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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Civic Education:** This is an awareness creation to different sectors, people and groups to understand their roles and responsibilities in line with the Constitutional requirements.

**Community Development:** Refers to initiatives or actions developed or started by different development partners including the Government, Private investors, NGOs, and the community itself geared towards generating solutions to the problems that affect the community. It is the improvement of the welfare and the living standards of the communities and making them more resilient to any shocks that may affect them.

**Devolution:** This is the transfer of rights, powers, property, and responsibility to the grassroots by the central government for purposes of regional balancing.

**Jurisdiction:** Refers to the geographical area to which an authority applies its mandates or powers. It also refers to the mandate, roles, or powers given to an authority to administer to a specific audience.

**Participation:** Refers to various/ different mechanisms/ avenues and opportunities provided to the citizens or the public to air their views, opinions as well as concerns about the issues that affect them and is mostly made to influence or contribute to the economic, political and social development initiatives.

**Participatory Development:** This refers to the inclusion of the views, ideas, and opinions, and any other contribution of all stakeholders in any development initiative right from the inception of the ideas to sustainability plans.

**Poverty Eradication:** This is the application of all development measures, strategies, initiatives to alleviate the status of the poor so that they are able to access productive resources and avoid dependency. It is mostly geared towards enabling the poor to create wealth for themselves.

**Promulgation:** A public announcement or a decree from an office.
**Public Participation:** This refers to the processes that ensure the citizens or the public are engaged one-on-one in making decisions on the issues that affect them and ensuring that their inputs are considered in the final decisions arrived at.

**Regional Balancing:** Refers to an equal distribution process of the planned development initiatives in different regions of a country. It demands distribution of investment in such a way so that the regional rates of growth in different parts of the country be equally attained, eliminating the regional disparities prevailing in the country.

**Rural Development:** Refers to the process of directing development initiatives towards the alleviation of poverty for the rural community and improving the welfare of the people in marginalized areas.

**Sustainability:** This is the situation in project management whereby the benefits of a development initiative continue way long after the funding/ implementing partner’s completion, exit, or withdrawal from the project. This means that the project does not close after the donor or the government exits.
ABSTRACT

Kenya’s development agenda and initiatives has been faced with historical challenges ranging from the top-down approach in development, allocation, and direction of huge resources to unplanned and unforeseen projects, poor inception, implementation, and completion of projects. Public participation is the fundamental standard of our democracy and has gotten one of the significant conditions which are basic for the usage of projects. During the promulgation of the new Constitution, 2010, Kenya made a deliberate effort to pave the way for participatory development. However, this is not the case in most sectors, development partners, and within the counties. The study conducted 10 years after the promulgation of the new constitution sought to establish how citizen involvement in the project management cycle relates to the success and long term existence and enjoyment of the project’s benefits by the primary beneficiaries. In addition, it sought to investigate the implications of the mechanisms, processes employed, and the established county structures of public participation at the county level. The study relied on two development theories, i.e. The Community Action Model and the Arnstein’s Ladder of Citizen Participation to understand and critic their works. It employed the descriptive research design which depicts or describes the participants in an accurate way. This research was conducted in Makueni County, targeting Kibwezi West sub-County. The researcher targeted a population of 80,805 a sample size of 384. Both open and closed-ended questions/interviews were employed in this research. Data analysis was done using SPSS whereby descriptive statistics were used in quantitative data analysis while thematic analysis for qualitative data. From the findings, the study established that mechanisms, processes, and country structures employed by the county governments and other development partners directly influence project sustainability. This was explained by model analysis using the Coefficient of adjusted determination i.e. 0.722 which translates to 72.2%. This indicates that variations in the dependent variable were explained by the independent variables (Mechanism, Processes, and Country Structures). The residual of 27.8% could be explained by other factors beyond the scope of the current study. Also from ANOVA, the P-value was 0.001<0.05, an indication that the study variables significantly influenced the sustainability of water projects. The study concluded that the mechanisms, processes, and country structures influence project sustainability. It is recommended that the level of participation in projects should be increased; and the communities should continue with their methods of organization with more emphasis on regular conference and institution of sanctions/rewards to encourage citizens to participate in development projects.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Participatory development became a serious subject of debate when different scholars questioned and criticized the decision making practice by a small circle of the high profile and most powerful people in the regimes (Shipley & Utz, 2012) through the publishing of different articles about power in decision making, (Rosenberg, Hartwig & Merson, 2008). Little milestones were documented until the middle of the 20th century when citizens became aware of the opportunities and rights that came with it (Lee & Chan, 200). The concept of participation was evolved gradually. New proponents unraveled and enriched the theory as well as the practice. The advancement of practice was not so apparent due to the complexity of the aspect as well as lack of preparation by the government and the practitioners for the transition.

Community participation approaches have become major demands by the development agencies including the United Nations, the World Bank, and other donors. The bottom-up approach has gained currency for its gains in project performance and sustainable development; it makes implementation better than the top-bottom approach. Globally, it is acknowledged that the bottom-up technique approach makes individuals improves proprietorship. Cornwall (2008) asserts that a major public-private partnership (PPP) initiatives in the United States have reportedly failed due to community opposition. This state of affairs reveals that a community’s participation in a project is critical to the project’s success and without its input the outcome may not be impressive. Through effective participation by the locals, project sustainability was very successful. This achievement made the government alongside universal organizations to imitate the model for urban advancement in different parts of the nation. Due to the project sustainability’s significant performance, it was copied by the other countries of the world including the US, UK, and Australia. Community participation enhance issues of project sustainability. A participatory methodology improves the accomplishment of the undertaking as well as makes extends increasingly productive and effective (Dunn, 2007). Advocates of local community participation which leads to the
sustainability of community development projects have frequently relied on case studies to illustrate their argument.

In Africa dates back in the late 1970s from a community development movement in some parts of Africa. According to the Khalfan (2006) development of the community looked at the improvement of the welfare of the locals, training the people on how local administration operated as well as ensuring that the local self-help activities carried out by the community had government control (Zawdie & Langford, 2000). Recently, community participation is coming up as one of the main strategies of development more so in local development initiatives which are basically viewed as a basis for project success and sustainability.

The Kenyan central government did not change the systems at once, but controlled and managed all the resources and the citizens were granted very limited opportunity to make decisions, which resulted in undemocratic institutions, (Gitau & Amaya, 2006). Multiple voices agitated for a more inclusive and democratic administration which resulted in the formation of multiparty in Kenya. Although pluralism expanded the democratic space, still more power was vested at the executive arm of the government. There was a need for devolution of more power to the grassroots so that the community members take part in decision-making processes. The Kenyan 2010 constitution created devolved units of governance that distributed power from the central government to the grassroots via the county governments. The new constitution has allowed the citizen to participate in not only county government affairs but the national government as well (Kivoi & Lutta, 2019).

The participatory development approach is not a new concept in Kenya. The government made numerous strides to support the strategy through multiple programs in the 1980s (Gabriel, 2015) such as the District Focus for Rural Development Strategy of 1983. The District Focus for Rural Development stressed the importance of rural development by encouraging local participation in development. The other strategy was the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) which also stressed the need of providing people with an opportunity to take part in empowerment initiatives (Oranga, Obuba & Nyakundi, 2020).
Mwanzi and Strathdee (2010) articulated strategies which included Special Rural development programs (SRDP) and through CDF which ensures participation of beneficiaries in project identification and implementation through writing proposal, the contribution of money, labor or materials in a construction type of projects. All these strategies were geared towards project ownership and sustainability since beneficiaries are involved in critical stages of the project’s life (Bohlers, 2019).

Over the recent years, governments all over the world and specifically Africa have recognized that citizen engagement through participation is a basic source of equality/democracy and most of them have made real efforts to actualize community engagement in grassroots development (Visser & Simpson, 2019). Kenya as a country has gradually moved from a more federal to a regional/devolved form of governance. One of the most recent efforts of the Kenyan Government was the adoption of the new constitution of Kenya in August 2010. The new constitution reintroduced devolution as a strategy to promote and ensure equal distribution of the Country’s resources throughout the country for regional balancing and ensure all regions achieve sustainable development. As a country, this structure of government increased the spaces for legitimate public engagement at both the national and county levels of governance. As an effort to further entrench public engagement, the country enacted the County Government's Act 2012 which provides for principles of public participation (Munene, 2019).

The above Act stipulates different avenues and methods in which citizens can participate in governance. These include the right of citizens to access information promptly, the obligation of county governments to respond to petitions and challenges by citizens, and the responsibility of county government to establish opportunities and avenues for citizens’ participation (Ngigi & Busolo, 2019). The Act further acknowledges the right of citizens as well as communities to control their affairs in relation to development. The Act gives Kenyan citizens the powers of self-governance and inclusion in the exercise of powers as stated in art 1 of the Constitution of Kenya (GOK 2010). This has resulted in having local communities included or given chances to take part in involved in both national and county plans as a strategy to plan as per community needs and ensure the success and sustainability of the projects.
The above constitutional provisions justify the need for active community engagement in development projects as a way of establishing need-based development projects that put the beneficiary at the center of project planning, management, and looking at the long term existence of the projects even after government’s exit (Rai, 2020). The government and nonprofits exist to improve the overall local community conditions by providing essential services such as economic, health, housing, education, infrastructure among others (Hassan, 2019). The enactment of the COK 2010, therefore, has seen a gradual and systematic distribution of resources from the National government to the grassroots through the counties. This is designed to bring development to the locals and give them a chance to control their resources as provided in the CGA 2012.

Devolution has seen the initiation of different projects that cut across various fields and meant to improve on essential services delivery (Rai, 2020). These projects target multiple areas such as water provision, improvement of health care services, infrastructural development, Provision of education, and others. Different counties have made strides to ensure citizens’ inclusion in county planning and decision making as an effort to ensure project success and sustainability (Wood, 2019).

Several counties have made some strides in the legislation of public participation frameworks and policies (Auriacombe & Sithomola, 2020). Research by World Bank identifies Makueni and Elgeyo- Marakwet counties as key regions that have made deliberate efforts in mainstreaming public participation. However, the two counties’ efforts do not directly point out the practicability of participation and the effects on the counties’ project sustainability. In line with the COK 2010, Makueni County prepared the Makueni County Public participation and Governance Bill in 2014, a year after the initial formation of the County Governments. This was made through an Act of the County Assembly to give effect to citizen inclusion in the county plans.

Makueni County’s citizen participation framework has different components. Firstly, citizens are involved in the identification, prioritization, and budgetary allocation of development projects. Additionally, Citizens participate in project management Committees (PMCs) which provide oversight during the implementation of the prioritized projects. Finally, citizen take an active role in the provision of the goods and services required for the implementation of the said projects as highlighted in by the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (Bonareri, 2020).
Public participation in Kenya has, therefore, been adopted with some counties ahead while others are still grappling with the initial challenges of implementing this constitutional requirement. Despite the legal provisions and the pressure to entrench public participation, no tangible structures are in place to monitor the implementation processes in terms of the mechanisms, structures, and their implications to the projects’ sustainability. The study, therefore, draws much interest in the progress of public participation within the context of devolution with a specific target of Makueni County being a pioneer county in entrenching citizen inclusion in county plans.

1.2 Statement of the problem
Various studies have been done to evaluate the status of public participation since the new constitution promulgated in 2010. A study done by Opiyo, Guyo, Moronge, and Odhiambo (2017) assessed the role of citizen engagement in the delivery of services by the county government. The study focused on four key areas including mechanisms of feedback, citizen participation in policy formulation, the empowerment of citizens, and conflict management.

Siala (2015) examined the factors influencing public participation in Nairobi County. The study evaluated how various factors including behavioral and socioeconomic attributes affect public participation in the processes of budget-making. The study collected quantitative data through a structured questionnaire. The key findings of the study are that education has the highest influence on the quality of public participation in budget-making procedures. The study also discovered that people with a positive attitude towards county governments are more likely to participate in the budget-making process. The current study, however, has different objectives, applies mixed methods, and took place in a rural setting.

Mbithi et al. (2019), used an Afro-barometer survey to evaluate the determinants of public participation in county governments. The study found out that the approval of a governor’s performance determines the amount of public participation. This study identified multiple factors that lead to poor public participation. These include challenges in accessing the information on the county budget, non-cooperative county-assembly members, and the challenges encountered by citizens in influencing decision-making. Essendi et al. (2014), mounted a qualitative study in Makueni County to find out the views of the community about participatory development. The study found out that many residents are willing to participate in development projects that are
planned to enhance their lives. The current study applied a mixed-method approach to evaluate the effects of community participation in the sustainability of water projects in Kibwezi West Sub-county.

Since the devolved government is prefaced on the idea of resident strengthening, one of the significant windows through which the achievement of county governments can be comprehended is public participation. The Constitution made an expansive system for public participation in region administration. Public participation in their undertakings has not yet accomplished the adequate levels that fit the bill to suggest full investment (Rural Communities Impacting Policy, 2002). In the discussion, public participation where the project should involve the community, the probability of project working to a sensible end is constrained; is this case in Makueni County. As indicated by a statement by the Society for International Development (2016), the majority of County Governments did not give platforms for dynamic citizen participation. Without dynamic public participation in project advancement choices made by a few frequently deny the majority their privileges to impact project development. The difficulties and achievements of project sustainability in devolved government have been seen across counties. Though, an array of documentation exists of these successes and failures. This is somewhat a result of the brief span during which devolution has been executed. This study focused on Makueni County particularly Kibwezi, West Sub-County which has documented both the successes and challenges of project sustainability through the devolved government using lenses of public participation. The interest was to learn from the mechanisms, processes, and Makueni structures employed by the County in particular.

1.3 Objectives of the study

1. To establish the effects of mechanism employed in public participation on projects sustainability.
2. To examine the effects of processes employed in public participation on project sustainability.
3. To explore the effects of county structures in public participation on project sustainability.
1.4 Research questions

1. What are the effects of the mechanisms employed in public participation on project sustainability?
2. What are the effects of processes employed in public participation on projects sustainability?
3. What are the effects of county structures on public participation have on project sustainability?

1.5 Justification and significance of the study

The Kenyan Constitution (2010) recognizes the centrality of public participation in all aspects of governance. Indeed, article 1(1) indicates that entirely sovereign power belongs to the Kenyans. Indeed, public participation is a value that has been anchored in the constitution. This study is an appraisal to determine the effects of participatory mechanisms in improving the sustainability of projects. Although many counties have not developed mechanisms through which public participation can be attained, Makueni County achieved this shortly after the establishment of the county government (Ngai & Oduro, 2015), and The County has a handbook that spells out how public participation should be carried out. Due to the recognition of public participation as an essential ingredient, Makueni county enables people to participate in governance through various mechanisms including participating through Public Management Committees (PMC), offering residents priority in the provision of goods and services to the county government, providing the general public and professional bodies an opportunity to participate in the processes of decision-making (Ngugi & Oduro, 2015).

Due to its location in a semi-arid area, Makueni County experiences perennial water shortages. To counteract this challenge, various nonprofits and county governments have initiated multiple projects that are meant to avail water to the residents (Ochelle, 2012). This steady is meant to evaluate the effects of public participation in determining the sustainability of the various water projects in Kibwezi West Sub-County.
The study is significant to the policymakers, development practitioners, and civil society groups in the sense that it will inform the policy debate on participation in relation to projects sustainability in the devolved system of governance. Within the context of research, the study will provide an analysis of the state of public participation in Makueni County being the pioneer county to entrench public participation after the promulgation of the new COK, 2010, and the effects to its development agenda.

The findings will also offer the other counties an opportunity to buy from the lessons drawn from the study. Barder (2012), notes that it is not enough for development programs to be implemented, but for sustainable development to be realized. The findings will contribute to the existing literature on the concept of public participation nexus sustainability in Kenya in the current context of devolution.

1.6 Scope and limitation of the study
The scope entails how far the study goes and the boundaries that it may not cross. This study has various scope areas including geographical, methodological, and theoretical scopes. Geographically, the study was carried out in Kibwezi West Sub- County, Makueni County. Many counties within Kenya may benefit from the study’s findings. However, the research findings could not be generalized globally because other countries may have different structures of governance.

The study intends to apply the case study approach. The method presents various weaknesses like difficulty in the generalization of the research findings. To overcome the challenges of the case study methodology, the researcher intends to employ a mixed-methods approach. The mixed-method methodology could enable the researcher to conduct an in-depth study whose findings can be generalized in specific situations that are similar to the case under study.

The study faced various limitations. Respondents could be reluctant to give information due to fear. However, the researcher promised the respondents of their privacy and also provide a letter of permission from the authority. A rapport was established that encouraged the respondent to participate in the interview. The researcher also ensured that identifying information such as names or addresses of research participants is not collected.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
Chapter two of the study presents a wider view of the project sustainability concept from different proponents and authors. The researcher reviewed the Makueni County Public Participation framework since the county has made strides in the entrenchment of Public Participation. There is a broader focus on the history of participatory development in Kenya, specifically within Makueni County with a closer view at the mechanisms, processes as well as the structures employed on public participation and their implications to the sustainability of County Projects. The Constitution of Kenya, 2010, County Government Act 2012, Public Finance and Management Act 2012 as well as the Urban and Cities Act will be a central reference document of the research. Focus on the above-mentioned references will provide insights into this study. The chapter will be highlighted in different topical issues, i.e. the concept of project sustainability in relation to (the Mechanisms for public participation in development projects, the processes employed as well as the practical structures of public participation. Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Framework.

2.2 Sustainability of Water projects
According to Jørgensen, Hermann, and Mortensen (2010), Sustainable development can be portrayed as the improvement that tends to the issues of the present age without exchanging off the limit of individuals later on to address their issues. There are different methods for defining sustainability with regards to projects development. The definition much of the time relies upon the viewpoints and needs of the stakeholders (Mathur, 2008). Sustainability can be alluded to the capacity of a program to react to the issues of a network in a nonstop, way (Noori, 2017). Rondinelli (2013) attests that the ‘Sustainability of project significant past the project time frame and is estimated by the level of merchandise and enterprises kept up and conveyed following five years of the end of usage of the task: the continuation of neighborhood activity invigorated by the venture and the age of successor administrations and activities because of venture constructed nearby limit’. Sustainability can likewise be characterized as the proceeding of project benefits past the task time frame, and the continuation of nearby activity animated by the task, and the age
of successor administrations and activities because of project-assembled neighborhood limit (Honadle and Vansant as referred to in Kamarah, 2017). The task is viewed as feasible in the transient when “the venture exercises and advantages proceeded at any rate 3 years after the life of the project” (John, 2018).

Project sustainability is one of the most basic viewpoints for all grassroots, national, and worldwide improvement organizations. Late examinations led by TANGO International (2008a, 2008b, 2008c, and 2008d) have demonstrated that while the pattern with the execution of ventures is indicating noteworthy improvement, the pattern with post-usage maintainability is fairly disillusioning - progressively, fewer tasks are being supported.

The primary audit of project sustainability directed by the World Bank's Operations Evaluation Department found that solitary nine out of twenty-seven of the farming projects contemplated were named “sustained”, eight more “doubtful”, and the staying ten were “not sustained” (Bamberger and Cheema, 1990). Furthermore, out of seventeen instruction ventures secured by a similar report and a later report by the World Bank, nine were named prone to be supported, five were suspicious, and three were probably not going to be continued. Khan (2000) asserts that the sustainability of the project is a significant test in many creating nations. Huge quantities of activities actualized at huge expenses regularly will in general experience challenges with manageability. This implies enormous consumptions are brought about in executing these projects while networks are denied the advantages that may come if these activities were to be sustainable.

Internationally, assets for social welfare administrations are shrinking. Population pressures, evolving needs, monetary challenges, and requests for more prominent viability are generally influencing the course of social welfare (Bens, 1994). The use of nonprofessionals through resident association instruments to address social issues has gotten progressively ordinary (Wasilwa, 2017 referred to Kaufman and Poulin, 1996). Besides, worry with the issue of project sustainability likewise originates from the mounting pressures from the residential voting public to definitely decrease or perhaps end remote guide programs together (Asongu & Nwuchwu, 2017). These weights have made governments, giver associations and advancement laborers begin to consider the viability and the estimation of help being conveyed to Third World nations over the previous decades. Contributor associations and improvement laborers are worried that the guide being
conveyed appears to give barely any positive effects on the beneficiary nations. Much of the time, the advantages of improvement tasks or projects likewise appear to end of government withdrawal or outside help from the activities or projects.

Project sustainability, in this manner, involves three segments including the network, project results, and external help (Luvenga et al, 2015). A project is attainable if the people from the system/beneficiaries are capable of solitude without the assistance of outside progression accomplices. The program recipients should keep creating results for their advantage for whatever length of time that their concern despite everything exists (Luvenga et al., 2015). Significant improvement associations including multilateral offices like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have landed at a close to an agreement that undertakings can't be maintainable and dependable except if the community’s participation is made integral to the arranging and the executives of tasks, (Kumar, 2002). Network-based ways to deal with improvement are among the quickest developing systems for diverting advancement help and as per moderate computations, the World Bank's loaning for community-driven advancement (CDD) ventures has gone up from $325 million out of 1996, to $2 billion of every 2003, (Mansuri and Rao, 2003). This pattern is upheld by narrative and experimental proof proposing network investment is an unfit decent as far as project results and sustainability (Narayan, 1995).

As indicated by Monday, Adadu and Usman (2019) most project failure starts from attempts to constrain standard top-down projects and exercises on various neighborhood genuine components where they don't fit or address the issues of the close by people. The top-down technique acknowledged that people were exorbitantly unmindful and possibly rough to effectively see and pick what was satisfactory and fitting for them and in like manner were not expected to set up their own improvement needs, rank them and recognize the most felt need (Mulwa, 2008). Due to the top-down technique that had been gotten by most governments and advancement organizations in creating nations for the greater part of the tasks they had started for its networks, manageability as a key segment for guaranteeing that networks claimed the program, kept enduring as long as improvement experts continued getting things done for the individuals. The top-down strategy was liable for the breakdown of most network improvement ventures, for example, dams, scaffolds, schools, and even wellbeing offices. Network interest being developed activities are intended to
address the insufficiencies of the top-down way to deal with community improvement, (Mulwa, 2004).

2.3 Mechanisms of Public Participation and Project Sustainability

The appropriate definition of the concept Mechanisms for the purposes of this study are the structures or networks through which the community constructively and positively engages in devolved governance. Simply these are the opportunities or the avenues provided by the development partners or the government to the citizens as an opportunity for them to give their views any development agenda.

The Constitution of Kenya, 2010 offers noticeable quality to public participation; it advances vote based system by furnishing the rights holders with the chance to partake in basic leadership forms influencing them and their communities. For example, Article 1 of the Constitution expresses that all sovereign force is vested to the individuals of Kenya. This means the move-in administration from incorporated to decentralized, and from “top-down” to “bottom-up”. Among numerous changes, devolution is the most noteworthy. The space for resident state cooperation keeps on extending, the legislature and common society have increased noteworthy experience conveying participatory devices and approaches for discourse and commitment, particularly associated with service conveyance.

Devolution, therefore, gave birth to decentralized units for inclusive grassroots development. With the Constitution giving a legal ground for effective public participation, the County Government Act 2012 breathed life to the functions of counties and the spaces for Public participation. Sec, 87 of the CGA, defines the values/principles of citizen engagement in counties which are: Well-timed sharing of any information, data as well as policy documents for analysis, inputs, formulation, and implementation by the public without any restrictions. The citizens have also been empowered to participate in the processes of the formulation and implementation of the policy documents and laws. This means there should be no policy or process gaps and the public should feel part and parcel of the whole process. The policy-makers should as well ensure there are promotion and protection of the rights and interests of the marginalized as well as the minorities including the youth, women, and PWDs. There should be legal grounds that protect them and their interests and their needs should always be taken into account. The Act also provides for the provision of a
balance in the functions and responsibilities of all actors like the Non-State Actors, National Government, and the Counties, and this should provide for shared responsibilities as well as partnerships. The section appreciates as well appreciates that the two levels should provide commentary oversight as well as Authority in their function. Non-state Actors should also be in the frontline in providing oversight for accountable and transparent systems.

Sec 91 of the Act allows the establishment of avenues or modalities for citizen participation which includes: ICT Platforms for communication and information sharing, City Hall forums/meetings, Citizen Engagement forums for budget plans inputs and validations, public procurement awards as well as public office appointments in line with the public attention. In this study, the research is interested in unveiling the sustainable mechanisms to engage all the stakeholders in development initiatives instead of relying on the theorized modalities. Bearing in mind that each county is unique with different economic, social, and physical structures, the study will try to highlight the most applicable and suitable avenues for community engagement minimizing the challenges in the processes and appreciating its uniqueness.

Various mechanisms for public participation were actualized during the detailing stage, including courses, workshops, working gatherings, work gatherings, present-day correspondence media, and meetings with key people, overviews, gatherings with establishments, and direct cooperation in pilot exhibition tasks and network exercises (Gauld, 2010). The usage of these components changed relying upon the target, the issues viable, and the unique situation.

Mechanisms for public participation has distinguished and facilitate the interests of bowl partners, giving access to data, and empowering dynamic network inclusion in the administration of the assets. Additionally, the venture started execution of an extensive and coordinated ecological training program identifying with the practical utilization of water and other characteristic assets, both through proper instruction forms (fusing natural factors in scholastic educational programs), just as through workshops, classes, meetings, manuals, handouts and media (Fung, 2006).

2.4 Processes of Public Participation and Project Sustainability
Rowe and Frewer (2010) propose four criteria for assessing a public participation method: Criterion of asset openness, the standard of undertaking definition, model of organized basic
leadership, and basis of cost-adequacy. Asset availability and organized basic leadership is especially useful for managing the development of the participatory methodology to cultivate social learning and structure member communication and thought. The primary essential standard, asset openness, stipulates the assets that members need to settle on a choice. This incorporates (a) data assets, or the realities expected to settle on an educated choice; (b) HR, or access to specialists and others that can give required data; and (c) material assets, or articles like projectors or whiteboards to encourage understanding. These assets would all be significant for conveying supportability ideas, issues, and answers for different members.

Fung and Wright (2011) combine key standards of engaged participatory administration. They express that strategies should lead exchange past a unique talk on values and rather center around discussions about handy issues and solid issues. Individuals influenced by the issues being talked about ought to be allowed a chance to ponder answers for the issues. Healey (2013) talks about inventive urban administration as an option in contrast to the built-up schedules (and) decide bound bureaucratic methods that encapsulate arranging forms. Under innovative administration, procedures would bolster instructive discussions that are encouraged through exploratory practices.

Public participation can likewise improve arrangement usage by expanding the authenticity of the basic leadership process and, in this manner, diminishing clash. Different examinations have exhibited that whether people, in general, acknowledge a choice relies on whether the open see the basic leadership process as reasonable (Bulkeley and Mol 2003; Murphy 2004; Newig 2007). Drawing in the general population in basic leadership can help defeat shortfalls in the majority rules system.

Adapting to low participant sustainability education in participatory methodology would lend to a requirement for able help. Rowe et al. (2010) consider including evaluations of satisfactory and reasonable elicitation just as data introduction. The capacity of open cooperation to convey on its heap guarantees relies on how governments and common society make an interpretation of standards into training. For instance, open interest doesn't improve fair practice in the event that it is not comprehensive. In like manner, open information doesn't improve the nature of basic
leadership if the correct individuals are not in the room (those with one of a kind data) or decision-makers do not consider that data (Fung, 2015).

Public participation has prompted a quick expansion of open gatherings, warning panels and other government activities explicitly intended to encourage resident commitment in the basic leadership process (Smith 2014; Fenton and Gustafsson 2017). Notwithstanding, open info isn't constrained to formal support components. Common society and social developments apply pressure from outside the political procedure; this preparation utilizes a scope of strategies, for example, network discussions, neighborhood alliances, and petitions to impact arrangement advancement. Truth be told, almost all argumentative choices today are molded by both organized public participation and preparation.

Public participation procedures to help maintainable advancement might be powerful if it encourages consideration about genuine issues and their potential arrangements, and if it underpins social learning. Because of normal time requirements of participatory arranging forms, we center especially on data assets and introduction just as a help to empower discussions about manageability results among partners who may not be agreeable or acquainted with maintainability. In this manner, facilitators should be uniquely prepared to lead thoughts on maintainability bolstered by materials like visuals to help member understanding. An open interest process adjusted to members' manageability education may yield helpful discourse, look for a bargain, discover normal comprehension, and empower powerful maintainability arranged results to impact consequent strategy choices (Ndege and Brooks, 2013).

2.5 County Structures and Project Sustainability

As indicated by the Report of the Task Force on Devolved Government, TFDG (2011), the constitution is giving a significant change in perspective from an arrangement of extraordinary rejection and minimization to a framework that puts an accentuation on incorporation and investment of all parts of the general public in the undertakings and advantages of administration. Support improves straightforwardness of cooperation in the open space through such offices as notice board declarations of openings for work, enrollments data, social/participatory planning, opening the spending procedure to resident investment, acquisition straightforwardness and oversight advisory groups, month to month income and use Report, quarterly advancement status
reports, semiannual checking report arranged through the Sub-County Citizen Forums, County and Sub-County Assemblies, month to month open income and use discussions, and quarterly vis-à-vis question and answer sessions with the representative and congressperson of every County. The authoritative components of every one of these instruments and stages for resident support may shift from part to area and from County to County.

The County Government Act, 2013, gives further rules to the acknowledgment of the objective of the Constitution of guaranteeing the interest of the individuals in administration. As indicated by segment 87 of the Act, Citizen investment in provincial governments will be founded on the accompanying standards: a) Timely access to data, information, reports, and other data applicable or identified with strategic plan and usage; b) Reasonable access to the way toward defining and actualizing strategies, laws, and guidelines, including the endorsement of advancement recommendations, activities and spending plans, the giving of grants and the foundation of explicit execution models; c) Protection and advancement of the premium and privileges of minorities, underestimated gatherings and networks and their entrance to important data.

The Constitution of Kenya requests straightforwardness, responsibility, support, and comprehensiveness in administration. The County Government Act, Kenya (2013) and other devolution laws command region governments to draw in residents in arranging and arrangement causing forms, to encourage open correspondence and access to data, and to lead community training, among others. Article 196 of the Constitution further accommodates open investment in the procedures of the County Assembly (the Republic of Kenya, 2010). This improves dependable administration and responsibility to the individuals just as network-based checking and backing for straightforwardness and responsibility. Firmly identified with authority and respectability, are the national qualities and standards of administration that should control us as a nation and as people in soul and practice.

As indicated by ICJ (2013), in accordance with these standards, a few arrangements have been featured underneath as key to open investment at the province level. Right off the bat, the Constitution in Article 118 and 196 requires Parliament and district congregations separately to lead their business in an open way, and hold their sittings and those of their boards of trustees, out
in the open; and encourage open investment and inclusion in the authoritative and different business of the get-together and its councils, (the Republic of Kenya, 2010). All the more critically, the Constitution restricts the two Houses from barring people in general, or any media, from any sitting except if in uncommon conditions where the speaker has established that there are legitimate explanations behind doing as such. The County Government Act additionally accommodates resident investment in various zones. Under segment 15, it gives any individual capacity to request of the region gathering to think about any issue inside its power, including sanctioning, altering or revoking any of its enactment. Furthermore, under segment 27 of the Act, it engages the electorate in a district ward to review their individual from the province gets together before the finish of the term of the part. To wrap things up, the Act determines the structure that the area government should set up to encourage citizen participation.

2.6 Water projects in Kibwezi Sub-county

Many of the water projects initiated in most parts of Kenya are poorly managed and stall a few years after their implementation (Kavindu, 2018). This state of affairs may be attributed to various factors. One of the reasons why many water projects stall is the lack of community involvement in all phases of the project. Additionally, as noted by Kavindu (2018), some PMC members lack the expertise to manage the water projects competently. The case in Makueni is, however, different because the county government has put in place mechanisms of involving all the stakeholders at all phases of project management. The county has initiated a number of water projects as captured in the table below:
Table 2.0: Kibwezi West Sub-county Water Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALGON water project</td>
<td>Kikumbulyu North</td>
<td>Kyenini</td>
<td>Initial Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwa Makio Dam</td>
<td>Kikumbulyu North</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makindu Water Project</td>
<td>Makindu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Sand Dam</td>
<td>Emali</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA/WIBA</td>
<td>All ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisingo Borehole</td>
<td>Makindu</td>
<td>Kisingo Borehole</td>
<td>Distribution Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngomano Borehole</td>
<td>Makindu</td>
<td>Ngomano Borehole</td>
<td>Distribution Stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Theoretical Framework

The study relied on two theories of development, i.e. The Community Participation Theory developed by David Wilcox and Arnstein's Ladder of Participation. Community Participation Theory articulates that participation of the community in the development and sustainability of projects is better achieved through five stages: program evaluation, service giving, governing, planning, enabling, and authorizing. However, none of the stages should be left out.

The Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation describes public inclusion in decision-making or participation as the reallocation of functions and powers that empowers the poor. She refers to the poor as have-nots, who are deliberately left out from the development processes in their localities and consider their deliberate inclusion in the future.
2.7.1 The Community Participation Theory
The theory was proposed by Windle and Chibulka (1981) but developed by David Wilcox in 1991. The theory offers a dynamic paradigm shift in practical mobilization, an elaborate plan for engagement, cooperation, and authority. The most significant procedure in any advancement venture is the support of the participation of the community. Deprived of community participation it is beyond the realm of imagination to expect to figure out what are the issues, imperatives, and nearby wants for a given network. As indicated by Harvey and Reed (2007) cooperation of venture recipients is of extraordinary quintessence in that it upgrades the feeling of possession among individuals. This is significant in guaranteeing that undertakings are worked and kept up after the execution stage. Network Participation Theory accepts that when numerous members participate in decision-making and own the process, external organizations will have less impact on changing what has been agreed upon. The theory concentrates on the contribution of communities and not just the workforce from actualizing organizations. Community participation is achieved through community-oriented or joint association of task recipients and the implementing organizations (Khwaja, 2004).

This study benefited from the concepts of Community Participation Theory because most of the research questions touch on the key aspects of the theory. The theory informed the study on how project beneficiary involvement leads to the sustainability of programs.

2.7.2 Arnstein's Ladder of Participation Theory
Sherry Arnstein argues that citizen participation entails the reallocation of power among all the people from the top-most to lowest. This shift enables the poor who she refers to as have-nots, in most cases excluded from development initiatives, to be deliberately included in the simultaneous action plans. The action plans could be political, social, or economic in nature and should affect the citizens directly. In her Ladder of Citizen Participation (1969), she proposes and discusses eight levels of participation. According to the Ladder of Participation, Sherry shows that the level of participation ranges from High to Low. Basically, Ladder illustrates who has the power, where important decisions are made, and when the decisions are made. Her ladder clearly illustrates the so-called “power” and “powerlessness” of people. She gives eight stages each with its illustration on people’s engagement in decision-making. These include Manipulation, Therapy, and
Informing, Consultation, Placation, Partnership, Delegated power, and Citizens Control from the top to lowest.

The theory of Ladder of Participation is crucial to the current study because it was used to evaluate how empowering citizens through participatory development assists them to own the program translating to its sustainability. The program is not just imposed on them by the powerful institutions; the citizens play an active role in all its phases.

2.8 Conceptual Framework
In research, this section characterizes the researchers’ synthesis of the other studies/ writings done and how to use that to explain the study phenomenon. The conceptual framework directs or provides a road map of the actions to be undertaken in the course of the study. It is the understanding of how different variables in the study relate or interlink by the researcher. It prepares a platform for the presentation of research questions or objectives that drive the study. The conceptual framework allows the investigator to prepare a report based on the problem under study as asserted by McGaghie et al (2001). In this study, the researcher explored how public participation leads to project sustainability considering other underlying factors like mechanisms, processes, and structures of public participation with constant factors of Legal provisions for public participation in Kenya within the counties with a keen focus of Makueni County as illustrated below:
Figure 2.1 Conceptual Framework
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- ICT platforms.
- City hall meetings

Processes of PP
- Dialogue
- Structured decision making
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- Village Level

Dependent Variable
Projects Sustainability
- Long term services
- Projects Ownership
- Economic Empowerment
- Improved Standards

Conceptual framework presenting the link between variables. Source, Researcher 2019
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This section provides a description of how the research is undertaken to meet the study objectives. The chapter, therefore, presents the design of the research, study target population, Study sample size, and the procedure used for sampling, study instruments, data collection procedure, and data analysis techniques and presentation.

3.2 Research Design
The study adopted a descriptive survey research design that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data. It helps to describe and analyze phenomenon as they appear without bias. Besides, a descriptive survey makes institutionalized estimation increasingly exact by implementing uniform definitions upon the respondents. The design is appropriate for this particular study because the researcher aims at understanding the extent to which participatory development in water projects has been achieved in Kibwezi Sub-county.

3.3 Site of the Study
The research was conducted in Kibwezi West Sub-County in Makueni County. The study area has been purposively identified due to the establishment of a Makueni County public participation framework with clear structures and an implementation strategy. Makueni has been a county of interest for lesson learning by other counties from its development record in terms of viable projects, accountable records with clean financial records from the Office of the Auditor-General, and leadership with goodwill for public participation. The county is unique in the sense that, despite the fact that several counties have established public participation frameworks, the majority of the counties have not established and operationalized the required public participation policy implementation frameworks.
3.4 Target Population
The study population was residents of Kibwezi West Sub-County both Local and Non-locals who are registered as voters. The targeted population is 80,805 registered voters in Kibwezi West Constituency which is a Sub-County (IEBC, 2017). The study also targeted 20 county administration who lead the implementation and in participatory development in the delivery of water projects.

3.5 Sample size and the Sampling Process.
Sampling is the choice of some piece of totality based on which a judgment about the totality is made (Kothari, 2015). It is the way towards getting data about a whole populace by analyzing just a piece of it since it isn’t conceivable to acquire data from the entire universe to precisely achieve study goals. Simple random sampling was used for this study to select 384 community members. Every spectrum, therefore, constituted a stratum. Members within strata were picked randomly.

The sample size was obtained using the Fischer (1998) formula

\[ n = \frac{z^2pq}{d^2} \]

\( n = \) Desired sample size (population > 10,000).

\( z = \) Standard normal deviation at the required confidence level (set at 1.96).

\( p = \) the proportion in the target population (80,805) the p is 50%

\( q = 1 - p = 0.5 \)

\( d = \) level of statistical significance (usually 0.05)

\[ n = \frac{1.96^2 \times .05 \times 0.5}{0.05^2} \]

\( n= 384 \)

Therefore, a minimum of 384 community members.
Moreover, 6 county Administration leaders. i.e the Sub-County administrators, ward, and village administrators were purposively selected i.e. one from each ward. They are the ones concerned with participatory development in the delivery of water projects within the county.

Table 3.1 Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makindu</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikumbulyu North</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikumbulyu South</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguumo</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguu</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emali</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Research Instruments

To collect quantitative data, the research utilized questionnaires with both open-ended and close-ended questions. An in-depth interview was used to collect qualitative data from the County Leaders in the Ministry of Devolution.

3.7 Validity of research instruments

The validity of the exploration instrument alludes to how much an instrument allots what it sets to gauge (Kothari, 2004). The exploration instrument was exposed to both substance and develop validity. To discover the substance legitimacy, the inquiries in the survey were evaluated to see whether they accomplish the targets of the investigation or whether the respondents addressed the inquiries posed in the poll. Through build validity, the inquiries in the instruments were surveyed to show whether they are stated as far as clearness, vagueness, and in a way that guarantees
validity. In this study, a content validity test was used to determine if the instruments are valid. To achieve this, the researcher engaged the university supervisor and other experts to ensure that the questions reflect the objectives of the study. To guarantee to construct validity, the lucidity of the items and level of language were checked.

3.8 Reliability of research instruments
Reliability is the extent to which a measuring instrument is stable and consistent (Kothari, 2004). In order to ensure reliability, the researcher distributed questionnaires to the respondents who were not included in the final data collection. The tools were pretested to ensure reliability. Cronbach alpha determines the reliability based on internal consistency (Bonett & Wright, 2015). An internal consistency method was applied utilizing Cronbach’s Alpha to test the reliability of the instruments. The alpha value ranges from 0 to 1 with reliability expanding with the expansion in esteem. A coefficient extending above 0.7 is suggested and demonstrates that the exploration instrument is acceptable and reliable.

3.9 Data Analysis and Presentation
After the data collection, data was cleaned by checking for any missing or inaccurate data. Quantitative data were analyzed using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and findings were presented in tables and graphs. For qualitative data, several themes were discussed in detail and presented in a narrative form according to the objectives of the study. The recorded interviews were transcribed and translated into English. The researcher carried out multiple regression to find out the relationship between the variables. Linear regression analysis was utilized to estimate the coefficients to the linear equation and independent factors that were best foresee the value of the reliant variable. The regression equation is:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \epsilon \]

Where;

\( Y = \) Community participation

\( \beta_0 = \) intercept coefficient
\( X_1 \) – Mechanisms

\( X_2 \) – Processes employed

\( X_3 \) – County structure

\( \beta_1, \beta_2, \text{ and } \beta_3 = \) regression coefficients

\( \varepsilon_i \) – error term (extraneous variables)

### 3.10 Ethical Consideration

This study was guided by various ethical considerations. In informed consent, the researcher informed the respondent about the research aims, the area of study, the profession of the researcher, and any dangers that the study may carry.

The confidentiality of the respondent was upheld as they were not obligated to jot down their names. In case they choose to indicate their names, the researcher kept them safe and did not share them without the respondent’s consent. When managing the measurable application, the researcher maintained the most significant level of integrity and his own emotions and recognition did not any approach to interfere with the research procedure.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents, discusses and analyses the research findings. The data was collected using questionnaires and interview schedules. The data was collected from community members and county leaders within the target area of study. Both quantitative data and qualitative data was collected. Quantitative data was coded, computed, and analyzed descriptively using frequency tables, percentages, mean, standard deviation, graphs, and charts. Qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis and presented thematically in prose and verbatim form.

The results of the study are presented according to the study questions under the following subtitles:

i. Mechanisms of public participation in relation to sustainability of water projects

ii. Processes of public participation, and

iii. County structures and projects sustainability

4.2 Response Return Rate

The researcher targeted 384 respondents; however, 330 out of the 384 respondents targeted filled and returned questionnaires making a response rate of 85.9%. The response rate complies with Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) provided the following classification of response rate: over 85% as excellent, 70% - 85% as very good, 60% -70% as acceptable and below 50% as not acceptable.

Additionally, 1 Sub-County Administrator and 6 ward administration leaders who were purposively selected were interviewed. This presents a response rate of 100%. This response rate, therefore, was an excellent representation of the entire population.
4.3 Demographic Information of Respondents

The study sought to find out the demographic information of respondents with respect to their gender, age, and marital status, source of income, and level of education. The purpose of this information was to establish the general characteristics of the respondents.

4.3.1 Gender of Respondents

The study sought to determine the gender distribution of the respondents in order to establish if there is gender balance in public participation of project development in the County. Gender has a larger impact on planning and implementing project activities and responses are as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Respondents’ gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As portrayed in Table 4.2, 184 (55.8%) of the respondents were male and 146 (44.2%) were female. The result shows that men were more involved in public participation processes in project development and implementation in Makueni County. This describes the levels of gender involvement in decision making which portrays that men still form the largest percentage of decision-makers in any society. Despite the fact that there is gradual uptake of women’s inclusion in decision making, the study shows that there is still a need for more and balanced inclusion of all gender in decision making more so women since water is a basic domestic need for the family
especially women. Moreover, 7 county administration leaders were interviewed out of which 5 were males and 2 females. These research findings are similar to those by Papa (2016) who asserted that rural society is predominantly patriarchal in which female participation in development activities is traditionally looked down upon. It is also argued that socially accepted gender roles and the position of females in many African societies have a strong impact on the development of the projects in communities.

4.3.2 Age of Respondents

The study sought to determine the age distribution of the respondents since the age of the participants is an indispensable factor in the study since it determines one’s experience and way of reacting to situations. The findings were tabulated in Table 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 29 years</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39 years</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.2 shows that 35.8% of the respondents were aged between 20-29 years, 30.9% between the age of 30-39 years, 17.9% between the age of 40-49 years, and 9% were 50 and above years and only 6.4% were aged below 20 years. Hence, this explicitly implies that all the respondents based on the age distribution were in the position to the respondent to the
questions. This clearly indicates that participation in project development was largely represented by the youthful population. The findings affirm with findings of KNBS (2019) Kenya has a youthful rural population; the latest data from the census 2019 by the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) reveals. In this case, 35.7 million Kenyans (75.1%) are below 35 years, while 32.73 million (68.9%) live in rural areas.

**4.3.3 Education Level of Respondents**

Education has been regarded as a tool through which ignorance is removed from an individual to enable one to be economically productive. This implies then that education is very vital for personal development. Figure 4.1 shows the distribution of respondents by the level of education.

**Figure 4.1 Distribution of the respondent by education level**

![Pie chart showing the distribution of respondents by education level: 23.6% primary level, 29.6% secondary level, 46.8% tertiary level](source, Field data (2020))

According to Figure 4.1 on the distribution of respondents by the level of education, it was found that 23.6% of the respondents had primary level education, 46.8% secondary, and 29.6% tertiary level of education. Based on the findings all the respondents had the requisite knowledge to give
reasoned out responses to the study hence making the study findings dependable. The findings portray that the largest population in Kibwezi West Sub- County comprises of secondary school graduates who will determine the level of involvement in relation to the technical knowledge required to participate fully in decision-making forums. The results of this study, therefore, revealed that there is a need to engage high education level that strengthens the aptitude to make rational decisions, thereby accelerating growth and development (Jatto, 2012) especially of water projects within the target region

4.3.4 Source of income

The study sought to establish the distribution of respondents by the source of income. The findings are shown in Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock rearing</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from Table 4.3 showed that the majority of 32.4% of the respondents get their income from farming, 29.4% from livestock rearing, 17.6 from business, 13.3% from employment, and
only 7.3% from non-governmental organizations (NGOs). For the analysis, the study portrays that majority of the residents of Kibwezi west rely on farming despite the fact that the area is an arid and semi-arid region. From some discussions with the sub-county administrators, the study reveals green grams as the main crop is grown which is ideally categorized as a cash crop within the area. The level of income is a cross-cutting issue that in the long run determines the level of locals’ participation in decision making since it builds upon the capacity to facilitate their movement to facilitation forums and at the same time the priority needs that if implemented would boost their incomes. As a result, it can be said that the source income level affects participation. Consequently, the economic condition of people, in general, determines their active participation in projects run by County Government or any donor agencies.

4.4 Descriptive Statistics

4.4.1 Mechanisms of Public Participation and Project Sustainability

The first objective of the study was to establish the effects of mechanisms employed in public participation on project sustainability in Kibwezi West Sub-county. The study sought to determine the most practical mechanisms employed by the county government of Makueni to facilitate public participation forums on water projects towards their sustainability. Water has been a thorny issue in Makueni and any efforts geared towards sustaining the available water sources ought to be inclusive from planning to hand over. The findings are presented in Figure 4.2. Below:
The results shown in figure 4.2 revealed that majority of respondents 38.4% indicates that the residents have attended ward forums which indicate as the most attended public participation mechanism used to allow the community to air their views toward projects sustainability especially on water agenda, 32.3% noted sub-county forums while 29.3% noted village forums. The study also reveals that despite the various avenues provided in the constitution of Kenya as well as the Makueni County Public Participation Framework, the most suitable and practical for the target area are the different levels of sub-county, ward and village forums where community members present themselves and air their views in relation to implementation and sustainability of projects. Community participation in projects, therefore, demands reasonable practical participation by community members. Communities should participate in all stages of project development and levels within their reach, availability, and capacity to do so. By doing so, communities are free to engage in accessible avenues and available opportunities provided by the county government and
therefore long-lasting solutions are provided documented and agreed upon. To avoid continuous engagement through mobilizations and invites, it is therefore important to affirm these sub-county, ward, and village structures of participation, allocate enough resources, and create awareness about them to ensure the locals are conversant with them, and can freely participate and give their views. The ward forums have a majority of the attendance and the reason behind this was realized was to be as a result of the fact that most of these ward headquarters are with semi-urban centers with a larger population which becomes easy to mobilize the public to participate in the forums.

Moreover, the respondents were required to indicate how often they have been involved in the following public participation mechanisms that are provided by the county government of Makueni which include: Budget Making Forums, Legislation process by the county assembly, Vetting of Public officers, Formulation of County Policies, Planning of Community Priority Projects, Implementation, and Monitoring of development projects within the target area. The respondents were requested to rate the frequency using; Never- 1, rarely- 2, Sometimes- 3, frequently- 4, Always- 5. The means and standard deviations were developed. The findings were tabulated in Table 4.4 below:
Table 4.4 Effects of mechanisms of public participation on project sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget making process</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation process by county assembly</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetting of Public officers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of County Policies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning of Community Priority Projects</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of development projects</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of development projects</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N 330</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2020)

From finding in Table 4.4, the respondents were sometimes involved in the budget-making process with a mean of 1.34. This indicates that the residents within the target area have some knowledge of the budget-making process and are called upon to give their views and especially during the preparation of the County Budget Estimates. Respondents also noted that they are involved in the legislation process by county assembly with a mean of 1.96 and they are allowed to sit in the County Assembly chambers and listen to Assembly proceedings on issues that affect water provision in the region. Vetting of public officers took a mean of 1.51 whereby they agreed that the community members are allowed to vet the local officers before they are employed especially officers who come from the same locality. 142 participants acknowledged their involvement in the formulation of county policies especially at the approval and implementation stages. The largest sample population agreed that they are sometimes involved in planning, implementation, and
monitoring of county development projects as indicated by utilizing 1.88, 1.46, and 1.72 respectively. From the study, it is clear that the county has various mechanisms and employs them differently to ensure the public is involved in making critical decisions both at the assembly and at the executive level. The community members also understand these mechanisms but the levels of involvement and participation vary as shown in the study. The variance from our study was not of interest and this can be an opportunity for further study. This finding agreed with Gauld (2010) that various mechanisms for public participation were actualized during the detailing stage, including courses, workshops, working gatherings, work gatherings, present-day correspondence media, and meetings with key people, overviews, gatherings with establishments, and direct cooperation in pilot exhibition tasks and network exercises.

This was confirmed by county leaders that:

“The mechanisms used to enhance the sustainability of water projects in the county involve improving relationships and trust between decision-makers and the public, and among different stakeholders themselves. In Makueni County, there is a collaboration between stakeholders and community to manage difficult decisions, and resolve disputes towards sustainable development”

4.4.2 Processes of Public participation and Project Sustainability

The second objective of the study was to examine the effects of processes employed in public participation on the sustainability of water projects in Kibwezi West Sub-county. The respondents were asked whether they were aware of any public participation processes employed by the county government and share their levels of involved the findings were presented in Figure 4.3.
Figure 4.3 Awareness of any public participation processes within the sub-county.

Source, Field data (2020)

The majority of the respondents 55.7% revealed that they are not aware of any public participation processes while 44.3% are aware. This indicates that there is an effort by the County Government of Makueni in sharing information with the Public on public participation however there is still the need to bridge the knowledge gap where almost over 30% of the residents are not aware of the processes employed by the County Government. The findings collaborate with the findings of Levina (2005) inadequate community participation and tight project schedule timeframes without involving the community affected the quality of projects. In the same line of thought, communities should be fully empowered to understand the processes, timelines, and the required information for them to participate effectively when called upon.

Additionally, the respondents were requested to indicate the sources of water projects within the region. The findings were presented in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5 Sources of water projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project initiation</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County government</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>184</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings from Table 4.5 revealed that 77(41.8%) noted that the establishment of county governments has led to the initiation of various water projects which justifies devolution as an avenue to mainstream resources and power to the grassroots. Within the 10 years of devolution, the research shows that devolution can be the sure bet of developing marginalized and rural areas. 48(26.1%) of the sample population indicated that some of the water projects within the target area are initiated by the national government and this is mostly linked to the Constituency Development Fund(CDF) which is still an active function of the members of parliament. Being an arid and semi-arid area, 35(19.1%) noted that NGOs have had the interest to support the community especially on water projects and value addition of crops like green grams. Only 24(13.0%) agreed that the local community has taken some local initiatives to solve their problems like the repair of broken water projects and roads without the involvement of the local leaders. Communities have also supported the construction of local facilities like schools and hospitals. Structured and clear processes of public participation in any development set up to enhance the faster and smooth inclusion of the locals in decision making. Community Dialogues that are well planned understood and open are key to provide long term solutions for projects sustainability rather than having random community invites for random projects. Clear processes of community participation
control gaps of information flow between the development partners and the local communities as well.

The sustainability of community projects is also enhanced by both community involvement as well as community ownership. This finding is consistent with that of Gitari, Mbabazi, and Jaya (2016). Sustainability of community projects is also enhanced by both community involvement as well as community ownership. These are factors that have been found to boost community motivation which is deemed essential as it encourages the community to participate in project sustainability.

In addition, the respondents were to rate the parameters of the processes of public participation on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (undecided), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree). The means and standard deviations were developed. The results were presented in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6 Effects of processes of public participation in project sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>U</th>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th></th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The county provides adequate information for citizen participation in all</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county plans and processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public is consulted adequately to obtain feedback on their views in</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regards to projects planning and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public is involved throughout the budget-making process to ensure</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that public concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public is empowered to make final decision-making on issues</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerning the county government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2020)

Results from Table 4.6 shows that 55(16.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the county provides adequate information for citizen participation in all county plans and processes, 42(12.7%) agreed, 10(3.0%) were undecided, 90(27.3%) disagreed while 133(40.3%) strongly disagreed. Majority 133 (40.3%) of the respondents asserted that the County Government does not provide adequate information for citizen participation in all county plans and processes.

A sample of 41(12.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the public is consulted adequately to obtain feedback on their views in regards to projects planning and implementation, 56(17%) agreed, 21(6.4%) were undecided, 98(29.7%) disagreed while 114 (34.5%) strongly disagreed. An overwhelming 114 (34.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that County Government
consults and provide feedback on project planning and implementation. From the study therefore, majority of the respondents agreed that they are invited to participate in the public participation forums, but the county doesn’t provide adequate information for the planned discussions during the forums. One of the discussions portrayed that some local residents receive documents of discussions during the public participation forums whereby the documents are too detailed and most of the time written in English and this becomes a challenge for them to participate fully and give their views. It was also noted that 31(9.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the public is involved throughout the budget-making process to ensure that public concerns are collected and included in the budgetary processes, 24(7.3%) agreed, 19 (5.8%) were undecided, and 120(36.4%) of the respondents disagreed while 136(41.1%) strongly disagreed. Majority 136 (41.1%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that County Government involves the public in the budget-making process. Inside discussions, those who disagreed argued that their proposals most are rarely included in the final budgetary documents and this, therefore, invalidates their participation. Any public participation in project development requires good and effective communication of detailed information. The County should think about how to create sustainable and reliable communication with the stakeholders and durable locations/ avenues for maintaining and sharing information during county planning processes in order to capture and adopt community views to planning documents. This gives the community the confidence that their proposals based on their needs are actualized during the implementation stage. In the building community trust (Bos and Brown, 2015) reported a cultural change of behaviors usually bridged the gap in community participation. Majone (2005) reported that the existence of a political community was important in enhancing credibility in policy management.
Consequently, 25(7.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed that the public is empowered to make final decision-making on issues concerning the projects that the county government intends to implement, 20(6.1%) agreed, 18(5.5%) were neutral and 127(38.5%) disagreed while 140(42.4%) strongly disagreed. Most of the respondents, 140 (42.4%) strongly disagreed. These findings are similar to those by Kumar (2002) who reported that it is wise to begin consulting with the community right from the start. This helps to bring trust, understanding, and support for the group. If the project proceeds too far before the community is informed there may be problems with rumors and the spreading of misinformation. To build community support for any project there is a need to ensure that the community is well informed and ideally, part of the initial planning for the project. Inviting the public to express their views and concerns about the project can help to enhance community support and ultimately the success of the project. The community participation process must communicate to participants how their input affected the final decision by the government. Feedback is an essential exercise in this regard. With the county Government of Makueni having a well-structured system of public participation, it’s clear that there are teething problems of information sharing to the stakeholders and that the community is still not the final decision maker on their priority needs in line with county plans. The county therefore should create conducive and practical platforms that would enable communities to receive relevant and clear information and provide an opportunity to air their views and provide feedback. The community participation process provides participants with the information they need in order to participate in a meaningful approach. This was confirmed by one male county leader who had this to say:

“The participation process must be driven by a shared purpose, with the nature and scope of the participation task clearly defined. This includes ensuring that the process is transparent so that the public can see what is going on and how decisions are being made.”
On the other hand, one county leader reported that:

“Processes such as broad public participation in decision-making is a fundamental prerequisite for the achievement of sustainable development of projects and should not be gender bias. Adequate representation of implicated interests and openness to public scrutiny: Participation must be sufficiently broad to reflect a cross-section of concerned perspectives on the particular issue; and the results of the process should be open to inspection by all interested parties”.

4.4.3 County Structures and Project Sustainability

The third objective of the study was to explore the effects of county structures in public participation on project sustainability in Kibwezi West Sub-County. The respondents were requested to indicate whether they understand public participation structures in the County. The findings were presented in Figure 4.4.

**Figure 4.4 Public participation structures in the County**

![Figure 4.4 Public participation structures in the County](image)

**Source, Field data (2020)**

According to the findings from figure 4.4, 61.7% of the respondents did not understand the structures of the county used to facilitate public participation across the county while 38.3% are conversant with the structures the county government has established. Despite the fact that the county has a well-structured framework that is well established and even documented, the locals
within the target region indicated they were unaware of what happens at whatever level. Understanding county structures enhance community participation in the sense that people can take part at whatever level and understand the flow of information from the lowest level to the highest. Community participation allows for the tapping of under-used human resources and gets many people to understand and cooperate with measures called for in the planners’ strategy for development.

Moreover, the respondents were requested to indicate the level in which they have participated. The findings were tabulated in Table 4.7.

**Table 4.7 Level of participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village level</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward level</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-country level</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the participants 54(42.9%) had participated inward level, 41(31.5%) village level, 27(21.4%) sub-county level, and 4(3.2%) county level. A high level of community participation was seen as a key strategy for achieving this target. The research points out the strongest participation of the community to give their inputs on community projects is documented at the ward level followed by the village level. The level of participation can be affected by political, social, or economic directly or indirectly. One county leader reported that:

“Community participation in any development project encourages a sense of responsibility, ensures things are done the right way, and utilization of knowledge and skills which enhance decision making and thus effective project sustainability.”
It is however realized that community participation in water programs is usually being limited to the mobilization of self-help labor or the organization of local groups to ratify decisions made by project planners within the community. The findings concur with finding by WHO (2010) community participation is not mere involvement of members of the beneficiary community in development, but also empowering people and helping them make decisions on desired developmental outcomes.

Additionally, the respondents were to rate the parameters of county structures on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (undecided), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree). The means and standard deviations were developed. Findings are illustrated in Table 4.8.

### Table 4.8 Effects of county structures on project sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makueni County Public participation structures are clear and well understood by the citizens.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structures are inclusive and gender sensitive</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County structures have clear roles in relation to the public participation of the locals.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County structures have enough resources to carry out effective public participation at all levels.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2020)
As presented in Table 4.8, 64 (19.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Makueni County public participation structures are clear and well understood by the citizens, 47 (14.2%) agreed, 9 (2.7%) were undecided, 92 (27.9%) disagreed and 118 (35.6%) strongly disagreed. County public participation structures are not articulated well as per by 118 (35.6%) responses. Ideally, no effective participation process can be designed without first learning about and developing some level of relationship with the stakeholders that will be engaged. As a rule of thumb, it is a good idea to try to meet the participation needs and desires of key stakeholders.

In addition, the majority of 113 (34.2%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that county government structures are inclusive and no gender biases during public participation. There are different levels of public participation in project sustainability such as village level, ward level, sub-country level, and county level to enhance project outcomes through information, consultation, involvement, and collaboration. The County Government of Makueni scores positively on the second level of participation in terms of project sustainability.

Moreover, 52 (15.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed that county structures have clear roles in relation public participation of the locals, 44 (13.3%) agreed, 13 (3.9%) were undecided, 110 (33.3%) disagreed while 136 (41.2%) strongly disagreed. Findings indicate that 136 (41.2%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that the county government has clear roles in regards to public participation of the community members.

Concerning resources, 60 (18.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed that county structures have enough resources to carry out effective public participation at all levels, 31 (9.4%) agreed, 11 (3.3%) were undecided and 117 (35.5%) disagreed while 110 (33.3%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. The majority, 110 (33.3%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that
there are adequate resources to fully enhance public participation towards project sustainability within the county. From the study, community members disagreed that there enough resources to facilitate public participation since the majority expect to be facilitated to participate in the forums adequately with transport, meals, and the documents required which rarely happens. The County Government Act provides for the allocation of 2% of the total County Annual Budgets to facilitate Public Participation. From the County Government perspective, the budget is not enough to facilitate all public participation forums that require community views. From the county leaders, there is the continued emphasis that participation should be free and voluntary by the community members since the development projects are bound to benefit them but the uptake of these views is very slow and gradual. The complaints from the community members are that they expect to be paid to take part in the participation forums. The findings collaborate with findings from a study by Kinyondi (2008) community participation utilizes individuals in the community for decision making. This employs the skills and talents of citizens to meet the collective goals of community participation. In every project, there is a need to identify the target and facilitate their participation. This was confirmed by interviewed county leaders who reported that:

“Knowing the community, who are to be the beneficiaries of any development initiative, is critical to building support. Successful community-building efforts are more likely to occur when the process includes taking careful steps to measure and analyses the needs and problems of the community (systematic gathering of information and analysis of community issues).

4.5 Inferential Statistics

The researcher conducted multiple regression analyses to examine the relationship between community participation and sustainability of water projects in Makueni County, Kenya. In this case, mechanisms, processes, and county structures were regressed on the sustainability of water
projects. The findings of Model Summary, ANOVA, and Regression Coefficients are as shown in subsequent sections.

4.5.1 Model Summary

The findings of the coefficient of correlation and coefficient of determinations were identified by the researcher. The findings are indicated in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9 Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Mechanism, Processes and County Structures of Public participation
b. Dependent Variable: Sustainability of water projects

Table 4.9 shows that the coefficient of correlation was 0.753 an indication that the study variables significantly influenced the sustainability of water projects. The coefficient of adjusted determination was 0.722 which translates to 72.2%. This indicates that variations in the dependents variable were explained by the independent variables (Mechanism, Processes, and Country Structures). The residual of 27.8% could be explained by other factors beyond the scope of the current study.

4.5.2 ANOVA

An ANOVA was carried out at a 5% level of the significance level. A comparison between $F_{Calculated}$ and $F_{Critical}$ was carried out. The findings are indicated in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.001^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>75.65</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1.954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77.97</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. Predictors:** (Constant), Public Participation Mechanisms, Processes, and County Structures

**b. Dependent Variable:** Sustainability of water projects

Source: Field Data (2020)

Table 4.10 shows that that $F_{\text{Calculated}}$ was 4.46 and $F_{\text{Critical}}$ was 2.14. $4.43>2.14$ indication that the overall regression model significantly influenced the study. The P-value was $0.001<0.05$ and an indication that the study variables significantly influenced the role of public participation in the sustainability of water projects.

4.5.3 Regression Coefficients

To investigate the effects of community participation on the sustainability of water projects in Kibwezi West Sub-county, Makueni County, Kenya, and the following coefficient were generated and presented in Table 4.11

Table 4.11 Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient*</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.0161</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>2.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>2.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Structures</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>1.302</td>
<td>2.852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data (2020)
As per the SPSS generated table, the equation \( Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon \) becomes:

\[
Y = 0.535 + 0.653X_1 + 0.689X_2 + 0.560X_3
\]

Where \( Y \) = Sustainability of water projects

\( X_1 \) = Mechanisms of Public participation

\( X_2 \) = Processes of Public participation

\( X_3 \) = County Structures of Public Participation

The findings from Table 4.11 indicate that mechanisms of public participation had a positive significant coefficient \((\beta=0.653, P\text{-value} = 0.001)\) which contributes positively to the sustainability of water projects. Processes of public participation had a positive significant coefficient \((\beta=0.575, P\text{-value} = 0.003)\) which contributes positively to the sustainability of water projects. County structures had a positive significant coefficient \((\beta=0.560, P\text{-value} = 0.003)\) which means that county Structures contribute positively to the sustainability of water projects. Community participation should start right from the inception of the projects ideas to facilitate the sustainability of projects. Community participation is important in project management life cycle phases (Westland 2007) initiation, planning, implementation to have sustainable projects. The participation of the community increases project effectiveness because of the objectives which are met and the benefits to society. It also helps in building beneficiary capacity through active participation and training during project planning and implementation.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents summarized findings, conclusion and recommendations of the research findings based on the objectives of the study.

5.2 Summary of Study Findings

From objective one on the effectiveness of the mechanisms employed in public participation towards project sustainability in Kibwezi West Sub-county, the study established that mechanisms of public participation positively influence project sustainability. The findings show that community members were sometimes involved in the budget-making process with a mean of 1.34. Respondents also noted that they were involved in the legislation process by the county assembly, vetting of public officers, formulation of county policies, planning of community priority projects, implementation of development projects and monitoring of development projects as indicated using 1.96, 1.51, 1.86, 1.88, 1.46 and 1.72 respectively. Communities should participate in all stages of the project development, by doing so, long-lasting solutions are found that fit their requirement including resources. Mechanisms for public participation were actualized during the detailing stage, including public participation forums at the village, ward, and Sub-county Levels.

The second object was to determine the effects of processes employed in public participation on project sustainability in Kibwezi West Sub-county. The findings revealed that the majority of the respondents 55.7% are not aware of any public participation processes while 44.3% are aware. Community participation processes should be clear, well understood, and clear structures to sustain and enhance the quality of projects. In addition, the majority 133 (40.3%) of the respondents
asserted that the County Government does not provide adequate information for citizen participation on all county plans and processes. An overwhelming 114 (34.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that County Government consults and provide feedback on project planning and implementation. Additionally, the majority of 136 (41.1%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that County Government involves the public in the budget-making process. Any public participation in project development requires good and effective communication of detailed information. Inadequate community participation and tight project schedule timeframes without involving the community affected the quality of projects.

The third objective of the study was to examine the effects of established county structures to facilitate public participation towards sustainability of water projects in Kibwezi West Sub-county. However, the findings reveal that 61.7% of the respondents did not understand the public participation structures of the county while 38.3% knew how participation structures are organized with their clear roles. Understanding county structures on public participation, therefore, becomes key in enhancing community participation. Moreover, County public participation structures are clear from the framework but may not be understood by citizens as per by 118 (35.6 %) responses. Majority 113 (34.2%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that county government structures are inclusive and no gender biases during project sustainability. Findings indicate that 136 (41.2%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that the county government has clear roles in regards to public participation of the community members. The county Public participation framework provides clear structures with clear roles but the response from the community members can be related to lack of information on the structures and the roles of each. The research findings also revealed that the majority of 110 (33.3%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that there are adequate resources
to fully enhance project sustainability within the county. Fortunately, this is a scenario that both the community members and the county leaders agree that resources for public participation are inadequate to facilitate effective public participation.

5.3 Conclusion

Community participation in projects is a key instrument in creating self-reliant and empowered communities, with stimulating and clear mechanisms, processes, and structures for collective action and decision-making. The study established that the County Government of Makueni used forums such as village forums, ward forums, and sub-county forums but community members were not proactively engaged with the county public participation platforms such as budget-making process, legislation process by the county assembly, vetting of public officers, and formulation of county policies among others. The study also established that community members are partially aware of the processes used by the county government to facilitate public participation processes. It is also clear from the study that there is no adequate information for citizen participation in all county plans and processes, inadequate feedback on views regarding project planning and implementation, and limited participation in final decision-making on issues concerning the county government. Moreover, the study established from the community perspective that county structures are not clear and did not have clear roles in relation to public participation of the locals unlike from the perspective of the County Leaders where they understand the roles from the Makueni County Public Participation Framework. In conclusion, we can say that the county has a good framework for public participation but still struggling in its implementation. There is limited decentralization from the county level to the lower units.
5.4 Recommendations

From the study, I recommend that;

i. The county government of Makueni should put more emphasis on the village and ward forums for public participation since they are more accessible by the locals. Since the constitution proposes various mechanisms for public participation, the county should ensure all are well understood and that community members can actively take part in any of those.

ii. The county should also ensure adequate, timely, and clear information which the locals can understand the mechanisms and processes of Public Participation is shared with the locals for them to participate actively and voluntarily. Timely feedback should also be given to the locals concerning their proposals to avoid suspicion and complaints.

iii. The County Government should also ensure that their County Public participation structures are well understood by the locals at all levels.

5.5 Suggestions for further Study

The study suggests that a similar study should be done in other rural areas in different counties especially counties yet to develop Public Participation Frameworks for comparison purposes and to allow for generalization of findings.

A different study can also be carried out in any County in Kenya to establish the facts that hinder citizen participation on projects sustainability.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire for Community Members

Hello! Am Juliana Ndunge Kiio, a student undertaking a Master's Degree in Public Policy and Administration at Kenyatta University. Am carrying out research on, ‘Roles of community participation on the sustainability of community water projects within Makueni County, Kibwezi West Sub-county.’ The research is part of my study requirements. I kindly request you to spare your little time and help me collect the relevant information by filling the questionnaire.

Part A. Respondent Background Information

Instructions: Tick where necessary

Name…………………………… (Optional)Sub………………………… County……………
Ward…………… Village…………

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

2. Age:  a) Less than 20 [ ] b) 20-29 [ ] c) 30-39 [ ] d) 40-49[ ] e) over 50 [ ]

3. Marital status:
   a) Single [ ] b) Married [ ] c) Separated [ ]
   d) Divorced [ ] e) Widow/widower [ ]

4. Source of income?
   a) Farming [ ] b) Livestock rearing [ ] c) Employment [ ]
   d) NGO’s or CBO’S [ ] e) Business [ ]
   f) Others specify…………………………………………………………

5. Level of education?
   a) Primary [ ] b) Secondary [ ]
   c) College/University [ ] d) Never went to school [ ]
Part C: Mechanisms of Public Participation

6. What mechanisms of community engagement does the County use to get the community needs/problems in your area? (Tick more than one)
   a) Village forums [ ]
   b) Ward Forums [ ]
   c) Sub-Count Forums [ ]
   d) Radio Discussions [ ]

7. Which mechanism have you ever participated in?
   a) Village forums [ ]
   b) Ward Forums [ ]
   c) Sub-County Forums [ ]
   d) Radio Discussions [ ]

8. How often have you been involved by the county executive or county assembly in the following participation mechanisms in your area? The respondents are given choices to tick; Never- 1, Rarely- 2, Sometimes- 3, Frequently- 4 or Always- 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget making process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation process by the county assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetting of Public officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of County Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning of Community Priority Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of development projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of development projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What methods are used to conduct forums?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
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10. State mechanism that you feel is sustainable for your area?

______________________________________________________________________________

Part B. Processes of Public participation

11. i) Are you aware of any public participation processes employed by the County in your area?

   a) Yes [   ] b) No [   ]

ii) If yes who initiated it? (Tick more than one)

   a) National Government [   ]  b) County Government [   ]
   c) Self-help groups [   ]  d) Community [   ]  e) NGOs [   ]

12. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the public participation process facilitated by the county government on the sustainability of projects in the county? The respondents are given choices to tick; strongly disagree- 1, disagree- 2, undecided- 3, agree- 4 or strongly agree-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The county provides adequate information for citizen participation in all county plans and processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public is consulted adequately to obtain feedback on their views in regards to projects planning and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public is involved throughout the budget-making process to ensure that public concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public is empowered to make final decision-making on issues concerning the county government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you understand why you are called for public participation processes?

   a) Yes [   ] b) No [   ]
14. Are you presented with the right information on why, when, and how you should participate?
   a) Yes [   ] b) No [   ]

**Part E: Structures for Public Participation within the County.**

15. Do you understand the Public participation structures in the County?
   a) Yes [   ] b) No [   ]

16. At what level have you participated so far?
   a) Village Level [   ] b) Ward Level [   ]
   c) Sub-County Level [   ] d) County Level [   ]
   e) Diaspora Meetings [   ]

17. Where do most of the forums take place from your experience in participation within the County?
   a) Village Level [   ] b) Ward Level [   ]
   c) Sub-County Level [   ] d) County Level [   ]
   e) Diaspora Meetings [   ]

18. Do you think the structures are well utilized and organized at your level?
   a) Yes [   ] b) No [   ]

19. Do you think the structure requires any or more resources if any for its implementation at your level?
   a) Yes [   ] b) No [   ]
20. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on county structures for public participation on the sustainability of projects in the county? The respondents were given choices to tick; strongly disagree- 1, disagree- 2, undecided- 3, agree- 4 or strongly agree- 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makueni County Public participation structures are clear and well understood by the citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The structures are inclusive and gender-sensitive?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County structures have clear roles in relation to the public participation of the locals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County structures have enough resources to carry out effective public participation at all levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How would you rate Makueni County Public participation structures in terms of the implementation of effective PP?

   a) Very Good [ ]
   b) Good [ ]
   c) Don’t know [ ]
   d) Bad [ ]
   e) Very bad [ ]

22. In your own opinion, what would you suggest to be done differently in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the participation structures in the County?

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

Thank you.

1) Bio data information
   • Name
   • Designation
   • Educational Qualification

2) What mechanisms are used during the public participation process in Makueni County?

3) What are the processes used by the county for public participation to enhance the sustainability of public projects?

4) What is the structure of the county for effective public participation processes in the sustainability of public projects?

5) What are the challenges facing the public participation process in the sustainability of public projects?

6) What measures put in place to enhance the effective public participation process?
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