.2	84	15.2	42	7.6	0	0	0	0
2	84	12.2	168	24.4	84	12.2	42	6.1	42	6.1
3	0	0	84	10	168	20	84	10	84	10
4	0	0	42	4	126	12	210	20	42	4
5	42	2.5	42	2.5	0	0	84	5	252	15
Total GMS		67.9		56.1		51.8		41.1		35.1

Source: Primary Data

THIRD SET OF FACTORS

TABLE 9: Awareness and public participation factor to be improved on from Garrett mean score ranking.

FACTOR	MEAN	RANK	
F1	67.9	1	Just inform citizens
F2	56.1	2	Consult citizens
F3	51.8	3	Involve citizens
F4	41.1	4	Collaborate with citizens
F5	35.1	5	Empower citizens

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 10: Stages of participatory budgeting factor to be improved on

S.No	F1	F2	F3	F4	Total
1	258	84	0	78	420
2	42	231	105	42	420
3	0	63	294	63	420
4	120	42	21	237	420
Total	420	420	420	420	1680

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 11: Percentage Position Determination

Rank	Percentage = $100(R_{ij}-0.05)/N_j$	Score
1	12.5	74
2	37.5	57
3	62.5	44
4	87.5	28

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 12: Garrett Mean Score

S.No	F1		F2		F3		F4	
	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS
1	258	45.45714	84	14.8	0	0	78	13.74286
2	42	5.7	231	31.35	105	14.25	42	5.7
3	0	0	63	6.6	294	30.8	63	6.6
4	120	8	42	2.8	21	1.4	237	15.8
Total		59.15714		55.55		46.45		41.84286

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 13: Stages of participatory budgeting factor to be improved on based on Garrett mean score ranking

Factor	Mean	Rank	
F1	59.15714	1	Identify needs
F2	55.55	2	Develop project proposal
F3	46.45	3	Select project to be funded
F4	41.84286	4	Implement, Monitoring, Evaluate and report

Source: Primary Data

FOURTH SET OF FACTORS

TABLE 14: General areas of participatory budgeting to be improved on

S.No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	Total
1	200	135	0	85	0	420
2	0	262	65	71	22	420
3	21	0	74	226	99	420
4	60	23	200	38	99	420
5	139	0	81	0	200	420
Total	420	420	420	420	420	2100

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 15: Percentage Position Determination

Rank	Percentage= $100(R_{ij}-0.05)/N_j$	Score
1	10	76
2	30	61
3	50	50
4	70	40
5	90	25

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 16: Garrett Mean Score

S.No	F1		F2		F3		F4		F5	
	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS	Freq.	GMS
1	200	36.19048	135	24.42857	0	0	85	15.38095	0	0
2	0	0	262	38.05238	65	9.440476	71	10.3119	22	3.195238
3	21	2.5	0	0	74	8.809524	226	26.90476	99	11.78571
4	60	5.714286	23	2.190476	200	19.04762	38	3.619048	99	9.428571
5	139	8.27381	0	0	81	4.821429	0	0	200	11.90476
Total GMS		52.67857		64.67143		42.11905		56.21667		36.31429

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 17: General areas of participatory budgeting to be improved on based on Garrett mean score

FACTOR	MEAN	RANK	
F1	52.6785714	3	Provide feedback
F2	64.6714286	1	Projects selected are implemented
F3	42.1190476	4	Are always informed
F4	56.2166667	2	Inputs/recommendations implemented
F5	36.3142857	5	My ward benefited

Source: Primary Data

FIFTH SET OF FACTORS

TABLE 18: Effectiveness factor to be improved on

RANK	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	Total
1	11	45	24	25	315	420
2	306	32	4	10	68	420
3	27	54	18	308	13	420
4	40	13	294	66	7	420
5	36	276	80	11	17	420
Total	420	420	420	420	420	2100

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 19: Percentage Position Determination

Rank	Percentage=100(Rij/0.05)Nj	Garret Score
1	10	76
2	30	61
3	50	50
4	70	40
5	90	25

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 20: Garrett Mean Score

Rank	F1		F2		F3		F4		F5	
	Freq	GMS	Freq	GMS	Freq	GMS	Freq	GMS	Freq	GMS
1	11	1.990476	45	8.142857	24	4.342857	25	4.52381	315	57
2	306	44.44286	32	4.647619	4	0.580952	10	1.452381	68	9.87619
3	27	3.214286	54	6.428571	18	2.142857	308	36.66667	13	1.547619
4	40	3.809524	13	1.238095	294	28	66	6.285714	7	0.666667
5	36	2.142857	276	16.42857	80	4.761905	11	0.654762	17	1.011905
Total GMS		55.6		36.88571		39.82857		49.58333		70.10238

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 21: Effectiveness factor to be improved on based on Garrett mean score

Factor	Mean	Rank	
F1	55.6	2	Contractors to deliver their work/services as planned
F2	36.8857143	5	Inclusion and collaboration
F3	39.8285714	4	Transparency and accountability
F4	49.58333333	3	Community to fully own the project
F5	70.102381	1	Providing intended results

Source: Primary Data

SIX SET OF FACTORS

TABLE 22: Efficiency Factor to be improved on

S.No	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	Total
1	0	100	20	70	230	420
2	21	0	30	230	139	420
3	30	220	70	69	31	420
4	268	30	101	21	0	420
5	101	70	199	30	20	420
Total	420	420	420	420	420	2100

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 23: Percentage Position Determination

Rank	Percentage= $100(R_{ij}-0.05)/N_j$	Score
1	10	76
2	30	61
3	50	50
4	70	40
5	90	25

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 24: Garret Mean Score

S.No	F1		F2		F3		F4		F5	
	Freq	GM Score	Freq	GM Score	Freq	GM Score	Freq	GM Score	Freq	GM Score
1	0	0	100	18.09524	20	3.619048	70	12.66667	230	41.61905
2	21	3.05	0	0	30	4.357143	230	33.40476	139	20.1881
3	30	3.571429	220	26.19048	70	8.333333	69	8.214286	31	3.690476
4	268	25.52381	30	2.857143	101	9.619048	21	2	0	0
5	101	6.011905	70	4.166667	199	11.84524	30	1.785714	20	1.190476
Total GM Score	38.15714		51.30952		37.77381		58.07143		66.6881	

Source: Primary Data

TABLE 25: Efficiency Factor to be improved on based on Garrett mean score

Factor	Mean	Rank	
F1	38.15714	4	Timely provision of resources
F2	51.30952	3	Timely delivery of service and work
F3	37.77381	5	Funders to meet expectation
F4	58.07143	2	Standard Procurement procedures be fully implemented
F5	66.6881	1	Council participatory budgeting structure be fully implemented and independent

Source: Primary Data

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results from the research study, the respondents were able to identify and ranked the factors that needed serious improvements. These factors the respondents found out were: 1. Availability of funds; 2. empowerment of citizens; 3. Strong implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting; 4. their ward to benefit from participatory budgeting projects; 5. councils and other ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) to be highly inclusive and collaborative and; 6. recommended that funders to meet their expectations. If the above factors are improved on, the effectiveness and efficiency of participatory budgeting in the Port Loko District and City council will achieve community development goals.

CONCLUSION

The recommendations of improvement factors for effective and efficient Participatory budgeting in the Port Loko District and City Councils to achieve future programme implementation that is fully participatory in nature; the research from the respondents recommends that, there should be available funds, the councils to empower their citizens, there should be strong implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of all participatory budgeting activities, they all want their ward to benefit from Participatory budgeting projects, they further recommended that councils and other ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) to highly include and collaborate with many stakeholders in their sovereignty if they want the project to be highly effective and efficient in the future and lastly as money is the backbone to every project they want funders to meet their expectations in relation to time of release of funds. When the above improvements are done there will be effective and efficient participatory budgeting process that will contribute to high community development in their localities.

REFERENCES

- [1] ACT, L. G. (2004, 03 1). *THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 2004*. Retrieved 11 01, 2020, from The Local Government Act, 2004-Sierra Leone Web: <http://www.sierra-leone.org/Laws2004-1p.pdf>.
- [2] Commonwealth Governance .(n.d.). *Local Government*. Retrieved 06 07, 2021, from Local Government of Sierra Leone https://www.commonwealthgovernance.org/countries/africa/sierra_leone/local-government.
- [3] EUKN.(n.d.). *Participatory Budgeting ?* Retrieved 11 1, 2020, from European Urban Knowledge Network: <https://www.eukn.eu/policy-labs/policy-lab-for-cy-public-participation-in-the-development-process-participatory-budgeting>.
- [4] LGA. (2020). *Participatory Budgeting*. Retrieved 11 1, 2020, from Local Government Association: <https://www.local.gov.uk/topics/devolution/engaging-citizens-devolution/approaches-civic-and-democratic-engagement-0>.
- [5] OCHA Services. (2016, 01 04). *Sierra Leone: Port Loko District Profile*. Retrieved 06 07, 2021, from reliefweb: <https://reliefweb.int/report/sierra-leone/sierra-leone-port-loko-district-profile-29-december-2015>.
- [6] Rahman, S. Z.-u. (2011, 01 24). *Henry Garrett Ranking Techniques*. Retrieved 06 06, 2021, from Scribd: <https://www.scribd.com/doc/47487605/Henry-Garrett-Ranking-Techniques>.