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ABSTRACT
Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) face various challenges in the implementation of their projects. This study seeks to establish the factors affecting the successful implementation of projects in NGOs within urban slums in Kenya. To achieve this objective, the study was guided by the following specific research objectives: finding out how funding affects implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation; establishing the effect of training on implementation of projects of Children of Kibera; establishing the effects of organisation structure on implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation and establishing the effects of stakeholder relationships on the implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation. This study was limited to one NGO - the Children of Kibera Foundation. As such the findings may not apply to other NGOs in Kenya because of the uniqueness of projects and project duration at the Children of Kibera Foundation. This study adopted a descriptive research design. According to Cooper and Schindler (2003), a descriptive study is concerned with finding out the what, where and how of a phenomenon. The target population of this study included all the employees at the Children of Kibera Foundation. As per the human resources records, there were 124 employees in the NGO. As at 31st December 2012. Following the high homogeneity among the respondents in the different strata, the study selected 30% of the target population for inclusion in the study. The collected data was analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods. Quantitative method involved both descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis such as frequencies and percentages were used to present quantitative data in form of tables and graphs. Descriptive statistics involves the use of absolute and relative (percentages) frequencies, measures of central tendency and dispersion (mean and standard deviation respectively). The study also established that the strategies were implemented on time. The respondents explained that strategy implementation was influenced by several factors key among them the availability of financial resources to see the strategy implementation to the end. The study also concludes that the organization structure of Kibera Children Foundation affected the strategy implementation process. The study also concludes that stakeholder’s involvement affected project implementation at the Foundation. The study recommends that the Foundation engages the stakeholders more to harmonize its goals and objectives with the aspirations of the stakeholders and reduce dissonance levels thereby increasing satisfaction. To enables employees deliver quality services, the study recommends that the Foundation hires qualified staff and in
addition, it trains them to enable them deliver services optimally. The study recommends that the Foundation involves stakeholders in all its strategic management right from strategic formulation to strategic evaluation. This will reduce the levels of resistance hence promote strategy implementation processes.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction
This chapter presents background information on subject of research and covers statement of the problem, research objectives, research questions, and significance of the study. The chapter also covers other sections including limitations and delimitations of the study and the scope. In the background of the study the study reviews the key concepts and how they relate to one another.

1.1 Background
A project in its basic definition is a temporary endeavour undertaken by people who work cooperatively together to create a unique product or service (Project Management Institute, 2000) within an established time frame and within established budget to produce identifiable deliverables. Project success has been defined by the criteria of time, budget and deliverables (Flaman and Gallagher, 2001). According to Antill (1974), a project is only successful if it comes on schedule, on budget, it achieves the deliverables originally set for it and it is accepted and used by the clients for whom the project was intended. According to Boyce and Haddad (2001), projects posses certain characteristics that distinguish them from any other activity in the organization. These include the fact that projects are temporary meaning that any project will have a start date and end date although it has nothing to do with short duration. Another feature is that projects produce unique results meaning that the product or service at the end of the project should be some way different than the existing. The other characteristic is that projects are characterized by progressive elaboration due to uniqueness and greater uncertainty projects cannot be understood entirely at or before project start, and therefore planning and execution of projects is happening many times in separate steps or phases. As project progresses, project team understands the steps to follow, deliverables and way of executing them much better. Based on this knowledge team members elaborate initial draft plans, and execute next phase of the project based on these detailed plans.
Projects differ from operations, because operations are continuous and repeating whereas projects are temporary. In addition, operations deliver the same or almost the same results over time whereas project results are in contrast unique. A project usually needs resources to deliver its results. Most of the time project execution is based on detailed plan, which considers also external factors and constraints. Planning, execution and controlling of project is the primary field of project management. For major projects it is necessary sometimes to set up a special temporary organization, consisting of a project team and one or more work teams (Flaman and Gallagher, 2001). Major projects can be divided into sub-projects, and program denotes collection of related projects. Implementation is the stage where all the planned activities are put into action. Before the implementation of a project, the implementers which are spearheaded by the project committee or executive should identify their strength and weaknesses including internal forces, opportunities and threats which include external forces.

The strength and opportunities are positive forces that should be exploited to efficiently implement a project. The weaknesses and threats are hindrances that can hamper project implementation. The implementers should ensure that they devise means of overcoming them. Monitoring is important at this implementation phase to ensure that the project is implemented as per the schedule. This is a continuous process that should be put in place before project implementation starts. As such, the monitoring activities should appear on the work plan and should involve all stake holders. If activities are not going on well, arrangements should be made to identify the problem so that they can be corrected.

Monitoring is also important to ensure that activities are implemented as planned. This helps the implementers to measure how well they are achieving their targets. This is based on the understanding that the process through which a project is implemented has a lot of effect on its use, operation and maintenance (Graham and Englund, 1997). Project implementation therefore requires genuine commitment to both the donor and the recipient country. This is often lacking, ultimately leaving most of the already started project to tarry from implementation.
Ad hoc projects would be of more benefit to the poor if the poor were involved from the start in identification and design as well as implementation. Development partners increasingly recognise the limits of projects, and are seeking to enhance impact by supporting sector-wide approaches, especially in the social sectors. This involves more budgetary funding, improved coordination among the funders, ideally led by national governments, and increased trust between partners.

Clearer guidance and increased incentives for programme managers are required if these projects are to be mainstreamed in donor agencies. Country programming could focus more on delivering benefits to the poor and actual results should be monitored. Most project implementers therefore need a broader range of poverty-relevant skills and to relocate them in field offices, with the authority and flexibility to build up pro-poor partnerships through dialogue (Mosley, Hudson and Horrell, 1986).

1.1.2 The Children of Kibera Foundation

The Children of Kibera Foundation (CoKF) is a 501c3 tax-exempt charitable foundation providing vital quality educational opportunities for orphans and vulnerable children living in the Kibera slums in Nairobi. The problems faced by Kibera’s inhabitants include high levels of unemployment, low-quality housing, lack of health-care, hunger, domestic violence, and drug abuse.

Solutions to these challenges are not easy. The Children of Kibera Foundation believe that long-term sustainable change is possible through the care for and education of the children of Kibera. The foundation partners with individuals and organizations whose creativity, skills, generosity, and dedication make it possible for the children of Kibera to overcome the obstacles of poverty, disease, and social alienation and to realize their dreams as productive, healthy citizens.
Figure 1.1: Kibera Foundation Organizational Chart

Source: (Children of Kibera Foundation, 2013)

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Major international development partners including, World Bank (WB), EU, IFC, GTZ, DANIDA, SIDA and other major development partners (MDPs) exert enormous influence on national and international approaches to projects development and implementation. There has been a lot of pressure from these organisations to most recipient countries, and especially the developing countries, on stewardship of projects that are financed by them. Yet historically, the communities that experience the direct effects of MDP-financed projects are rarely included in their design or implementation. Consequently, many projects fail to meet local peoples’ needs, often with disastrous results. Furthermore, local community groups which are best situated to monitor and report on the impacts of projects are typically denied critical information about their rights, the terms and conditions of these projects and the actual content of the banks’ mandatory policies.

In the past a lot of research undertaken partially addressed the factors that contributed to project failure in general. Much of the research was mainly focused on what causes delays in project implementation and cost overruns. Alajoutsijarvi (1996), focused on the time and cost overruns in the power projects in Kenya and attributed project failure to factors ranging from delayed payments to contractors, client, delay in disbursement of funds by financiers to approval of the project by the technical people. (Sumner, 1999)
studied project failure in the context of cost and attributed it to poor communication among the client and the project team members, inadequate financial resources, lack of motivation, tendering methods and poor project definition and project organization, environmental conditions, quality of project management, lack of proper project definition and infrastructure. Arrowsmith (1998) in analyzing project failure factors for Kenya Railways projects, identified poor communication, little experience of the project manager late procurement of equipment, lack of training of project managers and slow project selection methods has being the major causes of project failure.

To be able to respond to both internal and external variables/factors in a project environment that have affect project implementation, it was necessary to investigate, identify and understand these variables/factors and establish to what extent they individually or collectively contributed to project implementation, i.e. success/failure. Towards this end, a survey was conducted to establish what factors collectively and significantly contributed to project implementation at The Children of Kibera Foundation.

1.3 Objective of the Study

1.3.1 Broad objective
The broad objective of this study was to determine the factors affecting successful implementation of projects in Non Governmental organizations within the urban slums in Kenya using a case of children of Kibera Foundation.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives
This study was guided by the following specific research objectives
i. To find out how funding affects implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation
ii. To establish the effect of training on implementation of projects of Children of Kibera
iii. To establish the effects of organisation structure on implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation
iv. To establish the effects of stakeholder relationships on the implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation
1.4 Research Questions

The study will sought to answer the following research questions

i. How did funding affect implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation?

ii. What was the effect of training of staff on implementation of projects of Children of Kibera?

iii. What were the effects of organisation structure on implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation?

iv. What were the effects of stakeholder relationships on the implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study would be of importance to several stakeholders including the management of the Children of Kibera Foundation, Government of Kenya through the NGO coordination Bureau, whole NGO sector, Future researchers and academicians.

For the management of the Children of Kibera Foundation, the findings of this study would be important in understanding of the factors affecting its project implementation hence inform them on necessary mitigation strategies to mitigate on their effects. It will inform their future planning and strategy development as far as the operations of the NGO are concerned.

To the NGO coordination Bureau, this study would be important in the development of policies governing the NGO sector in the country besides elucidating the challenges that NGOs face in the implementation of their projects.

To future researchers and academicians, the study would be important in the suggestion of areas requiring further research to build on the topic of factors affecting project implementation among the NGO sector. In addition, the findings of this study would be important source of reference for future scholars and researchers.
1.6 Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to one NGO- the Children of Kibera Foundation. As such the findings may not apply to other NGOs in Kenya because of the uniqueness of projects and project duration at the Children of Kibera Foundation. A larger research would be more appropriate for generalization of the findings to the whole NGO sector in Kenya.

The organization confidentiality policy might have restricted most of the respondents who had a problem to release information due to the confidential nature. The researcher presented the introduction letter obtained from the university to the respondents to avoid suspicion. The researcher also asked the respondents not to include their names as they answer questions.

1.7 Scope of the Study

This study was limited to the Children of Kibera Foundation. The study targeted all employees at the NGO. As per the human resources records, there were 124 employees in the NGO as at 31st December 2012. These constituted the scope of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction to Literature Review

This chapter gives an insight into the literature by other scholars and researchers on the aspect of factors affecting successful implementation of projects in Non Governmental organizations within the urban slums. It reviews literature that is related to the specific and general objectives of the research. It specifically covers the past studies/main review where it discusses literature related to the specific objectives of the study. It also presents literature on the critical review of major issue, summary and gaps to be filled and the conceptual framework.

2.2 Past studies / main Review

This section presents literature on the issues of strategy implementation, theories of strategy implementation, funding/capital, training, organization structure and stakeholder relationship.

2.2.1 Strategy Implementation

Strategy implementation involves organization of the firm's resources and motivation of the staff to achieve objectives. Strategic implementation is about working together and sharing information with each other (Galpin, 1998). The value of any strategy and its potential contributions include increasing productivity, reducing costs, growing profits, and improving service or product quality (Alavi, 1994). Woolridge and Floyd (1990) noted that it can be much easier to think of a good strategy than it is to implement it as much of the shortcomings in the strategy area is attributable to failures in the implementation process rather than in the formulation of strategy itself.

The implementation process involves the collective wisdom, knowledge, and even subconscious minds of the collaborators. This powerful phenomenon is becoming a requirement to effectively compete in today’s global marketplace (Alavi, 1994; Hills, 1997). Implementing strategies successfully is vital for any organization, either public or
private. Without implementation, even the most superior strategy is useless. The notion of strategy implementation might at first seem quite straightforward: the strategy is formulated and then it is implemented. Implementing would thus be perceived as being about allocating resources and changing organizational structure (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000). However, transforming strategies into action is a far more complex and difficult task.

There is currently considerable interest in strategy implementation. Management interest can be gauged from the high levels of attendance at the large number of industrial conferences on the subject. Academic interest is manifest through the considerable number of papers on the topic (Neely, 1999). But this interest is not new. In the late 1970s and 1980s, authors expressed a general dissatisfaction with traditional backward looking accounting based on strategy implementation, identifying their shortcomings and arguing for change. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, this dissatisfaction led to the development of “balanced” or “multi-dimensional” strategy implementation frameworks which placed emphasis on non-financial, external and future looking strategy implementation (Galpin, 1998). They were then quickly followed by the development of management processes specifically designed to give practicing managers the tools to develop or redesign their strategy implementation system. The result has been the publication of alternative balanced strategy implementation frameworks and suggested management processes for the design of performance measurement systems (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000).

Starting in the early 1980s, several frameworks have been developed which are largely conceptual and/or descriptive. The overriding assumption among all these frameworks is that there must be a “fit” among the variables if the implementation process is to be successful. While proposing their frameworks, all scholars emphasise that there are continuous interactions among these variables and it is these ongoing interactions which make implementation possible. Based on a critical review of previous frameworks, ten key variables were identified. These are strategy formulation, environmental uncertainty, organisational structure, culture, operational planning, communication, resource allocation, people, control and outcome. Previous researchers have grouped
implementation variables into a number of categories such as “content”, “context”, “process” and “outcome”. Critical analysis reveals that the previous researchers have adopted these groupings mainly from Pettigrew’s works on managing strategic change (Pettigrew et al., 1992). There is no consensus as to which variable should be included in which grouping but there are suggestions made by previous researchers. Previous researchers appear to view strategic content as the overall strategic direction of the company and the need to design new initiatives.

Whereas it is argued that strategies are initiated and implemented in a strategic context and the variables in this grouping support and influence the implementation process; however, they are less controllable than the process variables (Bryson and Bromiley, 1993; Schmelzer, 1992). The operational process variables are seen as those which are primarily used and directly involved in the implementation process. It is assumed that companies have substantial control over these variables, at least in the short-term. The main difference between the context and process variables is that the latter are primarily used and employed in implementing decisions, while context variables are not primarily used but they are taken account of due to obstacles and problems in the implementation process.

The outcome variables are seen as the expected results of the initiated strategy. Based on these classifications and the review of the characteristics of the individual variables, the key variables were further grouped and a framework was developed which formed the basis of the fieldwork investigation. Strategy implementation has attracted much less attention in strategic and organizational research than strategy formulation or strategic planning. Alexander (1991) suggests several reasons for this including the fact that strategy implementation is less glamorous than strategy formulation which makes people overlook it because of a belief that anyone can do it and people are not exactly sure what it includes and where it begins and ends. Furthermore, there are only a limited number of conceptual models of strategy implementation (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000).

Organizations seem to have difficulties in implementing their strategies. Researchers have revealed a number of problems in strategy implementation: e.g. weak management roles in implementation, a lack of communication, lacking a commitment to the strategy,
unawareness or misunderstanding of the strategy, unaligned organizational systems and resources, poor coordination and sharing of responsibilities, inadequate capabilities, competing activities, and uncontrollable environmental factors (Alexander, 1991; Lares-Mankki, 1994).

Pettigrew’s (1987) framework for strategic change also sheds some light on the analysis of strategy implementation. Pettigrew distinguishes the content of the strategy, the outer and inner contexts of an organization, and the process in which strategic change is carried out. Pettigrew contends that the content, the context and the process are intertwined and affect one another. This has an important impact on strategy implementation research. In order to understand implementation, which is close to the process in Pettigrew’s model, also the content of strategy and the context in which it takes place must be understood.

Another issue influencing the study of strategy implementation is the perspective one has on strategy (Mintzberg, 1978). Implementation means carrying out the pre-determined strategic plans. Strategy emerges and evolves without interventions by the strategic planners, or in spite of them (Mintzberg, 1978). It is believed that in reality some strategies are planned and some strategies just emerge from the actions and decisions of organizational members. Planned strategy and realized or emergent strategy evolve hand-in-hand and affect each other in the process of strategy implementation, where strategies are communicated, interpreted, adopted and enacted (Noble, 1999).

From this perspective it is interesting to study how the strategies and the reality interact with each other through communication, interpretation, adoption and action. If this interaction is successful, the organizational vision may be achieved. When doing research from this view, the scope needs to be broad to grasp both the planning of the strategies and the real work practices through which the strategies come true.

2.2.2 Theories in Implementation of strategies

2.2.2.1 Co-evolutionary theory

Lewin and Volberda (1999) indicates that as firms grow and evolve from small to larger and multidivisional organisations, the strategy implementation methods also evolve
simultaneously. The various strategy implementation models described by Bourgeois and Brodwin (1984) are meant to meet the changing needs of firms as they evolve through various stages of the organizational life cycle (Parsa, 1999). In contrast to the earlier descriptive models, this model is more prescriptive with an, albeit limited, empirical basis. Their research highlights three of Bourgeois and Brodwin’s (1984) classifications of strategy implementation styles: change, collaborative, and cultural.

Not all firms implement their strategies in the same manner; nevertheless, research investigating the differing styles of implementation is scarce. Nutt (1995) utilizes Jungian theory (Jung, 1923) for his framework of implementation style; however, this is very much an analysis of the psychological style of individuals within the firm. More recently, Parsa (1999) utilised Bourgeois and Brodwin's (1984) classification of strategy implementation types.

The majority of extant taxonomy models in strategy implementation tend to be normative in nature (Parsa, 1999). Alternatively, they are developed from organisational observation, and as such, become context specific and frequently lack any broader theoretical grounding (Hooley et al., 1992). In contrast, Bourgeois and Brodwin's (1984) model is comprehensive, is based on specific theoretical assumptions and has been used by authors such as Parsa (1999). Bourgeois and Brodwin (1984) to refute the traditional approach to strategy implementation as simply an adjunct to the strategy formulation phase of the strategy process. Rather, they contend that strategy implementation evolves either from a process of winning group commitment through a coalitional form of decision-making, or as a result of complete coalitional involvement of implementation staff through a strong corporate culture.

2.2.3 Funding

The search for funding is necessary for the survival and the development of local NGOs (Vincent, 2006). Fowler (1997) suggests that there are reasons to believe that the ‘NGOization of the grassroots’ can be correlated with rises in the international availability of funding and that diminishing funds would mean the disappearance of many of these NGOs. NGOs require external funding sources to respond, and though some
NGOs can afford to establish emergency operations for short periods without specific external support, many NGOs eventually turn to UN funding, U.S., UK, or other government grants, private contributions from foundations, communities, or individuals, or umbrella organizations that distribute funding on behalf of another agency or organization. To appreciate the challenges of financial sustainability it is necessary to understand the potential sources of revenue for the NGO sector (More 2005). While there is tremendous variation in the sources of NGO revenue among countries and NGOs within any sector, there are at the same time identifiable trends of NGO financing. In their study of east African local NGOs, Semboja and Therkildsen (2005) for example, found that much local NGO funding comes from international donors (Hulme and Edwards, 2005)

Lee (1997) also revealed that there are three sectors from which NGOs can derive their resources. These are the private sector, the general public and government/public sector. Resources from each of these sectors can originate from both external sources (i.e. International) and local (i.e. Domestic or municipal public and private donors). More (2005) in a similar vein indicates that NGO revenue falls within three broad categories. They include government funding, private giving and self-generated income. Barr (2005) in their study of local NGOs in Uganda identified that the NGO sector grants received from international NGOs accounted for nearly half of the total funding in 2001 in Uganda. Grants from bilateral donors are the next most important source with grants from the local government being the third. The average NGO is less likely to receive funding from these three sources and more likely to depend on non grant income. Furthermore the authors discovered that the local NGOs derived very little revenue from members and non-members, with only 2.5 percent of all funding coming from these sources.

2.2.3.1 Private sector source of funding local NGOs

In countries where there is some economic growth recorded with a presence of a vibrant private sector, NGOs look upon the corporate agencies as major sources of funding. These corporate groups according to Lotsmart (2007) have corporate social responsibility (CSR) agenda for enhancing equity, social justice and development. Besides, in the
present times, some corporate agencies are also partnering with NGOs for joint profit-oriented projects. Private giving usually comes in the form of cash and in-kind donations from individuals, businesses, and foundations or other grant-making legal entities. The efforts of volunteers may also be considered donations and can be embraced by the concept of philanthropy. Another source of funding for NGOs is from the private charities/foundations/international organizations that are more privately handled and have a better focus on equipping local NGOs. It provides financial and technical resources to them. Donations and gifts, mostly from individuals or informal groups are also sources of funding for NGOs. According to Lotsmart (2007) donations come from individuals or groups such as churches, foundations and private firms.

2.2.3.2 Public sector source of funding local NGOs

According to a UNDP, 2007 report some countries, the local governments are a major source of funding as they have different community welfare and development schemes which NGOs can apply and raise resources and implement projects. The public sector provides various types of subsidies to non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Government funding includes a broad range of direct and indirect support. The UNDP (2007) noted that one-third of NGOs funding come from governments through varied degrees such as subsidies, government grants, and contracting. Exemptions from taxation can be considered a government subsidy. During the last term of Clinton (United State president 1993 -2000) administration for example, the white house support to NGOs increased from 13 percent to 50 percent through USAID assistance. In addition, most embassies of developed countries residing in the developing countries fund local NGOs (Lotsmart, 2007).

In the view of Fernand (2006) an NGO which receives more than 30 percent of its funding through an external agency, is not free in its actions and above this percentage, the NGO could find itself in a very difficult situation in case of separation between the NGO and the donor due to strategic factors. Turary (2002) stated that in a situation where a greater proportion of an organisation funding comes from external sources it will have an effect on the long run in the case of withdrawal of external funding. This means that
any organisation that depends solely on external funding will not be in a position to finance some of its initiated and laudable projects. The much reliance on external funding therefore makes it difficult for local NGOs to accomplish their stated objectives.

Fernand (2006) further argues that, external financing tends to impose some degree of constraint on local NGOs. The biggest challenge for the local NGOs therefore seems to be to take into consideration the demands of its donors, because losing the financial aid would have severe consequences not only for the activities, but also for remunerated personnel. NGO ‘self-control’ appears more frequently than one would think and it is for this reason that it is something to be carefully watched. Contractual arrangements often contain negative restrictions or conditions for the NGOs (Fernand, 2006).

### 2.2.4 Training

Training is the process of transmitting and receiving information to problem solving (Nadeem, 2010). Omole (1991) sees training as any process concerned with the development of aptitudes, skills and abilities of employees to perform specific jobs with a view to increase productivity. An organisation may have employees with the ability and determination, with the appropriate equipment and managerial support yet productivity falls below expected standards. The missing link in many cases is the lack of adequate skills, and knowledge, which is acquired through training and development. According Cole (2002) the purpose of training is mainly to improve knowledge and skills, and to change attitudes or behavior. It is one of the most important potential motivators which can lead to many possible benefits for both individuals and the organization. Changing technology requires that employees possess the knowledge, skills and abilities needed to cope with new processes and production techniques. Cole (2002) further argued that training brings a sense of security at the workplace which reduces labor turnover and absenteeism is avoided; change management training helps to manage change by increasing the understanding and involvement of employees in the change process and also provides the skills and abilities needed to adjust to new situations; Provide recognition, enhanced responsibility and the possibility of increased pay and promotion;
Give a feeling of personal satisfaction and achievement, and broaden opportunities for career progression; and help to improve the availability and quality of staff.

According to Krietner (2005) no matter how carefully job applicants are screened, typically a gap remains between what the employee does know and what they should know. An organization which desires to gain the competitive edge in its respective industry, needs among other things, extensive and effective training of its human resources. Training is therefore a key element for improved organizational performance; it increases the level of individual and organizational competences. It helps to reconcile the gap between what should happen and what is happening between desired targets or standards and actual levels of work performance. Although many employers continue to have reservations about the cost and extent of tangible business returns from training, the development of skills has been identified as a key factor in sharpening competitiveness. According to Casio, (1989), the economic and technological trends, the pace of innovation, change and development are growing faster year-by-year and as a result, provide clear signals that training and development are so relevant that both organizations and individual stakeholders must give a serious attention to.

2.2.4.1 Effect of Various Training Methods

The selection of method for training need to be based on identified training needs, training objectives, an understanding on the part of the trainees, the resources available and an awareness of learning principles. DeCauza et al. (1996) explained that the most popular training methods used by organizations can be classified as either on-the-job or off-the-job. On the job training is the most widely used training method, as in comparison, on-the-job method of training is simple and less costly to operate. Observing this method critically, the training places the employee in actual work situations and makes them appear to be immediately productive. The disadvantages are that the senior worker is not usually trained in the skills and methods of training therefore it can be a process that may be time consuming as a new comer struggles to cope with the senior worker’s explanations. Far more successful is to use a senior or experienced worker who has been trained in instruction or training method and whose teaching skills are
coordinated with a developed program linked to off-the-job courses. Here, there is a close collaboration between trainer and learner. There are three common methods that are used in on-the-job training and these are; learning by doing, mentoring and shadowing and job rotation.

A variety of methods could be adopted to carry out a training needs analysis. Job analysis, interview with managers and supervisors and performance appraisal are few methods commonly used. Despite the available variety of methods, an organization has to be cautious when selecting training methods for its use. A careful use of training methods can be a very cost-effective investment. Although one of the most important stages in the training process, evaluation and monitoring is often the most neglected or least adequately carried out part. Mentoring is another version of the system whereby a senior or experienced employee takes charge of the training of a new employee. This suggests a much closer association than master/apprentice and elements of a father/son relationship can exist whereby the mentor acts as an advisor and protector to the trainee.

Here, some of the methods used in the assessment centers include business games, in-basket, simulation, problem-centered cases, and many others, to enable the trainee learn the behaviors appropriate for the job through role-playing. The use of behavior modeling is based on social theory, and it is in particular an effective method for interpersonal or social skills training. This method of training incorporates the use of videos to clearly demonstrate the way things ought to be done, what behaviors are to be avoided. Behavior modeling is often based on the demonstration of the right and effective way to behave and as a result, trainees are provided with facilities to practice this. Bryn, (1990) asserts that behavior modeling is where target behaviors are selected and videos on each of the behaviors produced, showing competent persons achieving success by following specific guidelines. Key points are displayed on screen and are backed by trainer-led discussions. Learning here is trainer enforced through role play.

Job rotation is another version of training that became popular in the 1970s to help relieve boredom and thereby raise the productivity of shop floor workers. It is a management technique used to rotate incumbents from job to job or from department to department or from one plant to another in different geographical areas. The rotation is
done on co-ordinate basis with a view to exposing the executives and trainees to new
challenges and problems. It is also aimed at giving executives broad outlook and
diversified skills.

2.2.4.2 Training Policies

Scores of Literature available on training (Dole, 1985) indicate that traditionally,
training in an organization involved systematic approach which generally follows a
sequence of activities involving the establishment of a training policy, followed by
training needs identification, training plans and programs design and implementation,
evaluation and training feedback for further action. Kenney et al. (1992:3) makes a
point that to enhance employee performance, companies should have different policies
for training depending on the class or level of employment or level of employees to be
trained. They pointed out that training policies are necessary for the following reasons:
To provide guidelines for those responsible for planning and implementing training; to
ensure that a company’s training resources are allocated to pre-determined requirements;
to provide for equality of opportunity for training throughout the company; and to
inform employees of training and development opportunities.

For any enterprise to function effectively, it must have money, materials, supplies,
equipment, ideas about the services or products to offer those who might use its outputs
and finally people, which is the human resource, to run the enterprise. Beer et al. (1984)
define Human Resource Management as the involvement of all management decisions
and actions that affect the nature of the relationship between the organization and its
employees-the human resources. According to Beer et al. (1984), general management
make important decisions daily that affect this relationship, and this leads to a map of
human resource management territory, the core of which they refer to as the four Cs and
these are; competence of employees: high competence creates a positive attitude towards
learning and development. Commitment of employees: high commitment means that
employees was motivated to hear, understand and respond to management’s
communication relating to the organization of work. Congruence between the goals of
employees and those of the organization: higher congruence is a reflection of policies
and practices which bring about a higher coincidence of interest among management,
shareholders and workers alike. Cost effectiveness of Human Resource Management practices means that the organization’s human resource cost, that is wages, benefits, training and indirect costs such as strikes, turnover and grievances, have been kept equal to or less than those of competitors (Russell, Terborg and Powers, 1995).

As much as these policies seem to be accurate, they are silent on the elements of budgetary provision and top management support for training. According to Armstrong (1996), training policies are expressions of the training philosophy of the organization.

### 2.2.4.3 Quality of Training and Employee Performance

The quality of employees and their development through training are major factors in determining long-term profitability and optimum performance of organizations. To hire and keep quality employees, it is good policy to invest in the development of their skills, knowledge and abilities so that individual and ultimately organizational productivity can increase. Traditionally, training is given to new employees only. This is a mistake as NGO training for existing employees helps them adjust rapidly to changing job requirements. Organizations that are committed to quality invest in training and development of its employees (Evans and Lindsay, 1999). A new hire training program provides a fundamental understanding of the position and how the position fits within the organizational structure. The more background knowledge the new associate has about how one workgroup interrelates with ancillary departments, the more the new associate will understand his or her impact on the organization.

Another aspect of a comprehensive employee training program is continuing education. The most effective employee training programs make continuing education an NGO responsibility of one person in the department. This is an important function that will keep all staff members’ current about policies, procedures and the technology used in the department. A solid new hire training program begins with the creation of an employee training manual, in either notebook format or online. This manual acts as a building block of practical and technical skills needed to prepare the new individual for his or her position (Psacharopoulos & Woodhall, 1997).
Odekunle (2001) argues that much of today’s employee training and reference material belongs online these days in a company Intranet. But, if the organization is not ready to embrace the online world, keep the manuals up-to-date and interesting the quality of training was substandard. When possible, in computer training, visual images of the computer screen (multi-media screen capture) to illustrate functions, examples, and how to should be incorporated.

2.2.4.4 Training Evaluation and Performance

Upon checking the effectiveness of training, Kenney (1992) stated that the training program should be reviewed during and after its completion by the training officer, the line manager, and if necessary, by the trainees themselves. Evaluation differs from validation in that it attempts to measure the overall cost benefit of the training program and not just the achievement of its laid down objectives. Hamlin (1974) advocated that until control measures are taken to correct any deficiencies after the training, evaluation has not been completed and thereby ineffective. Evaluation is an integral feature of training, but it could be difficult because it is often hard to set measurable objectives.

Beardwell and Holden (1993) cited some of the methods as follows; questionnaires (feedback forms): this is a common way of eliciting trainee responses to courses and programs. Tests or examinations: these are common on formal courses, especially those that result in certification for instance a diploma in word processing skills.

2.2.5 Organization Structure

Structures include relevant Non Government Organization departments, workers, and other stakeholders in the organization. Execution of organizational functions is implemented by an increasingly professional, dynamic, and competitive and beneficiary focused management team. Litterer (1999) provides a conceptual framework to link firms’ organizational structure (architecture) to ethical behavior, as reflected in product quality. In particular, they argue that when quality is expensive for customers to evaluate, as is clearly the case with the quality (integrity) of financial information, managers will have incentives to cheat. The association between interdivisional relatedness and the structure of employee compensation has been the subject of previous research. According
to Rap (2004), two aspects of an organization must be considered-its structure and its decision flow processes. Structure deploys accountabilities so the organization can achieve its goals and objectives and ultimately, its mission. The enterprise’s mission and goals are the general and specific accountabilities of top management. The goals then are subdivided into objectives that are delegated to the next level of executive management. In effect, a strategy defines both the firm’s direction and top management’s job. Decision-flow processes, however, are the vehicles organization use to integrate results into coherent patterns for developing, implanting and controlling decision-making. Furthermore, bureaucracy makes this situation even more challenging and can make the whole implementation a disaster.

According to management theorists and conceptualists, resources influence implementation of strategies. For instance, Micknsey (1980) and Okumus (2001), support that resources forms an important variable in strategy implementation frameworks. However, this may not always be the case with schools. According to Esther Duflo, Pascaline Dupas, and Michael Kremer (2009) who conducted a study on education quality revealed that increase in resources such as personnel may not be sufficient to improve school quality. According to Duflo (2009), without changes in incentives or the organization of teaching, extra resources lead to less effort by teachers. Contract teachers tend to be present and in class more than tenured civil service teachers in the same type of school. Their students learn more and perform better on cumulative achievement tests. Also, where teachers are monitored by parents, results tend to be better than schools which have no empowered school committees. This signifies that instead of increasing resources, monitoring of commitment may be the better option in schools.

According to Richard Ingersoll (2001) teacher turnover drives demand for teachers and in turn creates school staffing problems. Although the demand for student enrollment is increasing, the demand for new teachers is primarily due to teachers’ moving from or leaving their jobs at relatively high rates. According to Ingersoll (2001) staffing problems are not associated with retirement or increases in student enrollment but due to excessive demand resulting from revolving door i.e. where teachers depart their jobs for reasons other than retirement. This has a bearing on education policy and in turn affects
strategic decisions in schools. Supply and demand theory hold that where the quantity of teachers demanded is greater than the quantity of teachers supplied, two basic remedies are applicable: increase the quantity supplied or decrease the quantity demanded. Rather than increase the quantity of teacher supply, an alternative solution to school staffing problems is to decrease the demand for new teachers by decreasing turnover. Ingersoll (2001), further points that improvement in organizational conditions, such as increased support from the school administration, reduction of student discipline problems, and enhanced faculty input into school decision-making and increased salaries would all contribute to lower rates of turnover, thus, diminishing school staffing problems and ultimately aid performance of schools. Ingersoll (2001) adds that teachers’ choice to stay or exit from school are shaped by particular occupational and organizational conditions in schools.

Ingersoll (2001) study finding corroborates with that of National Commission of Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) (2002) those salaries, working conditions, mentoring and teacher preparation affects staffing in schools. According to this study, higher salaries attract better prepared and high quality teachers and the student achievement may be associated with increases in teacher salaries as well (along with teacher experience and education, which are rewarded in teacher salary schedules. Prepared teachers stay in teaching at higher rates. According to Ingersoll and Thomas (2003), raising the teachers’ salaries would not solve staffing problem given the sheer size of teacher population. Instead, the working conditions, administrative support, student discipline and motivation and participation of teachers in decision-making are critical. Therefore, according to Ingersoll (2003) loss of new teachers plays a major role in the teacher shortage, but providing more teachers into the system would not solve the retention problem.

2.2.6 Stakeholders relationship

The notion of stakeholders was originally introduced to the mainstream general management discussion by Freeman (1984). Two years later, Cleland (1986) brought stakeholder thinking into the project management paradigm. Ever since, the role of stakeholder management as a central project management process has strengthened, and
today even the concept of project management is defined through stakeholders as “the process of adapting the specifications, plans, and approaches to the different concerns and expectations of the various stakeholders” (PMI, 2008). Despite the acknowledged importance of stakeholder management, project research still lacks both theoretical knowledge and empirical evidence of various project stakeholder related phenomena (Achterkamp and Vos, 2008). Until today, existing scarce research has primarily focused on the conceptual development of stakeholder management tools and frameworks in order to better manage stakeholders (Winch and Bonke, 2002).

The importance of stakeholder concept is growing in management literature. Stakeholder management is the process of managing the expectation of anyone that has an interest in a project or was affected by its deliverables or outputs. The application of stakeholder in the public sector seems to be in accordance with the wave new public management (Osborne and Gaebler, 1993). Stakeholder theory and empirical research (Clarkson 1995) indicate that companies do explicitly manage their relationships with different stakeholder groups. Donaldson & Preston (1995) point out that although this is descriptively true, companies appear to manage stakeholders for both instrumental (i.e., performance based) reasons and, at the core, normative reasons. Building on the work of others, Clarkson (1995) defines primary stakeholders as those “without whose continuing participation, the corporation cannot survive as a going concern,” suggesting that these relationships are characterized by mutual interdependence. He includes here shareholders or owners, employees, customers, and suppliers, as well as government and communities. The “web of life” view (Capra 1995) envisions corporations as fundamentally relational, that is, as a “system of primary stakeholder groups, a complex set of relationships between and among interest groups with different rights, objectives, expectations and responsibilities” (Clarkson, 1995).

Developing initiatives that are capable of achieving all stakeholder goals and objectives may be difficult, if not impossible (Wood & Jones, 1995). This may be the case in certain circumstances, because the interests of all parties are not given equal consideration, with broader social and environmental goals being traded off against economic concerns (Huang & Stewart, 1996). Ford (1980) suggests that companies pursue relationships with
other companies to obtain the benefits associated with reducing their costs or increasing their revenues. By entering into relationships, organizations hope to gain stakeholder satisfaction and loyalty while stakeholders look for quality (Evans & Laskin, 1994).

Kakabadse. (2005) in the extensive review on the stakeholder approach expressed that corporate social responsibility (CSR) and stakeholders' interests are partly related to each other. In line with this, Hillman (2001) noted that a firm has relationships with constituent (stakeholders) groups and the processes and outcomes associated with these relationships depend on the interest. The interests of all legitimate stakeholders have value and the focus of stakeholder theory is on managerial decision making”. Kakabadse et. al. (2005), therefore, concluded that managers should pay attention to stakeholders.

A study carried out by Mitchell, (1997) in stake holder identification and salience, it was found that one interesting characteristic of the stakeholder concept is the dynamics of stakeholders. Over time, the mix of stakeholders may change. New stakeholders may join and wish to be included in any considerations, while others may drop out, through no longer being involved in the process. The concept of the dynamics of stakeholders was acknowledged by Freeman, and according to him, in reality stakeholders change over time, and their stakes change depending on the strategic issue under consideration. Alkhafaji also contributed to the understanding of this concept. To explain the dynamics, he defined stakeholders as the ‘groups to whom the corporation is responsible’. They proposed that classes of stakeholders can be identified by the possession or attributed possession of one or more of three relationship attributes: power, legitimacy and urgency. The influence of the stakeholder in the project depends on the relationship attributes and may affect both timeliness and level of funding.

As an open system, an organization needs resources and has to negotiate with people, groups and other organizations that own these resources. Depending on the importance of these resources to the organization, this process can lead to dependency relationship within which resource suppliers are able to exert their influence over their organization (Pfeffer & salancik, 2008)
Figures for overall fund allocation and expenditure on road maintenance are notoriously difficult to come by. Maintenance is often not classified as a separate item in the budget or it is listed under the capital investment budget rather than the recurrent budget; budgets for maintenance are often used for improvement; funds may be earmarked for projects which in fact are periodic maintenance activities; different agencies are responsible for different classes of roads; often recurrent budgets do not differentiate between road maintenance and other recurrent activities. Allocations, particularly at the local level, are more difficult to identify. Road maintenance allocations, being part of the recurrent budget, are easily commandeered for other more pressing activities (Donnges, Edmonds, Johannessen, 2007).

The capacity to pay for road maintenance from domestic sources depends on a country's resources. Gross national product (GNP) per capita may thus be a good index of financial capacity, but some governments are able to capture more of it than others. And of the fiscal intake, the allocation to highways is a political decision about national priorities. Variations in income growth also affect funding: severe setbacks in income growth clearly explain some important instances of underfunded maintenance and consequent road deterioration (Clell Harral and Asif Faiz, 1988).

2.3 Critical Review of major issue

Despite the concerted efforts of academicians and researchers to identify the various factors affecting successful implementation of projects in Non Governmental organizations within the urban slums, the research is also limited by the fact that successful implementation of projects is affected by many other moderating factors such as government policies, organization culture and the strategy implementation process.

2.3 Summary and gaps to be filled by the study

This study seeks to establish customize local literature focusing on the factors affecting successful implementation of projects in Non Governmental organizations within the urban slums in Kenya using a case of children of Kibera Foundation.
2.4 The Conceptual Framework

Figure 2.2: The Conceptual Framework

(Funding) \rightarrow (Training) \rightarrow (Organization Structure) \rightarrow (Stakeholders Involvement) \rightarrow (Implementation of Strategies of Kibera Foundation)

(Independent Variables) \rightarrow (Dependent variables)

Source: Author (2013)
3.1 Introduction
This chapter sets out various stages and phases that were followed in completing the study. Research methodology is an approach and a set of supporting methods and guidelines to be used as a framework for doing design research (Russell, 2000). According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), research methodology includes research design, target population and sample, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures and expected output.

3.2 Research Design
Research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure (Kothari, 2004). This study adopted a descriptive research design. According to Cooper and Schindler (2003), a descriptive study is concerned with finding out the what, where and how of a phenomenon.

Descriptive research design has been chosen because this study seeks to determine the factors affecting successful implementation of projects in Non Governmental organizations within the urban slums in Kenya using a case of children of Kibera Foundation. By doing this, this study was building a profile about the factors affecting the successful implementation of projects in NGOs within slums in Kenyan urban areas.

3.3 Target population
Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), defines target population as that population the researcher studies, and whose findings are used to generalize to the entire population. The target population of this study included all the employees at the Children of Kibera Foundation. As per the human resources records, there were 124 employees in the NGO
as at 31st December 2012. Therefore, the target population of this study was 124 employees.

### 3.4 Sample design

Kombo and Tromp (2006) define a sample as a finite part of a statistical population whose properties are studied to gain information about the whole sample. Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill (2003) define sampling as the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study from the larger group referred to as the population.

This study stratified the population into the levels of employment at the NGO. There were three levels comprising of senior and middle level management and other staff. The study will then apply proportionate stratified sampling method to select a representative sample for the study. Cooper and Schindler (2003) argue that statistically, in order for generalization to take place, a sample of at least 30 elements (respondents) must exist. Kothari (2004) argue that if well chosen, samples of about 10% of a population can often give reliable data. Following the high homogeneity among the respondents in the different strata, the study selected 30% of the target population for inclusion in the study. These was distributed as shown in the table 3.1 below:

#### Table 3.1: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level in the organization</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample Percent</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level management</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Children of Kibera Foundation

### 3.5 Data collection procedures

Data collection involved contacting the respondents in the sample in order to collect the required information about the study (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). Data collection involved a self-administered questionnaire. The study made use of face to face interviews
at the respondents’ place of work for senior management because of their key role in the implementation of NGO’s projects.

This study made use questionnaires for primary data collection. The questionnaires were used because they are held to be straightforward and less time consuming for both the researcher and the participants (Owens, 2002). The Questionnaires had a number of sub-sections that are sub-divided based on the major research questions except the first sub-section (section A) that is meant to capture the background information of the participants like gender, marital status, age, working experience, level of education. Other sections cover the main areas of the study. Questionnaires are appropriate for studies since they collect information that is not directly observable as they inquire about feelings, motivations, attitudes, accomplishments as well as experiences of individuals (Borg and Gall, 1996). Satyanarayana (1983) stated that a questionnaire is useful in obtaining objective data. This is largely because the participants are not manipulated in any way by the researcher. According to Borg and Gall (1996) questionnaires have the added advantage of being less costly and using less time as instruments of data collection.

3.6 Data Analysis

The collected data was analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods. Quantitative method will involve both descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis such as frequencies and percentages will used to present quantitative data in form of tables and graphs. Data from questionnaire was coded and entered into the computer using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS V 18.0). This will involve coding both closed ended items in order to run simple descriptive analyses to get reports on data status. Descriptive statistics involves the use of absolute and relative (percentages) frequencies, measures of central tendency and dispersion (mean and standard deviation respectively). For open ended questions, the study will make use of content analysis to analyze.

3.7 Expected output

The process of implementation Strategies in any organization is not an easy one as compared to that of formulation. During implementation, the strategies are put into
practice which requires high levels of coordination and clear communication among the implementing agents. However, for NGOs, the implementation stage is subject to a number of variables including financing levels availed by the donors, training and skills possessed by the staff, organizational structure and stakeholders’ relationship. The expected output is therefore that these factors influence the implementation of strategies. However, following the unique organization setting, these factors may influence strategy implementation to different degrees from one organization to another. Hence the findings in this study very much depended on the interaction of all these factors among others.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATIONS OF RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents analysis of the data on the factors affecting successful implementation of projects in nongovernmental organizations within urban slums in Kenya. The study targeted a sample of 38 respondents out of which 29 filled and returned the questionnaires giving a response of 76.32%. This response was good enough and representative of the population and conforms to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) stipulation that a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and above is excellent.

4.2 Demographic Statistics

4.2.1: Gender Distribution of the Respondents

The study sought to establish the gender distribution of the respondents. From the findings below, the females made the majority of the respondents at 59% and the males at 41% as shown on Table 4.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.2.2: Level of Education of Respondents

The study sought to establish the highest levels of education attained by the respondents. From the findings shown in the table 4.2 below, majority of the respondents (41%) had a Diploma followed by those who had a bachelors’ degree at 38%. Those with Masters
level of education made up 21% while there was no respondent who had a Phd.

**TABLE 4.3: LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.2.4 Current Designation

The study sought to establish the current designation of the employees in the organization. From the findings shown in the table 4.3 below, majority of the respondents were field officers and other job categories. The other positions were only made up of one respondent since they only had one office holder.

**Table 4.4: Current Designation in the Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Officer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Field Data, 2013)
4.2.5: Period Worked Within the NGO

The study sought to establish that the employees had worked with the NGO. From the findings, majority (55%) of the respondents had worked with the NGO for between 6-10 years, 31% had worked with the NGO for between 1-5 years, 7% had worked with the NGO for 11-15 years and 3% each had worked with the NGO for between 16-20 years and above 21 years respectively as shown on table 4.4 below:

Table 4.5: Period Worked Within the NGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 21 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.3 Implementation of Strategies of Kibera Foundation

The study sought to establish whether the strategy implementation was undertaken as a collective responsibility of every member of the Foundation. From the findings 55% answered “yes” while 45% answered “No” as shown on figure 4.1. The respondents indicated that the process of strategy formulation was undertaken by the top management while during implementation, duties were assigned to all employees according to their job descriptions and ability to execute them. This is because the implementation process involves the collective wisdom, knowledge, and even subconscious minds of the collaborators of the organization.
4.3.2 Timeliness in the Implementation of strategies

The study sought to establish whether the strategies were implemented on time. From the findings 53% said yes while 47% said No as shown on figure 4.2 below. The respondents explained that strategy implementation was influenced by several factors key among them the availability of financial resources to see the strategy implementation to the end. The respondents indicated that at times, the partners delayed in availing the pledged support thus dragging the implementation of strategies in the Foundation.

Source: (Field Data, 2013)
4.3.3 Accuracy of Implementation of Strategies

The study sought to establish whether there was accuracy in the implementation of strategies at the Kibera foundation. From the findings, 55% said No and 45% said yes as shown on figure 4.3. The respondents indicated that the accuracy of strategy implementation was to a great extent influenced by availability of financial and human resources. They indicated that insufficiency of resources reduced the accuracy in implementation. The respondents also indicated that senior management’s involvement in strategy implementation increased the level of accuracy in strategy implementation as they clearly knew of the expected outcome and how to get there during strategy formulation.

Figure 4.5: Accuracy of Implementation of Strategies

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.3.4 Implementation of Strategies consistency with the needs of the beneficiaries

The study sought to establish whether strategy implementation at the Foundation was in line with the needs of the beneficiaries at the Kibera foundation. From the findings, 61% answered “yes” while 39% answered “No” as shown on figure 4.4 below. For those who answered yes, they indicated that during strategy formulation, they indicated that the strategies were formulated in line with aspirations of the beneficiaries. For those who answered no, they were not involved in strategy formulation hence did not specifically know whether the implementation was consistent with the strategy formulated.
4.3.5 Stakeholders Involvement in Strategies implementation

The study sought to establish the extent to which the stakeholders were involved in strategy implementation at the foundation. From the research findings, 85% said yes and 15% said No as shown on figure 4.5 below. Stakeholders were key partners in strategy implementation at the Foundation. Some stakeholders provided funding while others provided technical support hence their involvement was key for the success of project implementation at the Foundation.
4.3.6 Effectiveness of the Process of Strategy Implementation

The study sought to establish how effective the process of strategy implementation at the Foundation was. From the findings 21% said it was very effective, 38% said it was effective, 28% said it was moderately effective, 10% said it was less effective, and 3% said it was not effective at all as shown on figure 4.6 below.

Figure 4.8: Effectiveness of the Process of Strategy Implementation

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.4 Funding

4.4.1 Sufficiency of Financial Support from donors

The study sought to establish whether the Children of Kibera got enough financial support from donors for the implementation of its projects. From the findings 71% said yes and 29% said No as shown on figure 4.7. Those who said yes attributed to the degree to which the Foundation was able to deliver on its strategic objectives. From records at the Foundation, it was ascertained that the Foundation almost met between 80-95% of its strategic goals in any one given year. This shows the extent to which the Foundation received funding to run its projects.
4.4.2 Conditions of the funding

The study sought to establish whether funding availed by the donors had conditions on their applicability and whether no money can be spend outside the budget. From the findings 79% said yes and 21% said No as shown on figure 4.8 below. Like any other NGO, the Kibera Children Foundation was guided by a budget which was prepared in advance for the attention of financial partners. The financial partners availed funds as per the budget and as such little could be spend outside the budget. This therefore meant that the expenditure had to strictly follow the budget.

Figure 4.9: Sufficiency of Financial Support from donors

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

Figure 4.10: Conditions of the funding

Source: (Field Data, 2013)
4.4.3 Effects of Funding on the Implementation of Projects

The study sought to establish the effects that funding had on the implementation of projects at the Foundation. Several statements were fronted to which the respondents were to indicate their extent of agreement with each statement. The study then computed mean and standard deviation to aid in the analysis. The findings, on the question as to whether Funding had dictated the kind of projects to undertaken at the Foundation, the mean was 3.1584 with a standard deviation of 1.6501. On whether funding had slowed down the speed with which projects were implemented at the Foundation, the mean was 3.8936 with a standard deviation of 0.9364. On whether funding had limited the scope of the Foundation’s projects, the mean was 3.9174 with a standard deviation of 0.8173. The recorded means are slightly above three meaning that the respondents responses ranged from moderately agree to agreeing with the various statements.

Table 4.6: Effects of Funding on the Implementation of Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding has dictated the kind of projects to undertaken at the Foundation</td>
<td>3.1584</td>
<td>1.6501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding has slowed down the speed with which projects are implemented at the Foundation</td>
<td>3.8936</td>
<td>0.9364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding has limited the scope of the Foundation’s projects</td>
<td>3.9174</td>
<td>0.8173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.4.4 Extent to Which Funding Had Affected Project Implementation

The study further sought to establish the extent to which funding had affected project implementation at the Foundation. From the findings, 34% of the respondents indicated that funding affected project implementation to a great extent, 31% to a moderate extent, 17% to less extent, 14% o very great extent and 3% to no extent.
Figure 4.11: Extent to Which Funding Had Affected Project Implementation

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.5 Training

The study sought to establish whether training affected project implementation at the Foundation. Asked whether the Foundation’s employees were conversant with their core duties, majority 69% of the respondents indicated that the employees were conversant with their core duties while 31% indicated that the employees were not conversant with their core duties. These findings are well illustrated in the figure below. For those who answered yes, they explained that the employees were offered special training which equipped them with the necessary skills to enable them deliver on their job duties. For those who indicated no, they felt that the Foundation at times asked them to do some duties which were beyond their scope.

Figure 4.12: Training

Source: (Field Data, 2013)
4.5.1 Training Staff of Specialized Skills

The study sought to establish whether the Foundation trained its staff for specialized skills to equip them with the required skills to deliver on their duties. From the findings, 78% of the respondents indicated that the Foundation offered its employees training on how to run the affairs of the Foundation while 22% indicated that no training was offered. For those who indicated that some specialized training was offered, they indicated that this was offered through induction process and on the job training where employees worked under someone senior who taught them on what they were supposed to undertake.

Figure 4.13 Training Staff of Specialized Skills

![Bar chart showing 78% for Yes and 22% for No]

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.5.2 Effectiveness of the trainings offered

The study sought to establish how effective the training offered to staff was. From the findings of the study, 41% of the respondents indicated that it was effective, 38% indicated that it was moderately effective, 10% said it was very effective, 7% said it was not effective while 3% indicated that it was less effective.
4.6 Organization Structure

The study further sought to establish whether the organization structure of Kibera Children Foundation affected the strategy implementation process. First, the respondents were asked to indicate whether the existing organization structure affected strategy implementation. From the findings, 83% of the respondents answered “yes” while 17% answered “no”. The respondents indicated that the organization structure was lean to eliminate duplication of roles and at the same time speed up the process of decision making. Some respondents however indicated that at times the decisions made were not very strong and were biased.

Source: (Field Data, 2013)
To substantiate these claims, several statements were fronted to the respondents to which they were to indicate their level of agreement. From their responses, the study computed mean and standard deviations. Asked whether the organization structure allowed timely decision making, the mean was 4.3218 with a standard deviation of 0.5184. On the organization structure allowing quality decision making, the mean was 2.9154 with a standard deviation of 1.6157 and on whether there was duplication of roles in the organization, the mean was 3.9456 with a standard deviation of 1.0548. These findings indicate that the organization structure was optimal as there was no duplication of roles and it allowed timely decision making.

**Table 4.7: Organization Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization structure allows timely decision making</td>
<td>4.3218</td>
<td>0.5184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization structure allows quality decision making</td>
<td>2.9154</td>
<td>1.6157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure has no duplication</td>
<td>3.9456</td>
<td>1.0548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Field Data, 2013)

4.6.1 Extent that organizational structure affected project implementation

The study sought to establish the extent to which organizational structure affected project implementation at the Foundation. Majority of the respondents were indifferent indicating that it affected it to a moderate extent, 31% to great extent, 17% to very great extent, 10% to less extent and 3% to a no extent.
4.7 Stakeholders Involvement

The study sought to establish whether stakeholder’s involvement affected project implementation at the Foundation. From the findings, majority of the respondents 81% indicated that stakeholder involvement affected project implementation at the Foundation while 19% said that it did not affect project implementation. The study noted that stakeholder involvement improved the accuracy and speed of project implementation at the Foundation. Their involvement meant that projects were implemented as planned without delays.

Source: (Field Data, 2013)
4.7.1 Ways in which the stakeholders were involved.

The study sought to establish ways in which the stakeholders were involved in project implementation at the Foundation. The respondents indicated that stakeholders were involved in different ways. For the beneficiaries, they were involved by accepting to work hard with the resources provided to make sure that they were successful in life. For the donors, they were involved through audits and providing technical support whenever they could to ensure project success.

4.7.2 Extent to which stakeholder involvement affected project implementation

The study sought to establish the extent to which stakeholder involvement affected project implementation at the Foundation. From the findings, majority of the respondents (93.8%) indicated that it affected to a great extent, 31% to a moderate extent, 14% to less extent, 10% to a very great extent while 7% to no extent.

**Figure 4.18: Extent to which stakeholder involvement affected project implementation**

![Bar chart showing extent of stakeholder involvement](image)

Source: (Field Data, 2013)
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter provides the summary of the findings from chapter four, and also gives the conclusions and recommendations of the study based on the objectives of the study. The objective of this study was to determine the factors affecting successful implementation of projects in Non Governmental organizations within the urban slums in Kenya using a case of children of Kibera Foundation. This study was guided by the following specific research objectives: finding out how funding affected implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation; establishing the effect of training on implementation of projects of Children of Kibera; establishing the effects of organisation structure on implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation; and establishing the effects of stakeholder relationships on the implementation of projects of Children of Kibera Foundation.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
The study targeted a sample of 38 respondents out of which 29 filled and returned the questionnaires giving a response of 76.32%. The females made the majority of the respondents at 59% and the males at 41%. 41% had a Diploma followed by those who had a bachelors’ degree at 38%. 55% of the respondents had worked with the NGO for between 6-10 years, 31% had worked with the NGO for between 1-5 years, 7% had worked with the NGO for 11-15 years and 3% each had worked with the NGO for between 16-20 years and above 21 years respectively.

On whether the strategy implementation was undertaken as a collective responsibility of every member of the Foundation. 55% answered “yes” while 45% answered “No”. On whether the strategies were implemented on time, 53% said yes while 47% said No. On whether there was accuracy in the implementation of strategies at the Kibera foundation, 55% said No and 45% said yes. On whether strategy implementation at the Foundation was in line with the needs of the beneficiaries at the Kibera foundation, 61% answered “yes” while 39% answered “No”.
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On the extent to which the stakeholders were involved in strategy implementation at the foundation, 85% said yes and 15% said No. On how effective the process of strategy implementation at the Foundation was, 21% said it was very effective, 38% said it was effective 28% said it was moderately effective, 10% said it was less effective, and 3% said it was not effective. On whether the Children of Kibera got enough financial support from donors for the implementation of its projects, 71% said yes and 29% said No. On whether funding availed by the donors had conditions on their applicability and whether no money could be spend outside the budget, 79% said yes and 21% said No.

On the question as to whether Funding had dictated the kind of projects to undertaken at the Foundation, the mean was 3.1584 with a standard deviation of 1.6501. On whether funding had slowed down the speed with which projects were implemented at the Foundation, the mean was 3.8936 with a standard deviation of 0.9364. On whether funding had limited the scope of the Foundation’s projects, the mean was 3.9174 with a standard deviation of 0.8173. On the extent to which funding had affected project implementation at the Foundation, 34% of the respondents indicated that funding affected project implementation to a great extent, 31% to a moderate extent, 17% to less extent, 14% o very great extent and 3% to no extent.

Asked whether the Foundation’s employees were conversant with their core duties, 69% of the respondents indicated that the employees were conversant with their core duties while 31% indicated that the employees were not conversant with their core duties. On whether the Foundation trained its staff for specialized skills to equip them with the required skills to deliver on their duties, 78% of the respondents indicated that the Foundation offered its employees training on how to run the affairs of the Foundation while 22% indicated that no training was offered. The study sought to establish how effective the training offered to staff was. From the findings of the study, 41% of the respondents indicated that it was effective, 38% indicated that it was moderately effective, 10% said it was very effective, 7% said it was not effective while 3% indicated that it was less effective.

On whether the existing organization structure affected strategy implementation 83% of the respondents answered “yes” while 17% answered “no”. Asked whether the
organization structure allowed timely decision making, the mean was 4.3218 with a standard deviation of 0.5184. On the organization structure allowing quality decision making, the mean was 2.9154 with a standard deviation of 1.6157 and on whether there was duplication of roles in the organization, the mean was 3.9456 with a standard deviation of 1.0548. On whether stakeholder’s involvement affected project implementation at the Foundation, majority of the respondents 81% indicated that stakeholder involvement affected project implementation at the Foundation while 19% said that it did not affect project implementation.

The respondents indicated that stakeholders were involved in different ways. For the beneficiaries, they were involved by accepting to work hard with the resources provided to make sure that they were successful in life. For the donors, they were involved through audits and providing technical support whenever they could to ensure project success. On the extent to which stakeholder involvement affected project implementation at the Foundation, majority of the respondents 38% indicated that it affected to a great extent, 31% to a moderate extent, 14% to less extent, 10% to a very great extent while 7% to no extent.

5.3 Conclusions

Strategy implementation was undertaken as a collective responsibility of every member of the Foundation. The respondents indicated that the process of strategy formulation was undertaken by the top management while during implementation, duties were assigned to all employees according to their job descriptions and ability to execute them. This is because the implementation process involves the collective wisdom, knowledge, and even subconscious minds of the collaborators of the organization.

The study also established that the strategies were implemented on time. The respondents explained that strategy implementation was influenced by several factors key among them the availability of financial resources to see the strategy implementation to the end. The respondents indicated that at times, the partners delayed in availing the pledged support thus dragging the implementation of strategies in the Foundation. The study also established that strategy implementation was accurate. The respondents indicated that the accuracy of strategy implementation was to a great extent influenced by availability of
financial and human resources. They indicated that insufficiency of resources reduced the accuracy in implementation. The respondents also indicated that senior management’s involvement in strategy implementation increased the level of accuracy in strategy implementation as they clearly knew of the expected outcome and how to get there during strategy formulation. The study also established that project implementation was consistence with the needs of the beneficiaries. The respondents indicated that during strategy formulation, strategies were formulated in line with aspirations of the beneficiaries. The study also established that project implementation at the Foundation was very effective. From records at the Foundation, it was ascertained that the Foundation almost met between 80-95% of its strategic goals in any one given year. This shows the extent to which the Foundation received funding to run its projects. Funding affected project implementation at the Foundation to great extent.

The study concludes that the Foundation trained its staff for special skills to enable them deliver on their job descriptions. Respondents indicated that some specialized training was offered, they indicated that this was offered through induction process and on the job training where employees worked under someone senior who taught then on what they were supposed to undertake.

The study also concludes that the organization structure of Kibera Children Foundation affected the strategy implementation process. The respondents indicated that the organization structure was lean to eliminate duplication of roles and at the same time speed up the process of decision making. Some respondents however indicated that at times the decisions made were not very strong and were biased.

The study also concludes that stakeholder’s involvement affected project implementation at the Foundation. The study noted that stakeholder involvement improved the accuracy and speed of project implementation at the Foundation. Their involvement meant that projects were implemented as planned without delays. The stakeholders were involved in different ways. The study also established that stakeholders were involved in strategy implementation. Stakeholders were key partners in strategy implementation at the Foundation. Some stakeholders provided funding while others provided technical support.
hence their involvement was key for the success of project implementation at the Foundation.

5.4 Recommendations

The study recommends that the Foundation engages the stakeholders more to harmonize its goals and objectives with the aspirations of the stakeholders and reduce dissonance levels thereby increasing satisfaction. This will ensure that the stakeholders support the activities of the Foundation.

To enables employees deliver quality services, the study recommends that the Foundation hires qualified staff and in addition, it trains them to enable them deliver services optimally. Following the unique operations and accounting for NGOs, it is important that staff are trained on the operations for timely project implementation.

The study recommends that the Foundation involves stakeholders in all its strategic management right from strategic formulation to strategic evaluation. This will reduce the levels of resistance hence promote strategy implementation processes.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Study

This study concentrated on factors affecting project implementation at the Kibera Children Foundation. The study centered on key factors in the NGO sector. To allow for generalization, this study recommends that another study be carried out to establish factors affecting project implementation in Government organizations. This is specifically because Government organizations have a different operating environment from that one in NGOs.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Introduction Letter

CHRISTINE KAGENDO
P.O. Box 142256-00200
Nairobi
5th February, 2013
Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION IN A RESEARCH STUDY

I am a final MBA student at Kenyatta University. My area of specialization is project management. I am currently undertaking a research thesis on “FACTORS AFFECTING SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS IN NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN URBAN SLUMS IN KENYA. CASE OF CHILDREN OF KIBERA FOUNDATION”.

I would be grateful if you could spare some time from your busy schedule and complete the enclosed questionnaire. All the information provided was used purely for academic purposes and was treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

Christine Kagendo

MBA Student, Kenyatta University
Appendix I: Questionnaire

Please tick as appropriate

Demographic Information:

1. Gender:
   Male ( )   Female ( )

2. What is your highest qualification achieved?
   Diploma ( )   Degree ( )
   Masters ( )   PhD ( )
   Others (please specify) ____________________

3. What is your current designation within the organization?
   Chairman ( )   Managing Director ( )
   Programme Manager ( )   Finance manager ( )
   Project Manager ( )   Field Officer ( )
   Others (please specify) ____________________

4. How many years have you been in the NGO sector?
   1 – 5 years ( )   6 – 10 years ( )   11 – 15 years ( )
   16 – 20 years ( )   above 21 years ( )

5. How many years have you been at the Children of Kibera Foundation?
   1 – 5 years ( )   6 – 10 years ( )   11 – 15 years ( )
   16 – 20 years ( )   above 21 years ( )

SECTION B - IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIES OF KIBERA FOUNDATION
6. The process of strategy implementation is taken as a collective responsibility of every member of the Foundation

Yes ( ) No ( )
Please explain your answer
________________________________________________________________________

7. The Foundation has always implemented strategies on time

Yes ( ) No ( )
Please explain your answer
________________________________________________________________________

8. The process of implementing strategies at the foundation has been accurate

Yes ( ) No ( )
Please explain your answer
________________________________________________________________________

9. Strategies’ implementation at the Foundation is in line with the needs of the beneficiaries

Yes ( ) No ( )
Please explain your answer
________________________________________________________________________

10. Strategies implementation includes all stakeholders of the Foundation

Yes ( ) No ( )

11. How effective is the process of strategy implementation at the Foundation

Strongly Agree ( ) Agree ( )
Neutral ( ) Disagree ( )
Strongly Disagree ( )
SECTION C: FUNDING

12. Does the Children of Kibera get enough financial support from donors for the implementation of its projects?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain your answer

__________________________________________________________________

13. The funding availed by the donors have conditions on their applicability and no money can be spend outside the budget

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain your answer

__________________________________________________________________

14. Below are some of the effects of funding on the implementation of projects at the Children of Kibera Foundation. On a scale of 5-1 where 5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= neutral, 2= disagree and 1= strongly disagree, please indicate by ticking (√) the extent of your agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding has dictated the kind of projects to undertaken at the Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding has slowed down the speed with which projects are implemented at the Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding has limited the scope of the Foundation’s projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. In general, please indicate the extent to which funding has affected project implementation at the Children of Kibera Foundation.

Very great extent ( ) Great extent ( )
Moderate extent ( ) Less extent ( )
No extent ( )
SECTION D – TRAINING

16. The Foundation’s employees are conversant with their core duties?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain your answer

________________________________________________________________________

17. The Foundations trains its staff of specialized skills to equip them with the required skills to deliver on their duties.

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain your answer

________________________________________________________________________

18. How effective have the trainings been in equipping the employees at the foundation with the necessary to deliver on their jobs?

Very effective ( ) Effective ( )

Moderately effective ( ) Less effective ( )

Not effective ( )

SECTION E - ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE

19. Does the organization structure at the Foundation affect strategy implementation?

Yes ( ) No ( )

Please explain your answer

________________________________________________________________________

20. Below are statements on the organizational structure of the Foundation. On a scale of 5-1 where 5= strongly agree, strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= neutral, 2= disagree and
1= strongly disagree, please indicate by ticking (√) the extent of your agreement with each statement on how it affects project implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The organization structure allows timely decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization structure allows quality decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organizational structure has no duplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. To what extent does organizational structure affect project implementation at the Foundation?

Very great extent ( ) Great extent ( )
Moderate extent ( ) Less extent ( )
No extent ( )

SECTION F - STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVEMENT

22. Does stakeholder involvement affect project implementation at the Foundation?

Yes ( ) No ( )
Please explain your answer

23. In what ways are stakeholders involved in strategy implementation at the Foundation?

24. To what extent does stakeholder involvement affect project implementation at the Foundation?

Very great extent ( ) Great extent ( )
Moderate extent ( ) Less extent ( )
NO EXTENT ( )