Chapter 1: Introduction

One key important potential forum for popular participation in development and decision-making processes is Parliament. Parliament is used to describe an institution of consultative government; an assembly of representatives of a political nation or people, often the supreme law-making authority and symbol of national sovereignty (Wilding, N. and Laundy, P. 1968). As the Central institution of democracy through which the will of the people is expressed, in a normal arrangement, Parliament should provide opportunities for grassroots participation as it executes its roles of legislation, executive oversight and representation. As a unique elected body that represents society in all its diversity, Parliament has a unique responsibility for reconciling the conflicting interests and expectations of different groups and communities through the democratic means of dialogue and compromise.

This report has therefore sought through a case study of popular participation in parliamentary processes in Kawambwa District investigated whether, indeed there is popular and effective participation in whatever is happening at the National Assembly of Zambia and it has also highlighted that enhancing participation, communication, responsiveness and accountability of the development process to the citizenry is central to the process of good governance.

Further, the task of this research was to ascertain the weaknesses in the current communication and participatory approaches used by the National Assembly of Zambia and to highlight this aspect, at least to confront the Zambian parliamentarians with the new reality of their functions and the changing imperatives of the present, leading to the future and also bearing in mind that Parliament is the primary constituency in terms of communication to link the people to government. Both parliament and parliamentarians have a responsibility and challenge to ensure the sustenance of a participatory development process.

1.1 Background to the Study

Literature on development studies shows the centrality of people-participation in development initiatives if such programmes are to respond to their needs and aspirations in a meaningful way. That means creating opportunities for purposive interaction that

helps the people as primary stakeholders to gain access to decision making processes. This can either be directly or through legitimate institutionalised bodies such as parliament, community-based organisations and non-governmental organisations that represent their interests in development projects (Maiti, 2008). The stakeholders' consultative process that emerges as a result of participatory development contends that community involvement is imperative in all development processes from formulation stage to implementation and evaluation.

The debate on the centrality of popular and effective participation in all development initiatives has its roots in the late 1960s and has been extensively documented. In the 1970s and early 1980s the debate was concerned with how to facilitate access, to and participation in, development processes. It focused on groups, communities, regions and nations previously excluded from such access. More recently the emphasis has come to be placed on the notion of 'participatory development' or how to make development programmes and projects more 'participatory' and thus more likely to achieve their expected outcomes (Galjart, 1982; Stiefel & Wolfe, 1994; World Bank, 1994).

Currently, according to Oakley, (1991) understandings and interpretation of the term 'participation' have two broad contexts within which the concept is relevant to the development:

a) Participation in the democratic sense of people's rights to take part in national and local political processes and decision-making; and

b) Participation in an operational sense which is linked to a concrete development intervention. Participation, therefore, is not just an operational concept, but one which takes into the wider arena of the nature, role and relationships of the state and civil society.

People-Participation in the Zambian Context

In order for one to fully appreciate "participation" in the Zambian context, it is imperative to examine its historical background and not assume that 'participation' is merely a contemporary discourse.

Eradicating poverty in any society tends to be difficult as long as the people themselves do not participate in the initiatives, processes and indeed institutions that are set to fight poverty. For African countries, the need to put in place structures that promote and support the participation of the people in determining the direction and content of their socio-political and economic development is indeed urgent. This is aptly summed in the African Charter for Popular Participation in Development and Transformation:

> It is manifestly unacceptable that development and transformation in Africa can proceed without the full participation of its people. It is manifestly unacceptable that the people and their organisations be excluded from the decision-making process. It is manifestly unacceptable that popular participation be seen as anything less than the centrepiece in the struggle to achieve economic and social justice for all. In promoting popular participation, it is necessary to recognise that a new partnership and compact must be forged among all the actors in the process of social, political and economic change. Without this collective commitment, popular participation is neither possible nor capable of producing results. We, therefore, pledge to work together in the new partnership to promote full and effective participation by the masses together with Government in the recovery and development process in Africa (*African Charter for Popular Participation, 1990*).

The fundamental perception, that people, participation and democracy must be the hand-maiden of Africa's development mission and vision. This is a major underpinning of a paradigm trend towards a total re-orientation of national policies and re-imagining the relationship between the state and the citizens. States must recognise that development springs from the collective imagination, experience and decision of the cultural make-up, skills, needs and aspirations of individuals and communities.

One key important potential forum for popular participation in development and decision-making processes is Parliament. As the central institution of democracy through which the will of the people is expressed, Parliament provides opportunities for grassroots participation as it executes its roles of legislation, executive oversight and representation. The legislature as the legitimate representative of the people in any democratic country deals with what the Italian political theorist Norberto Bobbio (1987) has termed the 'broken promise' of democracy, that is the 'contrast between what was promised and what has actually come about'.

The Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU, 2006) observes that in order to remain relevant, Parliaments of the world need to make efforts "…to become more genuinely representative of their electorates, more accessible and accountable to them, more open and transparent in their procedures and more effective in their tasks of legislation and oversight of government."

A number of countries such as Zimbabwe, Canada, South Africa and Uganda have undertaken parliamentary reforms with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of their legislature in executing its mandate. The reform of the legislature is crucial in enhancing the democratic system of any country and democratic processes the world over now demand greater participation of the public in decision-making and more transparency in governance. Zambia is among several countries in both the developed and developing world that embarked on a series of Parliamentary reforms from 1992 to date.

The pre-reform period (1972-1992) for the Parliament of Zambia was characterised by limited scope of public participation in parliamentary processes. For instance, committee hearing were held in camera with little or no public input. Parliament was viewed as rubber-stamping legislation that was crafted by the Executive with no input from committees, interested parties and stakeholders. There was also no room for the press to attend and report on parliamentary proceedings. These and other aspects limited the democratic space, and therefore, there were calls for parliamentary reforms.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The political context of socio-economic development in Zambia has been characterised, in many instances, by an over-centralization of power and impediments to the effective participation of the majority of the people in social, political, and economic development. As a result, the motivation of the Zambian people and their organizations to contribute to the development process has been severely curtailed and their collective and individual creativity has been under-utilized. This research has sought to determine how the Zambian nation can be built using the popular support and full participation of the people in parliamentary processes as a springboard.

The research stems from a basic awareness of the strategic importance of parliament in the development process. In the face of the gradual transition to more participatory democracy, the Parliament of Zambia should have greater responsibilities thrust upon it. For it to cope with the demands of the Zambian people, the Parliament of Zambia requires not merely awareness of its role and function but also to deal with people's expectations, which constitute the source of its relevance in the public sphere.

The task of this research was to ascertain the weaknesses in the current communication and participatory approaches used by the National Assembly of Zambia and to highlight this aspect, at least to confront the Zambian parliamentarians with the new reality of their functions and the changing imperatives of the present, leading to the future. Parliament is the primary constituency in terms of communication to link the people to government. Both parliament and parliamentarians have a responsibility and challenge to ensure the sustenance of a participatory development process.

1.3 Justification/rationale of the study

There are many reasons that prompted the researcher to conduct a study of popular and effective participation in parliamentary processes in Kawambwa District that focuses on the Parliament of Zambia.

It was necessary to undertake this study to:

- Assess whether people's participation in the development of their communities is considered to be an integral part of the ideal and practice of democracy?
- Whether this involvement reflects the aspirations of the people and their elected representatives?
- Whether the involvement of the people entails allowing them to discover the possibilities of exercising choice and thereby managing their own development.
- Whether people's participation implies an increased role in the developmental activities taking place in their constituencies
- And to find out what has changed at the Zambian Parliament after under going parliamentary reforms.

It is manifestly unacceptable that development and transformation in Zambia can proceed without the full participation of its people. It is manifestly unacceptable that the people and their organization be excluded from the decision-making process. It is manifestly unacceptable that popular participation be seen as anything less than the centre piece in the struggle to achieve economic and social justice for all. Once these and many other issues are interrogated, the results of the research study should convince and provide justification to policy-makers for the necessity of popular participation in development. The results of the study, if shared with the Zambian community, might galvanize the people to action. If the findings are positive, the community can be shown that they are already doing a good job with regard to popular participation in development and should keep it up. If the results are negative, this could also serve as a catalyst for discussions with the community on the most appropriate means of action.

The study will serve as a reference point or benchmark for later comparison or impact studies to assess the effect of participatory methodologies in the development process. If conducted properly, results of the research can be generalised and used for communities and institutions with similar characteristics.

1.4 **Aims and Objectives of the Study**

    General Objective

- The main objective of this study was to do a case study of the Zambian Parliament and investigate popular participation in parliamentary processes in Kawambwa District.

    Specific Objectives

- To highlight that enhancing the participation, communication, responsiveness and accountability of the development process to the citizenry is central to the process of good governance.
- To show that parliamentary control of the development process is an appropriate political arrangement for ensuring communication and responsiveness of the development process to the needs of the people.
- Evaluate the extent to which the Legislature in Zambia is open and responsive enough for public participation in its business.
- To bring out ways and means of making the development process participatory, responsive and accountable to the people through avenues provided by Parliament as the central institution of democracy.

1.5 **Research Questions**

The study will attempt to answer the following questions:

- Is there popular political participation in Zambia?
- Does popular participation by the Zambian people constitute a fundamental part of charting a sustainable path for the country?
- Is effective communication and utilization of human resources at all levels key to the promotion of participatory development?
- What role has Parliament played in the participatory development process since independence?

- How has Parliament included the people in these processes to foster participatory democracy?
- Will signing of a social contract by the elected representatives address the issue of under representation and under development in constituencies?
- How does parliamentary/legislative control of the development process promote participation, communication and responsiveness of the development process to the people?
- What tools and techniques are available for parliamentary control of bureaucracies for promoting popular participation, communication, responsiveness and accountability of the development process?

1.6 Assumptions of the Study

In essence the theory of representative government suggests that being closest to the people, parliament is assumed to promote and facilitate people's participation in development. On the basis of this proposition, this research is underpinned by the following assumptions:

- Effective communication and popular participation will improve the delivery and effectiveness of development programmes
- Effective communication and popular participation will lead to good governance and equitable development.
- Effective communication and popular participation allows people to take part in the decision-making process.
- The study also assumes that the socio-economic and political environment will be conducive for conducting the research.

1.7 Significance of the Study

In the past, the structure and functions of the Parliament of Zambia have been dissected, examined microscopically and left to dry on the sometimes arid branches of scholarship by political scientists, research analysts employed by private foundations, and others. Some of these have been historical in nature. More have

been both descriptive and comparative; analysing the structures of parliament, the functions it performs, and the activities it employs to accomplish its goals. However, the communicative and participative aspects of the Parliament of Zambia frequently have been neglected. As a result of this neglect, current knowledge of communication and participation is fragmentary and inadequate for general use by either the government officials or the observer.

This research should be of significance to the domain of effective communication and participatory development as it extends the knowledge base that currently exists in that field. The concept of effective communication and popular participation in development is relatively new to the Zambian society. The handful of non-governmental organisations, Village Development Committees (Vidcos), Ward Development Committees (Wadcos) and other institutions that have chosen to embrace the concept and implemented it have welcomed the benefits it has to offer (World Bank 1994). Therefore, research which explores the advantages of such participatory methodologies will help to raise awareness among those who are unacquainted with its potential applications and benefits within their sitting.

To illustrate the potential of effective communication and popular participation the research investigates the Parliament of Zambia. It is hoped that the findings from the study will influence the methods by which development programmes are currently undertaken in Zambia. The interest among educators is evident from the growth of literature on popular participation in development not only in Zambia but the world over.

This research is also poised to expand the general knowledge base for further research into the area of popular participation in development especially as it relates to Parliament. The research is also likely to influence the following categories of people: policy-makers, government policy implementers (Bureaucrats), development theorists, NGOs, Cabinet, and local authorities.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

The study focuses only on one institution involved in the development process, the Parliament of Zambia since the one Party state to date. It looks at Parliament and, where appropriate, related institutions such as cabinet, the judiciary and local government.

CHAPTER 2:   Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Conceptually, this research was bound within the framework of studying people, participation and development: a case study of popular and effective participation in parliamentary processes in Kawambwa District.

Participatory development planning has increasingly gained centre-stage in the development process in African countries. In advocating the involvement of community members in the process of development, participatory development as a movement has become so obsessed with the concept that it is presented as a "religious theory". Yet by virtue of its broad nature, participation in development means different things to different people and the term is, therefore, wide open to interpretations.

This research was an attempt to understand Zambia's development problems and the prospects for popular and effective participation and in doing so adopts the people-centred theory, which was an offshoot of the modernisation school of thought. The people–centred approach to development views an individual not as a subject but as an actor who defines the goals, controls the resources, and directs processes affecting his/ her life (Korten, 1984:21). The key elements of this approach are:

(a) Empowerment
(b) Development of an administrative process which respond to the needs of the people.
(c) Human growth and well-being
(d) Equality
(e) Self-reliance
(f) Participation
(g) Communication and
(h) Sustainability

The 'man-centred' development is associated with increasing concern about the non-economic aspects of development. Development is conceived and measured not only in economic terms but also in terms of social well-being, political structure and the quality

of the entire environment. Development thus defined as 'growth plus change'. The strategic framework to development here consists of two central, mutually reinforcing elements: economic growth and investment in people. One without the other is not enough – as highlighted by *World Development Report* (WDR) 1990.

Development must bring about an improvement in the living conditions of people. It should, therefore, ensure the provision of basic human needs for all: not just food and clothing but also shelter, health care and education. This simple but powerful proposition is often forgotten in the pursuit of material wealth and the conventional concerns of economics.

There are three fundamental points of departure from the prevalent orthodoxy, which deserve emphasis. First, the people-centred approach starts from the premise that the well being of humankind is the essence of development. This is often forgotten in the dominant discourse, where aggregate growth figures or the pro-corporate concept of "economic freedom" get more attention than the well being of people. The focus, therefore, must be on people, ordinary people.

Second, the people-centre approach essentially makes a clear distinction between means and ends. Economic growth and economic efficiency are means. Economic development and social progress are ends. Similarly, trade is a means, while development is an end. All these are often forgotten in much of the current debate.

Third, the approach recognises that economic growth is necessary but not sufficient to bring about the eradication of poverty. It can not suffice to say that the outcomes of economic policies, which ensure growth with efficiency, should be moderated by social policies, say in the form of safety nets. The dichotomy between economic and social development is inadequate just as the dichotomy between economic and social policies is inappropriate (*World Development Report, 1990).*

Hence, as in industrial societies, there is a clear need for integration, rather than a separation, of economic and social policies. At the same time, it is important to create institutional mechanisms that mediate between economic growth and social

development. The people-centred approach stresses that the time has come to explore alternatives in development, where the focus is on people rather than economies, and on ends rather than means.

2.1 Definition of Terms

Several terms used in the on-going work are based on very controversial definitions like poverty, empowerment, and participatory development. Therefore, some explanations might be needed.

People

Politicians spend most of their working lives talking about "the people". However, do they actually know about "these people" they talk about? For the purposes of this research, the word people will be taken to mean the body of persons who compose a community or nation (*Dictionary of the English Language, 4ᵗʰ Edition*, 2000 by Houghton Mifflin Co).

Democracy

"Democracy" may be a word familiar to most, but it is a concept still misunderstood and misused in a time when totalitarian and military dictatorship alike have attempted to claim popular support by pinning democratic labels upon themselves. In the dictionary definition, democracy "is government by the people in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised directly by them or by their elected agents under a free electoral system" *(Cambridge International Dictionary of English, 1995)*.

Freedom and democracy are often used interchangeably, but the two are not synonymous. Democracy is indeed a set of ideas and principles about freedom, but it also consists of a set of practices and procedures that have been moulded through a long, often tortuous history. In short, democracy is the institutionalisation of freedom. For this reason, it is possible to identify the time-tested fundamentals of constitutional government, human rights, and equality before the law that any society must possess to

13

be properly called democratic. For the purpose of this study, therefore, the working definition of democracy will be taken within both the context defined in the dictionary and the one espoused by Abraham Lincoln which says that democracy is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people (Lincoln, 1809-1865).

Development

According to Bwalya (2008) development is a process directed at outcomes which involve improved standards of living and a high capacity of self reliance. It is a positive change from conditions based on the social situations that are not considered to be good enough for the goals and aspirations of the people to conditions that are considered to be better so that people's goals and aspirations are met.

Development often takes place in uneven way, resulting in some countries being more developed in some ways than in others. A country may be economically developed, with a very high Gross Domestic Product (GDP) – derived, for example, from the exploitation of rich oil reserves – while segments of the population still live in poverty and lack access to basic education, health and decent housing.

Hence the importance of human development indicators for example, life expectancy, infant mortality rate, poverty indices. These non-economic aspects of a country's development, therefore, help to give a more balanced view of what constitutes development (Kosnetz, 1972, Haq and Streeten, 1990).

Parliament

Parliament is used to describe an institution of consultative government; an assembly of representatives of a political nation or people, often the supreme law-making authority and symbol of national sovereignty (Wilding, N. and Laundy, P. 1968).

Poverty

Poverty shall not be understood only as a very low state of people's income or assets. These indicators are often not comparable and do not describe the complex dimensions of the problem. Poverty shall be understood instead as the opposite of well-being in as many dimensions based on the expansion or reduction of capabilities and freedoms. On the other hand, it emphasises especially the individuals subjective perspective of feeling poor or non-poor, which is most real but generally is not included in important assessment of living conditions because this (subjective) reality is not easy to analyse quantitatively. In this study, poverty will therefore, be taken to mean the lack of something essential for a human being's survival or that the quality of it is extremely low (CSO, 2001).

Participation

Participation should be as self-explaining as democracy and has probably as many interpretations as democracy has and this is politically relevant. There has been a demand for participation of "the poor" by many grass-root organizations as an answer to the general politics of donor agencies (representing the rich, colonising, industrialised counties) treating "the poor" like objects or target population and beneficiaries. This demand for participation was based on a fundamentally different approach to the mainstream development approach. It does not classify people and entire populations into beneficiaries or recipients of charities and funds on one side and donors and developers on the other side but is based on the conviction that all human beings (individuals and groups, ethnics) must have the right to participate in decisions and above all to decide on their own destiny, on their "development". Nowadays almost all development projects try to use a participatory approach" for the sake of political correctness. However, in very few cases "development initiatives" are limited and decided by the "target population" in a participative process (Regula Zuger, 2005).

Todaro and Smith (2003) defined participation as the various processes by which various individuals in society are able to play a role in determining how their society should be organised. They argue that this is a measure of whether or not they are

allowed or enabled to play a role and to what degree they may do so. In fact, Todaro and Smith (ibid) make the point that when people label some states as "democratic", "totalitarian" and "populist", they are making a comment on their perception of the degree of political participation that each relevant population is allowed. For the purposes of this study, participation will refer to involvement by local populations in the creation, content and conduct of a program or policy designed to change their lives.

There are also other types of participation and these are:

- **Passive Participation**: People participate by being told what is going to happen or what has already happened. This tends to be a unilateral announcement and people's responses are not taken into account.

- **Participation by giving information**: People participate by answering questions, designed by researchers and project managers. They do not have the opportunity to influence proceedings as the findings are neither shared nor checked for accuracy.

- **Participation by consultation**: People participate by being consulted, and external agents listen to views. External agents define both problems and solutions, and may modify these in the light of people's responses. People do not share in decision making as their views may or may not be taken on board.

- **Participation for material incentives**: People participate by providing resources (for example, labour in return for food or cash). Such people are not involved in the experimentation and have no stake in monitoring activities when the incentives end.

- **Functional participation**: people participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives related to the project. Their participation tends to occur at later stages of a project after major decisions have been made. They may become self-dependant but are initially dependant on external facilitators (www.uvm.edu. Down loaded on 11th July 2011)

Empowerment

Empowerment is also a heavily overloaded term; Sen says - everybody uses his/her own definition. Again the researcher will take the notion in the sense as Amartya Sen takes Marx's notion of "replacing the domination of circumstances and chance by the domination of individuals over chance and circumstances" (Sen, 1990). This seems to be quite comprehensive. Empowerment in that sense obviously is not easy to assess. In most cases project leaders will show in their evaluations that people have been "empowered" by proving participants' knowledge, degree of application of learning contents, organizational changes, may be they show how many participants did secure a job after a respective education. These results concerning empowerment do not (or in few cases) refer to the term empowerment in the sense of "replacing the domination of circumstances and chance by the domination of individuals over chance and circumstances". This research wants to go beyond whether there are sustainable changes inside people's realities, they feel different or they are different after an empowerment process. For the purposes of this study empowerment will be taken to mean the act of giving someone the official or legal authority or freedom to participate in the development process.

Communication

Communication is the sharing of ideas and information. While many people think of communication primarily in oral or written form, communication is much more. A knowing look or a gentle touch can also communicate a message loud and clear, as can a hard push or an angry slap. Communication is defined as:
- The act of transmitting
- A giving or exchange of information, signal, or messages as by talk, gestures, or writing
- The information, signal or message
- Close, sympathetic relationship
- A means of communicating; specific, a system for sending and receiving messages, as by telephone, telegram, radio, television, phone etc.
- The science of transmitting information especially in symbols.

This definition suggests that there can be several different types of communication, falling into the categories of non-verbal or verbal. Non-verbal involves exchanging information or transmitting data without the use of words. While verbal is communicating using words in many different languages (www. Communication.edu, downloaded on 11th July 2011).

Communication plays a very important role in bringing about social change and development. For any person to change he/she must acquire some useful information to bring that change and for any person to influence another person to change, he/she must communicate or pass on ideas to this person through the process of communication.

Communication emerged as a new social science in the 1940s. It constituted theories, which were sender-oriented and it occurred in one-way systems or channels. It was predominantly through mass communication and the messages were intentional and persuasive. The theories have, however, gradually shifted focus on the communication transaction as a dialogic human interaction where the sender now places importance on the needs of the receiver in the formation of messages. Meaning is now perceived as important and it should be shared rather than just information transfer. For communication to be effective, it should be a two-way and not a one-way process (White and Ascroft, 1994).

In order for communication to be effective especially when used for developmental purposes, it must be participatory. It reinforces the purpose of freedom, liberation, egalitarian ideologies and justice. This means that people must participate not only in identifying what information is needed but also in the process of message development and dissemination. Participatory development also reduces the possibility of conflicts between groups, communities and nations and that includes both the developed and the developing nations (ibid).

CHAPTER 3: Literature Review

4.1   Introduction

The study explored various related themes in the literature based on original and subsequent theorists who have made an impact on the development studies. It is important to note that a literature review is not a summary or abstract of articles. It is an analysis and synthesis of the source materials, written in specific styles, which flows from broad to narrow, and takes into account both the theoretical and empirical issues.

The importance of literature review cannot be neglected in thesis or report writing. Emphasizing the importance of literature review Borg and Gall, (1989) stated: "The review of literature involves reading and evaluating reports of the casual observation and opinion that are related to the individual's planned research project".

The literature reviewed by the researcher was an effort to highlight those facts related to the studies which were unexplored before. Therefore, an attempt to explore and synthesize the material was one of the objectives to promote new researchable dimensions which could provide strength to the research study.

4.2   Towards an understanding of participation in development in Africa

Any understanding of the nature of "participation" in countries south of the Sahara must take into account the history of the relationship between the state and civil society. This is necessary because a dominant characteristic of both the colonial and post-colonial period has been the continued marginalisation or suppression of civil society by the state and political elites (Chazan, 1988; Chabal, 1992; Bayarl, 1993).

Furthermore, it is also important to distinguish between "tradition" and "civil" society in an African context in order to indicate a difference between sets of norms and organizational forms controlling the production and distribution of resources between pre-industrial, pre-colonial societies and those characterised by the predominance of market economies (Abrahamson and Nilsson, 1995). In a general sense, the colonial

state practised a form of institutionalised participation in which local government and indigenous institutions were co-opted for the purpose of economic and social transformation (Illiffe, 1979; Clegg and Harding, 1985; Crummey, 1986).

By the late 1960s, however, many newly independent countries south of the Sahara had witnessed a demise of multi-partyism and the emergence of single party or military rule, despite the transfer of systems of liberal democracy enshrined in independence constitutions. The colonial state attempted to separate civil from political society and to capture, sideline or abolish more traditional forms of identity and relationship. This process has been continued after independence by elites who wished to continue the project of modernization and, through the state, to impose hegemony on civil society.

Clark (2000) says all people who write about or comment on the civil society agree that civil society is that part of the wider society which consists of individuals and groups of people whose living and livelihood do not depend on the pleasure or support of the government. Civil society is the other public domain consisting of private individuals and groups who enjoy relative autonomy or distance from the government in pursuit of their various activities (UNECA, 1996).

Political society, on the other hand, is that part of the political system which deals with how ideas and interests are aggregated into specific policy proposal. Much of the difficulty in consolidating democracy in Africa is seen by students of politics to be rooted in the problem of how contending social classes and interest groups are to be connected to the governing process. This arena is usually referred to as "political society", that is, the place where public demands get tackled by specific political institutions. Tegegne (2000) says rules for aggregating policy vary. One major distinction in democratic politics is between pluralist and corporatist systems. The former is competitive while the latter is directed. Many authoritarian regimes find the transition at the political society level especially hard since rules at this level tend to dictate who gets to power. Thus, the design of electoral systems tends to influence the party system; the party system the way the legislature operates. Countries in political transition tend to prefer a presidential system rather than a parliamentary one on the

assumption or belief that a strong executive can control political society and provide greater political stability.

As the state has become more extensive and pervasive, both traditional and civil societies have become more excluded, disenfranchised and powerless (Samudavanija, 1991). In a historical review of the previous three decades, Barrat Brown (1995) concluded that the majority of African people have been excluded from any significant contribution to the determination of national policy. If colonial Africa was characterised by popular participation in nationalist coalitions to win political independence, the post-colonial history of African countries has witnessed the rapid and systematic exclusion of the people as a whole from the political arena. This exclusion is a legal carried over from colonialism. Participation was frequently seen as inimical to modernisation and stability which were regarded as necessary conditions for development (Nyong' O, 1990). Indeed, many followed Upsets (1959) argument that high levels of per-capital wealth, industrialization and education were preconditions for democracy.

The language of development in Africa in the 1990s, therefore, is radically different from what it was in the previous decade. The World Bank's influential report in 1999 – *Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth* – set the tone and content of the debate: liberal democracy, social pluralism and market orientation were to be the three pillars of African reform. African economies were said to be burdened with large public sectors, excessive state intervention and control, poor functioning market mechanisms and the lack of opportunities for more wide spread popular involvement in wealth creation. The report, furthermore, turned around the theory that economic development would tend to bring in its wake greater social development and, ultimately, more political freedom. Instead, the Report suggested that political legitimacy and consensus were a precondition for sustainable development (World Bank, 1989; Harsh, 1993). However, most countries which implemented the World Bank recipe failed in their development efforts. In 2004, the World Bank acknowledged that its recipe had proved disastrous.

Decalo (1994) has commented that internal pressures for "participatory democracy" have been primarily rooted in a widespread recognition of the general failure of one party rule to promote economic development, political accountability and national unity. Across

the continent, it would appear that there is growing support for democracy, with all it uncertainties and unpredictability, as a response to the continuing abuses of authoritarian rule. Mkandawire (1994) furthermore identified the emergence of a whole range of 'social movements' which have begun to make demands not only in terms of specific policies but, more importantly, on the nature of the state itself and the processes of policy formulation.

Democratisation, in conjunction with institutional capacity building, has been seen as the best hope for 'getting the policies right' for the economic recovery in Africa (Sandbrook, 1996a). Commentators on African politics would appear to agree that the process, however, has yet to take firm hold and that its foundations are still insecure. Ake (1993) argues that the notions of "liberal democracy" and African democracy" are not necessarily compatible. Africa is essentially a communal but not homogeneous society and it is this communalism which defines people's perceptions of their rights, their freedoms and their responsibilities. In this respect, liberal democracy offers a form of political participation which is markedly different from an African concept of participation, which is so firmly linked to communalism. Western political concepts and systems cannot be easily superimposed upon African political heritage and efforts to do so may not prosper.

While the steps toward political reform may imply or even encourage more widespread involvement in policy formulation and implementation, such trends inevitably come up against the power of centralised authority. Thomas-Slater (1994) argues that, while African governments might encourage communities to undertake various kinds of developmental activities, which local people begin to develop, the centre inevitably moves to destroy any local organisation, which is perceived to be threatening. African governments historically emphasise administrative rather than political decentralization and there are a few instances in which real authority and resources are transferred to lower levels. Thomas-Slater cites Kenya's Harambee movement and Tanzania's experiment with participatory democracy – Ujamaa – as examples of national programs of promoting local involvement which were never allowed to 'threaten the status quo".

The question is whether greater and more effective democracy could generate the necessary political will and leadership to bring about the necessary economic reform, so that development is not the preserve of the powerful few. In this respect Sandbrook (1996a) argues that, while democratization may not directly strengthen political will, it could buttress a government's reformist resolve. Democracy by itself, however, does not necessarily ensure good governance or enhanced political capacity to enact economic reform. Indeed, Allen, Baylies, and Szeftel (1992) have argued that, as long as the pressures for democratization are sponsored by "external interests" (as opposed to internal social forces), they are likely to be confined to parliamentarism and the revolving of national elites. Furthermore, given the adverse consequences of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), the majority of Africa's poor are more concerned with survival than with demands for greater political representation (Mkandawire, 1996).

4.3   Participatory development

Over the past few decades new approaches to development have been adopted. The human element has lately acquired a new significance. Getting over their earlier obsession with economic growth, planners now readily appreciate that it is the involvement of the people in the development process that ensures sustainable development. The whole purpose of development is being redefined so as to bring people to the central stage.

Participatory development aims to foster participatory and equitable development process in communities. While programmes differ substantially in design, objectives, and target communities, a common organizing principle is clearly discernable. It is the belief and principle of participatory development, according to Keith R. Emrich (1984, p.360) that development must begin in the very lowest tier or level. There must be real opportunities for participative decision-making for the target groups and those decisions must relate to their future development.

According to the advocates (Mansoori and Rao, 2004), participatory development aims at accomplishing certain specific functions including:

- Identifying and eliciting development priorities by the target community itself.
- Strengthening the civic skills of the poor by nurturing community organisations and
- Enabling communities to work together for the common good.

Such efforts are expected to ensure that resources are allocated in a manner that is responsive to the needs of the poor; that local elites are prevented from capturing the benefits of development programmes and that the most disadvantaged in the community are able to participate in decision –making processes thus reducing social exclusion among the poor (ibid).

4.4. People's participation

People's participation as a strategy of development was given a lease of life in the 1970s, when the various governments in developing countries, international agencies and research bodies became disenchanted with the pace and direction of economic growth and social progress of the 1960s. Throughout the development decades, the United Nations has called for people's participation in the development process. The World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen (1995) reaffirmed the growing concern with participation in social development. With the shifting emphasis in development objectives and strategies towards promoting more socially equitable economic growth and meeting the basic needs of the poorest groups in developing countries, widespread participation in decision –making is considered essential to the development process (Rondinelli, 1981).

People's participation is considered to be an integral part of the ideal and practice of democracy, and reflects the basic aspirations of the people (OECD, 1994). The recently revived interest in participation is linked to concepts of good governance and democracy, which make the government more accountable, and government accountability is considered essential to benefit the poor (World Bank, 1994).

People-centred development reverses the old paradigm, arguing, "the goal of development is not to develop things but to develop man" (Manthur, 1986:14). The

involvement of the people entails allowing them to discover the possibilities of exercising choice and thereby becoming capable of managing their own development. Consequently, participatory development embodies a process of enlarging people's choices (Martinussen, 1997:38). The opportunity to make choices should include the opportunity to choose not to develop, or to develop according to their own understanding of development.

The justification for participatory development is not an attempt to invalidate the knowledge of development professionals. Participation implies an increased role of the communities and a decreased role of the state, entailing a major exercise in democratisation and the redistribution of political power. Yet states are required to make available more resources which should be under the control of the communities themselves. Local people need to be empowered by strengthening local institutions through which sustained participation is guaranteed. Participation is not confirmed primarily to the involvement of local communities in development projects, but concerns the development of organizations in which local people can articulate their interests and defend what they treasure.

The message of participation has been spread and continues to be spread. The growing canon of literature on participation can be a source of confusion. The term is used as a propaganda tool by external funding agencies to victimise national governments by making it a conditionality criterion for financial support, thereby encouraging agents of change to include superficial participation in their projects. It is used as a catchword to justify funding proposal or to legitimise externally promulgated programmes.

4.5   Nature and contexts of participation

4.5.1   The contexts participation

Participation has been defined in narrow and broad terms. In its narrow connotations, participation is defined as the active engagement of the citizens with public institutions, an activity which falls within three well-defined modes: voting, election campaigning and contacting or pressuring either individually or through group activity, including non-

violent protests (Verba et al., 1978; Parry et al., 1972). Excluded in this definition are attitudes towards participation in development efforts. In its broad terms, participation is a "collective sustained activity for the purpose of achieving some common objectives, especially a more equitable distribution of the benefits of development" (UNESCO, 1979:15).

Political participation has been an issue in development management from the beginning, but its significance has increased principally because it has become part of official rhetoric. Individual full participation in making societal choices and decisions is a natural outcome of the endowment of individual dignity because it contributes to individual self-development. Responsibility for the governing of one's own conduct develops one's dignity. In particular, full individual participation within local institutions contributes to the creation of community solidarity because everyone feels involved in what is going on relative to their welfare (Uphoff, 1986).

Individually, full participation boils down to popular participation where the largest proportion of the citizenry is invited and expected to express their wishes on issues of governance. On every issue, the views of the majority should prevail. This popular participation may be achieved through meetings in small and large communities through rate payers associations, neighbourhood groups, and other political and social associations. Public or popular participation in decision-making is an imperative tenet for democratic governance (Giddenjuys et al., 1991). On the other hand, in order not to deny the minority its rights of self-assertion, it is also a democratic imperative that while the majority would have its way, the minority must have a say. In return, the minority must accept the majority decision once that decision has been freely arrived at.

Although there are different ways to define participation, the dominant perspective is to treat it pragmatically and to view it as a strategy to improve the development process.

4.5.2   Varieties of participation

Joan Nelson (1979) has identified three varieties of participation. They are:

- Horizontal variety of participation, which involves partisan or political behaviour – voting, campaigning, interest group activity and lobbying. In other words, the horizontal type of participation relates to activities to have people involved collectively in efforts to influence policy decisions.

- Vertical variety of participation which includes any occasions when members of the public develop particular relations with elites or officials, relations that is mutually beneficial.

- Participation administrative processes which takes the form of interest-group activity to shape administrative decisions or of a particular exchange between patron and client; but usually it is more inclusive than either of the other two varieties. It may also overlap with either horizontal or vertical participation.

4.5.3   Changes in the meaning of participation

Bryant and White (1982) have postulated that the dominant concern during the 1950s and the 1960s was controlling the amount and type of participation. For example, military regimes may make efforts to foreclose participation at the national level. Indeed, participation was feared as a disruptive influence. Even where participation was encouraged, it was usually very limited in scope. This preoccupation with the dangers inherent in participation was consistent with definitions of development as capital – intensive and growth-oriented and with administration as a hierarchical to down structure.

Participation, during the 1950s and 1960s, was defined in purely political terms; it meant voting, party membership, activity in voluntary associations, protest movements etc. As modernization proceeded, it was assumed that the benefits of growth would trickle down to the public and gradually stimulate involvement in these political processes. In the meantime, it was important to provide institutions to channel participation so as to prevent its potentially unstable results. Parties were particularly encouraged as a means to harness and manage the political energies and demands of the public (Deutch, 1961; Parry, 1972).

By the 1970s, the meaning of participation in the development context began to be redefined. Rather than being identified with political and electoral processes, it became associated with the administrative or implementation process. A number of reasons account for the redefinition of the political scope of participation. First, according to Jon Cohen and Norman Uphoff (1978:11), the change of attitude was initially spurred by politicians, and "had a notable counter insurgency quality about it". Participation was valued as an alternative to revolutionary movements and uprisings. The reasoning was that if people could be mobilized to be part of the development process, they would be less available to revolution. Second is the realisation that the political process was too undeveloped to elicit preferences or involve the public, and therefore, participation would have more impact within the implementation process. In the words of Grindle (1980) "the implementation process may be the major arena in which individual and groups are able to pursue conflicting interests and compete for scarce resources. It may even be the principal nexus of the interaction between a government and its citizenry".

Recently, the definition of participation in development has often been located in development projects and programmes, as a means of strengthening their relevance, quality and sustainability. In an influential statement, the World Bank Learning Group on Participation defined participation as a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them (World Bank, 1995).

From this perspective, participation could be seen in the level of consultation or decision-making in all phases of a project cycle, from need assessment, to appraisal, to implementation, to monitoring and evaluation. While these participation projects could be funded by the state, participation within them was seen as a way of encouraging action outside the public sphere. Moreover, the focus was on direct participation or primary stakeholders, rather than indirect participation through elected representatives.

Surprisingly, within the development literature there has been less attention to notions of political participation which involve the interactions of the individual or organised groups with the state, and which often focus more on mechanisms of indirect participation. Political participation has been defined in broad or narrow terms by

28

different authors depending on the approach of inquiry. The classic study of political participation by Nie and Verba (1972:2) defines it as those legal activities by private citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of governmental personnel and/or actions they take. Parry, Mosley and Day (1992:16) define it as taking part in the process of formulation, passage and implementation of public policies.

Political participation is more associated with representative democracy and indirect participation (Richardson, 1983; Cunill, 1991). It expresses itself in individual and collective actions that include mainly voting, campaigning, contacting, group action, and protest towards influencing the representatives in government, rather than active and direct participation in the process of governance itself.

In her work in Latin America, Cunill refers to citizen participation as the intervention of private citizens with determined social interests in public activities. As noted by Cunill (1997), citizen participation refers to political participation but distances from it at least in two ways: it abstracts both participation mediated by political parties, as well as the one exercised by citizens when they elect political authorities. It expresses instead – although with multiple meanings – the direct intervention of social agents in which citizen's influence and exercise control in governance, not only through the more traditional forms of indirect representation.

In sum, within the discussions on mainstreaming participation, we begin to see a redefinition of the concept of participation, such that it moves from only being concerned with beneficiaries or the excluded to a concern with broad forms of engagement by citizens in policy formulation and decision-making in key areas which affect their lives. In a simple term, participation now is seen as a process of involving the community or beneficiaries of the intended development in identifying their problems and needs and equipping them with skills and the ability to find solutions to the problems.

4.5.4   Dimensions of participation

Participation is a very broad concept, and when the term is used in the context of development activities the question is how to operationalize that participation. The clear

answer to this question demands familiarity with the following dimensions of participation:

- What (activities)
- Who (elites/ordinary people) and
- How (the way/method of people's involvement

The "what" dimension of participation consists of the various activities where people may participate. The report of the United Nations (1975) and other development studies revealed that people should participate in development projects from needs identification to needs satisfaction stage, only then can they benefit from the development project. It implies the involvement of people in goal setting, planning, formulating, implementing and evaluation of development projects. According to Cohen and Uphoff (1980), people's participation includes participation in decision-making and participation in programme implementation and evaluation.

The second dimension is a focus on who participates? In a truly participatory approach all those affected have to play a role at all the stages of the development process (Lane, 1995). Cohen and Uphoff identified two groups of participants, residents and leaders, as particularly important in participation in development. The World Bank approach to the "who" dimension of participation calls for participation of "stakeholders". Stakeholders are defined by the Bank as the parties who either affect or are affected by development actions, who lack information and power, are excluded from the development process (World Bank, 1994).

The third dimension of participation is its organizational imperatives. The commentators and practitioners on development pleaded for participation through local organizations. The democratic, accountable and responsive organizations and associations including parliament, local authorities, progressive unions, farmers societies, traders association and multi-purpose cooperatives, may be effective in participatory development (Verhagan, 1980).

The focus of the "how" dimension of participation is also on the degree or level of participation – the degree of empowerment. In his World Bank Discussion Paper, Samuel Paul identifies four methods of participation: information-sharing, consultation, decision-making, and initiating action (Paul, 1987). The latter indicates participation of the highest intensity. Each level of participation is characterised by a different relationship of the implementing agency and the beneficiaries. Information-sharing participation refers to a process where the agency informs intended beneficiaries about the project, and so flows of information and control are both in a downward direction.

In a process involving consultation information flows are equal, with the agency often making use of local knowledge. However, control is still from the top down. In decision-making participation beneficiaries have some control over the process. Finally, where participation has advanced to the stage of the beneficiaries initiating action both information and control flows are primarily upward, from the beneficiary group to the agency. The World Bank has put forward a number of practical suggestions for participatory involvement. These involve six sets of mechanisms, moving from those in which stakeholders has least influence to those in which they have most influence, namely:

- Information-sharing mechanism;
- Consultative mechanisms;
- Joint assessment mechanisms;
- Shared decision-making mechanisms;
- Collaborative mechanisms; and
- Empowering mechanisms (World Bank, 1994).

Arnstein (1969) long ago considered people's participation as a categorical term for people power. According to her, it denotes nothing less than a redistribution of power that enables the have–nots to share in the benefits of society.

Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation

8	Citizen Control	Degrees
7	Delegated power	Of
6	Partnership	Citizen power
5	Placation	Degrees
4	Consultation	Of
3	Informing	Tokenism
2	Therapy	Non-
1	Manipulation	participation

Source: Arnstein, 1969, p 217

She proposes an analytical ladder of people's participation that ranges from (I) non-participation – manipulation therapy (II) degrees of tokenism – informing, consultation, placation and then to (III) degrees of people's power – partnership, delegated power, citizen power. The classificatory principle in Arnstein's ladder is the amount of power exercised. She presents her ladder of participation graphically with the least desirable elements first and the most desirable element last.

4.5.5   Problems with the participatory approach

The difficulty is that although participation is a practical concept, in many parts of the developing world it lacks analytical tools and an adequate theoretical framework. The irresistible urge to participate clashes with inflexible systems and procedures that are an integral part of the old bureaucratic style of development management. There will be those opposed to participatory development because it introduces a new order that will erode their former power base. Thus, in order to empower the powerless, participatory development must facilitate the organisation of disadvantaged members of the society in structures under their control on the understanding that genuine people's organizations have the ability to serve their own member's interests and this in turn legitimises them (Martnussen, 1997).

The powerful are already well organised in strong institutions.   Participatory development contends, in addition, that local institutions represent structures with which

local communities identify and control, despite their state of dysfunction. Thus, strengthening of existing structures takes precedence over the creation of new institutions, a move usually employed by agents of change. The basis for capacity – building in participation is less to do with individual involvement than with the development of organizations which local communities can face and challenge the powerful and articulate their views.

4.5.6 Integrating development theories : growth with participation

The core of this new vision of development is that although the earlier theories of modernization are limited in their application to the Third World conditions, they remain indispensable to the theory and practice of development. As a result, an alternative theory of development does not necessarily abandon their earlier, mainstream theories. Economic growth is clearly a desirable condition in terms of increasing incomes and production. Yet, on its own, economic growth is not a sufficient condition for improved standard of living of the majority of the poor. Nevertheless economic growth is a necessary condition for human well-being. Thus, while practice based on modernization theory has marginalised underprivileged members of the society who cannot board the train of commercialization; it has contributed significantly to the creation of wealth. It is thus integral to development both past, present and future.

This is why it is difficult to propose a wholly radical alternative approach. With its focus on the role of communities in development, the alternative approach to development boils down to the concept of sustainable development, enriched with a fundamental summary of the propositions of the traditional approaches to development. Participatory development planning, as an alternative approach, is a direct counter force to Western prescriptions of development in the Third World. While the practice of modernization cannot be detached from the proposed development theory and practice, it might be meaningful if it is adapted, adjusted or better still, integrated into the specific conditions prevailing in the Third World so that development becomes a culturally grounded process where objectives are not formulated on the exclusive conceptions of outsiders.

The modernization theory has alienated the beneficiaries of development from the processes of development itself and reduced the subject of the development process to mere recipients. Modernization theory is indispensable to development, but its application, especially in the Third World, where the majority of the people still rely on subsistence agriculture, is limited. Participatory development is an alternative approach. Local people appropriately allocate their scarce resources and achieve the highest possible efficiency under their conditions. As a basis for survival, this knowledge should be strengthened by infusion of relevant, adaptable and locally grounded innovations. Thus participatory development may build on the wealth of the poor. Nonetheless, participatory development should not be seen as a panacea to all development problems in the Third World.

4.5.7 Participation in Parliamentary Processes

4.5.7.1 The role and functions of Parliament

It is hard to imagine how people could live their lives without making frequent use of some form of representation that is, using something to stand in the place and be taken as the equivalent of something else. Much of what man does; in short, he does by representation rather than directly. Some kind of political representation – that employed is in the making and enforcing of government policy – performs a prominent role in all modern governments, democracies and dictatorships alike. In democracies, however, political representation is in some sense a key institution; for it is, in Sir Ernest Baker's (1942:39) apt metaphor, the principal "conduit or sluice by which the waters of social thought and discussion are brought to the wheels of political machinery and set to turn those wheels".

In the Westminster Parliamentary system of government, Parliament's role is three fold. Firstly, parliamentarians are the people's representatives, elected through the electoral process to speak on the people's behalf. Secondly, Parliament is the legislative arm of the state, responsible for the making of laws that govern the nation. And thirdly, Parliament is a pivotal part of democracy's system of checks and balances, providing a countervailing and monitoring function, to ensure compliance with laws and regulations,

integrity, transparency and accountability on the party of the Government and governance institutions.

This role of the Legislature is best encapsulated in the concept of the separation of powers in a parliamentary democracy:

> Parliament does not govern and should not seek to govern; that is the role of the Executive. The role of Parliament is to legislate; to scrutinise the policies and activities of the Executive; to hold the Executive to account for it actions, and to act as a forum for democratic participation by all Members of civil society. It should thus play a significant role in the system of checks and balances common to all parliamentary democracies. (Foundation Report of the Parliamentary Reform Committee, 1998)

When Parliament fails to effectively perform this monitoring role, experience has shown that the level of accountability and integrity in government and in public life declines to the detriment of the people. These are intended to be the ethos of its day-to-day functions and provide the basis for its accountability to their constituencies. Parliamentary procedure that is enduring must inculcate the habit of firm consideration to the plight of its electorates. A parliament which is borne of elected representatives cannot but centre its legislative proceedings towards the betterment of its electorates of which in the Zambian context, poverty eradication is paramount (Teleafoa, 1999)

Parliament represents the best opportunities for all societal forces to be represented at the national level in the policy-making process, since points of entry into the executive and judiciary are more restrictive. Since the parliamentarians are the "trustees" of the public mandate, it is assumed that they will uphold national and public interests over other narrow and parochial interests. Parliamentarians through enactment of national legislation, and oversight of the executive organs, are expected to lay down the fundamentals for establishing peace, security, democracy, good governance, sound economic management and people-centred development. They are expected to take measures to promote and overcome some inequalities, eliminate poverty and promote sustainable and equitable development for all citizens (United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2005).

4.5.7.2   Parliament and the policy-making process

Policy-making is referred to as "the process by which government statements are arrived at", while policy refers to "specific statements, guide lines and pronouncements on development and related issues". (Ikiara, Olewe-Nyuya and Odhiambo, 2004). The UNECA (2004), states that contrary to popular belief, the making and shaping of policy is less a set of organised, predictable and rational choices than a complex, often unpredictable and, above all, political process (UNECA, 2004:9). The point is made by Ikiara et al (2004) and Soludo et al (2004) that there are several theories and approaches to public policy making. One of the most popular to date, especially among economists, is the Rational Comprehensive Model, also said to be one of the oldest. This model sees policy as a smooth, linear, hierarchical and essentially a rational process consisting of two phases: policy formulation and policy implementation. In the formulation stage of this model, experts, statisticians and researchers identify the problem, analyse the options using the most sophisticated, up-to-date and applicable knowledge available (McGee, 2004).

Another model is called the Disjointed Incremental Model, which, as its name suggests, does not have the painstaking, deliberative and apparently objective flair of the Rational Model. Another model that is increasingly gaining coverts, the Eclectic Model, combines elements of both the rational approach and Incremental Model is called the Mixed Scanning Model. The shortcomings of the models, especially in the light of contemporary emphasis on participatory democracy and good governance, are that they do not adequately represent the nature of other non-state or non-expert actors in policy-making and so fictionalise the process. For as Soludo et al suggest; there is also a new and important phase in policy making which is the basis of much attention, discussion and dissension –the agenda-setting phase. Increasingly, this space is the locus of much contention and confrontation between citizens in general, bureaucrats, and civil society and private sector organizations through their representatives. The battles and encounters that take place in this space are becoming important subjects of research and discussion, as Ikiara et al (2004) report on their study in Kenya.

The general concern is that policy formulation is dominated by state elites and it is still confined to small and exclusive political circles. The growing recognition is that in the politics of policy making, power is key. The crises of African development and the development of experiences of the colonial, independence, post independence, post colonial and globalising state show the raw power which donors and international development partners wield. Mkandawire and Soludo (1999:133) bemoaned "the tragedy of African's policy-making and the complete surrender of national policies to the ever-changing ideas of international experts".

4.5.7.3   Why public participation in parliamentary processes is important in a democracy

In addition to policy-making, scholars identify two other key functions of legislatures: linkage and legitimation (Copeland and Patterson, 1994). The principle of more public involvement better results would equally apply to the linkage and legitimation functions of legislatures in a democracy. The linkage between citizens and their government is obviously strengthened when the public has ample opportunity to have their concerns heard by the legislature. Even in countries with weak legislatures subservient to a strong executive, parliaments may play an important role by voicing the concerns of diverse elements of the population.

The role of linking citizens and their governments is closely related to the complicated concept of legitimacy. Citizens who regard their government as legitimate are more likely to obey laws, support the regime and accommodate diverse points of view. Citizen participation in the legislative process is vital to creating this sense of legitimacy. Political scientist Norman Ornstein comments on the importance of legitimacy in writing about the Kenyan National Assembly:

The real power and influence of the Kenyan National Assembly comes through the exercise of its informal powers. The most important informal function the legislature performs is to provide legitimacy to government actions. This in turn promotes support among the populace for the regime. The legitimising functions are vital in light of the revolts and bouts of instability that have plagued other nations in the region. By accommodating cultural and historical realities, the Kenyan National Assembly allows for opposition and dissent within the system, yet also provides stability. As a result, the populace feels at ease about the strength and legitimacy of the system; at the same time, it feels it has some say in the political process (Ornstein, 1972:7).

The concept of government legitimacy implies that citizens have some knowledge of their representative institution and a certain level of support for it. A comparative study of public knowledge of legislatures in three countries suggests:

The exercise of democratic control over the legislative system and the policy - making process cannot occur unless the public has an elementary understanding of the national legislative institution and its membership. The quality of democratic politics diminishes if citizens are ignorant about legislatures (Barker et al., 1996:44).

4.5.7.4   The experience of the National Assembly of Zambia

With the advent of multi-partyism in 1991 and as a way of enhancing democratic governance, the Government of the Republic of Zambia and the Government of the United States of America signed a Grant Agreement on 28th September 1992. The essence of the Grant Agreement was to modernise strategic Government Institutions in order to enhance Democratic Governance in the country. The Grant Agreement contained four (4) components, namely:

1. The Civil Rights project component
2. The Media independence project component
3. The Legislative Performance component
4. The policy Co-ordination project component

The Legislative component related to the improvement of the operation of the National Assembly of Zambia in the context of the provisions of the Constitution. In order to implement the legislative component, the National Assembly of Zambia signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) on 28th February, 1993 (Parliamentary Report, 1993).

As a follow up, a Legislative Performance Study Group was formed to study and make recommendations for reforms in the areas which were considered to be cardinal to the efficient operations of the National Assembly. In this regard, the Study group was required to examine and make recommendations which would help strength the operations of the National Assembly, particularly and among other things, to increase public participation in parliamentary processes. Although Parliamentary Reforms started in the late 1980s, they were largely undertaken in an ad hoc manner. However, the Legislature became increasingly aware that it was still widely viewed by the public as being a remote institution, which was ill-equipped and inadequately resourced to effectively represent the constituents. Furthermore, there was a popular perception that Parliament was too weak to bring the Executive Branch of the State to account for its actions and for public funds (ibid).

Parliament was often perceived by some members of the public as being secretive and not open to public scrutiny. Such perception derived from the pre-independence era when issues of governance were a preserve of an oppressive minority. This negative public perception persisted for some time after independence. There were increasing calls by constituents and other stakeholders to access their elected leaders in order to have meaningful and relevant input into matters of governance as well as how national resources were mobilised and utilized. Therefore, in an effort to address these concerns, the institution established a Parliamentary Reform Committee (PRC) on 3rd February, 1999.

The Committee was appointed to study and make recommendations for reforms in the following five (5) areas:

1. The Committee System
2. The Legislative Process
3. The Administration of the National Assembly
4. Support Services to Parliament and its Members; and
5. The Member-Constituency Relations and civil participation in Parliamentary business.

In order to meet its mandate as set out by the terms of reference, the Committee held more than twenty (20) meetings to produce its background report. In its deliberations, the Committee considered:

(i)   Background papers prepared by the National Assembly staff on the five areas of reform, March 1999.

(ii)   The report on the workshop for senior civil servant on Parliamentary Committee reforms held at the Mulungushi International Conference Centre in February, 1999.

(iii)   Submissions made to the Legislative Performance Study Group by various interest groups;

(iv)   The report by the Committee of experts appointed by the Hon Mr Speaker in 1992.

(v)   Report submitted by National Assembly Officers attached to other Commonwealth Parliaments

(vi)   Reports on the Parliamentary Reforms in Zimbabwe and the House of Commons in Canada; and

(vii)   Report on the needs Assessment of the Zambian Parliament by A. B. C Katotobwe, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Lusaka Office, October, 1998.

The Committee also held discussions with parliamentary delegations from both Commonwealth and foreign countries which included delegations from the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the Gambia. As a comparative study, the Committee also undertook tours to the Parliament of Uganda and the United States of America under the sponsorship of the USAID.

In addition, the Committee held discussions with the Chairpersons of Sessional Committees of Parliament, Heads of Department in the Office of the Clerk of the National Assembly, and the four consultants engaged by the Committee with the assistance of the USAID. In November, 2000 the PRC submitted its final report confirming that Parliament was indeed, viewed as a remote institution which did not involve the public in its business, and that it was too weak to exercise oversight over the Executive wing of Government. The Committee also found that the public felt that the Legislature lacked the resources to effectively represent the people and that there was an urgent need for reforms. The Report also contained wide ranging recommendations to further strengthen the role of Parliament by having constituency offices opened in all the 150 constituencies. One of the most important recommendations focussed on the need to increase public participation in the legislative process.

The purpose of reforming the National Assembly of Zambia is to restore to private members an effective legislative function, to give them a meaningful role in the formation of public policy and, to restore the legislature to its rightful place in the Zambian political process.

The pace of reform of the National Assembly has quickened in recent years. Various explanations for this have been put forward, including cynicism about the political process, a desire to enhance the role of private Members, a conviction that Parliament must be more responsible and relevant to the public, the increasing amount and complexity of legislation, and the emergency of new demands on Parliament and the Parliamentary process.

Finally, given the level of political, economic and social environment in the country, the need to reform the Zambian Parliamentary system has been found necessary with a view to addressing some of the limitations which exist in the institution. This is so in order to enhance parliamentary scrutiny of the activities and also to allow for increased people's participation in the affairs of the country. Furthermore, the reforms in the National Assembly of Zambia will enable the

Zambian Parliament realise the intended results of its functions and bring about accountability, transparency and good governance system. In addition, there is a trend in parliamentary circles today to have most of the parliamentary business dealt with in Committees. This calls for strengthening of the Committees which support the work of Parliament. Parliamentary reforms in this regard, will not only relieve pressure on the House but will also enable Parliament itself deal with specialised matters in the most efficient manner.

CHAPTER 4:   Research Methodology

4.1 Scope of the study

The research made use of relevant documentary sources on the importance of popular and effective participation in development initiatives from policy to implementation. This was done by looking at the opportunities for participation of the public and other stakeholders such as the media and civil society in parliamentary processes in Kawambwa District.

4.1.1   Methods

4.1.2   Quantitative Survey

The Quantitative survey technique was used to collect data from 100 members spread across the constituencies. The questionnaire had closed ended questions so that numbers would be used.   The use of numbers permits precision and allows for the use of mathematical tools for analysis such as percentages.

4.1.3   In - Depth Interviews

In–depth Interviews were also conducted with key stakeholders such as the Speaker of the National Assembly, some members of Parliament, former members of Parliament and a sample of the electorate from selected wards in Kawambwa District, community based civic organisations whose work focuses on constituency relations, media practitioners whose work covers parliamentary processes and activities and principal officers of Parliament.

This is a qualitative method where unstructured discussions were conducted with key stakeholders such as staff. Knowledge is created in the process of interaction and not discovered. The role of the researcher was, therefore, to interpret the information rather than predict it. This method allowed for more probing and in –depth understanding on the part of the researcher.

In undertaking this case study of popular and effective participation in parliamentary processes in Kawambwa District, a comparative analysis of both the pre-reform and the post-reform era was carried out.

A critical approach was also adopted and this entailed both qualitative and quantitative analysis of opportunities for popular and effective participation in the activities of parliament as a way to contribute to development and decision-making processes.

The research also relied heavily on qualitative research for this case study using the following methods: documentary analysis, interviews, open-ended questionnaires, analysis of physical artefacts and observations.

4.1.4   Sampling Procedures

For the survey, electorates were sampled using a probabilistic sampling method. This method was used to ensure that every member of the community in Kawambwa District had a non-zero chance of being picked for questioning in the research. The sample included both male and female. The first house for the survey was picked randomly since there are no proper streets in the villages in Kawambwa District and houses are scattered. The remaining houses were also picked randomly.

Current and former Members of Parliament, Community based Civic Organisations in Kawambwa District according to the researchers findings are very few. This meant that they were purposively selected for an interview.

4.2   Data Collection

Data collection refers to the gathering of information to serve or prove some facts. In this research, data was gathered using recorded questionnaires, face- to –face interviews. The face - to – face interviews were used to ensure a high response rate especially from among the electorates (community) and those whose level of education was not high. This was to minimise the difficulty posed by varying educational levels in the sample. The research received a high response rate. This was possible, probably because the

researcher did most of the distribution of the questionnaires and conducted the interviews. On the other hand the researcher engaged six other reliable people to help in the distribution of the questionnaires. The result was good (almost 100%).

The researcher designed two types of questionnaires. The first questionnaire was meant for the people in the constituency and it was divided into three sections. The first section consisted of questions on general information, that is, age group, gender, marital status and educational back ground. Section B consisted of question on people's political and participative aspects. The last section consisted of questions on the social and developmental aspect of Parliament. In this section, the electorates were also asked whether signing of a social contract by elected representatives would enhance their participation in projects and whether this contract will compel Members of Parliament to work hard in their constituencies.

The Second questionnaire was meant for key informants such as the Speaker, serving and former Members of Parliament, Ministers, Councillors and heads of NGOs. This questionnaire was also divided into two sections. Section A consisted of questions on general information. Section B consisted of questions on participation of the people in the development process, the nature of MPs participation in development, relationship between the MPs and constituents and Parliament and development.

4.3   Coding Sheet

After data had been gathered, the researcher designed a coding sheet for coding data in order for it to be analysed by the computer. The coding was done by assigning numbers to various responses. There were instances when the coding would be extended to actual number of responses shown by the questionnaire. The reason for this was because in some cases certain questions allowed for more than one answer especially where there was follow up questions.

4.4 Pre-testing

The Non Profit Hub (2005) defines pre-tests that are given in order to establish a bench mark for which the individual or group being tested can be evaluated against in the future. In other words, a pre-test is a test done to test the effectiveness of the research design (design refers to the total experimental plan or structure of the research).

4.5   Cross tabulation

In order for the researcher to understand the association between multiple variables, cross tabulation was used in some cases in interpreting data. Cross tabulation is a method that displays the joint distribution of two or more variables. Each cell for instance, shows the number of respondents that gave a specific combination of responses.

4.6 Limitation of the Study

The research was limited to studying one public institution, the Parliament of Zambia as opposed to all institutions in the development process; hence the results may not be fully representative or readily generalised. Nevertheless, focusing on Parliament will provide in-depth insights into the institution's influence on development. Limiting the population restricts the conclusion of this research but a representative sample is covered. The thoroughness of focussing on one institution made up for these limitations.

4.6 Ethical Considerations

In planning and conducting the research, as well as in reporting research findings, the researcher promises to fulfil several obligations in order to meet universally accepted ethical standards. First, the research study was planned so that the chance for misleading results was minimised. The researcher further agreed to comply with the following principles, which aim at protecting the dignity and privacy of every individual who, in the course of the research, was requested to provide personal or commercially valuable information about him/her or others:

Before an individual became a participant of research, he/she was notified of:

- The aims, methods anticipated benefits and potential hazards of the research;
- His/her right to abstain from participation in the research and his/her right to terminate at any time his/her participation; and
- The confidential nature of his/her replies.

No individual became a participant to research unless he/she was given the due notice and provided a freely given consent that he/she agreed to participate. No pressure or inducement of any kind was applied to encourage an individual to participate in the research.

The identity of individuals from whom information was obtained in the course of the research was kept confidential. At the conclusion of the research, any information that revealed the identity of individuals who were interviewed as part of the research was destroyed or safely stored unless the individual concerned consented in writing to its inclusion beforehand. No information revealing the identity of any individual shall be included in the final report or in any other communication prepared in the course of the research unless the individual concerned has consented in writing to its inclusion beforehand.

Chapter 5: Research Findings and Analysis

This chapter provides a detailed assessment of the role of parliament in development and peoples' participation. By looking at Kawambwa District, the chapter outlines and assesses parliament in two aspects: firstly in terms of parliament's development initiatives and responses to the problems and needs of the people and secondly in terms of parliament's initiatives to promote and encourage people's involvement in development activities.

As planned and designed, the study examined empirically – through a survey of the people in different wards in Kawambwa District, Members of Parliament and key informants – the three elements of the workings of parliament: people's participation, representation and responsiveness to local problems and needs.

After the completion of the field work, the data collected from the sample of the people and key informants through interviews was checked before coding and editing. The data was classified according to wards', respondents (people or key informants), and socio-economic standing of respondents and objectives and hypotheses of the research. The classification enabled the researcher to check the extent of difference of perception in one area/group from the other.

5.1 Data Analysis

Descriptive methods were used for the data analyses. The finding of the research were analysed using the computer data analysis programme, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The methods of data analysis and presentation were divided in two parts: In the first part the researcher presented the factual aspects of the survey and the outline of the basic variables (socio-economic characteristics) of the people and the key informants. The second part of the analysis assessed and evaluated parliamentary processes from the people and key informants' point of views.

The first element of the survey involved detailed interviews, using semi-structured interview format with 100 people drawn from several wards in Kawambwa District to get information on the above aspects of people's participation and then some core questions were asked, designed to assess the perceived status and public image of parliament in terms of participation and development. The second survey involved interviews with 30 Members of Parliament, the Speaker and Officers of Parliament regarding their perception of participatory development.

5.2 People's survey

This was the main research endeavour carried out in 28 wards in Kawambwa District through a multi-module questionnaire – demographic information and people's participation in, and perception of the institution of parliament.

5.3 Profile of sampled people

Table1 below shows the relative characteristics of the sample of the people, including occupation, education, gender and age. An examination of the occupation characteristic indicates that nearly 68% of the people interviewed were engaged in agriculture. Small scale business is the primary occupation of 8% of the total respondents.

Table 1: Characteristics of respondents by %

Characteristics	Female	Male	Total Sample Average
Primary occupation			
• Agriculture/farming	42	26	68
• Business/trading	3	5.5	8.5
• Service	6	4.5	10.5
• Labour	4	9	13

Education			
• Formal schooling	8	22	30
• Primary	10	14	24
• Secondary	5	10	15
• College	2	7	9
• University	1	4	5
Age			
18-20 years	8	12.5	20.5
21-30 years	10	19	29
31-40 years	8	22.5	30.5
41-50 years	4	6	10
51-60 years	1	4	5
60+	0	5	5

Data on educational attainment given in the table indicates that about 60% of the total respondents were literate; twenty two per cent (22%) of the respondents have an education up to primary level. 15% and 9% are educated up to secondary and college level respectively while 5% of the respondents are educated up to university level.

An examination of the people's sample indicates that 29% of the respondents were 30 years old or younger, and 30% of the respondents belonged to the age 31-40. The percentage then decreased as the age group years increased.

5.4. Results of the survey

In order to assess the study propositions and hypothesis, the researcher designed a research to analyse parliament from three different aspects:

1. The institutional aspect: the institutional arrangements made by parliament for participation, and people's participation in the election of their Members of Parliament.
2. The functional aspect: people's participation in development projects.
3. The social perspective

5.5. The institutional arrangements

The Constitution of Zambia provides for the following functions for the Parliament of Zambia:

- Legislative
- Oversight
- Representation
- Forum for free debate on issues affecting the people

5.6. Participation in parliamentary processes

The study elicited for people's awareness of, and involvement in parliamentary processes relating to development. Participation in parliamentary activities was assessed by asking people if they voted in parliamentary elections, attending parliamentary sessions, public hearings, and sessions of Portfolio Committees and contacting the Member of Parliament.

5.6.1 Awareness measurement

Respondents were asked if they knew of the three arms of government. On average awareness was quite widespread with about 50% of the households having heard about one of the three arms and less than 20% having heard of all three.

5.6.2. People's participation in parliamentary activities

As indicated earlier, awareness of the existence of the arms of the state was found to be reasonable and can be said to be above average (50%). The above average level of awareness does not correspond with the level of involvement in activities of the different arms of the state.

Table 2: People's awareness of the different arms of the state

Arm of the State	Female %	Male %	Average %
Parliament	6	14	20
Executive	4	8.5	12.5
Judiciary	3	7	10

Involvement in these organs of the state was assessed by asking the people if they participated in any of their activities. The level of participation is different in the different arms of government. The closer the arm is to the people, the more is their participation in its activities. In this case, the level of awareness cannot be regarded as an indication of the degree of participation. This can be ascribed to various reasons, ranging from illiteracy to apathy as expressed by the respondents themselves.

5.6.3. People's participation in elections

The first important forum which provides people with an opportunity to participate in parliamentary activities is the parliamentary elections. When parliamentary elections were held in 1991 immediately after the re-introduction of the Multi party democracy, the popular enthusiasm was remarkably high. The survey study also shows that a significant majority (more than 65%) participated in elections for their Members of Parliament.

Table 3: Participation in elections

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	60	62
No	30	35
Do not remember	10	3
Total	100	100

The participation in the elections should however, not be taken as a sufficient index for participation. There are scholars of politics who hold that the act of voting under modern representative governments is connected in so remote a fashion to political decisions that it is not to be ascribed any political quality (Parry: 1971). Almond and Verba (1973) regarded voting "as a relatively passive form of participation in community life, though a form of participation it certainly is".

The social context within which electoral participation takes place has made elections an ineffective mode of participation. There is a patron client relationship where people are dependent on local elites for transport, loans and other services. By the reciprocity ethic, all help has to be repaid in some way. Because of this the poor people have to cast their votes in favour of the local elites. So the elites exercise tremendous control over the political choice during elections.

Table 4: People's consideration in parliamentary elections

Considerations	Female %	Male %	Total %
Followed the patron of the constituency	30	24	54%
Followed tribe	19	10	29%
Candidate's characteristics, personality and service to the community	7	10	17%
Total			**100**

Dependence and elite solidarity in constituency level politics preclude the possibility of election of those belonging to poor groups. Tribe consideration was also evident from the responses (29%). Candidates' characteristics, personality and his/her services to the community received some consideration as well (17%). The data revealed that the elites and tribe were the major factors which influence parliamentary elections.

5.6.4 People's contacts with Members of Parliament

As mentioned earlier, communication serves as a bridge between parliament and the people in the constituencies. It is necessary to know the needs of constituents and encourage them to participate in development activities. But communication is a two way process where initiatives and feelings can be transmitted to and from elite to non elite and vice versa. According to this theory people should have the opportunity of freely approaching Parliament/Members of Parliament and communicating their feelings and demands to it/them. The researcher tried first to find the upward communication and then downward communication from the people's perspectives, as the researcher assumed that Members of Parliament might exaggerate their contacts with their constituents.

Traditionally, a powerful justification for parliament has been its representative role. Parliament is uniquely able to detect and respond to the wishes of the people and to adapt national legislation to meet particular circumstances. In the view of the people, how successful has parliament been in this regard?

Beginning with general participation people were first asked about their contacts with members of parliament and then about the contact of members of parliament with the people. The data showed that 44% of the respondents were of the view that ordinary people do not have any contact with parliament or members of parliament. The reason as mentioned by the people is "Members of Parliament are only seen during election time".

On the other hand, the people were asked about the interaction of Members of Parliament with them. The results show that only 40% of the respondents feel that Members of Parliament are making any efforts to contact them. This is surprising since it is assumed that Members of Parliament are a relatively more visible contact point for the people. From this perspective, parliament which exists primarily to ensure participatory development plays a negligible role in such development. The people were also asked to reveal their reasons for the low contact of Members of Parliament with them. People (77%) disclosed that Members of Parliament do not like to contact ordinary people, as they are sure that such people would invariably vote for the patron of the constituency come election time. The majority (57%) of the respondents reported that the most frequent contacts of Members of Parliament are through elites. The higher frequency of contact through elites strongly supports the idea that Members of Parliament do not establish links with ordinary citizens. Hence both downward and upward communication is not developed.

5.7 The functional perspectives: People's participation in development

The general participation was perceived in terms of contacting /visiting parliament, meeting Members of Parliament regarding individual and community problems. While specific participation focuses on the involvement of the people in need identification, project formulation, implementation and evaluation.

5.7.1 Participation in the development process

One of the central functions of Members of Parliament is to stimulate people to initiate, participate in and implement constituency projects. Respondents were asked if they have to participate in the development of their constituency or not. The majority of the respondents pointed out that they should participate in development activities if they have to benefit from this development as shown in Table 5 on page 56 of this report.

Table 5: People's attitude towards participation

Question	Yes	Don't know	No
Do you think you should participate in the development of the constituency	**82.9%**	**10%**	**7.1%**

The data shows that the large majority (82.9%) of the respondents believe that they should participate in development which will lead to constituency development and eventually to their own development. The respondents asserted that if they do not participate, their constituencies would not get any development projects.

Respondents who indicated that they should participate in constituency development attributed the aim of this participation to two main reasons as shown in the table 6 below:

Table 6: People's reasons for participation in development

Reasons for participating	*%*
Participation leads to the development of the constituency	**82.7**
Participation is a cooperative process and we must participate in this development	**17.3**

The improvement and development of the constituency should be a cooperative process between the constituents and the Member of Parliament. But the result indicated that only a small proportion of the constituents participated in such projects.

After knowing the participation of people in development projects, the researcher inquired about the main areas of their participation. This participation is considered in many areas – from the provision of inputs (suggestions, ideas, labour, cash and material contribution) to decision making. The respondents'

participation at different stages of constituency development programmes have been presented in table 7 below:

Table 7:   Participation of citizens at different levels of development programmes

Provided input	Problem identification	Decision making	Planning	Implementation	Maintenance
26.7	25.55	15.25	0	30	3.5

Participation in constituency development projects was assessed by asking respondents who reported that they have participated, the particular mode of their participation. As shown in Table 7 above, about 83% of the respondents reported no participation, with 26.7% providing an opinion or suggestion (in put provision), 24.55% and 15.25% reporting that they participated in problem identification and decision making stages respectively. As shown in Table 7 participation in planning was more closed with 100% reporting no participation respectively and only 3.5% reporting having participated in the maintenance of projects. 30% of the respondents on average reported that they have participated in the implementation of the project by providing money, material, manpower and supervised the projects. As participation also means people's share in the benefits, they were asked whether they had gained from any of the development projects in the constituency. Most people interviewed acknowledged the general benefits of the projects but complained that they had not received any individual benefits.

In summary the study that parliamentary processes increase people's participation is not fully supported by the data. It seems appropriate to conclude that Members of Parliament have not been able to promote widespread community involvement in constituency development. What then were the causes of low participation?

When asked this question from the people's sample they (45%) out rightly replied "poverty" as is shown in Table 8 on page 58 of this report. The replies of some of

the respondents presented in the words of the respondents themselves, such as "to give a day's work free was equivalent to the loss of a day's meal". This was a pungent remark by one of the respondents. Similarly, for another respondent "Free labour means letting our children go to bed without dinner".

The data indicates that socio-economic status of respondents was an important cause for low participation.

Among a list of reasons given by respondents for low participation, the most reported one was biasness by Members of Parliament as the elected officials usually contact the well to do who supported them in elections or who belonged to their party. This had generated an atmosphere of pervasive mistrust and caused respondents' unwillingness to participate in development projects. Underlying this, in part, was the fairly common perception that their personal and social ties constituency elites, biased Members of Parliament, and, as a consequence, development projects benefited some segments of the constituencies only. 27% of the respondents who did not participate gave precisely this reason. Furthermore, respondents (28%) pointed to illiteracy as contributing to low participation. The reasons reported by respondents and their percentages are listed in Table 8 below.

Table 8: People's reason for non-participation in development

Reason	Female %	Male %	Total %
Do not participate due to poverty	20	25	45
Biasness of Member of Parliament	7	20	27
Do not participate due to illiteracy	18	10	28

So these results led to a conclusion that the hypothesis that "parliament facilitates participation" is partially proved. The hypothesis that "being closes to the people, people's participation in parliamentary processes is much greater than other institutions at national level" is fully proved.

The data confirms that establishments associated with parliament are perceived and ranked number one as compared to other government units. The data in Table 9 below shows a significant contrast in public image of parliament vis-à-vis other state institutions. It is quite visible that people are having most trust in parliament (88%), followed by local authorities (62%) and the central government (61%). Despite limited institutional capacity parliament ranked higher than other government institutions.

Table 9: Comparative score of government units on participation dimension

Unit of government	Percentage	Ranking
Parliament	88%	1
Local authorities	62%	2
Central government	61%	3

5.8 The social perspective: participation and development

It is widely acknowledged by practitioners and scholars alike that participation is a viable instrument for rural transformation and delivery of social services to the people (Besley: 1999). Indeed the strategic importance of participation to the development process is not in doubt. The central question that we seek to answer research is does participation increase the sensitivity of public investment decisions to local needs? And so is developed the proposition that parliament is more responsive to local needs when compared to other government institutions.

In this study, parliament's responsiveness is evaluated by means of filed stimulation. In order to assess responsiveness, the researcher chose to evaluate the outcome of a typical interaction that might occur between a Member of Parliament and a citizen. In an attempt to determine whether representatives perceptions of

services are related we first inquired about the people's needs and then asked about the Members of Parliament's priorities and efforts to fulfil them.

Here we are concerned about people's perception of needs, wants and priorities and availability of services in constituencies in order to assess one of the assumptions of parliamentary democracy, that is, parliament acts according to the needs of the electorate. Therefore, the respondents were given the opportunity to list their needs. If the respondents thought there was a problem, they were asked, who, if anyone, had attempted to address those problems and one of the options was parliament/member of parliament. The frequency with which parliament/member of parliament is seen responding to existing problems is a crude indicator of its responsiveness to citizens concerns.

The local needs as pointed out by the respondents emphasised the need to provide clean portable water as the number one problem. Road construction was the next frequently mentioned need followed by education and health facilities. Provision of the fertilizer support programme and electrification were another category of needs mentioned during the interviews. The different popular needs of the respondents are shown in Table 10 below.

Table 10: Needs of the people

Needs	Female%	Male%	Total %
Drinking Water	50	25	75
Roads/streets	35	39.5	74.5
Education	20	47.5	67.5
Health	40	27	67
Fertilizer support programme	39	20.5	59.5
Electrification	10	17.5	27.5

In order to know that there is a match between the needs of the people and priorities of the Members of Parliament, people were asked whether services

provided were in accordance with their needs and priorities. Comparing the perceived needs and the development priorities in almost the sampled constituencies in Kawambwa District, we found a match between the two. Provision of drinking water; continued either directly or indirectly to be one of the important items on the development plans of most of the constituencies to both the members of parliament and the people. This suggests that Members of Parliament are aware of constituency development issues and are not complacent about their importance. It also suggests that parliament/Members of Parliament responded to constituency development according to local needs. So taking collectively, the data explicitly validates the hypothesis that parliament is more responsive to the needs of the people as compared to other institutions and is proved.

5.9   Survey of Members of Parliament

Parliament is by law composed of elected and nominated representatives of people. These elected representatives in turn represent their constituencies. The law relating to the election of parliamentarians are such that anyone who qualifies as per the requirements as outlined in the constitution can become a candidate. In this section we look at the kind of persons who lead citizens in parliament, as they have a special implication for representation and constituency development.

The researcher considered three aspects of Members of Parliament: socio – economic profile, localism and the number of times they were elected to parliament. Socio-economic profile is defined demographically. Members of parliament are considered less representative to the extent that they differ from the electorate generally in occupation, income, landholding and education. Localism is considered a second aspect of Members of Parliament's representativeness. We presumed that people who live among the electorate are accessible on a day to day basis and are better placed to represent the people. Being voted more than once into parliament is considered to be a sign of representativeness by a Member of Parliament because of familiarity with local problems and grievance mechanisms. All these dimensions have some effects on development.

Judging from the characteristics of Members of Parliament, the data shows that the traditional stereotype disguises a far more diverse picture in reality. The general picture in terms of occupation and landholding shows that Members of Parliament are not in any respect microcosms of society as a whole. But dissimilarity in socio-economic status does not connote absentee leadership. Constituency development demands leaders who can mediate between local activities and professional demands and deploy leadership resources in the constituency.

So on one hand the higher socio-economic profile could lead to the development of the constituency. On the other hand, it is one of the hardest realities of social life in developing countries that leadership is subject to constant change. Many of the qualities that enable a person to become an effective leader can readily be turned to personal advantage. It is important that leadership be of the people and be a force for change in critical areas.

However, the composition of parliament in terms of the social activities the Members of Parliament are involved in is widely distributed among the various sections of the society. You will notice from table 11 on page 63 that, about 55% of Members of Parliament are involved in agriculture while those involved in business are about 25%.

Further, it may be observed from Table 11 on page 63 that although about two thirds of Members of Parliament have modest education, the proportion of college graduates is not negligible. About 20% of the Members of Parliament are graduates.

Table 11: Characteristics of Members of Parliament

Characteristics	Female %	Male %	% of Members of Parliament
Occupation			
Agriculturist (Farmers)	20	35	55
Businessmen	8	17	25
Other	6	14	20
Landholding size			
Landless	20	10	30
1 – 25 acres	4	36	40
26 – 50 acres	2	16	18
Above 50 acres	2	10	12
Level of Education			
High School and below	20	40	60
College education	8	22	30
University 1st Degree	2	5	7
Masters and above	1	2	3
Age range			
30 – 40	20	42	62
41 – 50	11	20	31
51 and above	2	5	7

5.9.1 Elected members and people's participation

5.9.1.2 The main purposes and benefits of participation perceived by Members of Parliament

In order to know whether the elected representatives are in favour of people involvement in development activities, we asked them if people should participate or not. Almost two thirds of the Members of Parliament interviewed asserted positively that people should be involved in development activities. This shows a complete confidence by elected representatives of people's participation. Indeed it is good sign of people's democracy.

Table 12: Perception of Members of Parliament towards people's participation

Statements	*% of Members of Parliament*
People should participate in development activities in order to:	
Gain information on citizens' views	57
Meet statutory requirements	30
Meet donor agencies	20
Benefits of participation perceived as: Improvement in services Better decision making	 52 48

The questionnaire listed a number of possible purposes for public participation and ranked them according to importance. A clear majority of respondents (57%) selected "to gain citizens' views" and ranked this factor as number one. "To meet statutory requirements" came second, ranked by 30% of the Members of Parliament, and followed by "to meet donor agencies requirements" with a percentage of 20. No doubt this reflects the increasingly important role that elected representatives play in promoting public participation in development activities. It would seem that Members of Parliament see engaging the public as particularly important in helping to improve service delivery and decision making when they were asked about the benefits of this involvement. The greatest number of Members of Parliament (52%) indicated that "improvement in services" is the most important benefit of consulting the public – closely followed by "better decision making", which was selected by 48% of the respondents.

5.9.1.2 Problems in implementing participation initiatives

Respondents were asked about the possible problems they have/would encounter in implementing participation initiatives and asked to rank them according to importance. The results are illustrated in a table below. The survey suggests that

Members of Parliament still have some concerns regarding the benefits that are brought by engaging the public. A "lack of resources" was ranked as the number one problem in implementing participation initiatives by the greatest number of Members of Parliament. 48% ranked this as the number one problem. A "lack of time" was ranked the second most important problem by almost as many of Members of Parliament that is 22%.

Support from outside parliament is also seen as presenting difficulties, since "a lack of public interest" is ranked as the third problem, and received the next highest percentage (20%) score. Public apathy towards politics is an enduring concern – issues associated with low turnout in national elections would seem to extend to participation between elections. Members of Parliament continue to experience difficulties in motivating people to become involved in local development.

Table 13: Problems in the participation process as perceived by Members of Parliament

Problems	Percentage
Lack of resources	48%
Lack of time	22%
Lack of public interest	20%
Lack of support from within parliament	10%
Total	100%

Support from within the council – either from Members of Parliament or Officers – can also be a problem in implementing participation initiatives, but to a lesser extent. Looking at the percentage score (10%) from the data, the problem is ranked a number four in the ranking order. This suggests that Members of Parliament face different challenges in pursuing the participatory development agenda.

5.9.1.3 Disadvantages of Participation initiatives

The majority of Members of Parliament responding to the survey claim to have experienced some negative effect when carrying out participation initiatives: 97% reported this to be the case. It would seem most like that Members of Parliament have experienced negative effects relating to public perception and managing public involvement as indicated in Table 14 on page 66 of this report:

- Nearly one third of the Members of Parliament interviewed (31%) are concerned that public participation initiatives may lead to consultation fatigue among the public.
- 29% of responding Members of Parliament also seem concerned that consulting the public may simply capture the views of the dominant, but unrepresentative groups.
- 29% of the Members of Parliament reported that public participation undermines the legitimacy of elected members.
- 5% of Members of Parliament believe that participation exercises can raise public expectations that the authority cannot meet.

Table 14: Disadvantages of public participation as perceived by Members of Parliament

Disadvantages of public participation as perceived by Members of Parliament	Female %	Male %	Total %
Consultation overload	10	21	31
Captures the views of dominant, but unrepresentative group	8	21	29
Undermines the authority or democratic legitimacy of elected members	18	10	28

Raises public expectations that parliament cannot meet	2	3	5
Slows down the decision making process	1	4	5
Promotes disagreement and conflicts among different sections of the community	0	2	2

A sizeable number of Members of Parliament reported that public participation initiatives may cause negative effects on internal processes of parliament:

- 5% of Members of Parliament feel that engaging the public can slow down the decision-making process. However, as discussed earlier, other Members of Parliament see "better decision-making" as one of the most important benefits of engaging the public.
- 25% feel that conducting participation exercises promotes disagreement and conflict among different sections of the community

5.9.1.4 Perception of Members of Parliament with regard the developmental role of parliament

Here the researcher sought the perceptions of Members of Parliament with regard to the role of parliament in development of their constituencies. Specific efforts were made to get some idea of how parliament's role was understood and described by Members of Parliament themselves. A battery of open-ended questions was asked to specify the role that Members of Parliament perceived for parliament. Some of these perceived roles are presented in the Table 15 on the next page.

Table 15: Parliament's role as perceived by Members of Parliament

Role as perceived	%
Parliament's role is networking and improving the profile of constituency interest	72
Parliament is a mediator. It identifies the needs of constituencies and communicates them to relevant authorities	68
Members of Parliament acts as ambassadors of the people by taking their problems, needs and demands to the executive and seeking new development projects for the constituencies	66.5
Parliament could contribute to improving people's understanding of development in their constituencies, thereby enhancing their potential for meaningful participation in its policy making role	62
Parliament is the only arena of participation at the national level which brings local needs to the authorities	62

As is shown by Table 15 above, it is common for Members of Parliament to claim that parliament's role is networking and improving the profile of constituency interest (72%). This was acknowledged as a key role of parliament.

Many Members of Parliament expressed the view that parliament plays the role of a mediating and communicating agency (68%).

Judging from the data, Members of Parliament have accepted the Greenwood and Stewart's (1973) under which they acknowledge a responsibility especially in relation to issues like constituency development and the welfare of their communities which is wider than the statutory responsibilities conferred on parliament. They also emphasized on cooperation with local authorities and other governmental organs to improve social services in constituencies. So a considerable number of Members of Parliament emphasized their role as follows:

- Identifying problems in their constituencies
- Making collective choices

- Lobbying for resources
- Exerting political pressure to get funds for development
- Encouraging self-help to help develop the constituencies.

It appears from the foregoing discussion that Members of Parliament perceived a greater role for parliament in development. The national development mandate of parliament is strengthened by its role in approving the national budget.

When asked about achievements of parliament at constituency level, there were no clear lead categories, except possibly a widespread appreciation of the role of bringing constituency interest into this sphere: bringing development programmes, acting as ambassadors in building interest about self-help activities and also helping to bridge the gap between the electorate and the government. Generally, parliament is credited with sensitizing development provisions to rural areas and has been successful in creating a stronger sense of national focus to development programmes. In parliament, there is evidence of interest and ambition in development, considerably greater was voiced over the institutional implications of this development. But in consequence of limited involvement in local development networks and activities, Members of Parliament acknowledged that parliament had little credibility in this area.

5.9.1.5 Causes that disrupt parliament's development capacity

The researcher reached the conclusion that parliament has little credibility in the area of constituency development. The researcher therefore asked for the causes of this poor development record. Here we have tried to discuss the various causes that obstruct parliament's development performance from the view point of Members of Parliament.

When the researcher inquired about the reasons which rebuffed parliament's development efforts, the majority of the Members of Parliament linked the poor performance to parliament's poor funding. As Members of Parliament expressed it, one of the reasons for a wariness of overreaching on capacity and involvement

in development was simply a matter of funding "we are very much concerned with development. But we cannot do anything about it because we do not have enough money to solve constituency problems".

The main factor which has most effect in providing and delivering development to constituencies by parliament is funding. If the money is insufficient then Parliament is faced with a severe dilemma in bringing development. Up until 1994, Members of Parliament did not have funds put aside in the national budget to help with constituency development. The 1996 budget introduced the Constituency Development Fund to help members in developing their constituency in as far as smaller projects are concerned.

The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) was created with the aim of fighting poverty at the grass roots level through the implementation of community based projects. It was also intended to relieve Members of Parliament from the heavy demands of fund raising for projects which ought to be financed through the national budget. A closer look of the legal provision of the establishment and operation of the fund suggests that the fund is essentially a model for decentralization of development planning and implementation. The primary argument for decentralization is that it enhances the process and speed of development through the provision of social and economic services.

It is indisputable that the establishment of the CDF programme is an expression of continued faith by Government in decentralization. Decentralization has many virtues key among them is participation. The participation of the local population lends additional accuracy to assumptions about the development situation of the local communities, assumptions upon which decisions are made and action taken.

A discussion of the institutional arrangement of the CDF programme can appropriately begin with the relationship between the constituency and the central government. The CDF requires the government to grant each constituency a fixed amount of the national revenue for each financial year. The financial relationship between the central government and the CDF programme is therefore quite

appropriate in the sense that the exact size of the grant to be remitted to the Constituency is predetermined in the budget. When the CDF was introduced it was K15million per constituency per year. This figure has steadily been rising to K720million as at the time of this research. The CDF was housed under the Ministry of Local Government and Housing. With the coming in of the new government, it is not yet clear which of the merged Ministries will handle the disbursement of the CDF.

The CDF will no doubt have a major bearing on the development and rehabilitation of the socio-economic infrastructure in the 150 constituencies. The CDF helps provide services to communities that for many years did not benefit substantially from government services. Members have however, bemoaned the little amounts that have been availed for this fund.

Table 16:   Reasons for Parliament's low development performance as perceived by Members of Parliament

Reasons	Agree	Disagree
Inadequacy of funds	79.1	20.9
Inadequacy of authority	56.4	43.6
Lack of human resources	46.6	53.4
Appointed officials do not provide adequate cooperation and guidance	42.1	57.9
People are not cooperative and participative minded	27.35	72.65

As seen in Table 16 above, Members of Parliament (79.1%) indicated CDF as insufficient and even totally inadequate. Through the data in this section, it appears that the most important factors which play a fundamental role in parliament's development capacity are funding, authority, personnel and lack of communication between Members of Parliament and the electorate.

Even critics of parliament recognise that it is unfair to criticise parliament for not being more responsive to constituency development in the light of the funding and other restriction which it faces. However, parliament, like Oak and Stewart (1994) asserted, should focus not only on "choice" but also on encouragement of "voice". The key role of parliament is not local choice but local voice. It does not assume significant responsibility for constituency services, but its key role is express and press for what the constituencies want. The direct provision of services or even responsibility for that provision is seen as a distraction or even a distortion of that role. It is left to other agencies and organizations.

5.9.1.6 Signing of a social contract

There has been an outcry especially from churches and civil society alleging that the reason why Members of Parliament fail to fulfil their promises in delivering development to their constituencies is because they do not sign a social contract with the people who elect them to represent them. The researcher asked the people whether they felt that signing of a social contract between the elected representative and the people would enhance the participation of the people in project management and implementation in constituencies. The majority of the people interviewed felt that signing of a social contract would not help participation and project implementation in constituencies. They stated that Members of Parliament cannot do anything if they are not supported by government in terms of releasing adequate finances for projects in time. However, a few felt that in a way, a social contract will compel Members of Parliament to visit their constituencies and explain government policies and the challenges they were facing.

5.10   Parliamentary Constituency Offices

In order to improve public participation in the legislative processes, the Parliament of Zambia has opened 150 constituency offices. The intention of the Parliament of Zambia is to bring parliament closer to the people. They contend that most times Members of Parliament are in Lusaka attending to parliament work and during this

period there is no contact between the people and their representative, hence the creation of these offices which are open 24 hours. The researcher was therefore interested to find out whether the creation of these constituency offices are indeed increasing public participation and how many of the electorates know about the existence of these offices in their areas. It was shocking to note that the majority of the people interviewed do not even know of the existence of the parliamentary offices. The few that know, has either just seen the building written with the words "National Assembly Office", they have never been there and they do not even know the importance of these offices. It is the researcher's view that not much has been done in terms of publicising the existence of these offices and because of this they are not serving the purpose under which they were created.

Chapter 6: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Summary

There is no doubt that the founders of the institution of parliament had in mind increased public participation in government and accelerated development as the major outcomes. Possibly the most advocated aspects were the degree of and character of popular participation, the representation and development role for parliament.

Parliament has not made any significant contribution to the creation of democratic institutions at constituency level which favour participation in development. There is however, a reasonable increase in the political participation of people which highlights the significance of local democracy to the rural population. In terms of development participation, both the people and the Member of Parliament are nonetheless more inclined to favour people involvement in development activities which is encouraging for improved participation in future.

Similarly the share of parliament in constituency development is considerably low, explained very largely by lack of resources and the preferences of central government to directing major development projects through other bodies thus by passing the people's representatives. But, despite the failures, belief in parliament as the viable institution for constituency development is continuously preferred by most of the people.

Zambia is a geographically diverse country with heritage of economic and political centralization. Although the notion of participation has lacked sustained political support, economic and social trends have made it an enduring political concern since the reintroduction of multiparty democracy in 1990. Political leaders have used participation as a slogan to rally support in constituencies, but after coming into office, they were unwilling to implement policies that would undercut their influence.

Parliament was assessed in terms of participation and development from three different perspectives: institutional, functional and social.

6.1.1 The institutional perspective: Organizational arrangements

Despite pronouncements and the subsequent adoption of the policy to establish Parliamentary offices in every constituency in the country, to promote people involvement at the local level, the institutional arrangements for involving people in development activities were not in place in the sampled constituencies in Kawambwa District.

6.1.2 Politics/electoral participation: awareness and involvement in national institutions

On average awareness was quite widespread with between 40 to 50 per cent having heard about any of the three arms of the state and 35% having heard about all the three. The high level of awareness does not correspond with the level of involvement in these institutions. However, a significant majority (more than 62%) participated in parliamentary elections but the fact remains that elite preferences coloured the selection of Members of Parliament.

6.1.3   Contacts

More than 44% of the respondents do not have any contact with Members of Parliament as "they have nothing to offer to the constituency and its people and also because of the people's poverty.

6.2   The functional perspective: people's participation in development

As shown in Table 5, on page 56 of this report, the majority (82.9%) of the people and 66% of the Members of Parliament believe that the people should participate in development to improve services and infrastructure for the constituency. But

only a small percentage of the people (less that 17%) participated in such projects. The social and financial status of the people has hampered popular participation.

Among those who participated (refer to Table 7, on Page 57 of this report), 26.7% provided an opinion or suggestion, and 24.55% and 15.25% participated in problem identification and decision making stages respectively. No participation was recorded or the planning stage. 3.5% participated in the maintenance stage and 30% have participated in the implementation of the project by providing money, material and manpower and supervised and monitored the projects.

Most people (68%) acknowledged the general benefits of the development projects but no individual benefits. Poor people exhibit the lowest participation levels.

6.3 The social perspective: responsiveness of parliament to the needs of the people

On average 33% of the respondents thought that parliament have extended its efforts towards the problem of constituencies. Despite the small share in constituency development, parliament is perceived and ranked number one (49.8%) as compared to other government institutions in terms of needs responsiveness.

The responsiveness of parliament to people's needs and their opportunity to participate in its decisions were assessed as good by 49.8% and 42% respectively. The overall performance of parliament was assessed as poor at 50%. However,, nearly 85 of the ordinary people and 55% of the Members of Parliament thought that parliament is a necessary element in constituency development and a substantial majority preferred the parliamentary system despite its failure in participatory development. Respondents shared the view that parliament failed because of the lack of financial resources (28.66%), by passing of parliament by other agencies (10.98%) and lack of interest on the part of the Members of Parliament (0.60%).

6.4 Members of Parliament and people participation

When you analysis Table 14 on page 66, Members of Parliament acknowledged the benefits of people's participation as almost two thirds of them (66%) favoured involvement of people in development activities to gain information on citizen's views, improvement in services (52%) and closely followed by allowing "better decision making" at (48%). Despite this, Members of Parliament still have some concerns as consultation fatigue among the public (31%), capture the views of dominant, but unrepresentative groups (29%), undermines the legitimacy of elected members (28%), raises public expectations that the authorities cannot meet (5%), slows down the decision making process (5%) and promoted disagreement and conflict among different sections of the community (2%).

Members perceived a greater role for parliament in development. But in consequence of little involvement in local development networks and activities, the respondents acknowledged that parliament had little credibility in this area. Regarding the reasons, Members of Parliament indicated: insufficient and inadequate funds (79%) and lack of authority (54.4%).

6.5 Conclusions

Parliament was set up to increase public participation in government and to accelerate development countrywide. Possibly, the most advocated were the degree and character of popular participation and the development role for parliament.

Parliament has not made any significant contribution to the creation of democratic institution at the constituency level which favours participation in development. There is however, a reasonable increase in the participation of which highlights the importance of local democracy to the population.

In terms of development participation, both the people and the Member of Parliament are nevertheless more inclined to favour people involvement in

development activities which is encouraging for improved participation in future. The links of the constituencies with parliament are still weak, both physically and psychologically and people, especially the poor are not involved in decision making processes and development projects. Despite this, the people have a strong confidence in parliament as they perceived it a more effective tool for participatory development.

Similarly the share of parliament in constituency development in terms of involvement and allocated resources is considerably low, explained very largely by lack of resources and the preference of government to directing major development projects through other bodies, thus by-passing parliament. But the match between what constituencies need and what they obtained has reasonably improved. In general, parliament has developed policy measures in a manner which has been responsive to the local perception of local economic problems. Parliament has also brought an increase in the resources directed towards local levels like the CDF. So despite the failures, belief in parliament as the viable institution for participatory development is continuously preferred by the people, believing that parliament with the passage of time might lead to constituency development in Zambia. This suggests that despite weak performance, the majority of the people preferred the parliamentary system. If the participatory structures of parliament were left in place for a long period, they can become instrumental in constituency development.

Government's commitment to people's participation is common, but it is often observed that the rhetoric does not culminate in actual policies. Members of Parliament and the people clearly recognise the benefits of engaging the public, particularly in terms of having and improving service delivery and decision making without extending efforts for its realization.

Parliament has a particularly important role to play, both in constituency development and the renewal of democracy. Lack of financial resources both in parliament and the constituencies has hampered parliament's and people's

participation in constituency development. It was observed that those people who were economically sound participated more than the economically depressed.

Most people gave a high value to democracy and participation, and declared an interest in parliamentary issues and wish to be involved in the decision making processes, however relatively few seldom have been involved in these processes. The structure, however, purported to create wide opportunities for people's participation which were not generally grasped. A frequent reason for this was the belief that parliament was not attentive to their views due to their poor financial and social status. But these reasons probably reflect personal choice as well. There appears to be ample scope for parliament to develop strategies to increase citizens' participation. It is necessary not to prejudge an attempt to secure change which can only be attained over the long term. Opportunities, though not exploited as anticipated, have been created and awareness stimulated.

Parliament is strongly trusted as an agent for constituency development and citizen participation because some of the barriers are beyond its jurisdiction. Lack of resources (both human and financial), and the preference of central government to directing major development projects through other institutions and by-passing parliament are some of the reasons of parliament's ineffectiveness in development. All these have created a sense of frustration among the people and also shaken their faith in the efficacy of the parliamentary system.

6.6 Recommendations

It is important in a study of this kind to suggest new models or as often towards new concepts and strategies for development. With some justification, attempts were made to deviate from the path of prescriptions, to discuss what are seen as vital issues. What this study and other experiences point to is the need for some way of putting parliament in context – ensuring that it is grafted and not bolted into the local set up. The results of this research suggest some general directions for improvement. Uphoff and Esman (1974) argue that national institutions which are separated and isolated from other levels are likely to be impotent developmentally.

What makes the most difference are systems or networks of organisations that make constituency development more than an enclave phenomenon. Thus for development purposes, the strength of parliament in terms of the salience of the functions it performs, the base of financial resources and the effectiveness of carrying out the responsibilities are more salient than the status of being an independent arm of the state. To achieve these objectives, in light of the Zambian context, a number of measures may be considered. Although measures to be taken for enhancing parliament as an effective local government institution are varied, they fall into two distinct but connected areas:

- Accountability
- Development capacity

The most commonly talked about mechanism for improving local accountability is the election of Members of Parliament. Evidently, elections present no universal panacea in terms of improving local accountability, they create a visible link to local accountability and the evidence available shows that it can stimulate Members of Parliament to make sure that their achievements are visible for all to see.

There is indeed an urgent need to involve the people in development processes. Exactly what form this takes, may be defined differently by different people. In addition there is a compelling necessity to organise people at the constituency level, as it is a pre-requisite for participation. The recent trends in development call for greater participation by the people at all stages in the development process. Furthermore the recent call is to move from "people first" to "people empowerment" (Goetz and O'brian: 1995). Considerable attention should therefore be paid to the following:

- Rational democracy – creation of forms of participatory policy making and involvement of parliament in the national development process;
- Representative democracy – strengthening the position of parliament and making it responsive and accountable to the electorate;

- Direct democracy – involve the people in the development discussion and decision-making (Tops and Depla: 1994).

Developing constituencies and ensuring public participation are two important dimensions that are being prominently stressed for making parliament more effective. There is however, a vexing problem in the development role of parliament. The main concerns in this area which are commonly raised are: lack of clarity of the developmental responsibilities of parliament and the mismatch between functions and resources. However, democracy and resources can neither be considered as the pre-requisite of parliament's development capacity nor can its values and potential contribution to constituency development be dismissed. What is lacking are not resources but political will. More generally, there is now a large amount of literature that points to what may be termed "political commitment" as a key cause of low levels of performance in developing countries (Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith: 1992). In essence, it is concluded that parliament need political support if they are to obtain resources, be listened to and generally be effective. We have not only to reinvent our governments (Osborn and Gaebler: 1993) but also to reinvent ourselves. What this really means is the reinvention of the concept of government, by both the authorities and the citizens. Only then can we establish an enabling environment for participatory development.

6.7   Areas for future research

Parliament has always been a core area of investigation for the research which has made significant progress in advancing knowledge regarding participatory development. This research illuminates the participation aspect of parliament in development. However, the ideas discussed and analysed need to be tested and refined through additional comparative research as constraints of time and resources have not permitted the researcher to cover all significant aspects of parliament and participatory development.

There is need for detailed studies of specific issues and problems of the institution of parliament. Studies are required which look at participation in terms of the

interaction between the legislature and the executive, that is intergovernmental relations. This is a research area where a particular contribution can be made by the discipline of political science, together with studies on communication, public administration and multi-disciplinary studies on development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnstein, S.R (1969). *Ladder of Citizen Participation, journal of the American Institute of Town Planning*, Vol. 35, pp216-224

Aziz, A., Nelson, C., and Babu, D (1996) *Power to the People*: The Karnataka Experiment, in A. Aziz and D. D. Arnold (eds), Decentralised Governance in Asian Countries, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage

Baker, E (1942). *Reflections on Government*, London: Oxford University Press.

Bhuvan and Aubrey, C Williams (eds), *Participatory Development and the World Bank: Potential Directions for Change*, World Bank Discussion Paper 183, Washington DC: The World Bank.

Bryant, C. and White, L. G. (1982). *Managing Development in the Third World*, Boulder, CO, Westview.

Bwalya, M. E. M. (2008). *Community Media Versus Mass Media in their role of promoting Development and Democracy Among the grassroots in Zambia* (Thesis for doctorate), Salesian University, Rome.

Casley, D. J. and Lury, D. A. (1987). *Data Collection in Developing Countries*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cheema, G. S. and Rondinelli, D. A (eds) (1983). *Decentralisation and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*, London: Sage

Chenery, H. et al (1974). *Redistribution with Growth: Policies to Improve income Distribution in Developing Countries in the context of economic growth*, London: Oxford University Press.

Cernea, M. M. (ed) (1991). *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. New York: UNDP.

Chibesakunda, N. M. (2001). *The Parliament of Zambia*. Venus Stationery. Lsk. Zambia.

Clayton, A. Oakley, P. and Pratt, B. (1998). *Empowering People: A guide to Participation*, New York: UPND.

Cohen, M. J. and Uphoff, T. N. (1977). *Rural Development Participation: Concepts and Measures for Project Design, Implementation and Evaluation*, Ithaca: Centre for International Studies: Cornwell University.

Colin, P. (1975). *Theories of People's Participation in Development Administration: An Empirical Comment, Planning and Administration*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp58-69.

Conyers, D. (1985). *Future direction in Development Studies: The Case of Decentralization, World Development*, Vol. 15

Deutch, K (1961). *Social Mobilisation and Political Development*, American Political Science Review, Vol. 55.

Festinger, L. and Denial, K. (eds.). *Research Methods in Behavioural Sciences*, New York: Dryden Press.

Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), (1990). *Participation in Practice: Lessons from the FAO People's Participation Programme*. Rome: FAO.

Griffin, M. S. and Khan, A. R. (1982). *Poverty in the Third World*: Ugly Facts and Fancy Models in Alvi, H. and Shawn, T. (1982). Introduction to the Sociology of Development, London: McMillan.

Hoinville, G. et al. (1987). *Survey Research Practice*, London: Heinemann.

Houghton Mifflin Co. *Dictionary of English Language*, 4th edition

Hulme, D. and Turner, M. M. (1990). *Sociology and Development: Theories, Policies and Practices*, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hunt, D. (1989). *Economic Theories of Development: An Analysis of Competing Paradigms*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Huntington, S. and Nelson, J. M. (1976). *No Easy Choice: Political Participation in Developing Countries*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ikiara, G., Olewe-Nyunya, J. & Odhiambo, W. (2004). Kenya: *Formulation and Implementation of Strategic Trade and Industrial Policies in Soludo C.*, Ogbu O. & Chang Ha-Joon, (eds) 2004**. The Politics of Trade and Industrial Policy in Africa.** IDRC and Africa World Press, inc. Ottawa, Asmara.

Isaak, A. C. (1969). *The Scope and Methods of Political Science*, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Makumbe, J. (1996). *Participatory Development*. The Case of Zimbabwe, Harare. University of Zimbabwe Publications.

McAllister, K. (1990). *Understanding Participation: Monitoring and Evaluating Process, Outputs and Outcomes*, Ottawa IDRC

Mkandawire, T. & Soludo, C., (1999). *Our Continent, Our future. Council for the Development of Social Sciences Research in Africa*. Ottawa, Africa World Press, inc., Asmara and IDRC.

Moser, C. A. and Kalton, G. (1989). *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*, Calif: Sage.

Myrdal, G. (1968). Asia Drama: *An inquiry into the Poverty of Nations*, London: Allen Lane.

National Assembly of Zambia (1993). *Strengthening Democracy in Zambia. A Report of the Parliamentary Reform Committee*. Lusaka, Zambia.

Oakley, P. and Marsden, D. (1984). *Approaches to Participation in Rural Development*, Geneva: ILO

Parry, G. (1972). *The Idea of Political Participation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ranney, A. (1958). *The Governing of Men: An Introduction to Political Science*, New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Rose, H. (1991). Case Studies in Graham. *Handbook for Research Students in the Social Sciences*, London: The Palmer Press.

Sadik, N. (1991). *Rethinking Modernism*: Towards Human-Centred Development, Journal.

Seers, D. (1979). *The meaning of Development*, in Lehman. D. (ed) Development Theory: Four Critical Studies, London. Frank Cass.

Stiefel, M. and Marshall, Wolfe (1994). *The Nature of Participation: A Voice for the Excluded; Popular Participation in Development Utopia or Necessity*? Geneva, Zed Books Ltd, London & New Jersey, in Association with UNRISD.

Streeton, P. et al (1981). *Economics for a Developing World: An Introduction to Principles, Problems and policies for Economic Development in the Third World*, London: Longman.

Todaro, M. P. ((2003). *Economics for a Developing World: An Introduction to Principles, Problems and Policies for Economic Development in the Third World*, London: Longman.

Verba, S., Nie, N. H. and Kin, J. (1980). *Participation and Political Equality: A Seven Nation Comparison*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

www.communication.edu down loaded on 11th July, 2011-10-25

www.uvm.edu down loaded on 11th July, 2011-10-25

World Bank, (1990). *World Development Report*, Washington DC, Oxford: University Press.

Yen, Robert, K. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Newbury Park. Calif: Sage.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE (A) FOR PEOPLE IN CONSTITUENCIES

Ms Elizabeth Katongo Chitika is a full time student enrolled for a Masters of Communication for Development (MCD) programme at the University of Zambia. The chosen topic of study is People, Participation and Development: A case study of Popular and effective Participation in Parliamentary Processes in Kawambwa District. This questionnaire seeks to collect information about people's participation in parliamentary processes as part of her studies.

- All information collected will be used for academic purposes only and will be treated with confidentiality.
- You do not have to write your name on this questionnaire.
- May you please fill in this questionnaire to the best of your knowledge.
- Would you allow me to acknowledge the information I am going to get from you by citing your name?   (1). YES [   ] (2). NO [   ]

If YES please write your name:……………………………………………….

Name of Constituency:………………………………………………………..

Section A: General Information

1. Age Group

   (1). 18-20 [   ]   (2). 21-30 [   ]   (3). 31-40 [   ]

   (4). 41-50 [   ]   (5). 51-60 [   ]   (6). 60+ [   ]

2. Gender:
   (1). Male [   ]   (2).Female [   ]

3. Marital Status:
   (1). Single [   ]   (2). Married [   ]   (3). Divorced [   ]

4. Educational Background:

   (1). Formal Schooling [   ]   (2). Primary Education [   ]

   (3). Secondary Education [   ]   (4). College Education [   ]

   (5). University [   ]

5. Occupation: …………………………………………………..

6. What is your approximate monthly income?...........................

Section B: The Political and Participative Aspects

7. Do you know what Parliament is?

   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………

8. Did you vote during the 2006 General and Parliamentary elections?

   (1). YES [   ]   (2). NO [   ]

9. If "NO" why did you not vote?

   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………..

10. Have you ever contacted any elected officials (MPs or Councillors)?

    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………

11. Who do you think is easily accessible?

    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………...

12. Did any of the following contact you?

    (1).Member of Parliament [   ]   (2). Councillor [   ]

13. How did they contact you?

    ………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………

14. Why did they contact you?

    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………….................

15. Besides government, which other key institutions of governance exist in Zambia?

    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………

16. Do you believe that people in constituencies should participate in parliamentary processes?

    (1). YES [ ]   (2). NO [ ]   (3). Don't Know [ ]

17. If "YES" why do you think so? Please give reasons

    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………

18. If   "NO"   why   not?   Specify reasons………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………

19. If "YES" then how? Please specify:

    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………

20. Did any of the parliamentary processes benefit you personally?

    (1). YES [ ]   (2). NO [ ]

21. If "YES" what benefits did you gain from the processes? Specify

    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………

22. Some people say that there are people who have benefited more than others from Parliamentary processes. Do you agree?

    (1). Agree [ ]   (2). Disagree [ ]

23. Which group of people do you think have benefited the least?

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

24. Are you aware that Parliament has opened a parliamentary office in your area?

(1). Aware [　　　　] 　　　　(2). Not Aware [　　　　]

25. Have you ever visited this office?

(1). YES [　　　　] 　　　　(2). NO [　　　　]

26. What was your first impression when you visited the Parliamentary office?

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

27. Did you get the necessary information from the parliamentary office?

(1). YES [　　　　] 　　　　(2). NO [　　　　]

28. Is it important to continue maintaining this office:

(1). YES [　　　　] 　　　　(2). NO [　　　　]

29. If "YES" state reasons:

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

30. If "NO" Please specify:

……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………

Section C: The Social and Development aspect of Parliament

31. What development activities do you think need to happen in your constituency?

    1. ……………………………………………………………………………

    2. ……………………………………………………………………………

    3. ……………………………………………………………………………

32. Are there any Parliamentary activities or services operating in your constituency?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………

33. How do you assess the overall performance of the MPs/Parliament in Constituency Development?

(1). Poor [ ]   (2). Average [ ]   (3). Good [ ]

(4). Very Good [ ]   (5). Excellent [ ]

34. If "POOR" or "AVERAGE" what do you think is the main reason (s) your MP/Parliament did not provide services to your constituency?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………….............

35. In enhancing the participation of the people in projects in the constituencies, would you recommend that people draw a social contract and MPs sign as they come into office or not?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………

36. There are no more specific questions that I would like to ask, if you would like to express any opinion or suggestions concerning parliamentary processes, participation and development in constituencies, please feel free to do so.

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………

Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation

APPENDIX 2

QUESTIONNAIRE (B) FOR KEY INFORMANTS (SPEAKER, MINISTERS, MPS, COUNCILLORS, HEADS OF NGOS)

Ms Elizabeth Katongo Chitika is a full time student enrolled for a Masters in Communication for Development (MCD) programme at the University of Zambia. The chosen topic of study is People, Participation and Development: A case study of popular and effective participation in Parliamentary Processes in Kawambwa District. This questionnaire seeks to collect information about people's participation in parliamentary processes as part of her studies.

- All information collected will be used for academic purposes only and will be treated with confidentiality.
- You do not have to write your name on this questionnaire.
- May you please fill in this questionnaire to the best of your knowledge.
- Would you allow me to acknowledge the information I am going to get from you by citing your name? (1). **YES** ☐ (2). **NO** ☐

If YES please write your name:………………………………………………

Name of Constituency/:Org: …………………………………………….

Section A: General Information

1. **Age Group**

    (1). 18-20 ☐   (2). 21-30 ☐   (3). 31-40 ☐

    (4). 41-50 ☐   (5). 51-60 ☐   (6). 60+ ☐

2. Gender:
    (1). Male ☐   (2).Female ☐

3. **Marital Status**

    (1). Single ☐   (2). Married ☐   (3). Divorced ☐

4. Educational Background

    (1). Formal Schooling ☐   (2). Primary Education ☐

    (3). Secondary Education ☐   (4). College Education ☐

(5). University

5. What is your approximate monthly income?

[   ]

Section B: Participation in Development Process

Nature of MPs participation in development

6. Who usually initiates development projects in your constituency?

(1).Member of Parliament [   ]   (2). Councillor [   ]

(3). District Commissioner [   ]   (4). Council Secretary [   ]

(5). NGOs [   ]   (6). Business people [   ]

7. Should people be involved in the development process?

(1).**YES** [   ]   (2**). NO** [   ]

8. What do you see as development?
    …………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………..

9. What do you perceive as the advantages and purposes of people participation in the development process?
    …………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………

10. What problems do you think will arise out of people participation in the development process?
    …………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………

Relations between MPs and Constituents

(This section will be adjusted depending on who is being interviewed).

11. Do you interact with people in the constituency for their priorities and needs?

(1**).YES** [   ]   (2). **NO** [   ]

12. How do you communicate with your constituents?

……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

13. What participative initiative have you introduced in your constituency?

……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………….

14. What forms of contact should there be with the people in the development process?

……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

15. In driving development in the constituency in accordance with the needs of the people, would you recommend that people draw a social contract and MPs sign as they come into office or not?

……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

Parliament and Development

16. How do you rate the performance of parliament in constituency development?

……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

17. Are you satisfied or not?   (1). **YES**   (2). **NO**

18. If satisfied, who do you think is responsible for this state of affairs?

……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

19. What do you consider to be the fundamental function of parliament?

……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………

20. What sort of things would you like parliament to do for constituency development?

....
....
....

21. How much influence do you think Parliament can have on the development process in a constituency?

....
....
....

22. What do you consider to be the major problems facing parliament today?

....
....
....

23. What do you consider to be the major source of these problems?

....
....
....

24. What changes do you feel are needed and how can these be brought about?

....
....
....

Thank you very much for your participation.