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ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CBPs  Community Based Projects
CDF  Constituency Development Fund
CDPs  Community Development Projects
FBOs  Faith Based Organization
NGOs  Non-Governmental Organizations
SCBD  Sustainable Community Development Projects
SD  Standard Deviation
SPPSS  Statistical Package For Social Sciences
DEFINITION OF OPERATION TERMS

Community - A group of people living within the study area.

Community Development - A process of organizing community members to initiate, implement and monitor projects.

Facilitators - Registered organizations (CBPs, NGOs; FBOs, Churches), Government agencies and funding agencies involved in community based projects in the local setting.

Management - A process which involve planning, organizing, staffing, directing, motivating and controlling during project implementation.

Phase-Out - This is the point at which the donors and facilitators completely hand over the management of the CBP to the community.

Sustainable Development – This refers to the state in which the CBPs become self-sustaining.
ABSTRACT

With an aim of fighting poverty at the grass root, many donors and facilitators are opting to channel their funding through Community based projects (CBPs). These CBPs have a gestation period or life-span in all the areas or communities. In order to achieve the goals of these programs with the planned resources, there is need to find a way of how best these can be sustained or managed by the community after the gestation period (phase-out). This study is motivated by the fact that there are numerous efforts in the recent past of phasing out the community based projects but there is failure on the part of the communities in managing or sustaining the projects.

The research was set out to find out factors that affect the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District of Kitui County. This was through the following objectives; to investigate the role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs; to find out the geographical factors affecting the sustainability of CBPs and to establish the role of project controllers and implementers on the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District. The research took the form of descriptive analysis and both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. The target populations were CBPs managers, project donors and facilitators and the projects beneficiaries. The respondents were selected through both purposeful and random sampling. Both the finding of the literature and the quantitative and qualitative results were analyzed with the aid of SPSS software.

They were then presented in form of figures, tables and narratives. The study found that the greatest factor affecting the sustainability of the community based projects lies with the controllers and implementers. This was followed by geographical factors and finally the community. The main controllers and implementers were identified as the donors, CBOs and NGOs. These carry the greatest impact on the sustainability of the CBPs. Geographical factors highlighted include natural resources and the environment. The most dominant role played by the community was security and provision of human resources to the CBPs. These answered the concerns raised regarding the factors affecting sustainability of CBPs in the study area.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Sustainable development is a concept that is used in our daily talks but difficult to define. The Bruntland Commission memorably defined it in its 1987 report (Our Common Future) as ‘development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (World Bank, 2005). Most authors perceive Sustainable Community Based Development Project differently. Roy (2003) viewed development as for the people and by the people. His argument was that, the essence of sustainable development is determined by the people, which can be attributed to change of peoples’ attitudes, leading to a change in their habits.

It took many years of intensive work to reach a global consensus on the elements of sustainable development, but it was finally achieved in 1995 at the World Summit on Social Development. This definition brought together what is popularly known as the three e’s; environment, economy and equity. In this context the main concern in characterizing a sustainable development was that which had a capacity to help the poor maintain and improve their natural capital (natural resources), while developing their human capital (human resource development). Such a development was also required to have the capacity to develop human made capital (investments infrastructure and directly productive capital goods), and social capital (the institutional and cultural bases and political systems that make a society function). (Celliso and Jean-Louis, 2004). With this diversity Robert (2003) argued that, sustainability is an essentially vague concept, and it would be wrong to think of it as being precise, or capable of being made precise.

Morris and others (1999), in their study of the Plandro anti-poverty program to increase the incomes of the rural poor in western Honduras, found out that better-off areas were the most likely to receive program assistance, and the most deprived areas were the least likely. They argue that the weak targeting was due to the project’s implementation schedule, its rate of return criteria, and an evaluation strategy that emphasized economic results for beneficiary farmers. These jointly created an incentive to select areas that were easily reached—which typically
tended to be better-off areas—and to target project benefits to better-off households within these areas because they tended to be the most credit worthy and most able to absorb project funds.

In Kenya, an estimated two million people are being positively impacted by community based projects efforts. The focus of CBPs has included interventions in education, water, sanitation, health care, agriculture, spiritual nurture, community capacity building as well as micro-enterprise development (Kenya National Profile, 2001). Community based development projects are planned for a certain period of time called gestation period or life-span after which they come to an end and the community is expected to continue running the project and make them self-sustaining.

Government organs and NGOs in partnership with communities do establish community based development projects. However, the project activities collapse following the phase-out of funders support. A World Vision (2009) evaluation report analysis show that, most community development projects have failed to sustain themselves, become self-reliant and the communities have failed to continue running them after funding organizations withdraw their support. Some factors which should have been worked out, in order to stop this trend of projects collapsing are not done despite support being meant for a specified period with the objective of making the projects self-reliant.

Political economy considerations and perverse incentives created by project performance requirements can also result in poor targeting. Ravallion (2000) noted that a desire to ensure a broad geographic spread of participants can weaken pro-poor geographic targeting. Jalan and Ravallion (2003) also noted that social networks were a crucial determinant of who benefited from the workfare program. They argue that this can be corrected in the design of the program by offering a wage low enough to discourage wealthier members of the community from participating (Gachuki, 1982)
1.1.1 CBPs in Mutomo District
Mutomo District which is located in Kitui County is prone to abject poverty mainly attributed to long dry spells leading to failure in agriculture production. Many CBPs facilitators and donors have initiated several community based projects in the district as an intervention measure. These CBPs includes: World Vision, Swedish group, Catholic dioceses of Kitui, Red-cross, Compassion and Rincord international. Initiated projects include bore holes, health facilities, and irrigation projects. Therefore this location is expected to be ideal for this kind of study.

This study will therefore look at factors affecting the sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo district after phasing-out and the issues that contribute to lack of sustenance and thereafter make necessary recommendations on how the projects can be managed by the communities. Facilitators for instant NGOs, CBOs and Church based organizations have had an opportunity in the past years to establish more than one hundred community based projects country-wide. All of these were established under the assumption that after the agreed period by the Support office and the facilitating partner end, the project would become self-supporting and continue meaningful service to the community. In other words this study will present a critical analysis of how community development projects can be managed and be sustained after phasing out with a particular focus to community based projects in Mutomo District.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
CBPs consistently use social impact assessments and in country situation evaluations as a means to advocate for citizens and minority groups, to fund projects aimed at improving the standard of living for the communities in which they work. However, CBPs not having the money and standing as the governments that they oppose, they must rely on generous donors to fund such assessment which is an enterprise which can be filled with pitfalls and ethical dilemmas. Ethical dilemmas between donors and CBPs implementing programs as desired and needed versus fulfilling donor requests are evident. Ethical conflicts and concerns have been raised (Welch, 2001.pg 20). These donations in return influence program development resulting in closure and redirection of programs.
Very few of CBPs which have been phased-out, have had major impacts on the community members’ overall living standards. This is attributed to them not becoming self-reliant (Blank, 2003). This may be due to poor management and not achieving sustainability by the community members as noted by. The new CBPs being initiated now are likely to join the graveyard path of other community based projects (CBPs) in failing to impact community beyond the planned intervention phase. Those that plan these CBPs may systematically fail to work out their sustainability as evidenced by many stalled projects in the district. This is a worrying trend in a district riddled with high levels of poverty, unemployment and poor infrastructure leading to underdevelopment. Therefore, this study was set out to investigate factors affecting sustainability of Community based projects with a particular emphasis on CBPs in Mutomo District in order to generate knowledge that will not only improve the sustainability of CBPs but also increase access to infrastructure and development.

1.3 Objectives of the Study
The main objective of the study was to investigate the factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo District.

1.3.1 Specific Objectives of the Study
The study was guided by the following specific objectives:

i. To investigate the role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District.

ii. To identify the geographical factors affecting sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District.

iii. To establish the role of project controllers and implementers on the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District.
1.4 Research Questions
The study sought answers to the following research questions:

i. What is the role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District?

ii. What are the geographical factors affecting the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District?

iii. What are the roles of project controllers and implementers on sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District?

1.5 Purpose of Study
The study “Factors Affecting Sustainability of Community Based Projects in Mutomo District” will endeavor to determine the factors that would make the community development project self-reliant and sustainable after phasing-out.

1.6 Significance of the Study
The frequency of instant sluggish of community based development projects has come to light in the recent past with the obviously, increasing concern and frustration on the non-sustainability of the projects by the facilitating organization (NGOs) and the Support Offices (donors) with the inclusion of the communities themselves. It is now of vital importance to identify factors that impede sustainability of these projects and the best strategies to employ to make them sustainable after phasing-out. If the identified constraints can be eased and obstacles removed, then conditions for community development project sustainability, such as ownership could be established and community developmental activities sustained for future developments.

This study makes a great contribution to CBPs facilitators as it will bring out issues learnt and challenges encountered and make recommendations on how the community based development projects can be made sustainable after phasing-out. The study shows the benefit of making the community development projects self-managing, self dependent and self-sustaining.
1.7 Limitation
The researcher faced various draw backs while conducting the study. Considering the fact that the study adopted a survey design, collecting data from the vast number of respondents was very cumbersome. To counter this, the researcher was obliged to seek the help of research assistants to aid in data collection. Securing appointment from the selected respondents also proved troublesome. To solve this problem, the researcher booked appointments early enough and make a follow up.

1.8 Scope of the study
The study was bound to factors affecting sustainability of community based projects, other projects which are privately or government owned were not included in the study. The study was also bound within the boundaries of Mutomo District and projects outside the district were not included in this study.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Literature review encompasses the evaluation of all sources of information or data that relate to the topic and is not confined solely to academic publications (Baker, 2003). This chapter looks at what has already been published by some accredited scholars and researchers, on the management of Community Based Projects (CBPs). The chapter further considers what has been learnt about CBP facilitated by NGOs and see how they can be sustained by the community after phasing out. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are also known as “quasi-governments” because their operations are those for serving a need and are not expected to make a profit. Their main goal is that of serving and meeting their mission in the most efficient way. In implementing the CBPs, the organizations work hand in hand with the community members to make the projects sustainable after they are phased out.

This section will examine the following three theories; Theory of change, McClelland achievement need theory and Freirean theory of dialogue and society. Also the role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs, Geographical factors affecting sustainability of CBPs and the role of project controllers and implementers in sustainability of CBPs will be examined.

2.2 Theoretical Review

2.2.1. Theory of change

The first Theory examined is the Theory of Change. It defines all building blocks required to bring about a given long-term goal. This set of connected building blocks—interchangeably referred to as outcomes, results, accomplishments, or preconditions is depicted on a map known as a pathway of change/change framework, which is a graphic representation of the change process. Built around the pathway of change, a Theory of Change describes the types of interventions (a single program or a comprehensive community initiative) that bring about the outcomes depicted in the pathway of a change map. Each outcome in the pathway of change is
tied to an intervention, revealing the often complex web of activity that is required to bring about change as envisaged by community based projects (http://www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/#1 Retrieved on 28.07.2013).

2.2.2. McClelland achievement needs Theory
While the trait model focuses on enduring inborn qualities and locus of control on the individual's perceptions about the rewards and punishments in his or her life, (Pervin, 1980,), need for achievement theory by McClelland (1961) explained that human beings have a need to succeed, accomplish, excel or achieve. Entrepreneurs are driven by this need to achieve and excel. While there is no research evidence to support personality traits, there is evidence for the relationship between achievement motivation and entrepreneurship (Johnson, 1990). Achievement motivation may be the only convincing person logical factor related to new venture creation (Shaver & Scott, 1991).

2.2.3. Freirean theory of dialogue and society
This project is based on the third theory under review that is the Freirean theory of dialogue and society, and the major economics models of project assignment. The Paolo Freire’s theory of dialogue (Freire, 1970) states that dialogue, particularly between leaders and community, is essential to liberation and education of the masses by challenging historically held methods via the use of critical thought. Critical thought raises consciousness and questions the assumption that people should fall into established routines or systems, rather than help to form new systems that better address their needs especially concerning projects intended to better their lives. This emphasis on conscious, collaborative action gives power to community members motivated to redefine aspects of their cognitive systems. Whether by negligence, lack of budget, lack of motivation, or simple ignorance, there are disparities in implementation of community based projects.

Freire’s emphasis on dialogue is reflected in this project by my advocacy for community involvement with the development and management of CBPs in order to ensure continuity and provision of basic amenities even after phase out. Community members deserve not only to be
part of the project design and implementation, but to be explicitly invited to that process and thus get involved in the solutions. Additionally, information about these mechanisms must be presented in accessible language, and with appropriate context. This study will be anchored on this theory and serve as a bridge from the inaccessible and often intimidating language of development agencies to the people most affected by the discussion: communities.

2.3. Empirical Review

Sustainable development is a concept that is used in our daily talks but difficult to define. The Bruntland Commission memorably defined it in its 1987 report (Our Common Future) as ‘development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (World Bank, 2005). Most authors perceive Sustainable Community Based Development Project differently. Roy (2003) viewed development as for the people and by the people. His argument was that, the essence of sustainable development is determined by the people, which can be attributed to change of peoples’ attitudes, leading to a change in their habits.

It took many years of intensive work to reach a global consensus on the elements of sustainable development, but it was finally achieved in 1995 at the World Summit on Social Development. This definition brought together what is popularly known as the three e’s; environment, economy and equity. In this context, the main concern in characterizing a sustainable development was that which had a capacity to help the poor maintain and improve their natural capital (natural resources), while developing their human capital (human resource development). Such a development was also required to have the capacity to develop human made capital (investments infrastructure and directly productive capital goods), and social capital (the institutional and cultural bases and political systems that make a society function). (Celliso and Jean-Louis, 2004). With this diversity Robert (2003) argued that, sustainability is an essentially vague concept, and it would be wrong to think of it as being precise, or capable of being made precise.

Recent literature on poverty uniformly acknowledges different theories of poverty, but the literature has classified these theories in multiple ways (Blank, 2003, Goldsmith and Blakely, 1992; Jennings and Kushnick, 1999; Rodgers, 2000; Schiller, 1989; Shaw, 1996). Virtually all
authors distinguish between theories that root the cause of poverty in individual deficiencies (conservative) and theories that lay the cause on broader social phenomena (liberal or progressive). Ryan (1976) addresses this dichotomy in terms of “blaming the victim.” Goldsmith and Blakely, for example distinguish “Poverty as pathology” from “poverty as incident or accident” and “poverty as structure.” Schiller (1989:2-3) explains it in terms of “flawed characters, restricted opportunity, and Big Brother.” Jennings (1999) reviews a number of variants on these individual vs. society conceptions, giving emphasis to racial and political dynamics. Rank is very clear: “the focus on individual attributes as the cause of poverty calling for community development projects is misplaced and misdirected.” Structural failings of the economic, political, and social system are causes instead. (Rank 2004:50) focuses on the various theories divergent, and each result in a different type of community development intervention strategy.

One other principle of community development is popular participation. Popular participation deals with broad issues of social development and the creation of opportunities for the involvement of people in political, economic and social life of the nation (Obbo, 2003). Thus in this way it prepares a way for community participation, a concept which connotes the direct involvement of ordinary people in local affairs such as building of roads, schools, or election of local and civic leaders (Middler, et al 2006). This study will thus be anchored to this theoretical approach.

2.4 The Role Played By the Community in the Sustainability of Community Based Projects
At local level, sustainable community development requires that local economic development supports community life, using the local talents and resources of the local community. It further challenges us to ensure that the distribution of the benefits of development is done in a more transparent manner and equitably (Elizabeth, 2006). On the same Ismail and Richard (1995) also cited that there is a need to now move from improving living standards to improving the quality of life. This would happen when development becomes fully, participatory and people centered, driven by spiritual values that embrace caring and nurturing at their core.
However, the distinction between natural resource development and changes in human well-being needs to be made explicit. Further, we need to see development primarily from the point of view of its impact upon the poor people. Then we must go further and either define development in such a way that the welfare of the poor people is incorporated in it or show that material growth is a sufficient condition for an unambiguous improvement in human welfare (Hall, 2003). Development, defined variously related to the improvement, growth, increase, increments are the different facets of development. Development generally signifies improvement at the initial stages from undesirable state of affairs to desirable one in any field of social living. It is development in the economical economic sphere irrespective of the field of application—whether social, economic or otherwise, but it should be sustainable in the long run for the well-being of the people in the area concerned.

The community fosters cooperation in CBPs. Prior to the introduction of the concept of cooperation in community development; it has been difficult to win the support and commitment of the community members in development work. Cooperation is a social order. Cooperation is one of the techniques in community development. This is related to integration in the sense that the various units actually join together practically giving rise to cooperative groups with various principles. The principle involves people from the community to agree to form, own and control a business in production, marketing or consumption. Community Development needs cooperation as there is community development without cooperation (McPherson, 2002).

In any community development there is need for cooperation between the organization and the community. Most of the communities which community based projects operates in are characterized by social problems, which include poverty, unemployment and other social evils. In view of the prevalence of the socio-economic problems and geo-physical characteristics, the people in these communities have limited options for their development needs. Consequently these people remain backward and the mass living in these backward pockets are affected socially and physically. This has resulted in the shaping of their behavior in tune to the prevailing conditions. Community action means differently to different individuals, but in this report we shall rely on Poplin’s (2009) analysis of community action. Poplin gives three analyses of activities or events
that are considered part of the universe of community action. In this report only two of them will be examined. Firstly, he views an activity or event to be part of the universe of the community action if the participants in that activity or event intend to solve some problem related to the locality where they live. An example can be a local community coming together to build a clinic in its area. In some cases it may even build a house for the medical staff just to ensure that the community gets medical facilities in its locality. Community action activity or events should be free from vested interests groups whose aim is self-centered. All participants should contribute to the goal setting, realizing that the end results benefit the entire community. The role of the organization is to facilitate rather than direct the action.

The second technique is partnership or integration, which is used here to describe a community as whole, whose various parts are unified, coordinated and working harmoniously towards the desired end, thereby making the community act as a balanced whole (Ssengendo, 2008). The organization must be aware of the differentiation necessary in any community of the people or of a team that handles a community project. It is only after that awareness that the organization can estimate the level of integration that is required and the partnership among the various units. To bring out integration, the organization has to ensure that the various units have a common cause to partner with and work together, that is, their objectives are interrelated and they bring about a better interaction and cooperation. Sustainable development planning engages stakeholders such as, local residents, key institutional partners, and interest groups, in designing and implementing action plans. Planning is carried out collectively among the groups affected. It is organized so as to represent the desires, values and ideals of the stakeholders within the community.

An examination of the available literature reveals lack of commonly accepted definition of the concept of policy. There is agreement on the domain, function and processes of policy (Gil, 2006). Schorr (2008); Miller and Riessman (2008); and Miller and Roby (2000); define a policy in terms of action to reduce inequality through redistribution and access to resources, rights and social opportunities. Freeman and Sherwood (2001) conceive of policy as principles whereby societies and/or institutions come together to seek solution to common problems. Studies have in the recent past clearly shown that desk-made aid policies that govern developmental programs at
community level, can limit the quality and degree of trust between the donors, local institutions, and the beneficiaries.

Transplanting policies or guidelines that are foreign to the local communities can lead to substantial dislocation of social and economic relations (Ismail, 1997). The need to bring greater accountability and rationality to decision making has led to policy formulation and planning. Accountability and rationality raise the central question of efficiency and reducing social economic problems and the ability to justify actions and programs on the basis of objective evidence. With the same objectives of being accountable and rationalizing it project in terms of performance NGOs and other facilitators have their own policies they follow. There is a Memorandum of understanding which is part of the policy for the community development project (CDP). This implies respecting traditional (local) knowledge, values and perceptions, seeking to understand and use them, and possibly integrating them with the modern (outsiders) knowledge and values (Willy, 2003).

Many evaluations have shown that projects and programs following participatory approaches produce high and more sustainable returns. Participatory development is no “quick fix” but a learning process which takes time, resources, imagination and sometimes courage to implement. It requires behavioral change on the part of many actors, calls into question old habits and often reveals conflicts of interest because of the need for power sharing. The novelty in participatory development, lies in a new, people centered vision and development, which replaces the top-down procedures with approaches based on joint learning and negotiation. Another new feature is that participatory development can no longer be seen as an exclusively local issue, but has strong national and international dimensions (Jean, 2005).

2.5 Geographical Factors Affecting Sustainability of Community Based Projects

Given the basic tenet that participation requires not a single “blueprint” approach but a learning approach tailored to each specific situation, under different circumstances, progress has been made in practice towards more genuine participation i.e., participation in decision making with the new partnership where the conventional top-down relationship is considerably modified, if
not completely reversed (Jean, 2005). It is true to say that projects or programs that have been initiated or followed popular participation have been considered either an essential condition for sustainability or an end in itself. Although not all of the projects or programs have shown the expected results, they offer worth-while lessons for future initiatives. Communities however, should not be left to develop by themselves alone, rather they should be integrated into provincial, districts and chiefdom systems that will protect and simultaneously facilitate their programs organizations. Participation serves a range of general development objectives such as efficiency, equity and capacity building. Sustainability in particular depends on the people being in-charge. FAO (1991) puts it succinctly thus without participation, rural development initiatives are unlikely to be sustainable in the long run and rural inequalities are unlikely to be redressed. (Bhati 2005).

In light of this, caring about environment in Sub-Saharan Africa is not a luxury but a prime necessity because African economies depend heavily on their natural resources. This is even very true in the context of alleviating poverty because of environment degradation is, therefore, a key element of strategy to reduce poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. Calliso and Jean-Louis (2006) mentioned that such a strategy requires every effort to maintain natural capital and to use it sustainably by promoting sound environmental management. It can further be said that protection of the environment is today one of the most urgent responsibilities of society. One of the participants is Government whose primary task is to achieve an ecologically sustainable industrial society.

In 1987, the World Commission for Environment and Development, the so called Bruntland Commission, presented its paper (Our Common Future). The message was that the countries of the World must create a global policy of permanent sustainable development. The new challenge was to satisfy today’s needs without jeopardizing the possibility of future generations to satisfy their own needs (Carl, 2006). Although environment is not the focus of this research, this view should be that there is a need now than ever before, to integrate the environmental challenges in the development programs. Sustainable development may indeed require a strong policy on the part of Government and other stakeholders of protecting the natural resource base if the same is
not in place. The source base including all forms of capital should perhaps be maintained intact or even enhanced.

Development is sustainable if the rules of the game are transparent and the game is inclusive. The challenge for sustainable community development is to ensure a better quality of life for all people while meeting everyone’s aspirations for well-being. A sound program design, adapted to local conditions and based on simple methods that facilitate beneficiary involvement i.e., Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) should always be chosen and beneficiaries should be involved in the selection. Participatory survey should define the social context of support, and communities should be well organized, trained, and sensitized before needs are identified. Judy (2001) has explored the ways in which knowledge of the local conditions becomes side tracked before it can affect other planning or implementation of programs largely initiated from outside.

The definition of evaluation depends on the intellectual background of the person define the concept. Writers such as Suchman (2007) have a broader view of evaluation which include outcomes (impacts) as well as analysis of efforts (program input). However this definition excludes consideration of programs activity. The other definition is that whose major concern is with outcomes. The focus here is with output related to the achievement of programs goals. For this study evaluation will be defined in a more or less comprehensive terms as a robust area of activity devoted to collecting analyzing, interpreting information on the need for implementation of, and effectiveness and efficiency of intervention efforts to better the lot of human kind by improving social conditions and community life (Rossi, et. al,1985)

Evaluation of on-going projects requires a proper strategy which can work if one is to achieve the desired results. It is of vital importance to discuss about “participatory evaluation”, asking the people concerned to participate in evaluating their own projects thereby, enabling them to determine the future effectiveness of their goals of the project. Calliso and Jean-Louis, (2006) connoted that evaluation is a process integral to the development process and by which a community (where project is established) assesses whether what is being done is bringing the desired results. In view of the definitions above, there are many reasons of conducting an evaluation which include the following: To judge the worth of ongoing programs/ projects; To
estimate usefulness of attempts to improve programs; To increase the effectiveness of management and administration of programs; To delay a decision; and to justify and legitimize already made decisions (Suchman, 2007).

2.6 Project Controllers and Implementers in Community Based Projects

A measurable goal is a written statement of the final desired result. It is essentially realistic, time bounded, acceptable, and measurable. In other words, a goal should answer the following questions: Who? How many? How much, What? When? Where? Like baselines, a measurable goal is essential to be able to evaluate progress change (Chitire, 2009). After setting measurable goals of any project in the community, what should follow next is an indicator. An indicator is something that can be counted, measured, or observed which will indicate whether or not progress has been made toward a goal (Chambers, 2003). This is a kind of system which is maintained throughout the duration of a project which keeps truck of activities and measurements of indicators, and records necessary information for evaluation. Ideally, monitoring system is designed and maintained at the community level. It can vary from simple pictorial graph to complex charts or forms according to the abilities and needs of those who create it and who use the information (Lyle, 2007).

It is important to point out here that, the results of evaluation, whether eternal or external, should be communicated to the decision making group. With this opinion, anyone undertaking evaluation program of the project based in a community, should not overlook some of the essentials regarding the participation of the community members. Evaluation should measure success and how to build on this success (or lack of it). The participation on the part of the people therefore, is always essential. It can be done in the participatory mode as opposed to top down. Monitoring is the basis of evaluation, and both should be conceived as an integral part of the program cycle, so that learning can take place as events unfold. The most important audience of evaluations is the beneficiaries themselves. Participatory evaluation should be promoted, so that communities can be involved through rapid appraisal techniques (David 2003).

Batchelor (1985) observed that, development is a slow process, because the less privileged people are the last in the line to be reached due to poor communication and transport system in
the rural areas. They keep a low profile. They are last to speak. In light of this therefore, they need to be encouraged in what they are already doing for survival. The idea of development is an attractive one. It could mean that more people should have a voice in deciding how to improve their community and that the project should be seen and understood as their own and not something imported or imposed on them. Many attempts at locally initiated rural development projects unfortunately fail. Rural people have often have limited organizational and managerial skills. This not only makes them vulnerable to intentional mismanagement and theft, but also causes projects to fail due to inadequate planning.

Self-help projects are easily frustrated because of inability to analyze problems and formulate simple solutions. When such failures occur, the negative experience goes a long way to discourage similar initiatives in future. Women are consistently left on the fringes of most development activities. Though women supply the bulk of labor when local projects require it, they have minimal access to information, education opportunities, or decision making. This is particularly tragic because women, as care-takers of rural families, are extremely practical. They can bring much needed commonsense to project planning but are usually excluded from the process. There are indeed substantial impediments to broad participation in rural development. Different approaches for promoting participation have all had to contend with these obstacles. (Terry, 2003).

In part, Chambers (2003) in his book, discusses about the reversals on the part of all the stakeholders that. The reversals of current positions and practices by all stakeholders are required if the nature and extent of community development is appreciated and if the future actions are to be tailored to the felt needs of the less privileged members of the community. He further says that, it is important for the beneficiaries themselves to realize that, development is something very different from what they had always understood it to be. Development that they should see is not a matter of receiving funds from the donors for infrastructures, rather, it should be all about helping Peoples’ Attitudes and their habits and helping them to do together things that, alone, they could never have achieved.

It has been said also that, Community organization is very essential in achieving development. Community organization is a descriptive term which has been applied on a wide variety of
activities and programs. More recently, the definition of the phrase has been narrowed down to focus on a method or process of affecting social change. In this process the community members are organized, so that they are able to identify their own felt needs, establish priorities among their needs develop a program of action and move to implement this program (Lyle, 2007).

The authors whose works have been reviewed above, none has produced a definite and a holistic discovery of consensus on what are the inhibiting factors to sustainable community based development.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

This study will be conceptualized in the sense that, there are key determinant of CBPs sustainability. As illustrated in figure 1, the independent variables will be the community participation, geographical factors and the role of project controllers and implementers. The dependent variable will be the sustainability of Community based projects, while the intervening variables will be political, economic, social and technological factors within the study area.
Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

In this case, manipulation of any independent variable is expected to affect the sustainability of community based project either in a positive or negative way. Sustainability of CBPs is measured in terms of rate of survival of CBPs after phase-out and achievement of project objectives.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter represents the research methodology of the study. It describes and justifies the methods and processes that were used to collect data that were used in answering the research questions.

3.2 Research Design
The researcher undertook qualitative research. The study employed a descriptive survey research design. The design is used to enable researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2002). According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a survey is an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the current status of that population with respect to one or more variables.

3.3 Population
The target population of this study was CBPs managers, Donor agencies (World Vision, Swedish group, Catholic diocese of Kitui, Red Cross, Compassion and Rincord) and targeted beneficiaries from each sampled CBP. The study was conducted in Mutomo District which has 27 registered CBPs and six donor agencies as per the District Development Plan 2008-2012. The District is poverty stricken with many residents relying on relief support, subsistence farming and livestock rearing to earn a living (Mutomo District Development Plan 2008-2012).

3.4 Sampling
According to Mugenda (2003) a sample size of 10% - 30% of the total population is adequate for a study in descriptive research. The study thus applied simple random and purposeful sampling. The respondents were five senior most project managers in the selected CBPs purposely sampled for the study. The researcher further purposively sampled nine beneficiaries from the sampled CBPs and a respondent from each of the six donor agencies in the district. Therefore the total numbers of respondents were fifty six as explained in the table below.
### Table 3.1: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBP Managers</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Agencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher

#### 3.5 Data Collection

Secondary data from previous research reports was used to provide a wider understanding of the issues under research. Primary data was collected through the use of a questionnaire. The questionnaire had both closed-ended and open-ended questions. The questionnaires were dropped and picked later from respondents. In extreme cases, some of the respondents filled the questionnaire with the help of experienced research assistants.

#### 3.5.1 Validity of the instruments

The researcher used content validity which was done with the help of experts. A valid instrument should accurately measure what it is supposed to measure. The research instruments were pretested to ten respondents within the study area. The selected respondents were not included in the study because they are similar to the samples used in the actual study. The feedback was used to validate the instruments in readiness for the study. After administering the instruments to the selected respondents, the data obtained should be a true reflection of the variables under study.

#### 3.5.2 Reliability of the Study

Reliability is the degree of consistency and precision in which the measuring of the instrument demonstrates under same circumstances. Same research respondents using the same instrument should generate the same results under identical conditions (Amin, 2005). In determining...
reliability of the instrument, the researcher carried out a pretest by issuing 10 questionnaires to employees of the CBPs in the district and the data obtained was entered into the Statistical Package for Social Science research (SPSS) to determine the reliability of the tool. Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient (2004) was used to assess the internal consistency, where a score of 0.7 and above implies that the instrument was considered reliable for the study.

Table 3.2: Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Data Analysis
According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), data analysis is the processing of data to obtain answers to research questions. The purpose of descriptive statistics is to allow for meaningful description of a distribution of scores or measurements using a few indices or statistics. The primary data was then analyzed through Statistical package for Social Sciences (SPSS) as the most suitable analysis tool. The statistics derived mean, standard deviation and variance. The findings were presented in form of tables, graphs and narratives. They covered information on demographics from the study area and the other objectives envisaged in the study. This provided information on factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo district in Kenya.

3.7 Ethical Consideration
According to Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003), ethical considerations are important for any research. Ethical issues that were taken into consideration included proper conduct of the researcher and confidentiality of the information obtained from the respondents. An introductory letter to meet the respondents was obtained from the University and County Commissioner. Respondents were encouraged to participate voluntarily and before administering the questionnaire, the researcher sought informed consent from respondents. The researcher ensured anonymity and confidentiality of all the information collected.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATIONS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results of the analysis. From the 56 questionnaires distributed, 43 were collected and used in the study. This shows that the response rate was 76.8%. The findings are based on these responses as presented in this chapter. First, the sample characteristics are shown. This is followed by a presentation of the results based on the study objectives.

4.2 Demographic Information
This section presents the findings on the general information and characteristics of the respondents.

4.2.1 Gender of the Respondents
The study found that 55.8% of the respondents were male while the remaining 44.2% were females. This shows that majority of the respondents in the study were male. The results are summarized and presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data

This is an indication that the community based projects are dominated by men. However it's important to note that the gender ratio as per government regulations has been surpassed. This should be evident in the quality of decisions made to support the growth and sustainability of CBPs.
4.2.2 Age of the Respondents

The study revealed that 34.9% of the respondents were aged less than 30 years, 27.9% were aged between 31 and 40 years, another 14% were aged between 41 and 50 years while the remaining 23.3% were aged above 50 years. These results are summarized and presented in table 4.2. The results imply that majority of the respondents were aged below 30 years of age.

Table 4.2: Respondents Age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 31 and 40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 41 and 50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data

Demographic information on age showed that the community based projects are in the hands of young and vibrant populations. As shown on the table, over 62.8% were aged below 40 years, a clear indication that they are well informed on the developments on the community based project issues and challenges. This should provide candid views on sustainability of CBPs in the district. These findings point to the fact that most of the respondents are in an age bracket (21-30) which is informed on most issues concerning the area of study and thus the researcher was confident that these were the right people to involve in a study.

4.2.3 Respondents Education

In terms of the respondents’ level of education, the study found that 48.9% had post-secondary levels of education, 32.6% had college education, and 16.3% had university degree and higher. These results are summarized and presented in Table 4.3. The results imply that majority of the respondents had at least a secondary education.
Table 4.3: Respondents Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree and higher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data

The educational background points to the fact that most of the respondents are properly educated and thus easily understood the issues raised in the questionnaire concerning the area of study. Given the level of education the respondents also clearly understood the ethics of research and thus were expected to give honest and informative responses which would add to the credibility of the final research findings and report.

4.2.4 Respondents Duration of Work in Mutomo District

The study further revealed that 55.8% of the respondents had an experience of more than 10 years in the district, 9.3% had an experience of between 5 and 10 years, and the remaining 34.9% had an experience ranging from 0-5 years. This shows that most of the respondents had more than 10 years of experience in the district. The length of time the respondents have worked in the district has a great impact on the responses they provide as they have a better understanding of what has been the challenges affecting sustainability of community based projects at Mutomo district. These results are summarized and presented in Figure 4.1.
4.2.5 Involvement in CBPs at Mutomo District in Kitui County
All the respondents indicated that they are involved in community based projects in various roles including beneficiaries, managers and donors. They confirmed that they are involved in CBPs as project managers, donors and beneficiaries.

4.2.6 The Role Played by the Community in the Sustainability of CBPs
In order to investigate the role played by the community in the sustainability of Community Based Projects in Mutomo District of Kitui County, the study used a likert scale in which 5,4,3,2, and 1 represented continuum scores for Very Large Extent, Moderately large Extent, Moderately Low Extent, Very Low Extent and No Extent respectively. These enabled the tabulation and interpretation of the responses from the research instrument. The main statistics derived are mean, standard deviation and the variance. The mean illustrated the extent to which the respondents agreed or disagreed with the statements put forth on the role of the community in the
sustainability of CBPs in the district. This is well elaborated in the table and narratives below which show the respondents and the statistics.

Table 4.4: Role Played By the Community in Sustainability of CBPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Played</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design of programs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>1.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Human Resources</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>1.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Financing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>1.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>1.297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data

We find from Table 4.4 that majority of the respondents felt that their role was in safeguarding the CBPs with a mean of 4.05. This was followed by those who felt that the role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs was provision of human resources with a mean of 3.88. The next popular role identified was design of programs. This is interesting considering that non-involvement in the design stage leads to failure of CBPs as pointed out by other researchers. Some respondents appreciated the fact that they are project implementers with a mean of 3.42. Project monitoring and part financing had means of 2.74 and 2.49 respectively. This implies that the respondents disassociate the two as major roles played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District. The table further indicates the standard deviation (SD) and variance of the findings. It is clear that respondents gave varying responses as to the role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs with monitoring and part financing recording the lowest SD of 0.954 and 1.077 respectively. Their corresponding variances were 0.909 and 1.161 respectively. The role of security and project implementers had SD and variance of 1.133/1.139 and 1.283/1.297 respectively. Further the respondents had slightly varying responses as to the
role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs with regard to provision of human resources which had a SD of 1.199 and variance of 1.439.

This is a clear indication that the community has a great role in the sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo district. This is very important considering the high rate of collapse of the community based projects after phase-out stage. The stakeholders involved in the design, implementation and management of community based projects must engage the community going by the findings of this study. This will lead to more interest and eventual ownership of community based projects by the community. By emphasizing that the community has a great role to play will lead to higher growth in the projects thereby attaining their objectives which are mainly income generation.

The there topmost roles by the community as found by the study are security, provision of human resources and design of the programs. These are very strategic functions for community based projects to survive. There is need for honesty, accountability and upholding of high ethical standards to ensure that projects benefit the intended sections of the community while being available for future generations.

4.2.7 Geographical Factors Affecting Sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District

The investigation of the geographical factors affecting the sustainability of Community Based Projects in Mutomo District of Kitui County entailed the use of a likert scale in which 5,4,3,2, and 1 represented continuum scores for Very Large Extent, Moderately large Extent, Moderately Low Extent, Very Low Extent and No Extent respectively. Through these, tabulation and interpretation of the responses from the research instrument was possible. The Mean, Standard Deviation and Variance were derived. They show the extent to which the respondents agreed or disagreed with the statements put forth on the geographical factors affecting sustainability of CBPs in the district. This is well elaborated in the table and narratives below which show the respondents and the statistics.
Table 4.5: Geographical Factors That Affect Sustainability of CBPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>1.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>1.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data

The Table 4.6 illustrates the geographical factors affecting sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District. Majority of the respondents felt that natural resources and the environment affect the CBPs most in the district with means of 4.47. This was followed by climate and then infrastructure with means of 4.44 and 4.05 respectively. Stability had the lowest mean of 3.91 indicating that stability of geographical conditions had the least popularity among the respondents. The table further indicates the standard deviation (SD) and variance of the findings. This received varied responses with environment having the lowest SD at 0.540 followed by infrastructure with a SD of 0.712. This indicates that there was somewhat agreement amongst respondents on these two as main geographical factors affecting sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District. The respondents through the SD also highlighted the importance of climate with an SD of 0.908 and geographical stability with a SD of 0.971 as major geographical determinants of sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District. The general finding is that geographical factors do affect the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District.

The sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo district is a major function of the geographical factors as shown by this study. There was an overwhelming agreement that the environment, natural resources, climate and infrastructure play a key role in the sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo District of Kitui County. These hamper the design,
implementation and monitoring of the community based projects to a great extent. This is greatly due to the dilapidated infrastructure and other vagaries of weather. Access to the community projects is limited during the year due to poor roads, telecommunication infrastructure and other basic needed by the community based projects. Mitigation of issues of geographical nature requires long term strategies in order to have long lasting solution to issues of sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo District.

4.2.8 The Role of Controllers and Implementers on Sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District

Controllers and implementers also have a bearing on the sustainability of Community Based Projects in Mutomo District of Kitui County as indicated by the findings below. The section entailed the use of a likert scale in which 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 represented continuum scores for Very Large Extent, Moderately large Extent, Moderately Low Extent, Very Low Extent and No Extent respectively. The results were tabulated and interpreted through the Mean, Standard Deviation and Variance was derived. They indicate the role of controllers and implementers on sustainability of CBPs in the district. This is well elaborated in table 4.7 and the narratives thereafter.

Table 4.6 The Role of Controllers and Implementers on Sustainability of CBPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controllers and Implementers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agencies</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Leaders</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Class</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO’s</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data
There was overwhelming indications that donors have the greatest role as controllers and implementers of CBPs as shown on Table 4.7. The majority of the respondents felt that donors control and implement CBPs with a mean of 4.58, a SD of 0.852 and a variance of 0.725. Being the sole financers of many of the CBPs like in any locations, its expected that they stamp their authority in safeguarding their resources. This was followed by those who felt that CBOs had an upper hand in the control and implementation of CBPs in the district. This collaborates the earlier assertion that donors are the main controllers and implementers of CBPs in the district. The role of CBOs had a mean of 4.53, a SD of 0.882 and a variance of 0.779 affirming its importance the role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs. This was followed by NGOs which we reckon is a major force in the CBPs network. This had a mean of 4.47, a SD of 0.984 and a variance of 0.969. This is affirmation if the importance of NGOs in project control and implementation. Political class, government agencies and religious leaders had the least role in control and implementation of CBPs in Mutomo district with means ranging from 2.93-2.51, SD ranging from 1.078 – 1.001 and variance in the range of 1.162 – 1.001.

The sustainability of community based projects lies in the hands of donors, CBOs and NGOs. As for the donors, being the main financiers of the projects, they need to have a big vote in order to ensure that their funds are utilized as per the rule and regulations established between the donor and the community based project managers. Funding gives them the upper hand in deciding what to do with the funds, when to do it and how to do it. This goes hand in hand with the CBOs and NGOs who are tasked to ensure the implementation of the community based projects in Mutomo District. There was an interesting observation that religious leaders and the government were the least reported as controllers and implementers of community based projects. That would explain the high rate of failure because by not involving the two agencies, projects are left in the hands of agents who may not be interested in the long term growth of the projects. For sustainability of community based projects, there should be a shift from alienating religious and government agencies and instead entrusting the projects to them. They deal with issues in the local areas and understand the needs of the people. They are best placed to better understand the solutions that the people need. Their network is wide and would be an asset in ensuring the sustainability of the community based projects through educating the people the need to contribute to the growth and success of the CBPs’.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the summary of research findings, discussion of key findings, conclusions made from the study and the recommendations for policy and practice. The chapter also presents suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of Findings
The main objective of this study was to find out the factors affecting the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District of Kitui County. This study was guided by the following research questions formulated to aid in gathering the information regarding the research topic.

i. What is the role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District?

ii. What are the geographical factors affecting the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District?

iii. What are the roles of project controllers and implementers on sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District?

Out of the fifty six (56) questionnaires distributed, 43 were collected representing 76.8% response rate. The findings showed that majority of the personnel engaged in the CBPs are male at 55.8% while female were 44.2%. This is in line with many researches where male population dominates the jobs opportunities and positions of responsibility. The majority of the respondents are less than 30 years of age at 34.9%. This was followed by those aged between 31 and 40 years at 27.9%, while those between 40 and 50 years and those over 50 years were 14% and 23.3% respectively. Majority of the respondents had college education at 32.6% followed by those with secondary education with 30.2%. About 20.9% of the respondents had primary education while 16.3% had an undergraduate degree and higher. No respondent recorded a certificate level of educations. The study also purposed to establish the duration the respondents had worked in the district. The majority at 55.8% had worked for over 10 years while another 27.9% had worked in
the Mutomo District for between 1 and 5 years. There were 9.3% of the respondents who had worked for between 5 and 10 years while 7% had worked for less than a year. Based on the study results, all the respondents were involved in CBPs in Mutomo District of Kitui County.

5.3 Discussion on Findings
This section presents a discussion of the findings and compares and contrasts these findings with other scholarly studies done on the same topic.

5.3.1 Discussion on Role of the Community in the Sustainability of CBPs
The study findings showed that the role of the community in the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District of Kitui County was mainly security, provision of human resources, design of programs and being engaged as project implementers. This is because majority of the respondents are the beneficiaries either through funding or provision of goods and services to the CBPs. These components scored highly on the likert scale a clear indication of their importance as factors affecting sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District. It became clear from the findings that the community has a very major role to play in the sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo District as providers of security to the CBPs’. They are also the major source of manpower to the community based projects. Although these are crucial roles, they may be misused often leading to collapse of the very projects they are meant to sustain and nurture.

5.3.2 Discussion on Geographical Factors Affecting the Sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District
The dominant geographical factors identified were natural resources and the environment. These were followed by climate and the infrastructure in the District. Finally, topography and weather stability were the least popular although they had means of over 2.5. The high scores in the responses regarding geographical factors affecting the sustainability of CBPs confirmed that they were a major reason for concern if CBPs have to survive after phase out. The study findings showed that donors were the main controllers and implementers of CBPs. This was backed by findings that CBOs and NGOs were also ranked highly as controllers and implementers of CBPs in Mutomo District. The donors, CBOs and NGOs are directly involved in CBPs because they
have committed their funds to uplift the lives of members in their jurisdiction. They have to take charge of the management of the CBPs. However, does this in any way contribute to the sustainability of the CBPs? Does this hand’s on style cripple the management and eventually the sustainability of CBPs after phase-out? Geographical factors may make or break CBP’s in any setting. In Mutomo District, it became clear from the study that geographical factors affect the sustainability of CBP’s negatively. This is because they are cited as potential causes of failure of CBPs.

5.3.3 Discussion on Role of Project Controllers and Implementers on Sustainability of CBPs

The results indicate that the community, geographical factors and controllers and implementers all affect the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District. The magnitude may not have been an objective of this study but it was clear that controllers and implementers recorded much higher value responses in terms of mean, SD and variance. This confirms the assertions in the study that the sustainability of the CBPs in Mutomo County is a function of the role played by the community in the projects, geographical factors in the area and the controller and implementers of the CBPs in the District.

5.4 Conclusion

As the study results shows, it is evident why many CBPs die after phase out. This section presents a discussion of the findings and compares and contrasts the findings with other scholarly studies done on the same topic.

5.4.1 The Role Played by the Community

The study has shown that the role played by the community is very crucial in ensuring sustainability of the community based projects. As set out in the study, majority of the respondents agreed that there is a very major role played by the community in sustainability of community based projects; the most outstanding role was identified as the provision of security to the projects. Project managers and directors had more inclination towards the role of the community on sustainability of CBPs in the District.
5.4.2 The Geographical Factors
The geographical factors need to be studied in a bid to come up with avenues of mitigating their negative effects on the sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo District. The most pronounced geographical factors involve the natural resources and environmental aspects. These were identified as major factors contributing to failure of community based projects in Mutomo District. The community based organizations respondents had more issues with geographical factors and controllers and implementers of the CBPs.

5.4.3 The Projects Controllers and Implementers
The controller and implementers of the community based projects led by the donors, CBOs and NGOs have had a major bearing on the sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo District. Although the responses varied from each category of respondents, it was clear they all pointed at the same conclusions. The beneficiaries noted that geographical factors were the most dominant of their worries. This can be looked in the sense that geographical factors affect many of the projects bearing in mind that the area is arid and semi-arid.

More measures must be put in place to monitor CBPs and ensure that the factors identified are addressed in order to alleviate the problems faced by the community based projects in Mutomo District and any other District in Kitui County. This will go a long way in ensuring that CBPs are sustainable after phase out.

5.5 Recommendations for Improvement
The recommendations arising out of this study include looking at the value that the community can bring into the sustainability of CBPs. Right from project design to control and implementation, the community can play a bigger role. The community should be aware that any commissioned project is like a debt that needs to be re-paid through proper management to ensure attainment of stated objectives.

More research should go into finding ways and means of mitigating geographical factors which may remain constant over the project period. Natural resources and the environment were single
out as important geographical factors. Further study can be done to establish how this can be mitigated.

Donors, CBOs and NGOs need to rethink their models in line with these findings. Infrastructure was mentioned as an inhibiting factor. Perhaps more research should link sustainability of CBPs with infrastructure. Funding agencies may have to apportion some funds to take care of infrastructure in the areas that they operate.

5.6 Recommendations for Further Studies
The study on the sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo District has brought to light the major causes of failure of many CBPs in Mutomo District. Due to the similarities of the District to the adjacent ones within the County, it will be very important that the study is replicated in these other areas. These provide an opportunity for the region to address the problems together if indeed they are similar. In the event that they are not, it will be important to have a critical look at the differences and therefore make better and more informed decisions on handling the factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in Mutomo District and the entire catchment area.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Introduction Letter

Dear respondent,

I am a Master’s student in the School of Business at Kenyatta University carrying out research on *Factors Affecting Sustainability of Community Based Projects, with a case study of Mutomo District in Kitui County*. The purpose of this letter is therefore to kindly request your voluntary participation in this study by filling the attached questionnaire. The information gathered shall be treated confidentially and shall be used for this research only.

Kindly sign this form if you agree to participate in this study.

Sign ..............................................Date.........................

Yours sincerely,

Charles Mahinge Githinji

Kenyatta University

P.O BOX 43844

Nairobi

Charles Mahinge Githinji

D53/OL/14838/2009
Section A: Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible

1. Gender  □ Male  □ Female

2. Age category  □ Less than 30 years  □ Between 31 and  □ Between 41 and 50  □ above 50

3. Highest level of education Attained

□ Primary Education  □ Secondary education  □ College  □ Certificate
□ University degree and higher  □ None of the above

4. How long have you been working at Mutomo District?

□ Less than 1 year  □ Between 1 and 5 years
□ Between 5 and 10 years  □ Above 10 years

5. Are you involved in CBPs in Mutomo District?

□ Yes  □ No

If yes, please specify how……………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………
Section B: The role played by the community in the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo district.

To what extent does the community contribute to the sustainability of CBPs at Mutomo district in the following roles? Please tick your corresponding responses that are in a scale of 1 No Extent, 2 Low Extent, 3 Moderate Extent, 4 Great Extent, and 5 Very Great Extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles Played by Community</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design of programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Implementers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section C: The geographical factors affecting the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District.

To what extent do the following geographical factors affect the sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo district? Please tick your corresponding responses that are in a scale of: 1 No Extent, 2 Low Extent, 3 Moderate Extent, 4 Great Extent, and 5 Very Great Extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section D: The role of controllers and implementers on sustainability of CBPs in Mutomo District.

To what extent do the following control and implement CBPs in Mutomo County? Please tick your corresponding responses that are in a scale of: 1 No Extent, 2 Low Extent, 3 Moderate Extent, 4 Great Extent, and 5 Very Great Extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controllers and Implementers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Work Plan and Budget

WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td>Project writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23rd July 2013</td>
<td>Project defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29th July –9th Aug 2013</td>
<td>Field work (Data collection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10th Aug – 15th Aug 2013</td>
<td>Data analysis and editing report writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aug 16th – Aug 24th 2013</td>
<td>Finalize report, prepare and submit required copies of report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Amount (Kshs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Data Collection/Transport expenses</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data Analysis (SPSS)</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stationery and printing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. 4 reams of Printing papers</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pens</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. 50 envelopes</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Printing/Binding</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>