Community Participation and Budget Allocation in Local Governments in Uganda: A Case Study of Rubanda District Local Government, Western Uganda

Moses Ntirandekura[1], Friday Christopher[2]

[1]Faculty of Education and Humanities, Metropolitan International University
ntimoses33@gmail.com
[2]Faculty of Sciences, Metropolitan International University
fridaychristopher@rocketmail.com

*Abstract: The study aimed at establishing the relationship between community participation and budget allocation in local governments in Uganda. The study focused on the relationship between community consultation and budget allocation in Rubanda District, the relationship between community involvement in planning and budgeting process and budget allocation in Rubanda District and the constraints of community participation in budget allocation in Rubanda District. The study espoused a cross sectional survey research design with both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The researcher used a sample size of 148 respondents from a population of 251. Simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were used in selecting respondents. Questionnaires, interviews and documentary review were used in data collection. Data analysis was done using statistical package for social sciences software version 20.0 to generate frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviations for descriptive statistics and and Pearson linear correlation coefficient for inferential statistics. From the findings, it was revealed that community consultation empowered communities to participate in the budget spending which reduced resource wastage, improved financial resource allocation to priority sectors, ensured revenue expenditure control and budget implementation reviews which improved on performance the of Rubanda District Local Government. The study found a significant poritive correlation between community consultation and budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government (r = 0.684**) which implied that community consultations increased proper budget allocation in the District. The study found out that a significant positive relationship existed between community involvement in planning and budgeting process and budget allocation in Rubanda District (.512**). The findings also revealed that Rubanda District faced constraints such as absence of logistics, delayed implementation of identified projects and lack of funds to enhance community participation and effective budget utilization in Rubanda District Local Government. The study recommended that the Central Government should provide funds to the Local Government purposely for community sensitization and organization to increase on community participation in budget allocation. Efforts should be made by the local governments to involve Local Councils at the village level, Non-Governmental Organisations and Civil Society Organisations in the mobilization of local people to attend the needs identification meetings. It is also recommended that planning and budgeting meetings should be organized more regularly with the involvement of all stakeholders in order to identify priority sectors where funds can be allocated in order to ensure effective service delivery. It is recommended that village planning meetings are organized but all effort should be made by the lower local government officials to ensure that local community members are well informed and are continuously reminded about the day, date and time of the meeting.*

Keywords; Community participation; Budget allocation, Local governments, Uganda

INTRODUCTION

The study established the relationship between community participation and budget allocation in local Governments in Uganda.

Gaventa and Valderrama (2009) define community participation as the intervention of citizens with determined social interests in public activities'. This can be directly or indirectly. Direct participation, the focus of this study, occurs where citizens - individually or in various forms of self-organization - are actively engaged in the decision-making processes on matters affecting them. Indirect participation is where citizens express their preferences through their elected and other representatives.

Rosen (2012) describes budget allocation as the taxing, spending and debt management of government, which influences resource allocation and income distribution. The spending portion covers the budget cycle, including budget preparation, internal controls, accounting, internal and external audit, procurement, and monitoring and reporting arrangements (Witt &Müller, 2016).

Background of the Study

The Government of Uganda (GoU) 2013 formalized community participation as an innovation to ensure the supervision, management and implementation of all aspects of local governance. These communities are community members and councilors. These communities 3 operate alongside other non-community stakeholders. It is relevant to note however that these two community

groups had earlier been in operation since the Uganda's independence in 1962. In other words they are not new phenomena. What is significant is that councilors were not as dominant in the past as they are now. This improved dominance was enabled by the GoU redefining their responsibilities to accommodate supervisory and managerial roles.

In Uganda, when the National Resistance Movement (NRM) government came to power in 1986, it initiated the process of empowering local governments through decentralization. This policy at the National level started in 1986 with the establishment of the resistance councils and committees (Kabwegyere, 2000). It was launched in October, 1992. However, due to absence of adequate finance and skilled personnel forced the government to apply the program to thirteen districts initially. Its main objectives among others were to increase democratic and popular participation through effective representation of the population and provision of opportunities for participation of the people in decision making.

From the bush days the NRM had put emphasis on the people becoming masters of their own destiny. As President Museveni put it in 1994, "we want to unleash local initiatives and invigorate the local democratic process, which together will sustain development and enhance local capacities for self-governance and service delivery" (Decentralization in Uganda No. 3: 3). In Uganda context, community participation is the direct involvement of people in budget allocation/spending, implementation of budgets, monitoring and sharing the benefits from them in order to achieve concrete development.

In Uganda, community participation is accorded as a right under Article 38 of the Constitution, which states: (i) Every Uganda citizen has the right to participate in the affairs of government, individually or through his or her representatives in accordance with law. (ii) Every Ugandan has a right to participate in peaceful activities to influence the policies of government through civil society organizations. The Constitution also provides for citizen involvement in the formulation and implementation of development plans and caters for systems and processes key to supporting the exercise of the right to participation such as for example provisions for the operation and independence of NGOs, including human rights institutions and state facilitation of the operations of the same (Mbazira, 2013).

Community participation takes different forms: indirect participation which involves representation through elected leadership such as local councils which can be targeted at special interest groups such as women, youth, the elderly and persons with disability, many of whom may be marginalized (socially, economically and politically). Direct participation involves personal engagement through platforms such as village meetings, local council meetings, budget conferences and Barazas which are intended to facilitate direct community participation in decision-making processes such as for example government budgeting and development planning cycles. In some instances, there are joint actions by citizens and civil society groups to interact with local government in policy-making, including consultation and joint projects (Chrispine, 2015).

Local governments in Uganda are in the business of providing essential services to its citizens. In order for the government to do that effectively, it relies on the revenue it collects from the citizens. If the citizens are not willing or motivated to pay taxes, levies and rates, the government cannot provide them with the basic services. For this reason, it is important that the government generates a conducive environment for cost recovery from its citizens. Devolution provided such an opportunity.

Citizens are now, more than ever before willing to pay any fees charged of them because they know the money would come back to them in response to their needs (Local Government Act, 1993). Further, devolution has developed a sense of ownership among the citizens because they are actively involved in the decision making and implementation of projects and programs meant for them. When the citizens are actively involved in governance, through public participation, there is likely to be growth in the counties in terms of better planning; projects are prioritized, citizen needs' targeted; government activities are better monitored, which in turn contributes to better governance; and increased effectiveness, that have a positive impact on governance. Therefore, every local government's budget, before its implementation, is subjected to public participation to ensure proper budget utilization, financial resource allocation to different areas, control of aggregate expenditure of financial resources and proper budget spending.

Rubanda district is a newly established district which was curved out of the greater Kabale district in 2016. By the end of the first quarter, Rubanda district received shillings 5,36 5,557,000 corresponding to 24.3% of the total annual budget instead of 25%. This down fall in revenue has been due to poor performance in donor funding which performed at 0.5% and other government transfers which performed at 16%. However, there was notable good performance in conditional government transfers which performed at 26.6%. More so, Rubanda district Local Government spent a total of 526,4904,000 in quarter one of which 3,101,821,000 is wage, 1,440,335,000 is non-wage recurrent, 664,537,000 is domestic development and 58,210,000 is donor funding (Rubanda Town Council Local Government Budget Framework Paper, 2018/19).

The community being the recipient of these services was required to participate in optioning the money to relevant sectors. The question lies on the issue whether community participation influences better budget allocation in order to option money to appropriate

sectors, ensure proper budget utilization, control of aggregate expenditure of financial resources and proper budget spending, hence the basis for conducting a study on community participation and budget allocation in lower local governments in Rubanda District.

Statement of the Problem

Rubanda District has been introduced and dedicated to providing better and equitable services to citizens through encouraging community participation in planning, budgeting and monitoring and evaluation of their budgets (Republic of Uganda, 2013). By the end of first quarter Rubanda District Local Government had spent as follows: administration had spent 45,000,000 corresponding to 26.5% of the annual expenditure, Finance and planning had spent 30,000,000 corresponding to 17.6% of the annual expenditure, Statutory bodies had spent 5,000,000 corresponding to 2.9% of the annual expenditure, Health had spent 34,000,000 corresponding to 20% of the annual expenditure, works department had spent 50,000,000 corresponding to 29.4% of the annual expenditure, Community Based services had received 6,000,000 corresponding to 3.6% of the annual budget. The government of Uganda introduced decentralization policy in order to give mandate to local governments to mobilise financial resources and allocate them to all its sectors and also ensure that community members freely participate in addressing issues that affect them. This is done through their elected representatives at the district and Sub County levels where planning and budgeting process and done. Despite the efforts by the government of Uganda, there is still poor budget allocation to priority sectors which was attributed to inadequate financial resources, limited control of aggregate expenditure of public resources and inefficient operational use of resources and poor budget spending (Rubanda District Local Government Budget Framework Paper, 2018/19). Based on this backdrop, the study was conducted to establish the relationship between community participation and budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government.

Purpose of the Study

The study established the relationship between community participation and budget allocation in local governments in Uganda.

Specific Objectives

i.   To establish the relationship between community consultation and budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government.

ii. To assess the relationship between community involvement in planning and budgeting process and budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government.

iii. To identify the constraints in community participation and budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study espoused a cross sectional survey research design because it was conducted in a short period of time and did not involve follow up of participants for a long time. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used to support the research design.

Study Population

The study population was 250 from Rubanda District Local Government. It comprised of technical planning committee, councilors, parish chiefs, LCI, LCII, LCIII and community members.

Sample Size Determination

The study used a sample size of 153 respondents which was derived from a population of 250. The sample size was determined using Slovens formula as indicated below;

$n = \dfrac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$ Where n is the sample size, N is the study population and e is the level of precision which is 0.05

$n = \dfrac{250}{1+250(0.05)^2} =$

$n = \dfrac{250}{1+250(0.0025)}$

$n = \dfrac{250}{1+0.625} = 143$

$$n = \frac{250}{1.625} = 153$$

Sampling Techniques

The researcher employed both purposive sampling and simple random sampling methods in the course of this study.

Purposive Sampling

Purposive sampling technique was used to select key informants to provide data regarding community participation and budget allocation in lower local governments. The respondents from technical planning committee, parish chiefs, councilors and respondents from local council II, III were purposively selected to provide specific data in the course of the study.

Simple Random Sampling

To ensure fair representation of the community the researcher employed simple random sampling technique to select members of the community and LCI chairpersons because the method would enable the researcher to raise the required number without bias.

Data Collection Instruments

The researcher used the following data collection instruments to collect data from the field;

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were used to collect data from technical staff, local council officials and councilors who were not available for interviews. Questionnaires was designed in likert format (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree) was used to collect primary data from respondents.

Interview Guide

Interview guide was used because it would help the researcher to understand the perceptions of the respondents better because it was a social encounter which catered for respondents who were more willing to talk than writing as they preferred to remain anonymous.

Data analysis

Qualitative data analysis was employed to analyze data through typing field notes, sorting and coding of responses after the data collection. Qualitative results were presented in a narrative form. Data obtained using questionnaires was analyzed using the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) computer package. Data analysis from questionnaires was done using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, mean and standard deviation. Inferential statistics in form of Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to establish the relationship between variables.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Response Rate

The study set out to cover 153 respondents but only 133 respondents were successfully covered indicating a response rate of 86.9 percent hence making the results highly representative enough.

Community Consultation on Budget Allocation in Rubanda District Local Government

Table 4.1 shows descriptive statistics on the community consultation and budget allocation

Table 4.1: Community Consultation and Budget Allocation in Rubanda District

Statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Mean	Std Dev
Community consultation empowers communities to participate in the budget spending to reduce resource wastage	32(24.1%)	40(30.1%)	8(6.0%)	36(27.1%)	17(12.8%)	3.95	2.03

Community consultation improves financial resource allocation to priority sectors	55(41.4%)	60(45.1%)	3(2.3%)	10(7.5%)	5(3.8%)	4.11	1.95
Community consultation ensures that there is revenue expenditure control and budget implementation reviews	37(27.8%)	60(45.1%)	15(11.3%)	15(11.3%)	6(4.5%)	3.96	2.05
There is proper budget utilization when community member are consulted as this helps to access information about their needs	35(31.6%)	59(44.4%)	10(7.5%)	12(9.0%)	10(7.5%)	3.95	2.03
Community consultation and provision of material incentive towards the community needs makes full use of the budgets that leads to a meaningful development	34(25.6%)	41(30.8%)	8(6.0%)	29(21.8%)	21(15.8%)	3.38	1.96
Community consultation on development projects by designing programmes improves on proper resource utilization to different sectors	27(20.3%)	42(31.6%)	12(9.0%)	24(18.0%)	24(18.0%)	3.35	1.94

Source: Field Data, 2020

Table 4.1 reveals that community consultation empowers communities to participate in the budget spending which reduces resource wastage was strongly agreed by 24.1% of the respondents, 30.1% of the respondents agreed, 6.0% undecided, 27.1% disagreed while 12.8% strongly disagreed and the respondent scored mean value was 3.95. The implication is that the majority of the respondents (54.2%) agreed with the view that community consultation promotes empowerment of community members in determining which amount of money is spend by a sector. The scored mean value of 3.95 implies that community consultation improved on community empowerment while the standard deviation of 2.03 implies there was variation in the responses.

Findings revealed that community consultation improves financial resource allocation to priority sectors was strongly agreed 41.4% of the respondents, 45.1% of the respondents agreed, 2.3% undecided 7.5% disagreed while 3.8% strongly disagreed. The scored mean value for this sub-construct was 4.11 and the standard deviation was 1.95. Since majority of the respondents agreed (86.5%), it implies that community consultation is encouraged to improve financial resource allocation to priority sectors. The mean value of 4.11 implies that community consultation improves financial resource allocation to priority sectors while the standard deviation of 1.95 implies higher variation in the responses.

The above findings are in harmony with Birskyte (2013) who states that participation by consultation of the community offers citizens a chance to prioritize the use and public money to provide services and thus reduces wastage. This suggests that community consultation is intended to allow citizens of specific jurisdiction to participate in decisions on the allocation and management of local government's available public financial resources to provide the needed services.

In support of the results, Gibson, Lacy, and Dougherty (2015) state that the local government in East African aims to ensure that citizens at the grassroots level are involved in the planning and implementation of development programs in their local areas through proper use of government money.

It was also revealed in the table that community consultation ensures there were revenue expenditure control and budget implementation reviews which improves on performance the council was strongly agreed by 27.8% of the respondents, 45.1% agreed, 11.3% undecided 11.3% disagreed while 4.6% strongly disagreed. The scored mean value for this sub-construct was 3.96 and the standard deviation was 2.05. The mean value of 2.05 implies that community participation was satisfactorily done to contribute to revenue expenditure control and budget implementation.

The findings concur with Siswana (2014) who asserts that community consultation helps to ensure that expenditure patterns in relation to programmes and projects occur within a budgeted vote to ensure that there is no wastage of resources.

Table 4.1 clearly reveals that 31.6% of the respondents strongly agreed, 44.4% of the respondents agreed, 7.5% were undecided, 9.0% disagreed while 7.5% strongly disagreed that there is proper budget utilization when community member are consulted as this helps to access information about needs. The scored mean value for this item was 3.95 and the standard deviation was 2.03. The findings mean that majority of the respondents (76.0%) agreed with the statement that here is proper budget utilization when community member are consulted as this helps to know their needs. The scored mean value of 3.95 implies that community consultation promotes proper budget allocation. The standard deviation implies there was much variation in the responses.

More still, community consultation and provision of material incentive towards the community needs makes full use of the budgets that leads to a meaningful development was strongly agreed by 25.6% of the respondents, 30.8% of the respondents agreed, 6.0% undecided, 21.8% disagreed while 15.8% strongly disagreed. The mean score value for this item was 3.38 and the standard deviation was 1.96 implying that community consultation in paramount in the provision of material incentive towards the community needs makes full use of the budgets that leads to a meaningful development.

The table above shows that community consultation on development projects by designing programmes improves on proper resource utilization to different sectors was strongly agreed by 20.3% of the respondents, 31.6% agreed, 9.0% undecided, 18.0% disagreed while 18.0% strongly disagreed. The means value for this parameter was 3.35 and the standard deviation was 1.94 indicating that community consultation ensures control of social and economic institutions which improved on proper resource utilization to different sectors in Rubanda District Local Government.

Table 4.2: Correlation between Community Consultation and Budget Allocation

		Community consultation	Budget Allocation
Community consultation	Pearson Correlation	1	0.684**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	133	133
Budget Allocation	Pearson Correlation	0.684**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	133	133
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Source: Field Data, 2020

Table 4.2 shows that Pearson's Correlation Coefficient for community consultation and budget performance was r = 0.684 which was positive meaning that as community consultations increase, improved budget performance is realised. The findings indicate that empowering communities to participate in the budget spending, involvement in financial resource allocation to priority sectors, revenue expenditure control and budget implementation reviews and proper budget utilization through community consultation improves on budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government.

Community Involvement in Planning and Budgeting Process and Budget Allocation in Rubanda District Local Government

Table 4.3 shows responses on involvement of community in planning and budgeting process and budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government.

Table 4.3: Community Involvement in Planning and Budgeting Process and Budget Allocation in Rubanda District Local Government

Statement	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Mean	Std Dev

Involvement of the community in budget implementation contributes to proper budgets spending and successful plans	20(15.0%)	27(20.3%)	1 (0.8%)	47(35.3%)	39(29.3%)	2.07	1.40
The community is involved in setting village development priorities and the amount of money to be spent on those priorities to improve service delivery	28(21.1%)	50(37.6%)	4(3.0%)	32(24.1%)	19(14.3%)	3.95	2.03
Appropriate local government revenue spending to priority areas is always guided by the committee involving community members	28(21.1%)	44(33.1%)	7(5.3%)	29(21.8%)	25(18.8%)	3.38	1.96
The amount allocated to all sectors is adequate and properly utilised and this determined by the community involvement	18(13.5%)	30(22.6%)	12(9.0%)	46(34.6%)	27(20.3%)	2.23	1.88

Source: Field Data, 2020

Table 4.3 indicates that involvement of the involvement of the community in budget implementation contributes to proper budgets spending and successful plans was strongly agreed by 15.0% of the respondents, 20.3% of the respondents agreed, 0.8% were undecided, 35.3% disagreed while 29.3% strongly disagreed, indicating that the majority of the respondents disagreed implying that community involvement did not ensure proper budgets spending and successful plans. The scored mean value for this sub-construct was 2.07 and standard deviation was 1.40 signifying that community participation in planning and budgeting to ensure proper budgets and successful plans was not satisfactory.

Table 4.3 also reveals that respondents' views on the second item, that is the community is involved in setting village development priorities and the amount of money to be spent on those priorities to improve service delivery, the findings revealed that 21.1% of the respondents strongly agreed, 37.6% agreed, 3.0% of the of the respondents undecided, 24.1% disagreed and 14.3% strongly disagreed with the statement. Since majority of the respondents (58.7) of the respondents agreed, it implies that the community participation in setting village development priorities and the amount of money to be spent on those priorities was encouraged to improve service delivery. The scored mean value for this item was 3.95 while the standard deviation was 2.03. This implied that the community needs and priorities were identified by the community and they were also involved in in budget allocation and spending to those priorities.

Appropriate local government revenue spending to priority areas is always guided by the committee involving community members was strongly agreed by 21.1% of the teachers, 33.2% agreed, 5.3% of the teachers undecided, 21.8% disagreed while 18.8% strongly disagreed. The majority of the respondents (54.3%) felt that community members were also involved in local government revenue spending. Since majority of the respondents agreed, it implies that expenditure of lower local government revenue in Rubanda District Local Government is always done in line with the approved budget. The scored mean value for this item was 3.38 which shows that expenditure of lower local government revenue in Rubanda District Local Government was always done in line with the approved budget were satisfactory.

More still, findings indicated that 13.5% of the respondents strongly agreed, 22.6% agreed, 9.0% undecided, 34.6% of the respondents disagreed while 20.3% strongly disagreed. From the findings majority (54.9%) of the respondents disagreed implying that the amount allocated to all sectors were not adequate and properly utilised and this was not determined by the community involvement but rather the top administrators of Rubanda District Local Government. The scored mean value for this item was 2.23 which show that the amount allocated to all sectors were not adequate and properly utilised and determined by community involvement was not satisfactory. The standard deviation was 1.88. This indicates there was some variation in the respondents' views on this item.

Table 4.4: Correlation between Planning and Budgeting Process and Budget Allocation

	Community involvement in Planning and Budgeting Process	Budget Allocation

Community involvement in Planning and Budgeting Process	Pearson Correlation	1	.530**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	133	133
Budget Allocation	Pearson Correlation	.512**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	133	133
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Source: Field Data, 2020

Based on Table 4.4 above, the study found out that a significant positive relationship existed between budget implementation and budget performance (.512**) in Rubanda District Local Government which suggests that increased community participation through community involvement in budget implementation, setting village development priorities and the amount of money to be spent on those priorities, appropriate local government revenue spending to priority areas and ensuring adequate and properly utilization of funds would improve on budget performance in form of resource allocation to different areas, budget utilization and control of expenditure.

Constraints of Community Participation and Budget Allocation in Rubanda District Local Government

The findings in the table below show the constraints of community participation and budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government.

Table 4.5: Constraints of Community Participation and Budget Allocation in Rubanda District Local Government

Statements	SA	A	UD	D	SD	Mean	Std Dev
Absence of logistics such as food and drinks	45(33.8%)	43(32.3%)	6(4.5%)	27(20.3%)	12(9.0%)	3.52	1.47
Time when the meeting is called is sometimes not favourable for community members to get involved	42(31.6%)	61(45.9%)	5(3.8%)	14(10.5%)	11(8.3%)	3.64	1.39
Delayed implementation of projects and programmes	22(16.5%)	70(52.6%)	8(6.0%)	23(17.3%)	10(7.5%)	3.64	1.39
Inadequate access to information by public	44(33.1%)	39(29.3%)	17(12.8%)	22(16.5%)	11(8.3%)	2.23	1.88
Limited funds and diversion of finance to other sectors	27(20.3%)	50(37.6%)	11(8.3%)	28(21.1%)	17(12.8%)	3.95	2.03

Source: Field Data, 2020

From the table absence of logistics such as food and drinks was strongly agreed by 33.8% of the respondents, 32.3% agreed, 4.5% undecided, 20.3% disagreed while 9.0% strongly disagreed. The mean score value for this item was 3.52 and the standard deviation was 1.47 implying that the no food and drinks would be provided during planning meetings with community members.. From the findings, it can be seen that the majority of the respondents (66.1%) agreed implying that in order to enhance community participation adequate logistics such as food and drinks should be provided during planning meetings and budget allocation at all local government levels.

Time when the meetings were called was sometimes not favourable for community members to get involved was strongly agreed by 31.1% of the respondents, 45.9% of the respondents agreed, 3.8% undecided, 10.5 disagreed while 8.3% strongly disagreed. Since the mean value for this item is 3.64 and the standard deviation is 1.39, it implies that sometimes, time when the meetings were called was not favourable for community members to get involved in in planning and budgeting for resource allocation

From the table, delayed implementation of projects and programmes was strongly agreed by 16.5% of the respondents, 52.6% of the respondents agreed, 6.0% undecided, 17.3% disagreed while 7.5% strongly disagreed. The mean and the standard deviation for this item is 3.69 and 1.40 respectively. Since majority of the respondents agreed, it implies that there was always delayed implementation of projects and programmes in lower local governments in Rubanda District Local Government.

Furthermore, inadequate access to information by public was strongly agreed by 33.1% of the respondents, 29.3% agreed, 12.8% undecided, 16.5%) disagreed while 8.3% strongly disagreed. Since majority of the respondents agreed, it implies that community members could not participate in budget allocation due to limited access to information. There is therefore need for public awareness so that community members can fully participate in needs identification so that there is proper financial allocation and budget utilization by priority sectors.

The findings are in agreement with Rondinelli (2015) who states that systematic planning procedures require information and data which observed was simply not available in most developing countries. In support of the findings, Lukwiya (2014) further noted that these materials are not properly kept. In most cases, they are found scattered in files. This, as a result, has led to administrators using whatever data is at hand regardless of their appropriateness or accuracy. In addition, there is also a tendency for planners to use information and data that can be easily gathered or manipulated by statistical methods. Quantification, therefore, makes the planning and analytical procedures ends in themselves. Information and data generated should be up to date and adequately disaggregated in order to meet the demands of planning.

Poppe (2014) also supports the findings that lack of information flows between the communities and planning professionals, poor access can constrain participation in the planning process. This study therefore tried to investigate and establish how availability of information /data affects bottom-up planning in decentralized local governments in Uganda.

The hindrance of limited funds and diversion of finance to other sectors other than those identified by the community was strongly agreed by 20.3% of the respondents, 37.6% of the respondents agreed, 8.3% undecided, 21.1% disagreed while 12.8% strongly disagreed. The mean value for this subcontract is 3.95 while the standard deviation was 2.03 implying that there was finance diversion in Rubanda District Local Government.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

Relationship between Community Consultation and Budget Allocation in Rubanda District Local Government
The study established that there was a positive significant relationship between community consultation and budget allocation in lower local governments. The study established it was established that community consultation empowered communities to participate in the budget spending which reduces resource wastage, improves financial resource allocation to priority sectors, ensured revenue expenditure control and budget implementation reviews which improves on performance Rubanda District Local Government and contributed to proper budget utilization when community member were consulted as this helps to know their needs.

Relationship between Community Involvement in Planning and Budgeting Process and Budget Allocation in Rubanda District Local Government
The study established that there was a significant positive relationship between community involvement in planning and budgeting process and budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government (.512**) which suggests that increased community involvement in budget planning and budgeting process improves on budget allocation in form of resource allocation to different areas, budget utilization and control of expenditure.

Constraints of Community Participation and Budget Allocation in Rubanda District Local Government
The study established that community members were not effectively facilitated and funds were not adequately available to facilitate the community members in budget allocation and this led to further delays in budget implementation. There was no existing reliable information gathering mechanism which could enable the administrators to get up-to- date data that could influence and improve the quality of budget spending and utilisation. Also, the absence of up- to- date data adversely affected both the budget allocation and

the quality of development plans generated at the town council and sub-county level and this ultimately affects the quality of the district plan. It can therefore be said that the limited and inadequate participation of the local people in the planning process for budget utilization and spending, especially due absence of information to create awareness of the planning meetings and the failure of the technocrats to put in action the priority projects identified by the local people among others have negatively affected the budget allocation in Rubanda District Local Government.

Limited local people's participation affects the budget allocation and the quality and relevance of the budget in financing priority needs that are finally made is negatively affected. Since the turn up for the planning meetings is low, there was poor budget spending and financial resource allocation. The plans where resources were spent were in most cases those produced by the technocrats and the bureaucrats and could not perfectly reflect the priorities of the local people.

Recommendations

The Central Government should provide funds to the Local Government purposely for community sensitization and organization to increase on community participation budget allocation. The local council leaderships should be provided with funds to enable them effectively reach to the villagers and sensitize them about the need for effective participation. Concerted effort should be made by involving development workers who will be expected to increase awareness of the local people by informing them the benefits of participating in development planning.

Efforts should be made by the local governments to involve local councils at the village level, Non-Governmental Organisations and Civil Society Organisations in the mobilization of local people to attend the needs identification meetings.

It is also recommended that in order to increase community participation, officials follow procedures stipulated for in the Local Government Act. It is important to follow the requirements like gazetted bye- laws on public sensitization on development projects and dates on which community planning meetings are to be held should be made public and people should be practically made to know and appreciate the benefits of being part of the planning process.

The study further recommends that planning meetings should be organized more regularly by local government officials and the people should always be informed of the progress or delays in the implementation. It is important that village planning meetings are organized in conjunction with the local leaders and local government officials who should be able to inform the villagers about the operation of Local Governments.

REFERENCES

Birskyte, L. (2017), Involving citizens in public decision making in Lithuania. *Financial theory   and practice, 37*(4), 383-402.
Chrispine, M., (2015), Participation's place in rural development: Seeking clarity through specificity. *World Development* 1: 213 – 235.
Gaventa, J. and Valderrama, C., (2009), Participation, Citizenship and Local Governance. Background note prepared for workshop on 'Strengthening Participation in Local   Governance'. Institute of Development Studies, June 21-24, 2009. [Online] Available at http://www.uv.es/~fernandm/Gaventa,%20Valderrama.pdf [Accessed July 5, 2012]
Gibson, E., Lacy, W., and Dougherty, G., (2015), County government budget implementation. *Financial   reporting   and management conference for county governments and assemblies   - travellers beach hotel Mombasa.* Mombasa: Office of the Budget Controller.
Kabwegyere, T., (2000), People's choice, people's power: challenges and prospects of democracy   in   Uganda,   4th   editions, published in *2000* in English, UK.
Lukwiya O. (2015), *District Development Plan in Institute of Local Government Studies, 1987,   Development   of   Local Administration in Uganda.* A compendium of workshop papers, Birmingham United Kingdom.
Mbazira, B., (2013), *Effects of government spending on economic growth in Kenya.* Unpublished   Masters of   Science   project. University of Nairobi.
Poppe, Manfred (2014), "*Towards an Organizational framework for District Development Planning and Management* "in Jenssen B (ed) 2014: Planning as a Dialogue. Dortmund.
Republic of Uganda Ministry of Local Government. (2013). *LGMSD Operational Manual 2011.* Kampala: Ministry of Local Government.
Rondinelli, D.A, and Cheema, S.G., (2007), Decentralizing Governance, *Emerging Concepts and Practices*
Rosen, A.N.M. (2016), An Empirical Investigation on the Nexus between Tax Revenue and Government Spending: The Case of Turkey. *International Research Journal of Finance   and Economics, 16, 46-51.*
Rubanda Local Government Budget Framework Paper, (2018/19).

Siswana (2014), Participatory Budgeting in Europe: potential and challenges. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 32*(1), 164-178.

Uganda Debt Network (2006). How prop-poor are local government budgets in Uganda? Retrieved November 10th 2013 from http://www.udn.or.ug/wp- content/uploads/2013/09/UDN-Pro-poor-Budgeting.pdf.

Uganda Government, Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995: Entebbe: Government Printer.