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DEFINITIONS OF OPERATIONAL TERMS

**Planning**: It’s a management process concerned with defined goals for an organization’s future direction and determining on the missions and resources to achieve those targets, using the available time and resources.

**Beneficiaries**: Individuals, groups or entities whose situation is supposed to improve. This includes the target group and others whose situation may improve as a result of development intervention.

**Performance**: The degree to which a development intervention or development partner operates in accordance with the stated plans.

**Relevance**: The degree to which the output, outcomes or goals of a programme remain valid and pertinent as originally planned or as subsequently modified in response to changing circumstances within the immediate context and external environment of that programme.

**Sustainability**: Durability of programme results after termination of the technical cooperation channel through the programme.

**Stakeholders**: People, groups or entities that have a role and interest in the aims and implementation of a programme. They include the community whose situation the programme seeks to change, and other decision makers who influence or decide the course of action related to the programme.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

NGO’S- Non- governmental organizations.

UNDP- United Nations Development Programmes.

ADB- Asian development bank

ERC- Energy regulatory commission.

KPLC- Kenya power and lightening company.

WFP- world food programme.

RCI- Red cross international project.

UNESCO – United Nations Education Science Cultural Organizations.

ASALS – Arid and Semi-Arid Lands.

M & E- Monitoring and Evaluation.

SPSS- Statistical Package for Social Science.

ICT- Information Communication and Technology.

PME – Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.

RBT-Resource Based Theory.
ABSTRACT

The research project was undertaken to determine the performance of donor funded projects in Mwingi-sub-county in Kenya. Donors play a crucial role in the development process in many areas of the world. They assist nations with acute shortage of funds, experiencing natural disasters like hunger and floods among others which results into predictable environmental circumstances, the level of the citizens per capital income decreases and severely limits their ability to acquire the goods and services they need for their social, educational and economic needs. The objectives of the research project were to; establish the influence of stakeholders’ involvement, Staff competencies, Monitoring and Evaluation, as well as Availability of resources in the performance of donor funded projects. It is important to note that aid/donor funds have a positive impact on growth in developing countries with good fiscal, monetary and trade policies but have little effect in the presence of poor policies. However many of the projects funded by donors have ended up collapsing either within the project period have not been able to proceed further after the termination of this support. This has been due to the problems of competent project staff, failure to do thorough planning for the projects or even sometimes the sources of funds mainly from donors are not convenient enough for project implementation and sometimes organizations implementing the donor funded project don’t involve the local community who are the beneficiaries of the project. This has raised my concern whether those projects were implemented well. The research was aimed at a target population of fifteen projects with a total of 75 staff working in the donor funded projects in Mwingi sub-county. The respondents included Project managers, administrators, ICT personnel, finance officers, and other staffs. The 75 respondents in the survey filled questionnaires to allow for collection of both qualitative and quantitative data. The data collected was classified and tabulated in a systematic manner. Data analysis was done by use of descriptive tools. In addition a statistical package for social science (SPSS) was used to speed up data analysis process. The data was presented by use of frequency distribution tables. The major findings of the study revealed that Stakeholders involvement, Staff competencies, Monitoring and Evaluation, as well as Availability of Resources all greatly influenced the performance of the donor funded projects.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Project management is the act of planning and managing resources in order to ensure completion of specific project goals and objectives within the stipulated time frame. This chapter will discuss the background of the study based on performance of donor funded projects.

1.1 Background to the study

Although foreign aid has played an important role in developing countries especially the sub-Saharan Africa, in most of these countries there is a high degree of indebtedness, high unemployment, absolute poverty and poor economic performance. The average per capita has fallen since 1970 despite the high aid flow.

(Janice Griffin and Ruth Judge, 2010) revealed that increasingly donor approaches are driven by the need to support the development of nationally owned policies rather than impose externally defined policies on the recipient Governments. The present preference by donors is for the provision of development assistance through the general budget support, where feasible and for more focused version of this, such as sector support where more appropriate. Both donors and recipient governments are now required to work towards an agreed model of good practice which, again, is guided by the principle of national ownership. Recipient governments are now required to develop policies, either at sectoral/programme level or for general poverty reduction and focus on achievement of results.
(Lavagnon, 2011) found out that project fail to achieve their goals due to a number of problems that could be termed “managerial” and organizational, poor stakeholders involvement and management as well as cost overruns, and delays in fund release during implementation. Projects seem to remain the instruments of choice for policy makers in international development. Yet, paradoxically, the poor performance of projects and the disappointment of project stakeholders and beneficiaries seem to have become the rule and not the exception in contemporary reality. Dissatisfaction with project results and performance dates back to the 1950s. The project failure rate at the World Bank was over 50% in Africa until 2000. The World Bank's private arm, the International Finance Corporation has discovered that only half of its African projects succeed

Performance measurement is a management tool that can help determine success of both organizational and functional performance. It provides feedback to managers on the effective of improvement interventions as part of learning and development. It’s aligned with organizational missions, policies and objectives. If donors include the views of recipient stakeholders in assessments of effectiveness, then multilateral organizations will need to pay closer attention to issues of governance and ownership. It is likely that the views of recipient stakeholders, both governmental and non-governmental, about donor performance will therefore become more important, and methodologies of this type will be increasingly used by donors to assess effectiveness before channeling funds. Given that governance and ownership appear to play an important role in shaping stakeholders’ views, multilateral organizations that want to improve their ratings will need to pay closer attention to these issues (Kongkiti phusavati ,Pornthep Anussornitisam., 2009)
The World Bank poverty reduction strategy paper source book (Dongier (R.I, 2006) et al 2001) views community development through donor funds as a mechanism for enhancing sustainability, improving efficiency, and effectiveness, allowing poverty reduction efforts to be taken to scale, making development more inclusive, and empowering poor people. Although more progress has been made over the course of the last 50 or so years in alleviating poverty than during any comparable period of time in history, poverty remains a huge global challenge since over one billion people of the world continue to live in conditions of absolute poverty, subsisting on less than 1 $ a day (abuzeid, 2009).

Donors have played a very significant role in the social development process in all areas in the world. They assist in circumstances where the state fund has been limited. Several donor agencies such as world Food Program (WFP), Red Cross international project (RCI) compassionate and United Nations Education Science Cultural Organizations (UNESCO), World Vision and Farm Africa among others have provided vital services to the population and contributed significantly to the strengthening of many individual lives, families and communities (Vidal 2001). Increasingly donor approaches are driven by the need to support the development of nationally owned policies rather than impose externally defined policies on recipient Governments. (Afande, 2013 ) Performance of donor funded projects is critical in that donors would want to be satisfied with the project results and performance in order to ensure that they have played crucial role in promoting the livelihood of people living in the country they have given the aid to. The study was conducted in Mwingi sub-county which is classified as an Arid and Semi Arid Land (ASALS). The Government has initiated various poverty eradication projects by
themselves or in collaboration with multilateral and bilateral development partners as well as NGO’S. The area generally experiences frequent drought which has greatly disrupted normal livelihood of the poor community. Donor agencies have funded and initiated various development projects with minimal success.

1.2 Statement of the problem

(Dr.xavier ,Harold Goodwin,Racheal Walton, 2012) projects which are often promoted as successful rely on external funding for long periods of time, or have little impact to show for themselves, and that such investments cannot be generally justified based on the value of money achieved for those communities. There is a common agreement on the fact that improving aid effectiveness is very important in ensuring that the millennium development goals (MDG) are achieved and ensuring development in the third world countries. It is also recognized that the successful implementation of development projects and programs depends on several factors including stakeholders’ involvement in the project and predictability and timing of their main source of finance.

(Nkamleu, 2011) in his research found out that donor funded projects often experience the problem of disbursement delays not only in the poor countries but in all countries. This may be because for example the ADB countries are demanding innovative projects that are more complex and take more time to get started. A delay at project start up is a weak part of the project cycle this will in turn affect the economic rate of return for the funded projects.
(Lavagnon, 2011) different success measures of a project come from different sources: country relevance, beneficiary relevance, efficiency/ cost, effectiveness, objectives, overall project.

The Government of Kenya through the various ministries especially the Ministry of Planning and Devolution in collaboration with donors has initiated projects countrywide including Education, Food security, health care among others. These projects however are faced with many challenges which affect their completion and they fail to achieve the desired objectives and thus (Chicati, 2009), recognised that over the past decade, both in Africa and the world in general, most of the projects funded by donors have failed drastically. There are many projects being undertaken in the rural areas with the aim of poverty eradication. A key challenge facing both the local and international community is how to ensure the effective delivery of foreign aid in poverty reduction efforts around the world. Those that have been implemented fully have been of little benefit to the community since most of them have proved to be unsustainable.

Many small and big donors have carried out different projects in Mwingi Region for various interventions to address various issues such as Food security, HIV and AIDS, Water and Education among others. These interventions were meant to help the poor local communities, they have spend huge amounts of resources but significant impacts have not been realized since most of the projects started ended up collapsing during the project period while those that survived ended up collapsing after the withdrawal of donor support. Meeting all the stakeholders’ expectations, and steering the project through the communication, cultural, linguistic and perception constraints is the biggest challenge faced by firms working on donor funded projects in remote communities under
diverse environment in this region and as a result the poor local community is left the way they were before the project was started. Due to the existing problems of the overall performance of donor funded projects, this has raised the concern of the researcher. This study was meant to investigate the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-county.

1.3. Research objectives

1.3.1. General objectives

The general objective of the study was to investigate on the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County.

1.3.2. Specific objectives

The following specific objectives guided the study

1. To find out how stakeholders involvement affects the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County.

2. To assess the extent to which the staff competencies affect the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County.

3. To find out how Monitoring and Evaluation affects the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County.

4. To determine the extent to which availability of resources affects the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County.

1.4. Research questions

The researcher was guided by the following research questions
1. What influence does the stakeholder’s involvement have on the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County?

2. What influence do staff competencies have on performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County?

3. How does monitoring and evaluation affect the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County?

4. How does resource availability affect the performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County?

1.5 Significance of the study

The findings of this study are of benefit to the following groups:

1.5.1 Project managers and implementers

The findings are meant to help them to improve on the projects by involving all the key stakeholders and ensuring that they recruit their staff on merit depending on the level of their academic qualifications and the overall experience on the job. In addition, to have a clear picture of the factors that have an influence on project performance of donor funded projects to ensure completion of projects within the scope, cost, time and even expected quality delivery.

1.5.2 The Government of Kenya

The findings can help the government in planning on the M&E systems to be used in their own projects and help them know how to oversee the implementation of projects.
1.5.3 Researchers and scholars

It is meant to help them with information which they can use for further studies.

1.6 Scope of the study

The study was limited to one Sub-County in Kenya (Mwingi Sub-County). It is in Kitui County of Eastern Kenya. The Sub-County borders Kitui Sub-County to the south, Masinga sub-county to the west, Mbeere and Tharaka to the North West, Isiolo and Meru to the North and Tana River Sub-county to the East. The sub-county has a population of 384,000 based on 2010 population estimate. The Sub-county has 5 Divisions namely: Nguni, Mui, Nuu, Central and Waita. The study included 15 projects with a total of 144 staff working in poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-County. The respondents consisted project managers, field coordinators, finance officers, and other support staffs where five respondents were chosen from each project. A total of 75 respondents were interviewed during the data collection.

1.7 Assumptions and limitations of the study

In the proposed study, it was assumed that; all the respondents were honest, cooperative and in addition the researcher used the proposed time to collect the data and that the findings were very accurate. The researcher was faced with financial problems, inadequate time and even distance challenges as a result of the terrain of the area and also due to the population distribution pattern of the Sub-county.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter covered the literature that is related to the topic that the researchers intended to undertake. It introduced donors as defined by various scholars, discusses briefly the concept of project performance and the conceptual framework among others.

2.2 Review of previous studies

2.2.1 Donors

(Kiloppenborg, 2011) defines a donor as the one who ‘owns’ a project and is considered responsible for ensuring its success- is typically the one propose a project and whose business unit will reap the benefits of successfully completed projects. (Dr.xavier, Harold Goodwin, Rachel Walton, 2012) argued that there is a myriad of donors of aid to both developed and developing countries including multilateral (World bank, UNDP and ADB) and bilateral donors (national cooperation and development aid agencies), Non-governmental organizations and foundations.

Donors spread their aid very widely. Data shows that over 80% of aid events involved less than 1% of donors total aid budget. The result is appearance of success at the micro project level competitive donor practices, where there are many small donors and no dominant donor erodes administrative capacity in recipient country Government and yet the effort for coordination between donors relate to harmonizing reporting system or sharing evaluation reports not specializing geographically or by sector. The appearance of success would be less if there were more thorough and careful reporting distinguishing between outputs (what was spent), outcomes and impacts as well as the benefits
achieved. (Dr. Xavier, Harold Goodwin, Racheal Walton, 2012). Projects funded by donors deals with several activities which include and are not limited to food security programmes, education, transportation and water harvesting among others.

2.2.2. Performance of projects

It is an ongoing review of the efficiency and importance of a given project. Performance management can be used to assess the performance of a worker or team of workers in a given project. A project may be dragged down due to poor communication, unequal workloads, or failure to co-operate among workers. There are many factors that determine whether a project is a success, varying based on the initial goals of the project. (Dr. Xavier, Harold Goodwin, Racheal Walton, 2012) analyzed the conditions necessary for the success of community based tourism enterprises and concluded that there were 10 characteristics which were important in explaining success and failure in the implementation of investments: a cohesive and resilient community; genuine community participation, ownership and control; adoption of a commercial mind-set, planning for financial viability from the outset; engagement with the private sector; initiatives based on market research and demand-driven product development; providing attractive, quality products based on natural and cultural assets and which are more accessible to tourists; time; engagement, support and collaboration in the enterprise by stakeholders with key areas of expertise; transparent and accountable governance, leadership and decision-making structures as well as sound, skilled financial management; and monitoring and evaluation so that communities and others can share and learn from experience and ensure continued success (2012:28).
In their research, Iyer and Jha (2005) identified many factors as having influence on project cost performance, these includes: project managers competence, top management support, project managers coordinating and leadership skills, monitoring and feedback by participants, decision making, coordination among project participants, owner’s competence, social condition, economic condition and climatic conditions. Elyamany et.al (2007) introduced a performance evaluation model for the construction companies in Egypt.

2.3 Theoretical review

2.3.1 Resource-based theory

According to this theory, all resources are equally important to determine the project success and performance. Findings show that intangible resources are important determinants for project’s successes such assets are scarce, specialized and difficult to trade, imitate or appropriate are viewed as intangible. Bamey, 2001, Conner, 2002, Ray et.al, 2004. Resources can be defined as the productive assets of the firms the means through which activities are accomplished (Mathews 2006). RBT theoretically predicts intangible resources as important factors for success of a project. Intangible resources are financial, physical, human, intellectual, organizational reputational and technological resources. For the success of a project, all the resources should be incorporated together. Human beings as a resource must have intelligence and required technology to manage the material and financial resource properly. A superior performance is usually based on developing a competitively distinct set of resources, heterogeneous and strategic development and a capable workforce in a well conceived strategy to sustain superior returns. (Fahy, 2007, Collis and Montgomery, 2006). Indeed strategist who embrace this
theory point out that competitive advantage comes from aligning skills, strategic deployment, capable workforce with organizational systems, structures and processes that achieve capabilities at the organizational level (Salaman et al., 2005).

2.3.2 Organizational Theory
This theory by Murphy, Trailer and Hill (2006), argues that much of research on performance has come from the organization theory and strategic management. It points out that business performance in an organization can be evaluated by the goal that it sets for itself. However, organizations have varied and sometimes contradictory goals, making cross-firm comparison difficult. The system approach partially compensates for the weakness of the goal-based approach by considering the simultaneous achievement of multiple, generic performance aspects. Project managers use organizational theories to manage people. Classical organizational theory emphasizes on obtaining optimal equipment and personnel and establishing universal management principles to enhance project performance. Neoclassical organization theory emphasizes the need for project team members to be happy when undertaking their activities. This allows creativity, individual growth and motivation which increases productivity and profits. The view taken by Venkatraman and Ramanujam (1986) in their paper argues that business performance which reflects the perspective of strategic management is a subset of the overall concept of organizational effectiveness has evolved. Thus both goal-based and system approaches fail to adequately account for differences between stakeholders groups perspectives on performance. The multiple constituency approach factors on these differences in perspectives and examines the extent to which the agenda of various stakeholders groups are satisfied. (Thompson, 1967; Pennings and Goodman; 1977;
Conlon and Deutsch 1980). The catastrophe theory describes how abrupt changes such as external environmental factors such as weather, politics, technology and social-cultural factors impact project performance and how well the organization is prepared to handle these issues.

2.3.3 Behavioral theory

The theory describes how leaders conduct themselves. Autocratic leaders make decisions without input from their subordinates, democratic leaders encourage subordinates to offer opinions and laissez-faire leaders allow subordinates to make their own decisions. Effective project managers use each of these leadership styles to ensure project performance. (Project management institute, 2008). Effective project managers use leadership theories to help them to choose the best approach for fostering team work and solving operational problems. Leadership attributes theories help project managers exhibit qualities such as empathy and assertiveness to enhance performance from their team members. Project managers use power and influence theories to exert their authority, coerce defiant subordinates and reward their team members by using for example bonuses to encourage performance. (Mind tools: Leadership styles) The contingency theory is a behavioral theory that says that there is no one who knows the best way to manage a company, to lead an organization or to make decisions. But the critical path analysis, the employees’ suggestions programs, SMART analysis, analytical hierarchy process etc are decision making ways that have proven to work better than others in their categories. Project managers also use the theory of planned behavior to influence the team members’ attitude, norms and beliefs towards achieving high quality products thus enhancing project performance.
2.4. Determinants of performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects

2.4.1. Stakeholder’s involvement

These are people, groups or entities that have a role and interest in the aims and implementation of a programme. They include the community whose situation the programme seeks to change, and other decision makers who influence or decide the course of action related to the programme. There are many different people with interest in development projects. It is important to identify these stakeholders, their needs, motives, and interests as well as the relationship between them. The way in which different development stakeholders relate to each other determines the type of partnership that develops within the project. The ‘target group’ or men and women who are the prime beneficiaries of a project should be the most important stakeholders (Frances, 2003). There is an increasing evidence that the more people are enabled to participate in decision about development activities which affect them, the more successful and sustainable the activities will be and thus the project will only be considered successful when their key stakeholders acknowledge they are in a success.

(Liisa Sallinen, Inkeri Ruuska, Toumas Ahola, 2013) defined stakeholder as a group who affect or are affected by the focal organization or the focal projects. The first step in the process of stakeholder’s engagement is stakeholder identification that is determining who your project stakeholders are, and their key groupings and sub-groupings. Influential stakeholders in projects include; government bodies, government actors, states consultants, contractors, legislators, regulators, regulating agencies and regulatory institutions. The stake that a governmental stakeholder has can be described as moral and based on values. In general, Smyth (2008) has explained that governments have moral
and ethical motivations attached to projects. If we look specifically at an actor who can be understood as a governmental stakeholder, Fassin (2009) argues that regulators represent citizens’ interests, the general public, society as whole, global interests and those of the environment; and that they do not have their own stake, but rather represent others’ interests. In a way, this type of stakeholder carries another party’s stakes and presents them to the focal organization. A stake can cover interests, motivations and legal claims. Governmental stakeholders base its influence on regulation and laws. Its objectives are by nature legal stakes but it also demands that societal needs be taken into account in the project. They may influence projects negatively leading to increases in costs and may delay the schedule. They can also withhold or limit the resources that a project needs to proceed. This may be through permissions or licenses. Through this, it may coerce the project to adopt a certain behavior (M, 2007), which the project would not implement. The government may order the organization to take on a certain responsibility such as environmental responsibility or responsibility of workers well being. The government can allow firms to participate in making regulations and through this the project can alter the regulations so that they are better applicable to the projects. It may also communicate with the society about the project. This is beneficial to the project because it advertises the project to the society. The communication may at least complement and support communication by the project to the general public. The governmental stakeholder communicates with the public and provides support in audits which are tasks that the project would have to do in any case.
(Marc Holzer, Kathryn Klorby, 2008) community when involved in the project is bound to succeed. This is because involved community becomes more informed and eager to dedicate their intellectual energy in the pursuit of a solution. Community participation requires managers to adopt mechanisms and strategies capable of balancing day to day operations and meaningful interaction with external environment in order to prescribe solutions and remedies that address their diverse needs. Managers themselves need the training necessary to effectively survey and engage citizens, collect data and translate findings into meaningful statements to support informed deliberations.

(Nahyan., Moza T.AI, Amrik s. sohal, Brian N. Fides, 2012) argues that successful completion of projects is dependent on meeting the expectation of stakeholders. The interest of the stakeholder can vary over the life of a project and reasons for these changes include, learning, changing values and specific experiences. They suggested use of cost and schedule overrun, technical performance and stakeholder satisfaction as the primary performance indicators of a project. They argued that issues relating to communication, co-ordination, knowledge sharing and decision making are not considered as important factors among key stakeholders for a project success. The need for effective communication, coordination, decision making and knowledge sharing amongst the stakeholders, especially during planning and design stages is very critical.

(Chicati, 2009) argues that involving stakeholders in the donor funded projects is very important. This is because, they have varied level of interest, involvement, and influence on the project. All the stakeholders should be identified and managed since they can influence the project either negatively or positively. The stakeholders can include customer, end users, sponsor, sellers, and vendors among others.
(Yan Chang, Suzanne Wilkinson, 2012), defines stakeholders are those with a vested interest in a project by influencing or being affected by it. They found community influence and participation in early decisions to have a major influence on the projects. Integration of different organizations in the supply chain is fundamental to successful project procurement. They identified the particular of strategic partnering with material suppliers for project resourcing performance e.g. selection of material suppliers and increasing their involvement in the project planning process helps to decrease deviation and attain resource procurement improvement.

Sponsor/donor is the key stakeholder and is responsible for ensuring a successful project outcome. He/she must co-ordinate communication activities that encourage open relationships and address concerns and interests of the project success, organizations needs to ensure that the project sponsor roles defined and communicated to incorporated traditional activities of client representatives and supporting activities associated with the internal sponsor.

(Frances, 2003) further argues that apart from the ‘partners, in development action, there are other groups to relate to at the Regional and National level. e.g national and local Government authorities, Labour Unions, Development Assistance agencies, and other organized groups. Even if they are not directly involved in the project, they may have opinions about it. It is important to find out their views and workout ways of relating to them. Different stakeholders will try to influence the choice of objectives, priorities and methods according to their own values and principles. At the same time, this may bring some conflict and power struggles especially when a donor organization’s influence predominates because of their control of finance resources.
The attributes of an effective sponsor include seniority and power, Political awareness and knowledge of business ability and willingness to make connections for the project, courage, ability to motivate team and communicate project vision, willingness to partner with project manager and team, excellent communication skills, personality compatible with other key players and ability and willingness to provide objectivity and challenge the project (Kiloppenborg, 2011)

2.4.2 Staff competencies

(Marc Holzer, Kathryn Klorby, 2008) one of the key part of managing for quality is developing human resources. Quality managers need to recruit the best and brightest and then provide them with systematic training and ongoing employee assistance. After training, they must be recognized for their contributions.

(Frances, 2003) During recruitment and selection of the project staff, it is important to select the ones with appropriate skills and experience since this is an important aspect to the success of the project. However the purpose, the type and size of the project or programme, and the budget available will determine whom to recruit. It is of importance that this should be done using the widest possible network of contacts to identify the candidates. Sources of staff include other donors, academic institutions (local and international), partner organisations. In addition, the staff should have experience of similar projects, and an understanding of the kind of work project involved, and at least some of the team members should have a good knowledge of the country and of the local situation.
(Nahyan., Moza T.Al,Amrik s. sohal, Brian N.Fides, 2012) for project success, improved human resource strategies that emphasize recruitment, training and development of personnel needs to be developed and implemented. Training of staff alone is not sufficient to enhance organizational effectiveness to a greater level because not all knowledge obtained from the training is properly transferred and applied to the organization. In other words transfer of knowledge (productive use of acquired knowledge and skills acquired during training must take place effectively to realize full benefits) Dirani (2012)

(Maina A. S and Waweru, 2011) argues that effective internal and external communication has a significant relationship with effective strategy implementation hence good performance of projects. Vera Ogeh, Fiador (2013) most NGO’s in Africa generally depends on voluntary staff to run their activities and programmes and therefore don’t have control over the quality of the staff they recruit. They argued that lack of well trained and experienced staff limit the extent to which they can manage their daily affairs and their capacity effectively, plan, appraise, implement and monitor their activities.

(Afande, 2013) found out that the extent of success of donor funded projects is determined by both technical and management capacity of human resources of the implementing agencies. He argued that the officers in the donor funds project chain may lack the formal training in foreign aid management, budgeting and accounting. These weak skills may lead to poor understanding of the donor expenditure protocols resulting into ineligible expenditure, which lead to rejection for further funding by the donor.

(Dr.xavier ,Harold Goodwin,Racheal Walton, 2012 ) found that “despite the conventional wisdom that the competence of the project designers, planners and the project
management team is most related to success”, the empirical evidence shows that effective consultations are far more important in influencing the project success, at least for the international development projects.

Staff competence is dependent on the managerial skills of the staff. The skills are not industry specific, industry related or firm specific. The skills are a source of differential levels of efficiency and thus generate ricardian rents. Managerial skills are very crucial in the performance of any project. In project management the manager is supposed to have the four factor typology of the managerial skills consisting of technical skills, human skills, administrative skills and citizenship skills. Technical skills refer to managers’ proficiency in specific methods or techniques related to that of managers function area. Administrative skills subsume areas such as planning, organization, delegating and coordinating if he lacks these skills, the project will completely fail due to poor planning of the scope. Human skills concerns with their ability to interact and work effectively with the team members. Abraham Carmel (2006).

(Jack R.M and Samuel J.M, 2006) reported that project performance depends on the managerial skills and competence of the project manager. An important, but always overlooked aspect of the implementation process concerns the nature of personnel involved. Many a times, the staff for the project is selected with less than the required skills necessary to make the project a success. It is important to develop a project team that has the requisite skills to perform their functions and also to understand the project well.
Staff training to enhance competency need to be encouraged in all the projects. Effective training should be carried out and the trainees given an opportunity to apply the newly acquired skills on completion of the training. Competent managerial leadership should be encouraged to guide adaptations and to realize sustainable project outcomes. The focus on capacity building of the project staff ensures a workforce with appropriate skills to promote participatory and sustainable implementation of projects.

2.4.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

It is increasingly recognised that monitoring and evaluation are indispensable management functions and they are therefore set by donor agencies as preconditions for the allocation of funds to the NGO’S (Hunter, 2009). He further argues that there is a growing interest within the International Community in participatory approaches to monitoring and evaluation. It has been found that the participation of stakeholders improves the quality of projects in the world as well as increasing the sense of national and local ownership in them, there is a greater likelihood that the project activities and their impacts will be sustainable. Stakeholder participation in M&E can strengthen partnership and teamwork at all levels and stages of project implementation.

Monitoring is a continuous management processes which seeks to provide programme managers and key stakeholders with regular feedback and early indications of progress or lack thereof in the achievement of the intended results. Monitoring and evaluation (M & E) of development projects is increasingly recognized as indispensable management functions. Evaluation according to American Evaluation Association is the process of assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the programs policies, personnel, products and organizations.
(Chicati, 2009) defines monitoring as “an internal project activity designed to provide constant feedback on progress of a project, the problems it is facing and the efficiency with which it is being implemented. It tracks the performance against what was planned or expected according to predetermined standards.” He further argues that project M&E helps the project managers and donors to know the extent to which their projects are meeting their objectives and leading to their desired effects, it also provides greater transparency and accountability in terms of use of project resources. In M&E, he suggested that there is need to use PME approaches where the stakeholder participation is very crucial. This helps the stakeholders to identify and solve programme related problems themselves thereby strengthening their capacity to be active participants in programme implementation, rather than remaining passive recipients of development assistance. It also ensures public accountability in that the programme participants and local citizens themselves monitor and evaluate the performance of donor and government institutions. For instance legal reforms that decentralize decision-making often encourage elected representatives at District or Municipal levels to be more proactive in monitoring implementation of local development plans. However community participation in M&E may be constrained by: lack of literacy skills, insufficient time and the intensity of analytical work to be carried during the evaluation, and the fact that many of the issues covered during the evaluation are not directly relevant to the community members.

(Nuguti, 2010)” PME is a process through which stakeholders at various levels engage in monitoring or evaluation of a particular project, program, or policy and engage in identifying or taking corrective actions.” This is very crucial in that the participants
involvement and feelings of “ownership” is very important for sustainability of the projects benefits.

For many years, M&E of development projects in Africa have been given little attention. This has been due to insufficient technical resources, limited funds allocation to M&E work by donors, limited training opportunities in evaluation, and shortage of trained staff among others.

(Andy Bruce & Ken Langdon, 2007) argues that the project should be monitored consistently from the start to the end as problems may occur anywhere along the way. This is done to assess how it is faring against objectives and time targets. During this stage, there is giving of regular progress reports, organizing team meetings, and also identifying the milestones that measure your progress. Effective monitoring allows one to gather information so that one can measure and adjust progress towards the project goals. It enables one to communicate project progress and changes to team members, stakeholders, superiors and customers and gives you justification for making any necessary adjustments to the plan.

According to ((Lewis, 2006), Monitoring and Evaluation of an organisation’s programs entail the systematic gathering and analysis of data on project and their activities. It identifies progress as well as difficulties that impact on implementation and assess the achievement of the individual program’s or project’s objectives. M&E also appraises an institution’s overall performance towards the achievement of the goals and objectives. Therefore M&E should be seen as an integral element of management that
helps to track implementation schedules and activities towards the fulfilment of the institutional objectives and mandates.

Evaluation is time-bound assessment that systematically and objectively assesses the relevance, performance success and effectiveness of ongoing and completed programmes and projects. It uses the information obtained from monitoring. Evaluation represents a systematic and objective of ongoing or completed projects in terms of their design, implementation and results. It deals with strategic issues such as project relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency in the light of specified objectives as well as project impact and sustainability. Periodic evaluation of ongoing projects is usually carried out for the purpose of reviewing the progress of the implementation process. Particularly lacking are methodologies that take into account the impacts as perceived by the beneficiaries of the funded projects which can often show how the positive impacts promoted are actually offset by negative impacts that go unrecorded and are suffered by the more vulnerable members of the community.

(Frances, 2003) In case of funded work, it will be important to distinguish between monitoring and evaluation that are internal to the organisation of the project, and that which relates to the expectations or agreements with the funders or sponsors. An evaluation may have more than one purpose, but it is important for stakeholders to agree on the priority purposes. Identifying stakeholders, and making sure that they agree about the main purpose of an evaluation, is essential in order to decide on the approach and methods to be used in actually carrying it out. He argues that a funder has a role in an evaluation. The interests of the funder may dominate the evaluation process, given its relative power. In cases of a sole funder, it may wish to evaluate the whole of the project.
but in cases of many funders of the same project, it may be worthwhile to involving all the funders in an evaluation so that the donors' demands are coordinated, resources are pooled, and they gain a share understanding of the work.

Monitoring and evaluation is conducted in order to generate detailed information about the project implementation process and also to improve the results in terms of why activities failed or succeeded (Mishra, et al 2006). Through the results of periodic evaluations, monitoring tools and strategies can be refined and further developed. Therefore through continuous monitoring and evaluation of donor funded projects, management is able to plan, schedule and control all activities in the project and thus complete it within the budgeted time and cost.

2.4.4 Resource Availability

Availability and adequacy of resources play an important role in the performance of donor funded projects. According to (Yan Chang, Suzanne Wilkinson, 2012) most project suffer resource shortages, supply disruptions and these resourcing problems contribute to final project failure such as cost over runs and deferred delivery. They argued that the source of funding may influence performance of projects since some donors release funds at intervals. In addition, lack of resources and difficult in resourcing are the most prominent issues confronting project participants and stakeholders. With regard to construction projects, project location and site layout planning techniques influence the efficacy of materials handling system. Factors pertaining operations such as resourcing plans and materials inventory management are considered to have a bearing on resource availability in terms of material transportation, time and cost.
The level of funding depends on the source. Sources of funds are also volatile, vulnerable to “donor fatigue”. Many of the management challenges revolve around fund-raising and financial sustainability and how to preserve identity and continuity in core programmes when income is difficult to predict from one year to the next. Vera Ogeh (2013). He also argues that in selecting from fund-raising options, a critical challenge for managers is how to avoid funding sources or modalities that lead to “mission creep”, compromise values and lead to cooption. In addition, there is apparent lack of multiple monitoring platforms with regard to financial resources which provides the stage for an unstructured and unorganized access to and disbursement of donor funds which will in the long run affect the financial health of the NGO and its capacity to execute intended project

(Assad, Mussa J., 2010) defines resources as stocks of available factors (knowledge, physical assets, human capital and other tangible and intangible) that are owned or controlled by the firm which are converted into final products or services efficiently and effectively. Negotiations on funding tend to take place between donors and management. Donors are typically members of the governing body and may therefore exercise considerable informal power over the decisions of the organizations.

According to (Chandra, 2008) availability of adequate funds has a direct connection with expeditious performance of projects. Firms with adequate funds had successful completion of their projects. The donor projects need to have systems and strategies for getting enough finances and manage these resources properly. Monitoring of the projects will ensure that there is reduction of costs since projects usually compete for resources.
These resources include manpower, money and time. These projects compete against each other putting the project manager in the position of being in competition.

(Andy Bruce & Ken Langdon, 2007) Argues that before starting to implement a project, one must study resource requirements and budgets. The resources required may include human resource, facilities and equipments for example Information or technology, or even money. This ensures that the budget allows one to complete all the activities without having to request for extra funds once the project is up and running.

In addition to availability of resources, (Phinney, 2007) notes that several projects have inherent problems in financial management which includes financial management working foundations are weak and the organisational structure is unreasonable, this leads to poor performance through the difficulty to play the role of supervision and controlling. Phinney notes that ignoring financial administrations, inadequate attention to checks and balances and if the cash management is not tight may result to funds being unused or insufficient in project implementation.

(Dr. Xavier, Harold Goodwin, Rachael Walton, 2012) noted that failure to disburse funds may be seen as an indicator that there are problems in the country departments which reflects badly on the project staff. Budgets are committed to interventions based on pledges, not performance, or when the latter is taken into account it relates to procedural due diligence and not impact. For many donor funded projects, there are legally defined institutions frameworks for the flow of resources. In all governments, funds flow through several layers of bureaucracy down to service facilities, which are charged with the
responsibility of spending the funds, this may in turn affect the performance of the project. (Afande, 2013)

All resources are equally important to determine the project success and performance. Findings show that intangible resources are important determinants for project’s successes such assets are scarce, specialized and difficult to trade, imitate or appropriate are viewed as intangible. Bamey, 2001, Conner, 2002, Ray et al., 2004. Resources can be defined as the productive assets of the firm. Intangible resources are financial, physical, human, intellectual, organization and technological resources. Human beings as resources must have intelligence and required technology to manage the material and financial resource properly. A superior performance is usually based on developing a competitively distinct set of resources heterogeneous and strategic development and a capable workforce in a well conceived strategy to sustain superior returns. (Fahy, 2000, Collis and Montgomery, 1994)

2.5 Summary of the literature review and research gaps

In this study, various literatures were reviewed mainly to establish the performance of those projects that are funded by donors. (Hunter, 2009) mainly focused on participatory monitoring and evaluation of the projects by the community. This was very crucial in that it brought about ownership of the project by the community who are basically the major beneficiaries. Most of the reports basically have dealt with performance of projects in general while failing to establish the performance of those project funded by donors because of their unique nature in that, donors partly choose aid recipients based on potential trade benefits or because of historic ties with former colonies. Sometimes donor performance goes beyond allocation, to include the amount of aid that is tied or the share
of aid spent on administration costs. A close scrutiny of the review shows that despite the importance of the donor funded projects in poverty eradication, very little attention has been taken to establish why most of them perform poorly and thus this poses a study gap which the study will seek to fill. The study will aim at generating new knowledge on how the performance of donor funded projects can be improved in order to alleviate poverty in the recipient communities.
2.4 Conceptual Framework

The model depicted in the figure below shows the relationship between the dependent and independent variables for performance of donor funded projects.

2.4.1 Conceptual framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders Involvement</td>
<td>Performance of donor funded projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholders register</td>
<td>• Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholders grid</td>
<td>• Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff competencies</td>
<td>• Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualifications</td>
<td>• Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience</td>
<td>Source: Researcher (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Progress list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Updated WBS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meeting minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approved budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The researcher adopted a descriptive research design. Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), describes a descriptive survey as a method which enables the researcher to summarize and organize data in an effective meaningful way. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used.

3.2 Target Population

(Ngechu 2005) defines target population as the total collection of elements about which we wish to make some references. The target population for this study included eight projects with 78 staff working in donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-county. There are various projects namely: Water projects, Education based projects, soil conservation projects among others. Respondents were sampled from the staff working in the projects and gave the information required. A total of 75 respondents were interviewed where in each project; five project staff were selected. The projects selected were spread across the five Divisions within the District.

3.3 Sampling Strategy

The researcher used purposive sampling techniques. (Kombo, D.K, & Tromp D.L, 2006), defines purposive sampling as a situation in which a researcher purposively targets a group of people believed to be reliable for the study. Purposive sampling was used because of the non–homogeneity of the donor funded projects, in terms of the management sizes, number of staff in each project and the nature of the services and products offered by the different projects. The researcher focused on the key personnel
who included: the project manager, finance staff, technical field staff and other field staff as in the table below. The researcher selected five staffs from each projects funded by the donors who were her respondents.

### 3.3.1 Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor funded projects</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Field Coordinators</th>
<th>Finance Staff</th>
<th>Others staffs</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic empowerment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee Keeping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Farming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Based Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Based Projects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Data collection Tools and techniques

The researcher mainly used the primary data. The data was collected through administration of questionnaires. They contained closed and open-ended questions which permitted free responses from the respondents. The researcher used questionnaires because they assisted her to collect a large amount of information in a large area within a short period. The questionnaires were administered through drop and pick by the researcher herself.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

(Mugenda, Mugenda A.G, 1999) defines validity as the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences based on research results. It’s the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represents the phenomenon of the study. The researcher carried out some pilot study and established the content validity.

Reliability is the degree to which a question consistently measures. It is the extent to which an experiment, test, or any measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials. A pre-test was done where the researcher critically analyzed the responses from the questionnaire in terms of their degree of reliability. The researcher had prior knowledge on the kind of the people who participated in the survey hence this increased the reliability.

3.6 Data presentation and analysis

The data was analyzed using quantitative techniques. Before analysis the data was organized first. The researcher used SPSS to obtain descriptive statistics and analyze the
data using measures of central tendency including frequency distribution tables, pie charts as well as bar graphs to represent the findings.

3.7 Research Ethics

The researcher upheld various research ethics. She protected the respondents by keeping the information given confidential. In cases where the researcher was required to disclose Information about a certain individual, she protected the identity and privacy of that particular individual. The researcher did preliminary test and obtain background Information in an effort to avoid imparting any harm to the subjects. The researcher acknowledged other peoples work in writing her final report and ensured that the respondents participated voluntarily and willingly.
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND FINDINGS

4.1. Introduction
Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables of frequencies and Percentages. Demographic questions are primarily analyzed based on total. Further analysis is done for specific objective questions and regression model for prediction.

4.2. Background information

4.2.1 Response rate
The study targeted 75 respondents in Mwingi sub-county and all respondents managed to respond to the questionnaires

4.2.2. Gender of respondent
Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables of frequencies and Percentages.

The results are in the table 4.1 below

Table 4.1: Gender of respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.1 above show almost a normal distribution of the staffs. Males are the majority being 60% and females 40%. It is a normal distribution as expected.
4.2.3. Age group of respondent

Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables of frequencies and Percentages and a pie chart as shown below.

Table 4.2: Age group of respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 to 35 yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 45 yrs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 55 yrs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 yrs and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data(2014)

Figure 4.1: Age of the respondents
Results in figure 4.2 above, show the age group having highest representation being 36 to 45 years at 49.5%. The age with the least representation is above 56 years which represented only 2%.

4.2.4. Education level of respondent

Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables of frequencies and Percentages.

The results are in the table 4.3 below

**Table 4.3: Education level of the respondent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors’ degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data(2014)
Source: Research data(2014)

Results in Figure 4.2 above show that majority of the respondents have a bachelor’s degree representing 40% of the respondents with the least educational level being postgraduate at 10.7% of the staffs. This means these staffs are knowledgeable and have the required academic qualifications.

4.2.5. Staff position

Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables of frequencies and Percentages and a pie chart as shown below.
Table 4.4: Staff position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Position</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field coordinator</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Figure 4.3: Respondents Job Position

Source: Research data (2014)
Results in table 4.4 and figure 4.3 above show field coordinators are majority with 38.7% followed closely by project managers with 14.7% and accountants were having a representation of 14.7%. Other staffs constituted 25.3%.

4.2.6. **Staff working duration**

Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables of frequencies and Percentages. The results are in the table 4.5 below.

**Table 4.5: Staff working duration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 4 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

**Figure 4.4 Staff working duration**

Source: Research data(2014)
Results in table 4.5 and figure 4.4 above show most of the staffs have worked in their projects for 1 to 2 years with a 50.7% while those with an experience above 4 years are 20%. This shows that there is need to increase staff retention rate to gain more experience in the same project.

4.2.7. Rating of staff contribution in the project

Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables of frequencies and Percentages. The results are in the table 4.6 below

Figure 4.5: Rating of staff contribution in the project

Source: Research data(2014)

Results in figure 4.5 above show most of the staffs play a very active role in their positions in the projects (46.6%). There is low ratings for minimal and not at all with only
4% and 1.3% respectively. This is an indicator that the project staffs fully own the project.

4.3. Project performance

4.3.1. Project duration
Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables of frequencies and Percentages.

The results are in the table 4.6 below

Table 4.6: Project duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.6 above show projects have been in operation for more than a year but most of them are within 2 to 3 years (36%) and 4 to 5 years (36%). However, some projects have been in operation for more than 5 years i.e. 9.3%.

4.3.2. Project completion
Results of analysis about whether the project was completed or not options are shown in the table 4.7 below.
Table 4.7: Project completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project completion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not completed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.7 above show most of projects were not completed within the period (53.3%). Only 33.3 % of the projects were completed.

4.3.3. Initial cost of the project

Costs of projects were analyzed and the results are in the figure 4.5 below

Figure 4.6: Initial project cost
Results in figure 4.6 above show most of projects were given a cost of Ksh.100,000 to Ksh500,000 which constituted 40%. Projects with the least allocation of Ksh.50,000 and below only constituted 4%. This shows that the projects were fully funded by the donors.

4.4. Staff Competencies

4.4.1. Competencies Scores

Results of analysis are presented using descriptive tables. The results are in the table 4.8 below

Table 4.8: Attributes associated with staff competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff competence</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time spend training</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment based on education level</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate training</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of enough ICT skills</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.8 above show that most of the staffs either strongly agree or agree with all the four statement; time spent in training have 64 mentions, recruitment based on education level 67 mention, lack of adequate training 69 mentions and lack of enough ICT skill with 56 mentions.
4.4.2. Recruitment process followed in donor funded projects

The rating results are in the table 4.9 and figure 4.7 below.

Table 4.9: Recruitment process followed in donor funded projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment process</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsourcing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Figure 4.7: Respondents Recruitment process

Results in table 4.9 and figure 4.7 above show new staffs are majorly recruited through the method of interviews which represents 77.3%, with the least staff recruited through
outsourcing being just 6.7% of the staff. As a result, the projects are able to get staffs that are highly qualified.

4.5. Monitoring and evaluation
Analysis was categorically done on basic statement that do have significant implications towards monitoring and evaluation impact and the descriptive result are shown in table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: Statements count scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project has a M &amp; E plan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E is carried out</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E reports are prepared regularly</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs conducting M&amp; E are competent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.10 above show that in regard to monitorance and evaluation; 17 staffs strongly agreed while 23 staffs agreed, in regard to M &E is carried out in this projects 18 staffs strongly agreed while 30 staffs agreed, in regard to M &E are prepared regularly by project staff 26 staffs strongly agreed while 41 just agreed and in regard to Personnel conducting M&E are very competent 23 staffs strongly agreed and 29 agreed. This figures are above average to mean the statement were concured to.
4.5.1. Whether the project has a computerized M &E system

The results are in the table 4.11 below

**Table 4.11: Whether the project has a computerized M &E system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computerized M &amp; E</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.11 above show majority of the donor funded projects don’t have a computerized M &E system which represented 76% with only 24% of the projects with these computerized M &E.

4.6. Resource availability

The results of scores of statements about resources are shown in the table 4.12 below

**Table 4.12: Attributes associated with resource availability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource availability</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate funds</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untimely disbursement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only donor funded</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)
Results in table 4.12 above show most staffs find the most projects to be only donor funded (i.e. 55 mentions) followed by inadequacy of the same at 57 mentions. Only 57 staffs mentioned strong or just mentioned about untimely disbursements.

4.6.1. Whether funds required are enough
The results are shown in the table 4.13 below

Table 4.13: Whether funds required are enough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds enough</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.13 above show adequacy of funds is viewed at its neutral or normal focus, with 50.6% saying yes and 49.4% saying the centrally. This indicates an insignificancy in equivalence of opinion subject to further research.

4.6.2. Whether funds will be enough to complete the project
The results are shown in the table 4.14 below
Table 4.14: Whether funds will be enough to complete the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds enough to Complete project</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.14 above show most projects will go to completion despite all other factors influencing. Those who suggested the projects will go to completion were 77.3% whereas those not are 22.7%.

4.7. Stakeholder involvement

The results of scores of statements about stakeholder involvement are shown in the table 4.15 below
### Table 4.15: Attributes associated with stakeholders involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders Involvement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active participation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing major role</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation in meeting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor awareness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2014)

Results in table 4.15 above show all staffs commented strongly on all the four statements with almost more than half in all statements suggesting to the positive on all statements.

#### 4.7.1. Stakeholder participation in implementation of projects

The results are shown in the figure 4.8 below.
Figure 4.8: Stakeholders participation in project implementation

Source: Research data(2014)

Results in figure 4.8 above show staffs consider the stakeholder participation as excellent with 32% response while good option has 50% outline, a few say fair and poor i.e. 14.7% and 2.7% respectively.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary
The results summary of the study is presented in this section. Frequencies and percentages are used in discussing all objectives and finally conclusions. The return rate of the questionnaire was 100% since this was done with support from ministry of planning and devolution.

5.1.1 Background Information
Males constituted 60% while females were 40%. Age distribution was as follows 20 to 35 yrs (32%), 36 to 45 yrs (49.3%), 46 to 55 years were (18.7%)

5.1.2 Stakeholders Involvement
Staffs consider the stakeholder participation as excellent with 32% response while good option has 50% outline, a few say fair and poor i.e. 14.7% and 2.7% respectively. Stakeholders needed training and involvements towards achieving desired success of this donor funded projects in the sub County. That is 48% and 32% respectively of the staffs suggesting this importance. Most of stakeholders needed training and involvements towards achieving desired success of this donor funded projects in the sub County

5.1.2 Staff Competencies
All staffs are moderately learnt with 10.7% having postgraduate degree, at least 40% have bachelor’s degree and 33.3% have got the diploma and 16% have basic education. Field coordinators are majority with 38.7% followed closely by project managers with 14.7% and accountants were having a representation of 14.7%. Other staffs constituted 25.3%. Those who have worked for 3 to 4 years are 29.3% while those with an
experience above 4 years are 20%. Staffs play a very active role in their positions in the projects (46.6%). An active and average participation is rated by 32% and 16% respectively. New staffs are majorly recruited through the method of interviews which represented 77.3%, while staffs recruited through promotion constituted 16.0% with only just 6.7% from outsourcing

5.1.3 Resource Availability
Most of projects were given a cost of 50,000 to 100,000 and 100,000 to 500,000 ranges with 40% and 17.3% respectively. There were 17.3% of the projects with a budget above 500,000

5.1.4 Monitoring and Evaluation
In regard to monitoring and evaluation; 76% of the respondents cited that the projects didn’t have computerized M&E with only 24% having M&E being computerized. This figures are above average to mean the statement were concured to. This indicates an insignificance in equivalence of opinion subject to further research

5.2. Conclusion
In order to achieve desired success in donor funded projects, there is need for constant monitorance, adequacy of resources and technical support from stakeholders. There are advantages to all concerned (donors, developing countries, and the private sector) by providing donor support for the development and funding of private-sector projects in infrastructure (and other) sectors in developing countries through multi-donor approaches such as the PIDG. Bilateral donors, particularly those with smaller aid budgets, are able to participate in and guide multi-million dollar investment programs; the IFC gains access to significant amounts of grant funding; and recipient-country governments and the
private sector have a single interface with an experienced investment professional and a quick, non-bureaucratic, decision on an investment request. (Afande, 2013) found out that the extent of success of donor funded projects is determined by both technical and management capacity of human resources of the implementing agencies. He argued that the officers in the donor funds project chain may lack the formal training in foreign aid management, budgeting and accounting. The research finding concurs with the Afande’s findings in that 48% of the respondents cited lack of adequate training in their jobs since they were recruited. This has greatly contributed to failure to complete the project within the stipulated time due to lack of some basic skills. According to (Chandra, 2008) availability of adequate funds has a direct connection with expeditious performance of projects. Firms with adequate funds had successful completion of their projects. The donor projects need to have systems and strategies for getting enough finances and manage these resources properly. Monitoring of the projects will ensure that there is reduction of costs since projects usually compete for resources. These resources include manpower, money and time. These projects compete against each other putting the project manager in the position of being in competition. The research findings shows that the projects didn’t have enough resources and this was reflected in that 53.3% of the projects were not completed.

5.3. Recommendations
The study found out that there was low stakeholders involvement and recommends that project leaders should be communicating with and involving all the key stakeholders in any donor funded projects. Many of the projects had inadequate funds which were untimely disbursed and thus there is need for projects to get other sources of finance. From the research findings, there is need to train all the project staff and stakeholders on M&E, and involve them in all the implementation process. Many of the projects
suffered from lack of detailed knowledge of the general farm systems, and the particular
crop production systems operating in the project area ... it was often difficult to obtain the
necessary knowledge during implementation ... Generally, it was found that the proposed
new crop technologies required further testing on small-holder farms in the areas ... the
changes were expected to be adopted by too great a proportion of farmers in too short a
period of time. Bank projects have also not been able to address the issue of limited use
of seeds by farmers because of inadequate access to complementary inputs

5.4. Recommendations for Further Research
This study is not conclusive and as such it is recommended that further research need to
be undertaken in this area especially to find out or establish how stakeholder’s
involvement of both the locals and the donors can be used to enhance the project success.
Lastly a study needs to be carried out in other regions of the country since different
regions have different challenges.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Questionnaire

1. This questionnaire is on determinants of performance of poverty eradication donor funded projects in Mwingi Sub-county. The undertaking is in line with a research requirement in partial fulfilment of Master of Business Administration Degree. Kindly answer the questions by ticking in the boxes provided or by writing a brief statement.

SECTION A: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Gender
   a) Male [   ]
   b) Female [   ]

2. Age Category
   a) 20-35 years [   ]
   b) 36-45 years [   ]
   c) 46-55 years [   ]
   d) Above 56 years [   ]

3. Highest Level of Education
   a) Diploma [   ]
   b) Degree [   ]
c) Masters [   ]

d) PhD [   ]

e) Others (specify) [   ]

4. Respondents position

   a) Project manager [   ]
   b) Field coordinator [   ]
   c) Accountant [   ]
   d) IT Personnel [   ]
   e) Others (staff) [   ]

5. How long have you been working in the project.

   a) Between 1-2 years [   ]
   b) 3-4 years [   ]
   c) Above 4 years [   ]

6. What is your contribution in the project?

   a) Not at all [   ]
   b) Minimal [   ]
   c) Average [   ]
   d) Active [   ]
e) Very active [  ]

SECTION B: PROJECT PERFORMANCE.

7. What was the duration of the project?
   
   a) Less than 2 years [  ]
   b) 2-3 years [  ]
   c) 3-5 years [  ]
   d) Over 5 years [  ]

8. Was the project completed within the period?
   
   a) Yes [  ]
   b) No [  ]

9. What was the initial cost of the project?
   
   a) Less than 50,000 [  ]
   b) 50,000-100,000 [  ]
   c) 100,000-500,000 [  ]
   d) Above 500,000 [  ]

10. Was the project completed within the budgeted cost?
    
    a) Yes [  ]
    b) No [  ]
**SECTION C: STAFF COMPETENCIES**

11. By using of a tick(✓) please indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) to the various statements regarding the staff competencies that affect the performance of donor funded projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The amount of time spent on training project managers and other staff involved in project implementation of donor funded projects is minimal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Recruitment of project staff is based on the level of education and not necessarily the experience in projects funded by donors because of their unique nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Some of the employees of the projects are not adequately trained on monitoring and evaluation of the donor funded projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Most of the project staff have only the basic ICT skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. How is the recruitment of new staff carried out in your project? Through:

a) Interviews [   ]

b) Outsourcing [   ]

c) Promotions [   ]

SECTION C: MONITORING AND EVALUATION

13. By using of a tick(✓) please indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) to the various statements regarding monitoring and evaluation of donor funded projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The project has a monitoring and evaluation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Monitoring and evaluation of the project is carried out in this project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Monitoring and evaluation reports are prepared at regular intervals in this project by the project staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) The personnel conducting M&amp;E are very competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Does the project have computerized M&E systems in place?

a) Yes [ ]

b) No [ ]

SECTION D: RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

15. By using of a tick(✓) please indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) to the various statements regarding resource availability for donor funded projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The funding received from donors is adequate for this project and this has made the project a success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Funds needed for the project are not disbursed on time and this has greatly affected the project performance to some extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The project receives funds from donors only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Are the resources needed for implementing the project adequate? 

__________________________________________________________________

17. In your view, do you think that the available resources will enable the project to bring the needed change to the beneficiaries.

a) Yes [ ]

b) No [ ]
18. In your view do you think the available resources will enable this project to be a success story to point to?

   a) Yes                [   ]
   b) No                 [   ]

SECTION E: STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVEMENT

By using of a tick(√) please indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) to the various statements regarding stakeholders involvement in implementation of donor funded projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>Most of the community members actively participated in the conception and design of this project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>The stakeholders have played a major role towards the implementation of the project and this has led to project success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Most of the stakeholders attend stakeholders meeting and are actively involved in monitoring of the project of the project activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Poor stakeholders awareness has slowed down the implementation process of the projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. In your own assessment what is the level of participation of the stakeholders in the Implementation of the project?

a) Poor  [  ]

b) Fair  [  ]

c) Good  [  ]

d) Excellent  [  ]

20. What do you think should be done to improve stakeholder involvement on the performance and success of donor funded projects?

THANKS FOR YOUR RESPONSES
## Appendix II: Sampling frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KE 384 DC Nzalae CDC</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mwingi Disaster Risk Reduction project</td>
<td>ADRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KE 394 RGC Thokoa CDC</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KE 381 DC Nguutani CDC</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mwingi Drought Resilience Building project</td>
<td>Farm Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>KE 764 FGCK KaluaCDC</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KE 765 FGCK Waita CDC</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KE 766 AIC Lundi CDC</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Putting African Mothers newborn and Children first project</td>
<td>Action Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kamutiu Earth dam water Project</td>
<td>World vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nguni Fish farming Project</td>
<td>Action Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nzikani Water Project</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yambyu Bee keeping project</td>
<td>Farm Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Muangeni Resource Centre project</td>
<td>Action Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kavisuni Earth dam water project</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Work plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MONTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSAL WRITING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNING INSTRUMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA COLLECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA ANALYSIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT WRITING AND SUBMISSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix iv: Research budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposal writing</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Price/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typing and printing the proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photocopying and binding of proposal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub - Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data collection and analysis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Typing and photocopying tools for data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travelling and telephone and internet bundles expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data entry and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research assistants training and wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub - Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Production of final report</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Typing nd printing finl copy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photocopy nd binding of final copy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub - Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>