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DEFINITION OF OPERATIONAL TERMS

Community development: can be described as both a process embarked on, and an outcome, of many and various processes and strategies that are purposefully initiated - and sometimes occur more naturally or spontaneously- towards enhancing the experience of people living in communities.

Community participation: covers a spectrum of activities involving people in their communities, from more passive involvement in community life to intensive action oriented participation in community development (including political initiatives and strategies).

Community empowerment: is the state of affairs that exists when members of a community feel empowered to achieve their self-determined goals, with some measure of significant control over the processes and strategies to attain these.
The study was designed to find out the factors that affect the implementation of community development programs in Burundi. The study conducted a case study of African Revival Ministries (ARM) an Non-Governmental Organization which conducts various community development programs in Burundi. The study was guided by research questions which formed the basis of literature review that the study concentrated on. The literature review focused on the factors that the research considered to affect the implementation of development programs. The study reviewed the concept of community development, the role of community participation in implementation of community programs, the effect of Government legislation and policies, the effects of donor support and funding on the implementation, the effects of staff capacity and training as well as the effects of community attitude on the implementation of the these community development programs. The study adopted a conceptual framework. On research design, the study followed a descriptive design which obtained information concerning the current status of the phenomena with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. The target population of the study was 90, the employees of African Revival Ministries (ARM) stratified according to the levels in the NGO and community leaders. The study sampled 50% of the population using stratified sampling giving all the employees an equal chance of being a member of the sample. Data was collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data was collected using questionnaires with mostly closed ended questions which enabled the researcher to probe the factors that affect the implementation of the programs. Data collection was conducted only after permissions and authority from relevant authorities had been given while the collected data was analysed using descriptive statistics. The analysis was done using Microsoft Excel. The analysed data was presented using pie charts, percentages, frequency tables and bar graphs. The study identified that the factors studied indeed affected the implementation of community projects. Government policies and regulations, community culture and attitude, donor support and funding and staff training and capacity improvement played a critical role in the implementation of community projects by ARM.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Community development is the process of the community coming together around its shared goals. It involves community members developing a sense of common vision. It is an inclusive process which reaches out to all segments of the community to ensure everyone participates in identifying their needs, making decisions and taking action. Community development is based on wide-spread participation, self-reliance, broad-based leadership, sustainable development with long-term perspective preferably 25 years and above, as well as innovative partnerships between government, business and community groups, community planning and cultural, economic, social and environmental goals.

Healthy communities have community spirit, adequate and affordable social services, a safe environment and opportunities for people to earn a fair living. Governments can no longer provide all of these conditions. More and more communities will rely on leaders who can work with other citizens to meet the needs identified by their communities. Effective community leaders will have the Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes outlined in the personal and organization development sections as well as a solid understanding and appreciation of the community development process.

The relationship between culture and economic development is extremely complex. Notice however, that this assumes, to start with, collective agreement upon the meanings of the terms (culture and development) is possible. Or indeed, that when agreement is achieved, the terms are not so general that they become tautological or lose all applicability. Working definitions will be provided below but the fact is that the concepts of culture and development are both opaque, making them impervious to meaningful discourse.

Eagleton (2000) reminds us that "culture" has been used differently in various historical and structural circumstances. The term stood for civility in rural labour, "civilisation" in the 18th century, and as a proxy variable for criticising industrial
capitalism in the 19th century. Today, the trouble with usage of the term is that it has come to mean, on the one hand, something disabingly local and overspecialised—basically nothing more than the affirmation of a specific identity—and, on the other, everything from a habit of mind, the arts, political institutions, to a whole way of life.

In the 1990s, the social policy agenda in much of countries, whether coming from governments, international agencies or the NGO sector, began to emphasize self-sustaining local community development and local employment as a mean to combat poverty and low levels of education and health. The aim of these policies is to mobilize the capacities or assets of even the poorest people as a necessary development complement to external resources. In contrast to the traditional emphasis on social policies designed and implemented from above by government, the new policies are based on partnerships between the different levels of government, private enterprises, NGOs and local communities in setting and implementing policy priorities.

This change of emphasis has given rise to a large number of innovations in areas such as employment creation, health, education, participatory budgeting and micro-credit, based on mobilizing the human and social capital of poor communities for their own development. These innovations often seek to increase the participation of previously excluded groups, such as women or indigenous populations. The new policies are important because they represent a radically different relationship between funding agencies and their clients and between governments and communities.

These situations give a different meaning to the idea of marginality and social exclusion than in the past. People may be "excluded" from good jobs or incomes, from education and from adequate housing or infrastructure. However, even in the poorest and remote communities, people will be in contact with agents of government or NGOs seeking to promote their development. The presence of these external actors is now part of the context of local development and understanding their actions and orientation is a necessary part of any analysis of factors influencing the implementation of community development programs.
As development programs of communities are spreading, implementation practice has shifted from a focus on the organization to a focus on the community. Before that, many programs were conceived and implemented within the organization. All strategies recommended for effective implementation included effective management, supervision, skills, and incentives were focused on the individuals and the organization involved in the implementation. The move to programs in community, rather than organizations, necessitated a change in implementation strategies that acknowledged the unique challenges of a community setting (Goodman, 2000).

Community development programs are more complex than programs implemented within the organizational settings because they work across multiple ecological levels and seek broad change in a large number of people. The social change becomes the main objective (Goodman, et al., 1996). Although the external environment has to be considered in programs implemented within organization, its impact is not as significant as in communities programs. These programs implemented in community settings are unable to function in a closed fashion as the environmental external to the organization is the actual setting for the organization.

Acknowledgement of the challenges and complexities of community settings has been an important development in the design and implementation of community program, as it is vital to the program's success that there is a comprehensive understanding of the community in which the program is to be implemented (Edwards et al., 2000). The result in this change in focus, from the implementing organization to the community, has been a loss of interest in the implementing organization to the community. Effective implementation of a community development program would not be possible without a functioning, implementing organization. The establishment and maintenance of an organization capable of effective implementation is as important to the implementation as the content of the program itself (Scheir, 1996).
Chen (1998) provided a conceptual model for factors that influence implementation. These factors include characteristics of (a) the implementation system (including the process and structure of the implementation), (b) characteristics of the implementer (for example the organization staff) and (c) characteristics of the setting in which the program is implemented (community). The importance of the people implementing a community program and the organizational climate in which they work has been widely recognized (Butterfoss et al., 1996). On this study, a particular attention will be directed to staff working directly on the community level.

Assessing implementation is a complicated process because the “gaps” between plans and delivery may be positive or negative (Scheirer, 1994). This issue is particularly relevant when considering the content of specific programs. It is likely that successful implementation requires more than just faithfully replicating program components. Elias (1997) and others (Eveland et al., 1997); (Meyer and Herman, 1993) noted that interventions are often adjusted to meet the needs and capacity of local communities, or to allow consumers to gain ownership of programs. There has been some argument on the literature regarding the degree to which this type of “reinvention” reduces or improves program effectiveness. This debate between fidelity and adaptation is critical to consider (Dane and Schneider, 1998). The decision about maintaining program integrity or allowing some measure of adaptability is particularly relevant to programs implemented in community settings, as there is high variability amongst community contexts (Serrano-Garcia, 1990). Communities differ in the resources they have available, their attitudes to perceived problems, and political climate. In addition to this, communities are fluid and can change during the implementation process (Edwards et al., 2000).

1.1.1 African Revival Ministries

In October 1993 Burundi plunged into serious ethnic conflict immediately after a military coup and the death of the first elected President, Melchior Ndadaye. In July 1996, Pierre Buyoya, who had been President before the 1993 elections, regained political power in Burundi’s third (his second) military coup. Neighbouring countries imposed total trade sanctions which were eased slightly in September 1996 to allow
some humanitarian aid, medical supplies and fuel for humanitarian agencies through. Sanctions were lifted early in 1999. However, the effects of the sanctions have been disastrous on all the socio-economic aspects of the country. The embargo has significantly worsened the situation and added to the humanitarian crisis which was already unfolding due to the fighting. As a result of the sanctions and the fighting, thousands of Burundians have been living in displacement camps or refugee camps where they have been looked after by the government and by some NGOs.

During the fighting, much of the destruction has been targeted on social infrastructure such as schools, hospitals, water sources, roads and bridges. In many areas this infrastructure is barely operating and the embargo has prevented the Government from undertaking essential rebuilding and reparation work. All of the people in the country have therefore suffered in one way or another due to impassable roads, collapsed bridges, closed or insufficiently stocked schools and hospitals, lack of food or shelter among others.

There also arose a serious erosion of societal values where prostitution has increased because, for many women, it has been the only possible source of income and therefore a matter of survival. This is particularly worrying due to the high incidence of HIV/AIDS. The poverty has also added to corruption within the government services due to the increased cost of living and the high levels of unemployment. On the issue of the national economy, it almost collapsed. The currency depreciated dramatically and many companies have closed down.

It is in this critical time of political, social and economic crises of Burundi that African Revival Ministries begun its activities.

African Revival Ministries (ARM) is an NGO which was founded in 1994 and operates in the Great Lakes Region (Burundi, Rwanda and Congo) and Senegal. The motto of the organisation is: "to demonstrate the love of God through practical means to achieve tangible results". The organisation particularly targets the poor and most marginalised sections of the society with the aim of achieving lasting and sustainable
development of the people by improving their basic living standards, through delivering health and education services as well as income opportunities.

In countries where ARM exists, the organisation in those countries is run by a national Director. Generally speaking, the activities (or projects) in each country are conceived and managed by their respective national offices in that particular country.

The ARM-Burundi was approved and registered by the Burundi government in 1996 though its activities began much earlier. ARM-Burundi is an active partner of the Government of Burundi with whom it co-operates widely in social welfare, medical issues and reconstruction programs and supports through humanitarian assistance and socio-economic development. It is particularly active in the provinces of Bujumbura, Gitega and Ngozi.

The ARM-Burundi is a major player in the area of health. The organisation possesses medical facilities officially authorised by the Ministry of Health (MOH). The medical care provision of ARM is based at its two clinics: Jabe Clinic and Rohero Clinic both of which are in Bujumbura and a health centre in Gitega. In order to increase the access to quality primary education and to improve the ability of vulnerable groups to undertake activities that meet their basic needs, ARM has established two schools in Bujumbura, one using a Burundian curriculum (600 children in nursery and primary level) and another using the British curriculum (350 children in nursery, primary and secondary level). The results and benefits from those schools include the provision of affordable and quality education for children in the community as a mean to reduce poverty alleviation.

The NGO is also actively involved in other various community development programs like rehabilitation and reconstruction programs in the country, development of minority groups like the pygmies. Compassion and care is extended to the people living with HIV/AIDS and orphans.
As other Non-Governmental Organizations, African Revival Ministries functions as an intermediary organization to mobilize resources and facilitate the development of communities. As an implementation agency, it has a collaborative relationship with the local people, but also a collaborative relationship with the government and other organizations involved in development work in the same region or sector.

1.2. Problem statement

Rickwood (2004) stated that implementing community projects requires an attitude shift for many a participant in order to support clientele’s rights and provide the types of services that maximize well-being for people within the targeted communities. She also argues that an understanding of the factors that affect the implementation, and success or otherwise thereof is crucial. Attitudes are thought to reflect the "mental readiness" or learned "disposition" that influence actions and reactions (Milne and Haddow, 1995).

There is big number of theoretical publications discussing effective implementation of community development programs. However, there are few publications regarding implementations practices and few successful programs have been replicated. So, the next challenge facing researcher is to help the consumers put “proven programs” into place effectively, so that they reproduce the effective outcomes shown when they were first developed and evaluated (Domitrovich and Greenberg, 2000). There has been a call for future research to focus on identification of the specific factors that affect implementation of these community development programs thereby maximizing the impact and uptake of future programs (Durlak and Ferrari, 1998; Lochman, 2001).

The objective of this research was to find out the factors influencing the implementation of community development programs with a particular attention to the people directly involved in the implementation processes in Burundi but specific focus on the projects implemented by African Revival Ministries (ARM).
1.3 Objectives of the study

1.3.1 Broad Objective
The general objective of the study was to investigate factors influencing implementation of community development projects in Burundi.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives
The study, however, sought specifically to:

1. Find out how community involvement and participation influenced implementation of community development programmes in Burundi.
2. Establish the extent to which funds and donor support influenced implementation of Community Development programmes in Burundi.
3. Examine the effects of Government policies and legislation in implementation of Community Development programmes in Burundi.
4. Determine if community culture and attitude influenced the implementation of Community Development programmes in Burundi.
5. Find out the effects of staff training and capacity improvement on the implementation of Community Development programmes in Burundi.

1.4 Research Questions
The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. How does community involvement and participation influence the implementation of community development programmes in Burundi?
2. To what extent do the funds and donor support influence implementation of Community Development programmes in Burundi?
3. What are the effects of Government policies and legislation in the implementation of Community Development programmes in Burundi?
4. Does the community culture and attitude influence the implementation of Community Development programmes in Burundi?
5. What are the effects of staff training and capacity improvement on the implementation of Community Development programmes in Burundi?
1.5 **Significance of the Study**

Community development is an important strategy to alleviate poverty in developing countries. To achieve that, it is imperative to success in the implementation of planned programs. It is hoped that this study will be employed by planners of community development programs, but also be a tool to practically guide implementers on the ground-level.

It is envisaged that the findings of the study will also assist other researchers in identifying research gaps for further study, generate debates and stimulate more research in the area of community development program management.

1.6 **Scope of the Study**

The research was based at African Revival Ministries (ARM) based in Bujumbura Burundi.

1.7 **Limitations of the Study**

The study was carried out with a view of overcoming all possible limitations that may be there. They included the limited available time to carry out an exhaustive research. However, to overcome this, the researcher intended to carry out the research within the Ministries so that all the employees were covered and a sample taken to cover for all them in the Ministry.

The other limitation of finances was also be dealt with by raking a representative sample so that the costs and expenditure involved could be minimized. Questionnaires, as the collection instruments were designed in such away that the respondents were able to understand all the questions which ensured that the limitation of non response was addressed. The questionnaire used open ended and closed ended questions and was as probing as possible to collect the information relevant to the study.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
The chapter presents a review of the literature related to the objective of the study. The chapter is organized according to the specific objectives in order to ensure relevance to the research problem. The review was undertaken in order to eliminate duplication of what has been done and provide a clear understanding of existing knowledge base in the problem area. The literature review is based on authoritative, recent, and original sources such as journals, books, thesis and dissertations. At the end of the chapter, the study provides a conceptual framework that the study will adopt.

2.2 Review of Past Studies

2.2.1 Community Development
The term “community” can have several meanings. Community can be defined geographically by political or resource boundaries or socially as a community of individuals with common interests. For example, the geographically community is usually a village political unit (the lowest governmental administrative unit); a social community may be a group of fishers using the same gear type or a fisher organization. A community is not necessary a village and a village is not necessarily a community. Care should also taken not to assume that a community is a homogeneous unit, as there will often be different interest in a community, based on gender, class, ethnic, and economic variations (NRC 1999). Given different definitions of community, it is possible that individuals will belong to more than one community that fulfils their many psychosocial needs (Fisher and Sonn, 1999). Community development is employed by Combat Poverty as “... a process whereby those who are marginalised and excluded are enabled to gain in self confidence, to join with others and to participate in actions to change their situation and tackle the problems that face their community” (Combat Poverty, 2000). Lee argues that this definition ‘is rooted in a broad understanding of citizenship that sees people as having
a right to influence and participate in the decisions that affect them and to have their experiences and views listened to and acted on. Community development is potentially a means or process whereby people can achieve this right’ (Lee, 2003).

The term community development is used in so many circumstances and for so many processes that it is important to maintain a relatively clear definition. In general definitions refer to participation in decision making and collective action, leading to an agenda of social change regarding equality, social inclusion and amelioration of poverty. There is also a ‘spirit’ of community development, with a focus on the process as much as the outcome, on rebalancing power inequalities and on action learning; it is a discourse of social action informed by communitarian values that aims to promote social inclusion and democratic participation. (Powell and Geoghegan, 2005)

The Budapest Declaration (2004): “Community development is a way of strengthening civil society by prioritising the actions of communities, and their perspectives in the development of social, economic and environmental policy. It seeks the empowerment of local communities, taken to mean both geographical communities, communities of interest or identity and communities organising around specific themes or policy initiatives. It strengthens the capacity of people as active citizens through their community groups, organisations and networks; and the capacity of institutions and agencies (public, private and non-governmental) to work in dialogue with citizens to shape and determine change in their communities. It plays a crucial role in supporting active democratic life by promoting the autonomous voice of disadvantaged and vulnerable communities.”

ADM (recently renamed Pobal) presents a useful description of the community development approach to addressing social inclusion by contrasting it to a direct intervention approach:
Social capital, social cohesion and PSOC (psychological sense of community) are important aspects of community development (Veno and Thomas, 1996). Social cohesion relates to the connectedness of groups within society and has been found to be a predictor of health outcomes (Nelson and Prilleltensky, 2005). Social capital is a subset of social cohesion and refers to the social structures that provide individuals with resources and assist in the production of collective action (Kawachi and Berkman, 2000). PSOC is a term originally coined by Sarason (1974) referring to a concept similar to social capital only at a local neighborhood or community level rather than a state or national level (Nelson and Prilleltensky, 2005). It describes the relationship between individuals and the social structures with which they interact (Chavis and Wandersman, 1990). PSOC works as a mechanism to stimulate community development as community members feel that they have more control over their environments when they have a strong PSOC (Charis and Wandersman, 1990). Community development works towards building social capital through the strengthening of relationships and networks both internal and external to the community (Kilpatrick et al., 2002).
Community development programs most commonly refer to community in terms of its geographical location (Chaskin and Chipenda-Dansokho, 1997), though, as noted above, this does not exclude relational communities within the geographical community (Fisher and Sonn, 1999).

Community development is undertaken with communities of place, identity and common interest. This includes communities based on faith, those with a shared culture or heritage, users of public and other services, those with common interests arising from their work, and people working together to promote the rights and responsibilities. Community development takes place in a context of social, demographic, technological, economic, environmental, political and other change. These changes have global, national, regional and local dimensions. Communities initiate changes and through networking have wider influence. There are also changes which are not initiated by communities that present both threats and opportunities. The community development process works with communities to analyze, initiate and influence social change (SCCD, 2001).

If community development is to fulfill its potential it is important that its role in achieving equal opportunities, accessibility, participation in democratic processes and sustainable economic, social and environmental change is recognized. Theses themes are important across government and within the private sectors. A community development approach starts with people in communities coming together to address these themes. It supports the connection that exist between them and the fact that individuals, groups and organizations need to learn from each other and co-operate if consistent and sustainable change is to be achieved. Community development spans the traditional boundaries of organization in a way which is flexible and responsive to the priorities and concerns of communities. (SCCD, 2001)

2.2.2 Community Participation and Community Development

The strategy for poverty alleviation has over the years changed focus from “trickle-down” approach to the empowerment paradigm. Whereas the “trickle-down” approach was based on the assumption that the poor would benefit largely from the
mere phenomenon of economic growth, the “empowerment” paradigm envisages moving away from an exclusive focus on economic growth implicitly to quality of growth and attention in particular to those at the lowest rung of the ladder. In this context, it is now recognized that the poor in society can best be helped by getting them increasingly involved in designing and implementing development activities. Of course, growth is recognized as the critically “necessary” condition for poverty reduction but not a “sufficient” condition. The new paradigm seeks to put the poor at the centre of the stage.

With growing awareness of the limitations of traditional “top down” approaches for poverty reduction, interest has increasingly shifted to the potentially powerful role of the participation of communities in the planning and management of public sector service delivery at the local level (Chebil and Haque, pg 117-118)

Secondly, wider participation is not just an important ‘process’ variable. It should also lead to better outcomes, since more focused or local understanding is brought into the system and decisions are thus better informed about the specific conditions and needs of a community. Fung and Wright set out several reasons why participatory structures should lead to more effective outcomes. They convene and empower individuals close to points of action who possess knowledge about relevant situations while citizens or street level bureaucrats may also know how to best improve the situation. They also create the possibility of generating better solutions over more hierarchical and less reflective aggregation procedures and create heightened commitment because they are not imposed from above as well as shortening the feedback loop between decision, action, effect, observation and reconsideration and because there are multiple command points it allows discovery and diffusion and the learning capacity of the system as a whole can be enhanced (Fung and Wright, 2001)

Communities cannot do everything in community development. A community development approach does mean that government and organization in the private and NGOs will act on the basis of the values and commitments of community development, support action by community groups and organizations, community
businesses and neighbourhood councils, and will have clear processes which enable communities to influence their policies, programs and priorities. The NGO will also recognize the right of communities to propose alternative courses of action, value different types and levels of participation, build local, regional and national strategy through dialogue with people and organization active in communities as well as recognizing the function of community development and allocate resources to it in their strategies. They will also recognize the resources, information and support required by community representatives and organizations when working in partnerships and change working practices and time scales to enable participation by communities (SCCD, 2001).

The development NGO functions as an intermediary organization to mobilize resources and facilitate the development of individuals, groups, organizations and communities in underdeveloped areas of the world. It has two types of relationships: collaborative relationships with the local people and indigenous organization; collaborative relationships with other organization involved in development work in the same region and sector (Joan Dixon, MOB, EdD: Role of NGO in development)
2.2.3 Funds and Donor Support and Community Development

A number of authors have written about factors that enhance the effectiveness of community development programs. It is important for programs to have a framework which provides the means to consider the program's potential to achieve its aims, while offering guidelines to enable program providers to reflect upon their practice (Prilleltensky and Nelson, 2000).

In Africa, a big part of funds which support community programs comes from outside donors, principally Europe and America. Some funds pass through north NGOs and figures which show exactly how much these organizations transfer to the South are not precise. This difficulty is largely because there exists no up-to-date inventory of these agencies. Further, the amount they transfer to the South is not at all static as it is often increasing.
John Clark states that in 1989 Northern NGOs transferred $6.4 billion to the South is accounting for about 12 percent of the entire Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC), aid inclusive of both public and private (Clark, 1991, 47). On the other hand, it is indicated in the report by an independent group of NGOs, The reality of Aid that Northern NGOs in 1991 transferred $5.2 billion and accounts for 13 percent of official Western aid which stand at $60 billion (ActionAid/ICVA/EUROSTEP, 1994, 2, 21). Similarly, the Human Development Report puts the figure at $7.2 billion as the amount transferred to the South in 1991. Further, ActionAid's report already referred to above states that other estimates put the figure on the amount currently transferred by Northern NGOs at between $9 and $10 billion. Ben Whitaker (1983) argues that the budgets of NGOs individually or collectively may seem small given the scale of world poverty, but the impact of the ideas of such organisations is what matters. Whitaker maintains that NGOs play a vital role in pioneering innovative methods that larger official agencies quickly copy. Not only that, NGOs gives quick and flexible assistance to many communities, which they would not have hoped to get anywhere.

As NGOs increase in size and number as a result of availability of official funds, they tend to move towards bureaucratic characteristics in their management procedure like official structures. Another problem that arises from greater NGO reliance on official funds is the tying of aid to projects. The project mode of funding is bemoaned on grounds that it inhibits participation, an essential tenet for the realization of sustainable development. It is argued that the project mode of intervention treats participation by beneficiaries as a mere cost-reduction input (Fowler, 1992, op.cit., 17). Since there is a propensity for NGOs to satisfy donor requirements, there is a danger that NGOs will take a 'top-down' approach to development projects thereby denying the beneficiaries effective participation. To secure funds, some NGOs put more importance to accountability to their main donors than to the beneficiaries. Another big problem is usually that aid is tied with government foreign policy and economic interest (Heidjen, op.cit,106) and relief or humanitarian aids are more given that development funds. This often leaves communities in dependency state and their participation in the planning and delivery of the programs is very limited.
2.2.4 Government policies and regulations and Community Development

Project implementation in communities is determined by government policies, relationship between government, NGO sector and the communities. 'Development' is a dynamic process, whereas 'structure' is a stable frame of rules and regulations. The government has a governing responsibility to ensure that there is the required delivery of services within legislative and policy frameworks. It therefore accepts primary responsibility for the development of policies and legislation to facilitate and direct the design and implementation of service programs.

Where the government has a positive social agenda (or even where individual ministries do) and where NGOs are effective there is the potential for a strong, collaborative relationship. As Tandon (1991) clarifies, this does not mean the subcontracting of placid NGOs, but a "genuine partnership between NGOs and the government to work on a problem facing the country or a region... based on mutual respect, acceptance of autonomy, independence, and pluralism of NGO opinions and positions."

At times, governments can inadvertently discourage communities from fully participating in projects. Such hurdles, for instance, include legal requirement for registration (often involving cumbersome procedures) for communities to organize and obtain legal status through registration. Development schemes conceived by the central government often contain detailed conditionalities based on the implicit assumption that communities lack capacity and therefore cannot be trusted to use funds wisely. Hence, they must be constantly guided to do the right thing. In the same vein, central governments’ interventions at times inadvertently delay pace of implementation by introducing rigid constraints such as limiting the cost of projects’ subcomponents. Another obstacle for community’s empowerment comprises a rigid condition for communities to contribute money rather than in kind to project investments. This approach poses a risk that project benefits will be oriented toward the higher strata of the community or priorities that will be established would not reflect the needs of the poorest segments. Difficulties of managing in-kind contributions, given the modalities of public bidding, incline project managers of
Community development projects to avoid such contributions, thus depriving many communities of the project’s development benefits (Chebil and Haque, 1998 – 2001).

In a study done by World Bank by Chebil and Inaamul Haque (1998-2001), only 35% of the World bank community driven development programs were rated as likely to provide sustainable benefit streams (in comparison to 67% for all bank projects). They propose as one way to address this issue was through cost-sharing or matching grants. This cost sharing system is essential to promote local ownership. The same study proposed a concerted effort by the World Bank and the development Agencies to disseminate best community development practices, including through translation of key documents on specific successful experiences to several languages to enable communities to learn from and capitalize on this knowledge (Chebil and Haque, 1998-2001). Program implementation and evaluation as well as community ownership are considered to be critical components of a program’s potential for sustainability and dissemination (Akerlund, 2000; Bridger and Lullof, 2001; Cameron et al., 2001).

2.2.5 Culture and Attitude and Community Development programs

Community development programs face particular difficulties when it comes to planning, implementation, evaluation and sustainability. Communities vary in their history, culture, attitudes to particular problems, available resources and political climate (Caplan, 1964; Edwards et al., 2000).

What do we mean by “culture”? When we talk about “culture” we often mean intellectual and creative products, including literature, music, drama, and painting. Another use of “culture” is to describe the beliefs and practices of another society, particularly where these are seen as closely linked with tradition or religion. But culture is more than that. Culture is part of the fabric of every society, including our own. It shapes “the way things are done” and our understanding of why this should be so. This more comprehensive approach is proposed in the definition of culture adopted at the World Conference on Cultural Policies (Mexico, 1982) and used in
ongoing discussions on culture and development: “Culture... is... the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or a social group. It includes not only arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs.”

Program implementation cannot occur unless the culture and attitude of community are receptive to new programs and innovations. There may be differing community philosophies regarding the need for the program and mission of the organization; however, these differences can be overcome when members of the community agree on the need for change and relevance of the intervention and are involved in the planning (Durlak and DuPre, 2008; Fagan and Mihalic, 2003; Gager and Elias, 1997; Gendreau et al., 1999)

Community programs are also financially expensive and time consuming to implement (Chaskin and Chipenda-Dansokho, 1997). In addition to this, disputes often arise between groups and individuals from the community that need to be managed (Messinger, 2004).

Weissberg (1990) noted that a combination of factors interact to influence both the outcomes that a program produces as well as the program’s future viability. These include the content and structure of an intervention, the manner in which it is implemented, relationships between program implementers and participants, and a variety of system-level variable. Thus, to adequately assess implementation, information is needed about the specific program components, how they were delivered, and the characteristics of the context (individual setting) in which the program was conducted (Dane and Schneider, 1998; Pents et al., 1990).

The community development principles view partnerships with stakeholders as an essential factor in the development of community (Nelson et al., 2000). Partnerships with other community organizations assist in the development of a shared vision for the community (Evashwick and Ory, 2003). The creation of partnerships not only increases the community’s sense of ownership of the program, but also its commitment and contributes to the subsequent sustainability of the program (Nelson
et al., 2000). It has been recommended that the development of partnerships should commence during the planning stage as it can be very time consuming (Barton et al. 1997). As noted above, staff are key to the development of these relationships (Schorr, 1997). It should also be considered that stakeholders in the community have something to offer implementers. They have knowledge, expertise, and experience of the community in which they live (Bridger and Luloff, 2001). Kramer, Laumann and Brunson (2000) found that community social service agencies provided valuable support for program implementers. Seeing their suggestions used gave stakeholders a sense of ownership over the intervention, ensuring participation and sustainability. It has been recommended that community interventions begin with programs that show tangible results in the short-term. This gives staff the opportunity to assess the appropriateness of individual programs while at the same time allowing partnerships to be developed with services in the community. It has the further advantage of creating a sense of good-will for the intervention within the community (Kubisch et al., 2002).

2.2.6 Staff Training and Capacity Improvement and Community Development

The program staff are the people putting the planning into practice. Clearly this makes them very important to the implementation and the success of the program (Morrissey et al., 1997; Stith et al., 2006). The natural abilities and personalities of staff members are vital to the creation of partnerships with key stakeholders and encouraging community participation. The importance of the relationships between the project workers and intervention recipients was identified by Schorr (1997). Though this aspect of program implementation was rarely explicitly stated as a pre-requisite to a program’s success, program managers identified it as a crucial factor.

An adequate number of staff is also critical to the effectiveness of the program. Community programs are often implemented by a small number of staff and volunteers, placing unnecessary time burdens on those implementing the program and making them susceptible to burn-out (Chaskin and Chipenda-Dansokho, 1997). Staff turnover complicates interventions as new staff have not received the appropriate
training and must renew relationships created by others (Lynch et al., 1998; Stith et al., 2006). This is a particular problem for rural programs where there is a limited pool of possible staff (Messinger, 2004).

The skills and abilities of employees can inhibit or enhance effective implementation in community programs. It has been recommended that staff be competent and sensitive and that staff-turnover be minimized (Nation et al., 2003). A number of important factors, for the maintenance of effective and stable staff, have been promoted in the literature. The significance of appropriate training was prominent in much of the literature. Training provides implementers with the opportunity to practice implementation methods and have their questions answered (Nation et al., 2003). Stith et al. (2006) stated that standardized instruction can improve program fidelity as practitioners are taught to implement the program in adherence with its design.

Staff needs to have ongoing support and supervision during the implementation process (Nation et al., 2003). Lochman (2001) noted that program staff may not be able to manage implementation problems that arise without ongoing guidance and consultation. St Pierre and Kaltreider (2001) found that lack of support led to resentment and negative attitudes from the staff, which at times resulted in the undermining of the program. Gager and Elias (1997) found that an organizational context that left implementers feeling isolated and unsupported had adverse effects on the program. Schorr (1997) noted the importance of program managers who are competent and committed, have good managerial skills and the ability to inspire their staff. A good manager will create an organizational environment that is supportive, respectful, and inspiring.

The organization also has a role in creating the appropriate climate for staff and managers. (Butterfoss et al., 1996) found a number of organizational factors that impacted on the effectiveness of community coalitions. These included effective leadership and greater influence in decision making. An environment that promoted
cohesion, allowed independence, and was ordered and organized also enhanced program effectiveness.

The implementation group is fluid, people move in and out of it, opinions and skills change as the people do (Baum, 2001). The human element of an intervention should not be underestimated, yet it is often overlooked. Community members are limited in the time that they have available to contribute to these projects and often find it necessary to distribute their available time amongst many different community endeavours. Further, many challenges of program implementation are related to the lack of predictability and malleability of people and environments (Meyer et. al. (1993).

The implementation of community programs requires human interaction. Implementers interact with each other, with the community, with evaluators and with program developers. The multiple human interactions required for the implementation of a community intervention could potentially result in group processes that might be a barrier to program implementation (Meyer et. al., 1993). He noted that animosity frequently occurs between external program developers and/or evaluators and internal program implementers. This animosity flows in both directions and although it may fluctuate in its level of intensity it invariably becomes a barrier to successful program implementation. The importance of the relationship between implementers within the program and between implementers and community groups is not acknowledged in the literature examining community development programs. However these interventions and relationships have not been neglected in the domain of organizational psychology which commonly uses systems theory to understand the inner workings of the organization and its interactions with its environment. The examination of community development would also benefit from the use of systems theory to more effectively understand these relationships.

2.3 Critical Review

Community development programs can be conceptualized with reference to three main stages: (1) planning or development; (2) implementation and (3) evaluation. Each stage has its own factors and processes that will influence the program's
effectiveness (Diebold et al., 2000). Steiner define planning "as a process which begin with the formulation of objectives and the definition of strategies, politics and detailed plans to achieve them, it takes also a new cycle of elaboration of objectives and definition of strategies used in relation of realised performance".

For Givery and Guinier, planning allows a logical way of process, control and follow up and also a just and rapid reaction when crises appear. A strategic plan will provide a program with the roadmap it needs to pursue a specific strategic direction and set of performance objectives. However, this is just a plan; it does not guarantee that the desired performance objectives will be reached any more than having a roadmap guarantees the traveller will arrive at the desired destination; but a program has little hope of success without good planning (Diebold et al., 2000). In the planning process, consideration needs to be given to the method by which the program intends to build community and increase social capital (Barton et al., 1997).

Domitrovich and Greenberg (2000) describe “the internal dynamics and operations of an intervention program” as a current gap in the research literature. These dynamics include the interactions between the program users and providers as well as the problems faced by implementers and how they resolve them. Increased understanding of these processes would further our understanding of program strengths and weaknesses. As noted earlier, the staff implementing the intervention is vital to its success. A great deal of effort has gone into understanding the communities in which programs are implemented. However, very little consideration has been given to the people implementing the intervention, and the social systems, of the community, the organization and the intervention itself, within which they operate.

Assessing implementation is a complicated process because the “gaps” between plans and delivery may be positive or negative (Scheirer, 1994). It is likely that successful implementation requires more than just faithfully replicating program components. Elias (1997) and others (Eveland et al., 1997; Meyer et al., 1993; Rogers, 1978) noted that programs are often adjusted to meet the needs and capacity of local communities, or to allow consumers to gain ownership of programs. There has been some argument
in the literature regarding the degree to which this type of “reinvention” reduces or improves program effectiveness. Some researchers are concerned that efficacy is compromised if programs are adapted to specific features of adapting sites. This debate between fidelity and adaptation is critical to consider (Dane and Schneider, 1998). Others argued that implementation quality may be compromised if service providers are not able to modify programs to meet their needs.

2.4 Summary of Research gap

The literature review indicates that the key variables that are important to implementation of community development programs include issues of community participation, funds and donors support, government policies and regulations, community culture and attitude, staff training and capacity improvement among others. However, the lack of discussion in the published literature regarding implementation practices has made it difficult for communities to adopt and replicate effective programs (Domitrovich and Greenberg, 2000). There has been a call for future research to focus on identification of the specific factors that promote effective implementation thereby maximizing impact and update of future programs (Durlak and Ferrari, 1998; Lochman, 2001).

This study therefore sought to gain more understandings of the factors involved in the implementation of community development programs with particular attention on those involved in the implementation process. Another goal was to develop a framework of best practice based on literature and experience of those implementing a community program and assess its applicability.

2.5 Conceptual Framework

Based on literature review on various studies, this study adopted a conceptual framework to examine the factors affecting the implementation of community development programs in Burundi. The study utilized both independent variables (community participation, funds and donors support, government policies and regulations, community culture and attitude, staff training and capacity development) and dependent variable (Effective implementation of community development programs).
It is important that the program’s core elements, long and short term goals, and the theoretical underpinnings should be clearly articulated, so that all involved in the program implementation have a full understanding of the mechanism by which the program works.

The program must also have adequate resources. These include time, money, availability of staff and space. Another important issue to achieve an effective implementation of a community development program is the adherence of the community to the project.

Figure 2: Conceptual Framework

Independent variables

Source: Researcher (2011)
This chapter presents the research methodology that was used. It covers the research design, target population, sample design, data collection analysis methods that was employed once the data had been collected.

3.1 Research Design

Descriptive research was used to carry out the research. Descriptive research was used to obtain information concerning the current status of the phenomena with respect to variables or conditions in a situation. The method ranged from the survey which describes the status quo, the correlation study which investigates the relationship between variables to developmental studies which seek to determine changes over time. The respondents were expected to describe factors that affect the implementation of community programs in Burundi. The method was crucial for this study because the issue at hand required to be described and the phenomenon analyzed for conclusions. The design was appropriate because according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), descriptive research design enables subjects to give more information on the issue of interest to the researcher.

3.2 Target Population

Population has been defined by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) as an entire group of individuals, events or objects having observable characteristics. In this research, the target population was 90 composed of the different management levels of the Non-Governmental Organization (Africa Revival Ministries) and the community leaders that are involved in the development and implementation of programs in Burundi. The population was stratified into four strata as tabulated below:
Table 2: Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level/Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Management</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leaders</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HR Office Data (2011)

3.3 Sample Design

A good and representative sample must be at least 10% of the entire population (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). From the target population of the employees of the NGO, a sample size of ration 50% was taken to obtain a sample of 45 respondents. Stratified random sampling was done where the employees were put into their category of management after which simple random sampling in each stratum was then applied to obtain the respondents. This sampling method was appropriate as each element of the target population was accorded an equal chance of being a respondent.

Table 3: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level/Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sample Ration</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Management</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Leaders</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HR Office Data (2011)

3.4 Data Collection tools and instruments

The researcher used both primary and secondary sources to collect data for this study. The primary data was sought due to its nearness to truth and ease for control over errors (Mutai, 2000). The questionnaires were done in such that it was probing in nature. In this case, the researcher administered questionnaires, with mainly closed
ended questions to the sampled respondents, and then collected them after one week for the respondents to have sufficient time to duly fill up the questionnaire. The researcher also enhanced confidentiality and assured the respondents as well that the information that they filled and returned was not used for any other purpose other than that which was intended which is academic. Secondary data was sourced from existing materials such as, financial reports, journals, other empirical researches in the area and any other relevant document that relates to the factors affecting the implementation of community development projects in Burundi.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

An introductory letter was written to Management of the NGO seeking permission to conduct the research. The letter contained the objectives of the study. Once permission was granted, a work plan based on the most convenient time for data collection was agreed upon. The questionnaire was first and foremost piloted before the actual data collection to ensure that the questions achieved the anticipated response from the respondents and where modification was necessary; the same was done before the actual data collection. The researcher used drop and pick method so that the personal touch, essential for maximum response rate, was enhanced. It also allowed for any clarifications needed to be made. Follow ups were done by use of emails and personal phone calls to the respondents to ensure the highest response rate possible. The questionnaires were collected after a week of distribution given that the majority of the respondents were within reach for the researcher.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedures

The collected data was thoroughly examined and checked for completeness and comprehensibility. The data was then coded, summarized and tabulated. Descriptive statistics were used to identify and establish patterns, trends and relationships, and to make it easier to understand and interpret implications of the study. Measures of central tendency (mean, mode and median) were used to establish any similarities in the data, while measures of dispersion (standard deviation and variance) were also used to establish any variations deviations from the data. Pie charts and bar graphs as well as percentages were also used to represent data which can be easily understood.
by other users. Microsoft excel was used to aid in the analysis to obtain correlations among the variables under consideration.
4.1 Introduction

The chapter presents a summary of the data collected and analyzed from the respondents. Tables, graphs and charts, including brief explanations are used to present the results of the findings. The details are under quantitative results.

4.2 Data Analysis

4.2.1 Response Rate

It was established from the respondents that most of the respondents gave their feedback. Forty five questionnaires were dropped but only thirty-eight questionnaires were filled and returned. Therefore, the response rate constituted about 84%.

4.2.2 General Information on the Samples

Implementation of community projects is a challenging field and it was important to study how the country (Burundi) has considered general information such as: gender, age and marital status in implementing its projects so as to ensure all sectors are represented in implementation process and it was looked at in this research.

On the marital status, 28 respondents indicated that they were married while the remaining 10 respondents said that they were single. This represents 73.7% and 23.6% respectively. This is indicative of the fact that the majority of them were elderly people who could manage projects, responsible and could be depended upon to implement projects at the community levels.
From the chart below, one of the respondents was below 25 years, eleven were between 26 to 35 years, eleven were between 36 to 45 years, fourteen were between 46 to 55 and one respondent were above 56 years. This represents about 2.7%, 28.9%, 28.9% 36.8% and 2.7% for the above age brackets respectively. This could imply that the older 55 years and above and the young generation below 25 years are less involved in the community project implementations.
On gender distribution, from the chart below 17 respondents were male and 21 were female. This represents 44.7% and 55.3% respectively. This implies that gender is equally distributed in the implementation of community projects.

**Figure 5: Gender Distribution**

![Gender Distribution Chart]

Source: Research Data (2012)

4.2.3 Length of Experience

From the graph below 17 respondents had less than five years of experience, 12 respondents had between 6 and 10 years of experience, 7 respondents had between 11 and 15 years and 2 respondents had above 16 years of experience. This represents 44.7%, 31.6%, 18.4% and 5.3% respectively. The high percentage of respondents with less than 5 yrs of experience and low percentage of respondents with more than 16 yrs of experience may mean people with inadequate experience or high turn over rate.
4.2.4 Academic Qualifications

From the graph below one respondent had literacy program qualification, eleven respondents had primary qualification, four respondents had secondary education qualification, twelve respondents had form six qualifications, nine had bachelors degree qualification and one of them said that his qualification was others, other than the ones listed. However, he did not indicate categorically or did not specify the exact qualification. This represented: 2.7%, 28.9%, 10.5%, 31.6%, 23.7% and 2.7% respectively. This could imply that the ARM did not involve people with higher level of education as that is only 2.7% involved.
4.2.5 Designation at African Revival Ministries

From the table below five of the respondents were in the designation of top management, nine of the respondents were in the middle management, nine were in the lower management and fifteen respondents were the community leaders. This represents 13.2%, 23.7%, 23.7% and 39.4% respectively.

Table 4: Category of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Top Management</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Community Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2012)

4.2.6 Implementation of the Community Projects

From the table below, in top management those who encountered challenges were; 2 had less than 5 years in the field, 1 had between 6 and 10 years and 1 had more than 16 years in the field whereas one with experience of between 6 and 10 years did not encountered any challenges in the implementation of the community project, two of
them said the project had high level of success whereas for the other three it had a middle level of success. This could imply that for top management the project was successful though it was challenging.

For middle management those who had encountered challenges were; 2 respondents had less than 5 years of experience, 2 respondents had between 6 and 10 years of experience, 1 had an experience of between 11 and 15 years and another 1 had more than 16 years of experience. Those who did not encountered challenges were; 1 less than 5 years of experience and other 2 with experience between 6 and 10 years, six of them said the project had middle level of success whereas 3 of them said it had low level of success .this makes the success of the project questionable.

For lower management those who encountered challenges were; 2 with experience of between 6 and 10 years and 2 others of experience between 11 and 15 years. Those who did not encounter any challenges were; 2 of experience of less than 5 years, 2 with between 6 and 10 years of experience and 1 with between 11 and 15 years of experience. Of them 1 said the project was highly successful, 7 said it was middle successful and one did not know and this calls for further studies to check if the project was really successful.

For community leaders those who had challenges were; 7 with less than 5 years experience, 1 with between 6 and 10 years of experience and 2 with between 11 and 15 years experience. Those who did not experience challenges were; 3 with less than 5 years experience and 2 with experience of between 6 and 10 years.7 said the project was highly successful, 5 said it was in the middle level of success, 2 sais it had a low level of success and 1 did not know. Two (2) who said low level of success and 1 who did not know calls for a further study on this area of research.

4.2.7 Community involvement and participation

From the table below, in top management those who think that the community is highly involved were 3; 2 of them had less than 5 years and 1 had between 11 and 15 years in the field. One thinks that the involvement was middle and he has between 6 and 10 years in the field. The last one thinks that the community involvement is low and has more than 16 years in the field. In the top management, 1 is dissatisfied by the level of participation of the population, 2 are satisfied and 2 are highly satisfied.
For middle management, 6 think that the level of involvement is middle, while 2 don’t know. Among them, 1 is highly dissatisfied, 1 is dissatisfied, 1 doesn’t know and 5 are satisfied.

For lower management, 3 think that the degree of involvement of the population is high, 8 think that it is middle and 3 think that it is low. Among them, 1 is highly dissatisfied, 2 are dissatisfied, 2 don’t know, 6 are satisfied and 4 are highly satisfied. In general, the respondents see the degree of involvement and participation of the community as high at 19, (4%), middle at 63.8%, low at 11.1% and 5.5% don’t know. 25% of them are highly satisfied, 52% are satisfied, 11, representing 1% are dissatisfied, 5, also representing 5% are highly dissatisfied and another 5 (5%) don’t know.

### 4.2.8 Funds and Donors support

The respondents were also asked on whether funding and donor support had an effect on the implementation of community programs in ARM. Majority of them (38%) strongly agreed that the funding and donor support affected the implementation while another 21% agreed that there was an effect. Only 11% of them said that they did not know if there was an effect yet the remaining 32% disagreed that there was any effect. No respondent mentioned that they were strongly disagreeing with that fact that donor support and funding had an effect on the implementation of community programmes by ARM.

**Figure 8: Donor Support and Implementation**
4.2.9 Government policies and legislation

The study also wanted to find out the effect that Government policies and legislation had on the implementation of programmes at ARM. Majority of the respondents (32%) strongly agreed that there was an effect while another 31% agreed that the government legislation and policies affected the implementation of community development programmes by ARM. Another 21% of the respondents disagreed while another 11% responded that they strongly disagreed but only 5% of them said that they did not the effect.

Source: Research Data (2012)
4.2.10 Community culture and attitude

On the effect of the community culture and attitude on the implementation of community development programmes by ARM, the respondents were asked on various aspects of the culture and attitude. On community lifestyle and the effect it had on the implementation of community programmes, all the respondents responded on average that they did not know the effect with a mean of 3 while the standard deviation was 2.70 meaning that the deviation from the mean was also 3 which is relatively minimal and can be concluded that the respondents were somewhat in agreement in their responses. On the effect of community beliefs and norms, 16 respondents said that they strongly agreed that it had an impact while another 7 said that they agreed that the community beliefs and norms had an impact on the implementation of community programmes by ARM. Eight (8) of the respondents however disagreed that it had an impact while only 2 of them said that they strongly disagreed. The mean however was 3.7 which translate to an agreement among all the respondents. The standard deviation was a bit high at 5.22 which implied that the respondents were diverse to a scale of 5 on their responses.
When the respondents were asked about the effect that climatic and geographical conditions of the communities had on the implementation of programmes, 11 respondents strongly agreed that there was an effect while only 4 agreed. Twelve (12) disagreed while another 6 strongly disagreed. The mean response of 3.05 implies that the responses on average did not know whether there was an effect of climatic and geographical conditions of the communities on implementation of programmes. The standard deviation of 3.64 is indicative that the respondents were not that different in their responses as regards the effect of climatic and geographical conditions of the communities on programmes implementation. On the effect of culture towards visitors, projects and generally exposure to new things on the implementation of programmes, the respondents on average agreed (3.5) that indeed there was an effect. However on individual responses, 9 of them strongly agreed, 12 agreed while 6 did not know whether there was an effect or not while the remaining 11 disagreed on the statement. The standard deviation of 4.82 is indicative of the fact that the respondents were not much diverse in their thoughts and responses.

Table 5: Community Attitude and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Lifestyle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7018512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community beliefs and norms</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>5.2249402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The climatic and geographical conditions of the communities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.6469165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The culture towards visitors, projects and generally exposure to new things</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.8270074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Data (2012)

4.2.11 Staff training and capacity improvement

The study also sought to find out whether the development and training of staff had any effect on the implementation of community projects by ARM in Burundi. In their
responses, majority of the respondents (30) affirmed that the development and training of staff had an effect on the community development programmes implementation by ARM. The remainder, 4 respondents, were of a different view that the effect was not there. In the explanations, the respondents affirmed that the effect could be there but was insignificant to be taken in consideration.

Figure 10 : Staff Training and Development

Source: Research Data (2012)
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
The chapter provides a summary of the research findings discusses the conclusion that the study has and provide recommendations that can be used to sort out the challenges that face the implementation of community projects in Burundi by African Revival Ministries (ARM).

5.2 Summary of Findings

5.2.1 General information on the sample
Information collected from the sample shows that in general, the majority of African Revival Ministries (ARM) staff is of middle age (between 26 and 55: 94.5%) and married (73%) and the gender issue has been taken in consideration (55.3% of female and 44.7% of male).

Among the samples, 39.4% are people working on the community level. During the study on the organisation, it was shown that those community leaders are not ARM staff, but rather partners working directly with ARM on the community level. It was also found that projects on the community level have duration of 3 to 5 years and the longest project, which was the exception, had 13 years. The experience shown in this project shows also the time in ARM only, and not the experience in other organisations. These reasons may explain why a big number of the samples (44.7%) have less than 5 years of experience. The level of education is not high, only 26.4% of the samples have university degree. This may also be linked to the big number of community leaders who generally, in Burundi, have a very low education level.

5.2.2 Implementation of community projects
In general, 63.15% of people did encounter challenges during the implementation process of the projects and 36.8% didn't encounter challenges, but in the same time, 81.57% found that the implementation was on high or middle level of success. The
rest found the success was low or didn’t know how to evaluate it, but nobody denied any success on the project implementation.

Different reasons have been given on the fact that the majority encountered challenges during the implementation. The main reason is the generalised poverty situation in the country and the habitue of being helped by NGOs especially because of many years of war in Burundi. Many people want to receive things without making any effort and others don’t want to work for tomorrow when they don’t have enough for today. So many people found challenging to work with a community who is waiting for you to meet all their needs and they had to take a long time to explain and motivate the community to adhere to the project even when they have asked for that project themselves.

Others found difficult to work in a community where leaders and the community have a very low level of education. It takes a long time for awareness when projects have limited time to be accomplished, limited budget and limited staff. They suggest that the country has to make a special effort on education so that communities can work on development programs much more easily. Lastly, others encountered security problems. Although the war had stopped in the country, some areas are difficult to access and people are still feeling insecure to work in some communities.

5.2.3 Community involvement

Almost 80% of people think that the level of involvement of the community was high or middle and around 83% are satisfied with the current level of involvement of the community. It is also important to notice that there are 10% of people who are dissatisfied and half of them are the community leaders.

To effectively involve the community in the implementation of projects, many people have proposed the intensification of trainings on the all issue of self development, on project cycle so that the community may willingly participate in the project at all stages. Others recognised the importance of working in associations or cooperatives, as it develops the sense of community, ownership and responsibility.
At ARM level, many suggested that the organisation has to increase trainings towards the population and create adequate tools of communication with the population to facilitate collaboration. Others recommended ARM to ask for community and local administration contribution, even if it is in kind to enhance the involvement of the community in the implementation.

5.2.4 Donors support and funding

Donors support and funding play a critical role in the successful implementation of projects, 89% of the samples agree with that, the rest disagree or don’t have any idea on the matter. Among all these people, 50% had challenges with the donors support and funding.

On what ways can donor support and funding be enhanced, some responded that some donors usually dictate the destination of their funds which limit NGO to have any flexibility and during the implementation, they don’t have any room of change which influence negatively the successful implementation of projects. The suggestion is then to negotiate flexibility in the allocation of funds as far as it can enhance the success of projects implementation. Another suggestion was to request the donors to visit projects before their implementation so that they can understand the reality on ground, then the implementers and the donors can speak the same language and that will surely enhance the success of the implementation.

5.2.5 Government policies and legislation

Although 63, 15% of the sample agreed that government policies and legislations influence the implementation of projects, only few people were able to identify actually those policies and legislations. In Burundi, NGOs and government sign an agreement of cooperation before doing any activity in the country, this protect communities from NGOs who can come just to exploit them and the government had the right to follow up what is done on the ground to make sure that all is done correctly. However, on the other hand, this involvement can sometimes handicap the implementation of projects when the government is asking more than what the NGOs
are able to offer or delaying the implementation process, causing a lost of money and time. Another aspect in those policies is the tax exemption for NGOs which help them to offer more cheap or free services to the community. That tax exemption has helped ARM to receive more donations, especially gift in kinds, which have helped many communities in need. In the health area, there is a policy of giving free treatment to children under five and maternity services. Although this policy has helped many people, it has also caused a decreasing of health quality services because the government was not proportionally covering the expenses caused by the free treatment. To overcome all these challenges, the respondents proposed a constant dialog with the government so that some corrections may be made to the good benefit of communities, NGOs and government.

5.2.6 Community culture and attitude

On the effect of the community culture and attitude on the implementation of community development programmes by ARM, it can be concluded that the effect on implementation of community projects is evident. On average the respondents said that the effect of the community lifestyle and the effect it had on the implementation of community programmes, all the respondents responded on average that they did not know the effect with a mean of 3 while the standard deviation was 2.70 meaning that the deviation from the mean was also 3 which is relatively minimal and can be concluded that the respondents were somewhat in agreement in their responses. On the effect of community beliefs and norms, 16 respondents said that they strongly agreed that it had an impact while another 7 said that they agreed that the community beliefs and norms had an impact on the implementation of community programmes by ARM. Despite the eight (8) of the respondents who disagreed that it had an impact and another 2 of them said that they strongly disagreed, it can be concluded that the respondents agreed that community culture and attitude affected the implementation of community projects.
5.2.7 Staff training and capacity improvement

More than 88% of the responded agreed that the current situation and capacity of staff affects the implementation of projects at the community level. The rest, even when they responded differently, in the explanations, they said that the current staff capacity is not enough and it affects negatively the implementation of projects. So, in general, they all agree that the level of staff training and capacity improvement is very important as staff once developed and trained would be better placed in decision making, budgeting, community mobilization, project supervision, project planning and conflict resolution. It also enhances the staff in understanding community believes, cultures, norms as well as techniques of overcoming these challenges they face in the implementation of the programmes.

5.3 Conclusion

Community programs are becoming common in many countries and there are number of different conceptualizations of them. It is likely that a framework for best implementation practice is not possible as community programs are many and varied and implemented in a multitude of contexts, making it impossible to generalize about their implementation and offer best practice guidelines. What this study does offer is an understanding of the implementation of projects in a particular NGO in Burundi, African Revival Ministries. This case study was able to illustrate some factors and dynamic that influences the implementation of community development projects.

African Revival Ministries (ARM) has been working with a number of community development programs in Burundi, especially in the rural area. Through the research done among different categories of ARM staff and local communities' leaders, the implementation of those programs has been in general successful, even when some challenges have been identified by different respondents. One of the main challenges was the community settling, where programs have to be implemented. The general state of poverty in the country had an influence on the participation and involvement of the community as many of the community leaders have a very low education level. ARM staff had to make particular effort to overcome that barrier in order to implement, together with the population, the proposed programs.
Donors support and funding played an important role as ARM was a link between government, external agencies and the communities. The desire was to see more flexibility in that relationship to be able to adapt in some circumstances and be more successful in the implementation.

Government legislation and policies provide guidelines which generally secure the relationship between government, NGOs and communities. In general, ARM staff found that these legislations and policies have worked positively toward the implementation of community development projects, except in the health sector, where the quality of services somehow decreased because of lack of resources to cover the increased needs.

Community culture and attitude have a big influence on the implementation of project. Many staff found that the implementation process and even the end results have been different according to the beliefs, practices and attitude towards new ideas of different communities. Program staff plays a key role to the success of program implementation as they are the one putting the planning into practice. ARM staff and communities leaders all agree that training and capacity building are very important and they have to be ongoing as technology changes also quickly.

5.4 Recommendations

Although many improvements are underway today in the formulation and implementation of project development programs, much more needs to be done to improve outcomes. ARM or other community programs have to work more towards empowering communities so that their involvement may be more effectively used to get better design, accountability, and implementation to ensure sustainability of different programs.

As many communities live in a cycle of poverty, it is very important that development agents work in synergy to maximize their effort to break that cycle.
5.5 Suggestions for Further Study

This study focused only on few factors influencing implementation of community development programs but an examination of the implementation process that considers the community processes in more depth would contribute enormously to understandings of community programs implementation. Community participation in community interventions is a complex and difficult task for implementers to undertake. Future research could focus on implementers’ perspectives of this element of a community programs and how to make their work more effective.

Program evaluation is clearly a vital part of ensuring that community programs are implemented according to the planning. This research did not include the evaluation process in it examination. The field would benefit from an enhanced understanding of the contribution that evaluation does or does not make to the implementation of these programs.
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APPENDIX 1: LETTER TO RESPONDENTS

ALINE MURYANGO
KENYATTA UNIVERSITY
P.O. BOX 43844 – 00100
NAIROBI

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH PROJECT

I am a Postgraduate student in Kenyatta University pursuing a Master of Business Administration. I am currently carrying out a study on “Factors influencing the implementation of community development projects in Burundi: A case study of African Revival Ministries (ARM)”. The success of the research substantially depends on your cooperation. I hereby request you to respond to the questionnaire attached as honestly as possible and to the best of your knowledge.

The questionnaire is designed for the purpose of this study only, therefore the responses will absolutely be confidential and anonymously given. No name will be required from any respondent.

Thanking you in advance.

Yours Faithfully,

Aline Muryango
**APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE**

**SECTION A: GENERAL**

1. What is your gender?  
   - Male [ ]  
   - Female [ ]

2. Within which age bracket do you fall?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>25 and below</th>
<th>26 – 35</th>
<th>36 – 45</th>
<th>46 - 55</th>
<th>Above 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is your marital status?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. For how long have you worked at African Revival Ministries (ARM)?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length (Years)</th>
<th>Less than 5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>Over 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What is your highest educational standard?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Level</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Form Six</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Others (Specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What is your designation at ARM?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Top Management</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Community Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B: IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY PROJECTS

7. Did you encounter challenges in the implementation process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If yes, which ones?

9. What level of success do you give to the implementation of the community development programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

10. What is the level of community involvement and participation in the implementation of projects under ARM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. To what level are you satisfied with the level of community involvement and participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where 1 – Highly dissatisfied, 2 – Dissatisfied, 3 – Don’t Know, 4 – Satisfied and 5 – Highly Satisfied
12. What programs would you propose to be implemented so that the community can be effectively involved in implementation of projects?

i. ........................................................................

ii. ........................................................................

iii. ........................................................................

iv. ........................................................................

v. ........................................................................

13. In what ways can the involvement of the community in projects implementation be enhanced at ARM?

i. ........................................................................

ii. ........................................................................

iii. ........................................................................

iv. ........................................................................

v. ........................................................................

SECTION D: DONOR SUPPORT AND FUNDING

14. To what extent do you agree that donor support and funding play a critical role in the successful implementation of projects by ARM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where 1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Don’t Know, 4 – Agree and 5 – Strongly Agree

15. Has donor support and funding for ARM projects been a challenge thus far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. In what ways do you think can donor support and funding be enhanced so as to enhance the successful implementation of projects by ARM?

i. ............................................................

ii. ............................................................

iii. ............................................................

iv. ............................................................

SECTION E: GOVERNMENT LEGISLATION AND POLICIES

17. To what extent do you agree that government policies and legislation influences the implementation of projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where 1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Don’t Know, 4 – Agree and 5 – Strongly Agree

18. What are some of the Government policies and legislation that influences the successful implementation of projects in Burundi?

i. ............................................................

ii. ............................................................

iii. ............................................................

iv. ............................................................

19. How can these challenges from Government legislation and policies be overcome?

i. ........................................................................

ii. ........................................................................

iii. ........................................................................

iv. ........................................................................
SECTION F: CULTURE AND ATTITUDE

20. Community culture and attitude influences project implementation. To what extent do you think the following factors affect this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community believes and norms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The climatic and geographical conditions of the communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The culture towards visitors, projects and generally exposure to new things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where 1 – Great Extent, 2 – Some Extent, 3 – Don’t Know, 4 – Little Extent and 5 – No Influence

21. On staff capacity and training, do you think the current situation and capacity, affects the implementation of the projects at the communities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain your answer


22. What other suggestion may you have but has not been captured in the questionnaire above?


END OF QUESTIONNAIRE
### APPENDIX III: TIME PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Submission</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX IV: BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SHS</th>
<th>CTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial services</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying and binding</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Communication</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet and Consultation</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>