

Influence of Youth Participation under Decentralization in Local Governments in Uganda

Shaft Nasser Mukwaya, Dr. Richard Asaba Bagonza, Dr. Grace Lubaale

Kampala International University, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, P. O. Box 20000, Kampala, Uganda

Abstract: This paper investigated the Influence of Youth Participation under Decentralization in Local Governments in Uganda. Using a mixed methods approach, convergent and parallel designs were adopted on a sample of 464 participants including 80 respondents for the interviews. Document analysis guides, interview guide and survey questionnaires were the main instruments of data collection. Quantitative results revealed a positive and significant effect on decentralization in Uganda local governments. The results are in agreement with the interviews and document analysis. This study recommends that; The Government of Uganda in line with the provision of Article 32 of the Constitution should empower the youth economically in order to address their historical marginalization and vulnerability, Cooperation, collaboration and partnership should be established between the state and all the non-state actors in the areas of youth development in order to build synergy, share best practices and conducive environment for youth empowerment in all spheres of life consistent with the global trend of private –public partnership, and The state and the non-state actors who are involved in youth development should adopt the strategy of youth mainstreaming and youth inclusion in all policies, programmes, project, laws and other initiatives in order to ensure that the contemporary interests and concerns of the youth are planned for by all the national, regional and local players.

Keywords: Youth Participation, Decentralization, Local Governments.

I. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of youth participation in Local governance rooted in both the global and national historical archives. Castel (1995) makes a historical analysis of youth participation in by asserting that the struggle for the youth to participate in governance process is as old as modern industrial societies.

In Uganda, right from pre-colonial periods, the youth have been struggling to have their voices heard amidst opposition from elders on account of social-cultural bias against their participation in public affairs (2). Further, In Uganda, participation is associated with the current decentralization policy, which was adopted in 1992. Uganda's decentralized system of local governance was built on a major assumption that local citizens including the youth, would participate effectively in making decisions on local development and would be able to enforce responsiveness and accountability from their leaders. It was also assumed that elected leaders would serve the best interests of their electorate, but the

reality on the ground shows mixed results (Francis and James, 2003; Kiyaga- Nsubuga and Olum, 2009).

Decentralization refers to the restructuring of authority such that there is a system of co-responsibility between institutions of governance at the central, regional and local levels according to the principles of subsidiarity. Based on such principle, functions (tasks) are transferred to the lowest institutional or social level that is capable (or potentially capable) of completing them (UN-DDSMS/UNDP, 1996).

Similarly, the UN (2011) defines youth participation as a process of involving young people in all affairs that affect them and the communities where they live. On the other hand, the UN (ibid) looks at youth participation both as a process as well as an outcome. The World Bank (6) concurs with the UN definition of youth participation but emphasizes that youth participation is more of a means through which young people can be assisted to take part in the development processes. (Ref.8) defines youth participation as a deliberate attempt through systematic framework to involve and engage young people in all organs of decision making. On the other hand, (Ref.8) looks at youth participation as “an end rather than a mean from the human right perspective. (Ref.9) of Uganda describes participation as the involvement of the youth in both the process and the outcome of the engagement thereby implying that participation is both a mean to an end and an end by itself. Subsequently, this definition is adopted to best address the purpose and objectives of this study. This study thus addresses youth participation in terms of: platforms for youth participation, forms of youth participation; factors affecting youth participation, and influence of youth participation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Until the recent amendments in the Local Government Act (LGA) (10) by the Parliament of Uganda, the age limit for persons intending to contest for the position of Local Council Five (LCV) and LCIII was 30 years and above. However, the NYC Act (1993) in section 1(g) defines a youth as a person between the age of 18 and 30 years. This means that the youth below the age of 30 were ineligible to occupy the position for Chairperson, Vice Chairperson in any Local Governments (LGs) in Uganda. This is a substantive gap that requires a new study to be conducted. The Exclusion of the of the youth from participating in governance at the LG level is further exacerbated by cultural and traditional practices that view them as inexperienced, not knowledgeable and unfit to

participate in decision-making. This socio-cultural mindset is deeply rooted in the historical setting of many societies in the world (11).

Origin of Youth Participation

Various scholars and development practitioners have given different genesis of the term participation in general and youth participation in particular. According to (Ref.12) both citizen participation and youth participation have their genesis in the growth of industrialized mass society which prompted them to adopt a system of representative democracy. Lamb further explained that participation was seen as a moral requirement for the citizens to take part in public affairs while (Ref.13) states that participation was promoted globally as a mean to measure democratic processes. It is argued that initiatives towards participation emerged from social and civil rights movement in the 1960's and 1970's that sought to democratize the existing governance system. This was mainly prevalent in Europe and USA where the citizens vehemently demanded for their representation on planning committees and housing boards while the young people who were mainly students demanded to be included in the governance structures in their universities and institutions of higher learning. According to (Ref.15-17), the collapse of dictatorial regimes across the world brought about opportunity for democratic governance which promoted participation as a governance instrument.

Community Perceptions on the Concept of youth

The term youth has no universal meaning. The definition of youth varies from one place to another, from one country to another and from one society and institution to another. There has never been a one size fits all definition (18). The youth are generally referred to in collective terms as being the youth. The youth therefore are diverse in nature, energetic in their approach and highly heterogeneous group with complex identities and social-economic as well as social-cultural background. (Ref.2) describes the youth and characterizes them as *"being different from each other since some of them are physically able while others are physically disabled, some are educated while others are illiterate, some live in rural areas while others live in urban areas, some are economically endowed while others are poor, some are female while others are male"*. Mondo further states that even among the youth, there is the upper age bracket and the lower age bracket that are younger and in most cases are still in school. The above characterization means that planning for the youth needs to take into account different approaches, interventions and models.

Youth participation in the decision-making and governance process cannot happen in a vacuum (19). In the case of Uganda, the LG structures were established under the decentralization policy to promote citizens' participation including the youth. In the context of this study, youth participation was contextualized in terms of platforms that provide space for the youth to participate in the governance

process at the LGs in Uganda. It further looked at the forms of youth participation to answer the question of how the youth are practically participating, the factors affecting their effective participation as well as the effects of their participation and how it is influenced by decentralization.

Background on Decentralization in Uganda

The Constitution of Uganda, 1995, in its national objectives and directive principles of state policy (number II [iii]), states that; 'the state shall be guided by the principle of decentralization and devolution of governmental functions and powers to the people at appropriate levels where they can best manage and direct their affairs'. This clause sets out participation and empowerment. Article 176 of the Constitution of Uganda, 1995, establishes the District as the highest level of LG, below which are other Lower Local Governments (LLGs) such as the municipalities, city divisions, town councils (in urban areas) and sub counties (rural areas). The District Local Council (LC5) is the highest political organ, with the District Chairperson as its political head, elected by universal adult suffrage (UAS) (LGA, 1997: ss10–13).

The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) is the head of public servants in the District and is the accounting officer who is responsible for the implementation of District Council and central government decisions (LGA, 1997: s65 [1]). The CAO is appointed by the central government's Public Service Commission (PSC). Below the district are LLGs in both urban and rural areas. Urban areas have municipalities (LC4 level) and city divisions/town councils (LC3 level), while rural areas have sub counties (LC3 level).

There are administrative units in the form of county, parish and village councils, which perform such duties as are assigned to them by their respective LGs. LGs in Uganda are body corporate, with powers enshrined in the LGA (1997) to: 1 make and implement development plans based on locally determined priorities; 2 make, approve and execute their own budgets; 3 raise and utilize resources according to their own priorities after making legally mandated disbursements; 4 appoint statutory committees, boards and commissions; 5 make ordinances and bye-laws which are consistent with the Constitution of Uganda; 6 hire, manage and terminate (middle and lower level personnel) and manage their own payrolls; 1 implement decentralized services, hitherto handled by the central government, as contained in the Second Schedule of the LGA, 1997.

Regarding personnel management matters, all persons in the service of LGs (with the exception of the CAOs and Town Clerks) are employed by the LGs through their respective District Service Commissions (DSCs). Regarding financial matters, the main source of revenue for LGs in Uganda is through the block grants from the central government, which constitute conditional grants (85 percent), unconditional grants and equalization grants. LGs are empowered to levy and appropriate fees and taxes as parliament may prescribe

(Constitution, 1995: Article 191). It should be noted, however, that these local collections by LGs are very meagre, as the local revenue collections fetch barely 7 percent of total annual budgets for LGs (3).

Decentralization and Youth Participation

Although Scholarly literature linking decentralization to youth participation is somewhat limited, some writers like (Ref.20-22) have noted the link between the two concepts of decentralization and participation of the youth. Since decentralization is a mechanism for development and service provision (Ref.23,24) elected officials are expected to articulate and implement better policies on behalf of their youths for better governance (25-27). Thus, decentralization is a conduit through which elected bodies and shareholders are involved in the decision-making processes. (Ref.28) through an explorative-qualitative study examined the effects of political decentralization on school leadership in Germany and discovered that representatives of the citizens performed better in decentralized setting than otherwise. Likewise, scholars advocating participation propose that policy and development personnel adopt a framework where local communities including youth are vigorously involved in decision making to facilitate development (25). To examine the engagement of local populations in decision making processes in participatory planning and budgeting, (Ref.29) reviewed scholarly writ and found out contrasting views. While governments showed the need to delegate control and management to allow better participation, community members were left out in the planning and budgeting processes, yet they are vital partners in decision making (30), which demands creation of awareness among youthful communities and their need to participate, a key gap this study sought to fill.

Similarly, youth councils that come as a result of decentralization provide an opportunity for youths to participate in their own local affairs (31-33). To provide explicit evidence about operating youth councils and how youths may contribute to decision making in a decentralized municipal council setting, Ref.34 carried out a study by which they reviewed documents and websites by various methods. Results from their thematic analyses, revealed that youth councils taught the youths that their opinions mattered and gave them a platform to express their views, yet their study focused on community impacts rather than the relationship of decentralization and youth participation. Moreover, youth councils must study out the challenges and needs of the youth but they are not spread out across municipalities (Ref.35) contend that democracy and human capital (youths) are linked to the elements of decentralization which are transparency and involvement of the public. In decentralized areas, youths delegate authority for decision making but remain with sole responsibility to measure and substantiate the actions of their elected officials. Besides, in a cross-sectional survey that involved 362 youth participants, (36) argued that with more conviction in government related institutions, youths were

likely to engage in pro-government activities such as politics because they had much political awareness.

III. METHODOLOGY

Research Approach

The study applied “mixed method” research approach. (Ref.37) define the mixed method approach as the application of both the quantitative and qualitative techniques in the entire process of the study. (Ref.39) would agree that mixed method approach involves the integration of more than one technique. The choice of the mixed method paradigm in this study was informed by many factors. The most important basis was the nature of the research problem which addressed the question of decentralization and youth participation which could better be explained by the use of both quantitative and qualitative data collection method and analysis (40).

Research Design

This study adopted a convergent and parallel design as proposed by (Ref.37). This design entails both qualitative and quantitative data collected in parallel and analyzed separately, then merged in the overall analysis and interpretation. The rationale for choosing this design was to obtain different and multiple perspectives so as to build comprehensive and extensive understanding of the research concepts.

Target Population and Sample Size

This mixed method targeted different populations involving youths, their leaders, Central Government officials, District and Sub-county officials, specifically the Community Development Officers (CDOs). Due to a large target population, the study concentrated on the accessible population of all the 411,145 youths in Gulu, Luweero, Mbale and Mbarara districts (NPHC, 2016). The overall study sample size was 464 participants comprising of 384 participants for quantitative data and 80 respondents for qualitative data.

Data Collection Methods

Document Analysis.

The study applied documentary review and analysis as one of the methods of collecting data under qualitative aspect. (Ref.41) defines document analysis as a process where the researcher gets data by consulting what has been written by others about the problem under investigation.

The study applied Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) as a method of data collection to reinforce data collected under quantitative paradigm. A Focus Group is a small group of six to ten who are led through an open discussion by a skilled moderator to discuss the questions contained in the focus group guide (35).

The study collected qualitative data through KIIs that lasted between 30 -45 minutes to complete. KIIs are qualitative in-

depth interviews with people who know what is going on in the community (42).

Data Analysis

The quantitative data and qualitative information that was gathered was presented through; charts; tabulation of frequencies and percentages; and arranged using themes and patterns. Quantitative data was analyzed using the statistical package for social scientists (SPSS). The data was subjected to descriptive statistics, measure of central tendency to determine expected scores by utilizing the means as well as standard deviation. The “means regression model” was utilized to analyze the influence of youth participation in the governance process in Uganda. In this study, qualitative data were subjected to thematic content analysis retaining the general idea in order to examine possible contrasts in the various views which are expressed (43). The researcher used manual coding on the transcripts to identify the significant statements across individual interviews. Subsequent statements helped in identifying sub-themes emerging within the patterns. For instance, textural descriptions, and quotes of participants were reported in italics. The structural descriptions as interpreted by the researcher were provided in plain text.

Qualitative and quantitative data was analyzed separately and then merged for interpretation. The exercise consisted of integrating data. Integration at the level of interpretation and reporting were achieved by synthesizing quantitative and qualitative data through triangulation. The results were connected to each other thematically, weaving back and forth around the key themes and concepts.

IV. RESULTS

Results on Youth Participation in Local Governments in Uganda

An analysis of qualitative data indicated that the youth in Uganda participate in decentralization and local government using various forms. This finding is in congruence with a report by Ref.19, participation cannot take place in a vacuum but has to take place within a legal framework which expressly defines the various forms of participation. The study revealed that the youth in Uganda have adopted both conventional and non-conventional forms of participation which is in line with (Ref.18) assertion that participation by the youth has various dimensions.

Results on the Influence of youth participation in local governments in Uganda

From the data collected, it was revealed that youth participation registered both positive and negative influence.

Positive effects of Youth Participation in local government Process

Youth leadership is characterized by disagreement, infighting and accusations which results into full-blown conflict and the

need to resolve this conflict is always present among youth leaders. In the process, they acquire sharp skills in conflict resolution and problem solving not only among the youth but also in the general public.

Another notable influence of youth participation was reported as acquisition of new opportunities in terms of contact, meeting new people and developing social capital through making new friends and role models. Respondents reported that social capital has helped them to promote collaboration and partnership with different people in society. Through this mechanism, the youth have also acquired jobs, scholarships and material assets such as animals and seedlings given to youth leaders by virtue of their positions. Some of the youth leaders were appointed by the President to serve in various capacities as Resident District Commissioners (RDCs), District identification and registration officers, Presidential Advisors and the civil service. All the youth leaders at the district level in the study area were all given cows under National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADs) and Operation Wealth Creation (OWC) by virtue of their youth leadership. At the national level, the entire eleven members of the National Executive Committee were given scholarships to pursue further studies in various universities in Uganda.

A number of respondents (16.7%) reported that youth issues and concerns have been mainstreamed in the various plans, programs, policies and budgets of the local government councils at the Sub County, district, and division city, municipal and national levels. Participation has resulted into acceptance of the youth as a special interest group who must be deliberately planned for in every action of government and non-governmental organizations. This has improved visibility of youth concern in most programs that have been implemented in Uganda. The voices of the youth can now be heard through their representatives and where they are not represented, other people willingly advocate for their concern.

During the focus group discussions and face to face interviews, participants revealed that participation has enabled the youth to hold their leaders at all levels accountable for their actions and political pledges. Youth leaders have demanded for the fulfilment of electoral promises made by politicians during the campaign periods through constant reminders using social media, political talk shows on radios and direct telephone conversation with other leaders

Negative effects of youth participation in local government

Class Society

A good number of respondents especially the grass root youth believed that the concept of participation and engagement of youth in public affairs has created the undesirable and unexpected negative influence of class society based on rural-urban divide. The youth from the rural areas feel neglected largely because they have no access to services and they are also not effectively involved in key decision making organs and processes. Participation is seen and conceived to be an

exclusive privilege for elite youth who are based in urban centers and who have greatly benefited from participation with all its attendant privileges.

Acquisition of bad practices

While participation in decision making has enabled youth to acquire worthwhile values as mentioned earlier, it was surprisingly revealed by the participants during the focus group discussions that youth participation has also resulted into acquisition of negative values and behaviours amongst the youth. This includes corruption and misuse of office for personal gain for example the youth reported that they are usually facilitated and financed more than twice by different organizations for the same thing. During International Youth Day celebrations that take place every 12th August of every year, they are facilitated by their districts and yet the National Youth Council which invites them for the same also facilitates them so they end up benefiting twice. In some cases, NGOs also give them facilitation to participate in the same meeting. Another example given is that some youth leaders sign for money on behalf of the rest but do not deliver it to the final beneficiaries. Some youth leaders were reported to be occupying two offices at both the District and sub county level and they sign and benefit from payments accruing to these offices contrary to the legal provision. Where a youth leader doubles as chairman District Youth Council and Chairman NRM Youth League, they also sign for two cows which were separately meant for each of these two offices. These practices are considered by the youth to be corruption.

Another negative behaviour which the youth consider to be unacceptable was tribalism, nepotism and sectarianism which they reported to be prevalent in most youth councils in Uganda. Tribalism mostly manifests itself during the elections of youth councils where various candidates contesting for the available positions tend to recruit supporters based on tribe and reinforced by religious affiliations. This is mostly common in districts with multi-ethnic formation. Where tribalism is not evoked because of the homogeneous nature of the district, clan affiliation and nepotism come into play. In Mbarara, it was reported that on discovering that the elected chairperson of the district Youth Council was a Mukiga and not a Munyankole, some youth leaders appeared to have been unhappy with it.

Alongside tribalism and nepotism, the respondents also revealed that youth leaders have developed a sense of selfishness, self-centeredness and have focused their attention on primitive accumulation of wealth using their offices at the expense of serving the interest of the youth. This behaviour was found to be one of the reasons why the youth are frustrated with their representatives thereby attracting abuse, name-calling and sometimes violence and intimidation from the youth. The youth leaders themselves reported that they have been threatened by the youth and accused of becoming rich at their expense thereby increasing expectations from the youth from their leaders for financial support. They added that

they are constantly living in fear because of the perception that they are exploiting the youth for their personal aggrandizement. This has caused conflict and enmity amongst the youth which has played in the hands of people who are against youth participation. The youth themselves feel betrayed by their leaders and therefore do not appreciate whatever they do which sometimes gives impetus to the youth to support elders other than one of their own.

Pretense and deception

Participation in decision making has revealed a high level of pretense and deceptions amongst the youth which is manifested in various forms. It was revealed that some youth pretend to be members of a political party when in reality they do not support it but are there for purposes of self-preservation and self-promotion. Further, support to political parties is not based on ideology but convenience and hope for financial gain. This level of deception has resulted in lukewarm support to political party activities and it has also retarded the growth of political parties in Uganda. The respondents also noted that the youth leaders often say what they do not mean and what they believe in often remain unsaid for political expediency. The participants therefore believed that this negative influence of youth participation if not addressed can militate against the need to advocate and promote youth issues in the country.

Results of Regression Analysis of Youth Participation on Decentralization

Table 1 Youth Participation on Decentralization

Variables	Crf	R ²	Adjusted R ²	P
Youth participation Vs decentralization structure	0.2585	0.2588	0.250	0.001

P= 0.05 level of significance

The P-value 0.001 less than 0.05 R² coefficient of determination (0.2588) decentralization structure influence performance by 26%.

The regression coefficient (R²= 0.285) indicates that a unit change in decentralization structure would bring about 25.85% change in youth participation. R² is 0.2588 meaning that about 26 percent of variance in youth participation can be provided by decentralization structure.

It is important to note however that a 26% variation in youth participation due to decentralization structure (R² = or 2.588) implies there are other factors that predict youth participation in local governments. Overall, the regression model was significant (0.001) <0.05), basing on this finding reject the null hypothesis that decentralization structure does not influence youth participation; and subsequently accept the research hypothesis that decentralization has appositive and significant influence on youth participation in local governments in Uganda.

This finding is consistent with data from interviews; where it was reported in several districts and Sub-counties that technical and professional staff initiated several youth empowerment programmes and the youth leaders played a critical role in the final stages of adopting and marketing the programmes. This resonates well with the fourth strand of Hart's ladder model of participation; of assigned but informed. Further, in support of Harts ladder model, in this study, in most Districts, youth representatives and elected youth leaders were reported to have initiated, directed and mobilized resources to implement youth empowerment programs; which aligns with the sixth strand of Harts ladder model.

V. DISCUSSIONS

Results of regression are also in line with findings by (Ref.16) revealing. That local decisions made under discretionary funding match national objectives to a great extent. On the other contrary, Ref.8, report that as far as different local government level are concerned, the stock of human capital is generally lower in lower levels of local government. Very often, higher levels are hesitant to transfer resources downwards, as they do not trust the ability of lower levels to use their resources downwards, as they do not trust the ability of lower levels to use their resources efficiently as well as to account for the funds.

Further in agreement with regression results; and results from both FGDs and informed interviews, (35) indicated that youth participation in decision making brings about shared vision between the youth and other community members at the local levels. Further, she indicated that Youth Council structures have enabled the youth to create a shared vision since the aspirations of the youth become part of the overall community programme. USAID (2009) concerned with the findings of this study, indicating that youth councils play an important role in promoting and advocating for the youth concerns. Additionally, in affirmative, Pinto (44), reported that government of Uganda has put in place initiatives and deliberate interventions within the law to ensure participation of the youth at local level. The study adds that before the advent of decentralization, participation at the local level was non-existent since the slate practiced direct rule from the Centre.

(Ref.45) and the LGA (1997), reveal that there exist five levels of government in Uganda, namely; Village Local Council (LCI), Parish Local Council (L.C II), Sub Country Local Council (L.C III), County / Municipal Local Council (L.CIV), and District Local Council (LCV). (Ref.46) showed that local council at the lower levels have provided various platforms through which the youth can participate in development programs, while (Ref.47) indicated that implementation of decentralization policy has indeed transferred decision-making powers on planning, budgeting and resource allocation at lower levels.

In contradiction however, (Ref.48) conducted a study on the level of youth participation using a sample of eleven districts, in which it was revealed that youth participation in decision making was low especially at district and sub county level.

Further, (Ref.49) explored the relationship between voter turnout and the new forms of participation of youths in Chile and Spain. Although, key findings in both countries showed higher favorability levels for participation and government paying more attention to their concerns, there was suspicion of the decentralized system which made the youths clamor for greater participation especially in political affairs. In a cross-sectional/evaluative study to assess the initiation and implementation of the decentralized policy in Uganda, (27) results exposed that Uganda did not copiously gain from the opportunities that decentralization offered particularly as a driver for youth participation. (Ref.27) argues that whereas key actors at national and local government levels are aware of decentralization, the existing structures call for participation of the marginalized youth because their engagement is low thus weakening the works of the local governments.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that there is a significant positive relationship between youth participation in the governance process and youth empowerment. A number of positive influences arising from youth participation in the governance process were observed in the areas of social, political, economic and personnel development of the youth. These include high self-esteem, improved livelihood, ownership of decision making process, policies and initiatives, mainstreaming of youth concerns, increased youth voice, improved harmony, peace and unity, increased involvement of youth in public life, enhanced youth leadership capacity, increased understanding of political dynamics, improved level of partnership and collaboration between the youth and other stakeholders, better conflict management framework and improved international relationship between the youth of Uganda and their counterparts in other countries.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this study's findings, it is recommended as follows:-

The Government of Uganda in line with the provision of Article 32 of the Constitution should empower the youth economically in order to address their historical marginalization and vulnerability by initiating economic interventions in the areas of job creation, entrepreneurship, financial inclusion and above all the participation of the youth in the country's economic growth and development process. Such initiatives should be done using youth friendly approaches and strategies. One of the policy issues identified in the research findings is the need for multi-sectoral, multi-ministerial and multidimensional approach to youth development. It has been recognized that the youth are not a homogeneous group but are different in various aspects which

calls for the need for customized planning for each category within the youth community.

Cooperation, collaboration and partnership should be established between the state and all the non-state actors in the areas of youth development in order to build synergy, share best practices and conducive environment for youth empowerment in all spheres of life consistent with the global trend of private –public partnership. This is specifically important given the fact that the youth development arena is not a monopoly of the State but it's comprised of several players including Civil Society Organizations, Faith Based Organizations, Cultural institutions, private sector and development partners. There is need therefore for a national coordination mechanism to be established to define the role and contribution of every player.

The state and the non-state actors who are involved in youth development should adopt the strategy of youth mainstreaming and youth inclusion in all policies, programmes, project, laws and other initiatives in order to ensure that the contemporary interests and concerns of the youth are planned for by all the national, regional and local players. In doing this, the youth themselves should be involved in all the stages of the decision making process in order to ensure that their interests are protected and their participation is guaranteed.

Another important strategy that will ensure participation of the youth in the development process is affirmative action. Policy makers need to point out that the youth face unequal power relation due to the archaic political and social structures that exist in Uganda. Therefore while planning for development, it is important to put into consideration the unique needs and concerns of the youth. The government policy of affirmative action has to be extended beyond political representation to include other aspects of life such as access of the youth to economic opportunities.

REFERENCES

- [1] DFID-CSO Youth Working Group. Youth Participation in Development A Guide for Development Agencies and Policy Makers [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2021 Aug 30]. Available from: https://youtheconomicopportunities.org/sites/default/files/uploads/resource/6962_Youth_Participation_in_Development.pdf
- [2] Mondo, K.F (2001). Mainstreaming Youth Issues in the Ongoing Development Process. The Youth Focus. Issue 1 2001. National Youth Council.
- [3] Francis P, James R, Francis P, James R. Balancing Rural Poverty Reduction and Citizen Participation: The Contradictions of Uganda's Decentralization Program. *World Dev* [Internet]. 2003 [cited 2021 Aug 30];31(2):325–37. Available from: <https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:eee:wdevel:v:31:y:2003:i:2:p:325-337>
- [4] Kiyaga-Nsubuga, John. (2009). Local Governance and Local Democracy in Uganda. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*. 10.5130/cjlg.v0i2.1006.
- [5] UNDP. Decentralization: A Sampling Of Definitions (Working paper prepared in connection with the Joint UNDP-Government of Germany evaluation of the UNDP role in decentralization and local governance) Decentralization: A Sampling Of Definitions. 1999.
- [6] World Bank Report (2008). African Development Indicators. Youth and Employment in Africa: The Potential, the Problem, the Promise World Bank. New York City, USA.
- [7] Plan U.K. (2009). Literature Review: Youth Participation in Decision Making Processes, London, United Kingdom. Poverty Reduction, Side Studies 2, Stockholm, Sweden. Report submitted to a UN conference on Youth, New York City, USA.
- [8] UNICEF. (2007). The Participation of Children and Young people in Emergencies: A guide for relief agencies. Union: <http://pjp-eu.coe.int>
- [9] UNDP. (2013). Enhancing Youth Political participation throughout the electoral Cycle.
- [10] Republic of Uganda .(1997). Local Government Act, Government Printery, Entebbe, Uganda.
- [11] AAU. (2012). Cost opportunity, Gaps in Youth Policy and programming in Uganda. Action Aid International Uganda.
- [12] Lamb, M. (2002). Young Conservatives, Young Socialists and the Great Youth Abstention: Youth Participation and Non-Participation in Political Parties. (A doctoral Thesis). Birmingham
- [13] Beetham, D. (2003). Democracy Under Blair: A Democratic Audit Of The United Kingdom, Politicos Publishing, London.
- [14] Zandbergen, D. & Rivke, J. (2014). Citizen Participation and Responsibility. *Etnofor*, Vol.26, No.2, Participation (2014). Stitching Etnofor. Retrieved from. www.jstor.org/stable/43264056.
- [15] Williams, N., and Vorley, T. (2014). Institutional asymmetry: How formal and informal institutions affect entrepreneurship in Bulgaria. *Journal of International Small Business*, Doi: 10.1177/0266242614534280.
- [16] Prachett, L. & Lowndes, V. (2004). Developing democracy in Europe: An analytical Summary of the Council of Europe's Acquis. Strasburg: Council of Europe.
- [17] Koonings, K. (2004). Strengthening Citizenship in Brazil's Democracy: Local Participatory Governance in Porto Alegre. *Bulletin of Latin America Research* 23(1) : 79-99.
- [18] Okidi, C. (2015). Youth and Public Policy in Uganda. Nairobi: Youth Policy Press.
- [19] Olum, Y. (2017). Literature Review on Youth Participation in Uganda. Kampala, Uganda.
- [20] Dauti, M. (2014). Outcomes of Participatory Decision Making: Evidence from Albania. *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures*, 226–247. doi:10.1177/088832541453626
- [21] Mills, L. (2016). Decentralisation of Budgeting Processes. Department for International Development and University of Birmingham.
- [22] Yerkes, S., & Muasher, M. (2018). Decentralization in Tunisia: Empowering Towns, Engaging People. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. CarnegieEndowment.org/pubs
- [23] Agegnehu, A., & Dibu, W. (2017). Does decentralization have a role in poverty reduction? The Ethiopian experience. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 9(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.5897/JASD2016.0421>
- [24] Clarke, R. T. (2019). Decentralization Policy and Citizen Participation in Government: The Case of Liberia [Doctoral Dissertation, Walden University]. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection
- [25] Gamha, M. E. (2019). Civil society advocacy for decentralization and youth participation in local elections through Facebook: The Tunisian Case [Communication for Development]. Malmö University.
- [26] Gyampo, R. (2012). Youth Participation in Youth Programmes: The Case of Ghana's National Youth Employment Programme. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 5, 13–28.
- [27] Mushemeza, E. D. (2019). Decentralisation in Uganda: Trends, Achievements, Challenges and Proposals for Consolidation. Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (ACODE). www.acode-u.org
- [28] Gessler, M., & Ashmawy, I. K. (2014). The effect of political decentralization on school leadership in German vocational schools. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 44(2), 184–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214549967>
- [29] Chirenje, L. I., Giliba, R. A., & Musamba, E. B. (2013). Local communities' participation in decision-making processes through

- planning and budgeting in African countries. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*, 11(1), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10042857.2013.777198>
- [30] Tsekoura, M. (2016). Spaces for Youth Participation and Youth Empowerment: Case Studies from the UK and Greece. *YOUNG*, 24(4), 326–341. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1103308815618505>
- [31] Agegnehu, A., & Dibu, W. (2017). Does decentralization have a role in poverty reduction? The Ethiopian experience. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 9(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.5897/JASD2016.0421>
- [32] Collins, M. E., Augsberger, A., & Gecker, W. (2016). Youth councils in municipal government: Examination of activities, impact and barriers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 65, 140–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.04.007>
- [33] Yombi, G. Y., Chouaibou, M., & Agoume, L. Y. (2019). Decentralized Territorial Communities and Implementation of Public Policies: The Case of Cameroon. In B. Açıkgöz (Ed.), *Public Economics and Finance-Intech Open* (pp. 1–11). Univerité of Yaoundé, SOA. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.80617
- [34] Collins, M. E., Augsberger, A., & Gecker, W. (2016). Youth councils in municipal government: Examination of activities, impact and barriers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 65, 140–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2016.04.007>
- [35] Harrison, T. M., & Sayogo, D. S. (2014). Transparency, participation, and accountability practices in open government: A comparative study. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(4), 513–525. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2014.08.002>
- [36] Allen, L., & Bang, H. J. (2015). Ecological contexts and youth civic and political engagement in Paris, France. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 39, 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2015.04.010>
- [37] Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [38] Morse, J.M. & Linda, N. (2009). *Mixed Method Design: Principles and Procedures*. Walnut Creek, CA, USA: Left Coast Press Inc.; 193 pages; ISBN 978-1-59874-298-5; US\$ 29.95 (paperback).
- [39] Morse, J.M. & Linda, N. (2009). *Mixed Method Design: Principles and Procedures*. Walnut Creek, CA, USA: Left Coast Press Inc.; 193 pages; ISBN 978-1-59874-298-5; US\$ 29.95 (paperback).
- [40] Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design. Choosing among five approaches* (3e éd.). London: Sage.
- [41] Bakkabulindi, F.E.K (2005). *Organizational Characteristics as Correlates of the Use of ICT in Makerere University*. Unpublished Research Prototype Proposal for the PhD Students, Semester Two, 2014/2015, College of Graduate Studies and Research (CGSR), Kampala International University (KIU), Kampala, Uganda.
- [42] UCLA. (2005). *UCLA Center for Health Policy Research*. Retrieved July 12, 2017, from UCLA Center for Health Policy Research website: healthpolicy.ucla.edu/programs/health-data/trainings/Documents/tw_cba23.pdf
- [43] Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) *Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology*. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- [44] Pinto, I.H (2016). *Justification for amending the National Youth Council Act*. A paper presented during the National Youth Council Consultative meeting on amending the National Youth Council Act (2003) held at Mosa Courts Hotel. Kampala, Uganda.
- [45] Makara, S. (2014). *NGO's in Uganda the in typologies, Roles & functions in Governance*. Kampala, Uganda: Center for basic research.
- [46] Anwar Shah, 2006. "Local Governance in Developing Countries," World Bank Publications, The World Bank, number 7192, July.
- [47] Adeyanju, S.A & Adebaju A. (2013). *Participation of Youth in Rural Leadership Development*
- [48] Katende M. & Pinto, H. (2017). *Youth Participation in Local Governance in Uganda*. Printed July
- [49] Sola-Morales, S., & Hernández-Santaolalla, V. (2017). Political abstention and new forms of political participation of young people: Comparative analysis between Chile and Spain. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, 72, 629-648. <https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2017-1183>