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Operational Definition Of Terms

A Project is a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service or result according to Project Management Institution, (2004) or a value creation undertaking based on a specific mission, which is completed in a given or agreed timeframe and under constraints, including resources and external circumstances according to Project Management Association of Japan, (2005)

Project Management is a dynamic process that utilizes the appropriate resources of the organization in a controlled and structured manner to achieve some clearly defined objectives identified as strategic needs. It is always conducted within a defined set of constraints (Trevor, 2008)

Project Life Cycle is the fundamental processes undertaken to complete a project which include initiation/conception, definition, planning, launch/execution, closure and post-project evaluation (Trevor, 2008).

Project implementation is an application, execution of an idea, plan, design, and policy. It is a process where all the proper planned activities are put into action (Rosario, J.G., 2000).

Livelihood- It’s defined in broad terms as the capability, assets and activities needed for making a living.

Poverty - Rakodi (2002) considers households to be poor when the resources they can command are insufficient to allow them to make sufficient consumption to achieve a reasonable minimum level of welfare.

Apiary - means a place where bees’ colonies are kept.

Bee equipment means hives, hive tool, bee protective clothing, bees’ smoker, bee brush, bee escape, queen excluder, honey and beeswax strainers, hone extractors, beeswax melter, honey and beeswax storage facilities and honey and beeswax grading equipment, queen rearing equipment.

Stakeholders are persons/people who have specific and clearly definable interest in the project processes or outcome. In a project there are internal and external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders are those associated with the processes, typically the members of the project team or governance structure, external stakeholders are those persons/people outside the project team or organization (Nicholas, 2011)
ABSTRACT

Project implementation is of major importance as it determines the achievement of the set objectives of a project. It attracts a lot of attention particularly to the beneficiaries and the stakeholders alike and even the general public. Their involvement is of great contribution to its success. The purpose of projects is to improve social and economic status of the people. Kenya has been a net importer of beekeeping products and the challenge has been why the deficit despite the many government and private projects being and having been carried out. The implementation of these projects, design and use of the required tools and techniques needs to be analyzed and ascertained. Four key issues, stakeholder involvement, financing, capacity building and culture have been focused to establish their relationship in the implementation of a beekeeping project. Thus, this study critically evaluated the issues involved in implementation of ASAL Based Livestock and Rural Livelihoods Support Project (ALLPRO) in Mwingi and Kajiando Districts. This research study adapted a descriptive survey design and employed simple and stratified random sampling. The research was conducted using data that is both qualitative and quantitative data. Structured and unstructured questionnaires were used to collect data from the implementers, stakeholders and the beneficiaries of the project.

The results showed that there was low stakeholder involvement that contributed to the low performance of implementation of the ALLPRO beekeeping project. Since the typical Kamba and Maasai beekeepers are traditionally unwilling to compromise traditional ties for modern beekeeping practices, culture was found to have greatly influenced implementation in both districts. There were both positive and negative cultural characteristics that influenced implementation. Majority of the respondents identified financing as the key driver. Stakeholder involvement and capacity building were also cited by many respondents, while a number prioritized culture factors. Other indicators that influenced implementation included, proper timing, training and adoption of appropriate technologies for the project. Based on these findings, project coordinators need to find ways to adjust project implementation programmes to involve stakeholders and cope with cultural characteristics of the target beneficiaries.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Project management is the discipline of planning, organizing, securing, and managing resources to achieve specific goals. The primary challenge of project management is to achieve all of the project goals and objectives while honoring the preconceived constraints. There is also need to optimize the allocation of resources and integrate the inputs necessary to meet pre-defined objectives (Dinsmore et al, 2005). Project management techniques and planning tools are useful for any tasks in which different outcomes are possible, where risks of problems and failure exist, and so require planning and assessing options, and organizing activities and resource to deliver a successful result. Different projects require different approaches of implementation depending on the scope of the project. However, the basic techniques and tools of project management apply to all regardless of size of the project all projects will require planning, organizing executing and controlling to ensure successful completion (Young, 2005). Project management has four to five processes, and a control system. Major process generally includes initiation, planning or development, production or execution or implementation, monitoring and controlling and closing.

Project implementation is an application, execution of an idea, plan, design, and policy. It is a process where all the proper planned activities are put into action. The process may be effective if some very important factors are considered in project management system. Before starting the implementation of a project, the implementers must identify the weaknesses and strength. The implementation process begins and includes many different phases. The first starts with project planning phase that wants you to plan your tasks of the project. The second one is the project design phase the other phases in the project implementation process consists of creating and unit test phase, integration test phase, training phase, and finally, the close out phase.(Phillips, 2003).
1.1.1. General Overview of Beekeeping Projects in Kenya

In the late 1960s, the Ministry of Agriculture, International Bee Research Association (IBRA), and Oxfam collaborated through projects and carried out a feasibility study on beekeeping industry in Kenya (MOA, Annual Report 1969). Thereafter, with project funds from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Kenyan government, the Kenya National Union of Farmers, and community groups were involved in beekeeping promotion in various parts of the country. AGOA (African Growth and Opportunities Act), carried out promotion of increased trade and investment between the United States and Saharan African countries in beekeeping products for over 10 years since 2000. In 2004, UNIDO initiated a Kenya integrated project (KIP) 2004-2006 with overall objective of the Project to increase rural incomes generated by entrepreneurs, including women in beekeeping. However these efforts were not successful to bring about the improvement of the honey industry in Kenya (Jiwa, 2004). Carroll (2006) notes that limited adoptions of modern technologies to enhance honey production have been the main challenge for all the projects. The efforts to promote improved hive technologies resulted in little impact in terms of popularity, enhanced production and improved livelihood among communities.

Arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) cover 84% of Kenya’s total land surface and supports 8 million Kenyans as well as 50% of Kenya’s livestock population. The government of Kenya accords ASAL (Arid and Semi arid Lands) top priority in its current development plan of vision 2030. ASAL Based Livestock and Rural Livelihoods Support Project (ALLPRO) is a project that comprises of four main components i) livestock productivity improvement ii) Animal health improvement iii) livestock marketing and iv) Drought management and food security initiatives. The project identified 20 districts within Rift Valley North Eastern, Eastern and Coast Provinces of the ASAL for priority support. It is funded by Africa Development Fund (ADF). One of the main activities funded by the project is beekeeping. The Ministry of Livestock development estimates that the current production level of honey is less than one fifth of the potential production which is estimated at 100,000 metric tons per annum. (GOK, 2010).

1.1.2 Beekeeping Projects in Kajiado and Mwingi Districts.

Mwingi District is a homogeneous district inhabited mainly by the Akamba community. The district has a population of 377,081 (population census, 2009) with a growth rate of 2.4 per cent.
The District shows a very high prevalence of poverty, which is estimated at 60 per cent with the poor residing in the driest divisions in the district namely Tseikuru, Kyuso, Ngomeni, Nguni and Nuu Divisions. Migwani, Central and Mui have least poverty prevalence. (Mwingi District Development Plan 2002-2008)

Mwingi, in Eastern Kenya, is an arid area, but for over 2000 local people it is also a land of milk and honey. They practice bee-keeping in the acacia forests found there and have been trained in practical techniques and how to process their honey products (ICIPE, African Journal 2010). The idea of group marketing for small-scale farmers has been gaining popularity for some years. In 2006, bee-keepers with support from the UN Development Programme increased honey production and they are playing an important role in managing the local forests, which provide food for their bees (DLPO Report, 2006). Through this UNDP GEF project the farmers have been organized into groups, forest conservation groups and they have been able to take charge of the forests in their areas.

Kajiado is a semi arid area that is characterized by rough terrain. To the north escarpments of the Great Rift Valley rise to form the Ngong hills, the escarpment then stretch southwards on the Eastern side; on the floor are several hills and valleys forming a hilly and rough terrain with some areas having long stretches of plane land. Most of the land is covered by grass and shrubs and thus forming a shrub land vegetation. Acacia is the most prevalent tree. This kind of vegetation favours cattle rearing and beekeeping. The ethnic community found in Kajiado North District are mainly the Maasai making a population of 508,758. (Population census, 2009). Population growth rate 4.6 Household size 4.2 Geographical area of 21,903 km², average annual income US$ 400 in paid income 32 %, below poverty line 39 %, Infant Mortality 45/1000, (RELMA, 2005).

The main economic activity among the Maasai is Pastoralism with them keeping cattle, goats, sheep, and donkeys. The Maasai people treasure their cattle a lot; in fact they believe all cattle were given to them by God “Enkai”. The Maasai live in small close knit communities with a strong support system (RELMA, 2006). Bee keeping project has become a lifeline to communities known for the importance they have attached to their cattle for many generations. Most of the farmers have invested beekeeping money in buying some goats and have also used
some to pay school fees (MOLD, 2010). The idea of the Maasai even contemplating life without their cows, let alone expressing happiness about it, is hard to fathom for many other Kenyans. Some Maasai communities have been known to opt for starvation rather than slaughter their cattle.

But for many farmers, the bad droughts have left the Maasai in Kajiado District with little option but to diversify. When the hives were initially started, the honey harvesters had to brave the angry bees without any protective clothing. By having modern equipment, they now harvest more honey. There are currently over 400 modern beehives reducing Maasai dependency on cows with most of the beekeepers being women. In the Maasai community, men dominate the women but beekeeping has empowered them. The hives have also been beneficial to the Maasai by conserving the environment. Fewer trees are being cut down these days as they are used for the beehives. Despite its success, however, beekeeping has not dampened the desire of Maasai to buy more cows. (District Development Report, 2005). Men has the responsibility of looking after the cattle and is regarded as the managers. They migrate to other areas looking for pasture during the dry seasons and also to allow growth of pasture in their home areas when the rainy seasons start.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Over the years numerous attempts have been made to develop beekeeping in Kenya with limited success. Government projects play an important role to the economic development of the country. Successful implementation of beekeeping projects helps improve efficiency and effectiveness with an ultimate goal of raising economic standards to meet vision 2030 (MOLD, 2009). The government through the ministry of Livestock Development carried out ALLPRO project with the main intention of improving livelihoods and food security through improved livestock productivity, marketing and support for community initiatives. However since beekeeping is peculiar from other forms of projects, it’s not clear, which factors influenced the implementation of the beekeeping related ALLPRO project. A quick evaluation of the resultant status related to the project still gives a relatively low adoption of the technologies as well as production levels (GOK 2009). The gap existing could primarily be due to failure to put in mind the factors that influence project implementation related to beekeeping. There could be other
socio-economic factors such as high poverty levels and high cost of these technologies leading to low outputs (Carroll, 2006).

Although beekeeping is a major activity in the country’s rangelands, its full potential has not been fully exploited. With appropriate implementation of projects and proper technology, the amount of honey produced could be increased from about 9,200kgs to over 100 tonnes per year (Mutungi 1998).

Jiwa (2004) points out that the absence of new and modern beekeeping technology and equipment and the use of the wrong beekeeping technology and equipment has been a problem facing beekeeping. Most communities engaged in beekeeping have been using traditional log hives, baskets, or clay pots. These beehives, while being very cheap to manufacture or acquire, produce only small volumes of crude honey once or twice a year. The poor harvesting techniques used by the beekeepers equally lead to the impregnation of the honey with smoke and other suspended particles that irreversibly destroy the colour, smell, texture, and taste of the honey. The harvesting almost always results in the cutting of all the honey combs and the destruction of the entire colony. Therefore, beekeepers have to wait until the next swarming season to catch bees and start all over again. (Muriuki, 2010) adds that about 90 percent of beekeepers in Kenya are still using traditional systems of production despite the efforts to introduce modern beekeeping through various projects. The actual implementation of the projects raises concern for this research. This research therefore explored the factors affecting the implementation of beekeeping related ALLPRO project in both Kajiado and Mwingi Districts.

1.3 Objectives of the study

1.3.1 General objective

To analyze the factors that influence the implementation of beekeeping related ALLPRO project in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts.

1.3.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the research were:
i. To find out the effect of stakeholder involvement in implementation of beekeeping related ALLPRO project in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts.

ii. To investigate how capacity building affects the ALLPRO implementation in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts.

iii. To identify the extent to which financing influenced the implementation of beekeeping related ALLPRO project in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts.

iv. To establish whether cultural factors influenced implementation of ALLPRO project in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts.

1.4 Research questions
The researcher was guided by the following research questions:

i. What was the role of stakeholder involvement in implementation of beekeeping related ALLPRO project in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts?

ii. How did capacity building affect the ALLPRO project implementation in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts?

iii. To what extent did financing influence the implementation of beekeeping related ALLPRO project in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts?

iv. How did cultural factors influence implementation of ALLPRO project in Mwingi and Kajiado Districts?

1.5 Significance of the study
This research study contributes to the enhanced understanding of the factors influencing implementation of beekeeping projects in a bid to improve rural livelihoods as envisaged in vision 2030. The study provide critical information to the ministry of livestock as to whether the ALLPRO project implementation met its main objectives and provide a guide for future project designs and implementation structure by stakeholders. Policy makers will benefit in formulating project directions on future development of beekeeping in the country. Due to the limited research carried out on the beekeeping projects, this study aimed to create more avenues for future researchers.
1.6 Justification of the study

As observed and over the years, numerous attempts have been made to develop beekeeping in Kenya with limited success (Jiwa, 2004). The reality check needs to ascertain the root cause of this low performance despite initiation of various projects. Implementation of these projects needs to be analyzed in terms of application of the tools and techniques for success. What this study aims, is to find out how the government sponsored ALLPPRO beekeeping project was influenced by the various factors in its period of implementation. The outcome of this study indicated possible guide, design and approach of future beekeeping project implementation process particularly on the variables in consideration.

1.7 Scope of the study

The study was conducted in Mwingi and Kajiado districts. Mwingi District is one of the thirteen districts in Eastern Province. It borders Kitui District to the south, Machakos District to the west, Mbeere and Meru south District to the north and Tana River District to the east. The district covers an area of 10,030.30 square km. It is divided into 9 divisions. These are Central Migwani, Kyuso, Mumoni, Nguni, Ngomeni, Nuu, Mui and Tseikuru, Thirty eight locations and one hundred and twenty seven sub locations (Mwingi District Development Plan 2002-2008). The landscape is generally flat, with a plain that gently rolls down towards the east and northeast where altitudes are as low as 400m. (Kenya Bureau of Statistics, 2009 report).

Kajiado District is an Administrative District in the Rift Valley Province of Kenya. It has an area of 21,903 km². The district borders Nairobi city to the north and extends to the Kenya-Tanzania border further south. It also borders the districts of Taita Taveta (to the south east), Machakos (to the east), Kiambu (to the north) and Narok (to the west). The district capital is Kajiado. The Kajiado District is divided into seven administrative divisions - Central, Isinya, Loitokitok, Magadi, Mashuru, Namanga, and Ngong. The landscape consists of plains plus some volcanic hills and valleys. The region is very dry with no continually flowing rivers and is officially designated as semi-arid. The annual rainfall varies between 500 and 1,250mm. (Kenya Bureau of Statistics, 2009 report)
1.8 Limitations of the study

The limitations of the study were due to the diversity of location of the sample population and the terrain of the two districts identified for the study. Time also was a limitation due to the schedules of the researcher. Sample selected may fail as representative due to errors and bias in methodology and language barrier.

By being in the Project area for one month, there were aspects of project practices and team communication that may not have been revealed exhaustively during the short period. Being an outsider was also a limiting factor on what was revealed to me.

1.8 Assumptions of the study

The study had an assumptions that the sample was a representation of the whole population and the respondents understood and answered the questions correctly.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter reviews relevant literature on factors influencing implementation of ALLPRO bee keeping project in line with the objectives of the study to determine whether stakeholder involvement, project financing, capacity building and cultural factors influences implementation of ALLPRO bee keeping project in Kajiado and Mwingi District. The chapter develops a conceptual framework that will be used in the study in regard to each variable in the study. The review will identify research gaps and areas that have been recommended for further research.

2.2 Theoretical Review
2.2.1 Project Life Cycle
Projects are undertaken to develop systems either by creating a new one or improving an existing one. The natural life cycle of systems give rise to a similar life cycle in projects called project life cycle. Each project has a starting point and progresses toward a pre-determined conclusion and passes through four phases. Each project is an organic system with a life that passes through the sequence of phases with some variables. The level of activities during the life of a project starts from zero and develops to maximum during implementation and gradually decreases to zero after evaluation.

The project implementation phase has the following, Project launching, Project implementation and control, Project completion, commissioning and handing over. Project launching is the first stage of the project implementation phase. It is during this stage that any ambiguities with regard to the project are cleared. At this stage the project charter and its contents are explained to all concerned. It is explained why the project is important and how its goals are aligned to the larger organisation objectives. Resources available and main stakeholders to the project are identified and fully described. Project launching is done through a workshop or a meeting in which introductions and orientation are made. At this stage, the project plan goes through a final review.
Project Implementation and Control involves execution of the project activities as planned and activation of appropriate project monitoring, evaluation and control procedures for feedback on progress and direction. At this stage problems that could hinder progress or derail the project from achieving its objectives are identified, isolated and controlled.

Project completion consists of scaling down and dismantling the project organisation after all project activities have been carried out. It involves transfer of project personnel, equipments and other facilities not required by the operational project product to other areas. It involves commissioning various parts of the project. The actual hand over involves finalization of the contracts and transfer of the product to the user.

Project Implementation stage is where all the planned activities are put into action. Before the implementation stage of a project, the implementers, spearheaded by the project committee or executive, should identify their strength and weaknesses, which are internal forces, as well as opportunities and threats, which are the external forces. The strength and opportunities are positive forces that should be exploited to implement a project efficiently. The weaknesses and threats are hindrances that can hamper project management and implementation. Monitoring is important at this stage to ensure that the project is implemented as per schedule. This continuous process should be put in place before project starts. As such, the monitoring activities should appear on the work plan and should involve all stakeholders. If activities are not going well, arrangements should be made to identify the problem so that they can be corrected. Monitoring is also important to ensure that activities are implemented as planned. This helps the project managers to measure how well they are achieving their targets. This is based on the understanding that the process through which a project is managed has a lot of effect on its use, operation and maintenance, (Graham, 1997).

Project management, therefore, requires genuine commitment to both the donor and the recipient country. This is often lacking, ultimately leaving most of the already started projects to tarry from management and implementation. However, projects would be of more benefit to the poor if the poor were involved from the start, in identification and design to implementation. Development partners are increasingly recognising the limits of projects, and are seeking to enhance impact by supporting sector-wide approaches, especially in the private sectors. This involves budgetary funding, improved coordination among the funders, ideally led by national
governments and increased trust between partners. Mosley, Hudson and Horrell (1986) clearly distinguishes between project implementation and project management by arguing that in project management, the parties involved in are often from different organizations under different commands and only come together to achieve project goals for a period, the latter is such that, they are from one organization and only come together under one leader who has total management. Clearer guidance and increased incentives for programme managers are therefore required if these projects are to be mainstreamed in donor agencies. Country programming could focus more on delivering benefits to the poor and actual results should be monitored. Most project managers, therefore, need a broader range of poverty-relevant skills and relocate them in field offices, with the authority and flexibility to build up pro-poor partnerships through dialogue (Mosley, Hudson and Horrell, 1986).

Figure 2.1: Project Life Cycles

This shows the activity as Phase I - Conception (4% effort), Phase II - Planning (8% effort), Phase III - Implementation (85% effort) Phase IV - Closure (3% effort). (Source: Harvey, 2010).
2.2.2 Factors influencing implementation of projects.

2.2.2.1 Stakeholder Involvement

Lack of stakeholders involvement hinder participation of the beneficiaries and hence weaken their capacity to monitor and evaluate projects thus utilization of funds (Ogawa, 2004), hence leading to poor performance of projects. It is expected to fund under divergences in the projects selected compared to expressed priorities and the participation of the communities in decision making several factors that influence performance of projects include: Stakeholder involvement, project initiation, project planning, project implementation and monitoring and evaluation.

To be a good corporate citizen, the projects leaders should be communicating with and involving its stakeholders to determine their issues concerning a particular project. There are costs associated with conducting these activities; however, costs to the project can be even greater if stakeholders take action against the project (e.g., hurting the project’s image through a media campaign, holding up permits, suing the project leaders). Being aware of issues and concerns and working to resolve them early before they turn into negative action is time and money well spent. On a positive note, ideas and suggestions from stakeholders can often be insightful and useful in improving a facility’s planning and operation. In this light, stakeholders can be seen as consultants to a project. (Vink et al, 2008).

Communication and stakeholder involvement should be a continuous activity conducted at a facility level and then augmented during periods of change or crisis when major decisions are being considered. Resources, history of community interaction, the role of the facility in the community, and decisions being contemplated. This is a new venture for many if not most cement companies so don’t be discouraged if your communications plan is basic and lacks the involvement of stakeholders. Changes or enhancements to a communications plan are needed when facility changes occur, such as: establishing a new facility; acquiring an existing facility or merging with another company; introducing new management; expanding your facility; making a major process change; changing quarry operation; decommissioning your plant; or responding to an unplanned event or accident. (Peelle, 1995).
In the experience of the cement industry, neighbors and other stakeholders respond positively to citizen advisory or community liaison committees, clarity of information, honest environmental reporting on performance measures, plant open days, pollution prevention initiatives, and well designed environmental restoration projects. Communities with a history of local empowerment and dialogue generally have lower levels of pollution, a better quality of life, and increased profitability for cement facilities. Collaboration among the community, regulators, and industry improves both facility performance and living conditions for all involved. (Humphrey L. 2004)

Ultimately, the local cement facility must be the one to take the first step to begin a positive, continuous dialogue and active partnerships. Everyone involved must then be willing to make changes that will yield results.

A robust communications and stakeholder involvement program includes communicating with and engaging stakeholders before making final decisions on significant changes so that you can determine stakeholder response and incorporate stakeholder considerations into planning. Feedback is also considered when making decisions and stakeholders are told how the input was used. If stakeholders feel that their suggestions are ignored or dismissed, the process can be undermined and future communications can be unproductive. Stakeholder involvement is most effective when it avoids jargon and encourages stakeholders to describe their underlying concerns and issues. Establishing a common ground can facilitate the resolution of difficult issues. The basic principles of stakeholder involvement according to Humphrey (2004) are:

**Voluntary involvement:** Everyone involved should be committed to progress and full participation.

**Openness, honesty, trust:** Open and honest communication is a requirement for mutual trust.

**Inclusiveness:** Strive to include all interested parties in some form of dialogue.

**Common information base:** Participants should have access to the same information.

**Mutual learning:** All parties, including host and stakeholders, should come to the discussion with a willingness to learn.

**Creative options:** Have a diverse set of stakeholders as a catalyst for creative thinking.

**Collaboration in decision making:** Build ownership to increase the likelihood of implementation, and future collaboration.
Coordination of stakeholder feedback: Communicate how you will use stakeholder feedback.

2.2.2.2 Financing

Project financing techniques date back to at least 1299 A.D. when the English Crown financed the exploration and the development of the Devon silver mines by repaying the Florentine merchant bank, Frescobaldi, with output from the mines. The Italian bankers held a one-year lease and mining concession, i.e., they were entitled to as much silver as they could mine during the year. In this example, the chief characteristic of the project financing is the use of the project’s output or assets to secure financing. (Yescombe, 2002)

Project Financing discipline includes understanding the rationale for project financing, how to prepare the financial plan, assess the risks, design the financing mix, and raise the funds. In addition, one must understand the cogent analyses of why some project financing plans have succeeded while others have failed. A knowledge-base is required regarding the design of contractual arrangements to support project financing; issues for the host government legislative provisions, public/private infrastructure partnerships, public/private financing structures; credit requirements of lenders, and how to determine the project's borrowing capacity; how to prepare cash flow projections and use them to measure expected rates of return; tax and accounting considerations; and analytical techniques to validate the project's feasibility. (Finnerty, 2007)

Project financiers may encounter social and environmental issues that are both complex and challenging, particularly with respect to projects in the emerging markets. For the proposed projects to take care of the concerns raised by project implementers there is need to consider reviewing these principles of project financing based on implementation experience, and in order to reflect ongoing learning and emerging good practice. (Michael E. M, 1994). These principles are intended to serve as a common baseline and framework for the implementation of the projects with regard to internal social and environmental policies, procedures and standards related to its project financing activities.
2.2.2.3 Capacity Building

Capacity building is a term beset by conflict and confusion (Lewis 2001. p.11). It is open to a number of different interpretations. At one level it is concerned with building the organizational capacities of NGOs to survive and fulfill their mission. At another it is concerned with building the capacity of civil society in its broadest sense, and strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders (including communities, families and individuals) to participate in the political and social arena (Eade 1997. p.35). There is particular confusion and conflict over the approach adopted by donors and Northern NGOs to strengthen Southern NGOs due to the inherent issues of power and autonomy in such partnerships. There is no one universally accepted definition of capacity building as the diversity of literature in this area demonstrates (Sahley 1994; Eade 1997; James 1998; Lewis 2001; Smillie & Hailey 2001, James 2002). Furthermore, capacity building as a term is not easily translated into different languages and perhaps not surprisingly, is rarely used outside the development community or the non-profit sector.

Capacity building is an ongoing process through which individuals, groups, organizations and societies enhance their ability to identify and meet development challenges. It often refers to strengthening the skills, competencies and abilities of people and communities in developing societies so they can overcome the causes of their exclusion and suffering. (Eade, 2005)

The UNDP outlines that capacity building takes place on an individual level, an institutional level and the societal level.

**Individual level**- Capacity-building on an individual level requires the development of conditions that allow individual participants to build and enhance existing knowledge and skills. It also calls for the establishment of conditions that will allow individuals to engage in the “process of learning and adapting to change”

**Institutional level**- Capacity building on an institutional level should involve aiding pre-existing institutions in developing countries. It should not involve creating new institutions,
rather modernizing existing institutions and supporting them in forming sound policies, organizational structures, and effective methods of management and revenue control.

**Societal level**- Capacity building at the societal level should support the establishment of a more “interactive public administration that learns equally from its actions and from feedback it receives from the population at large.” Capacity building must be used to develop public administrators that are responsive and accountable.

Implementing a capacity building program should involve the inclusion of multiple systems; national, local, institutional. It should involve continual reassessment and expect change depending on changing situations. It should include evaluative indicators to measure the effective of initiated programs. Evaluation of capacity building promotes accountability. Measurements should be based on changes in an institutions performance. Evaluations should be based on changes in performance based around the four main issues: institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and accountability (Allan 2000).

### 2.2.2.4 Cultural Factors

From a cultural point of view, the behavior of a project team is conditioned by the culture from which its members originate. The way people organize themselves around their notion of time, the way they apply universal rules to their professional activities (universalism versus particularize), and the extent to which they accept that power is distributed unequally (power distance) are cultural factors that should be analyzed in order to understand how a project develops. The fact that developing countries often accommodate an oral culture of communication is another factor that has to be taken into account. This factor has great influence on both the use of information technology and the communicating function of decision documents such as a project plan. Because a single organization can also accommodate a culture, organizational factors such as centralization, bureaucracy and task orientation, as well as whether an organization operates in a private or a public environment are also factors that should be analyzed in order to understand the development process of a project.(Ndolo 2010)

Cultural factors are all patterns of collective behavior that influence the project but which are impossible to control through project management. They are more or less preconditions for the
vanous tasks that can be shaped to execute the project. From this cultural conditioning perspective, the art of management lies within the ability of the project organization to be inventive in its adjustment to the local way of working.

Cultural differences can have various impacts in projects. They vary during different project phases and between project types. Impacts can be negative, positive, and everything between. Evidence from the conducted case studies showed that sometimes there was not any impact at all even if the differences existed. Big question is when these impacts have an importance on project outcome either it is negative or positive. It is important for project implementers targeting different cultures to understand what their clients believe and consider effective as well as acceptable. Understanding a culture's perception is useful in discovering major aspects of the clients' worldview (O’Neil, 2006).

Maasai live in the remote areas with hostile climate and extended drought periods. They are pastoralists who are forced by the prevailing environmental circumstances to move with their livestock in search of water and grazing (Harragin, 2008). Their heritage is in people and cattle and their resistance to change has led other communities to identify Maasai as living with nature. This community has a profound knowledge in livestock, wildlife, trees, herbs, roots, and grasses that are part of their surroundings. According to Phillip and Bhavnagri (2002), the Maasai have been rigid and opposed to learning about the western ways that are being imposed upon them. Due to influence from other cultures, the traditional Maasai way of life is increasingly threatened. They find themselves caught between a desire to maintain their culture and the need to adapt to a changing social, political and economic background. Over the years donor agents and government agents have initiated many projects to help the Maasai community find ways to fulfill their education needs and that of their children. However, the process has been slow (Kimani & Pickard, 1998). Low population densities, poor communications and the unpredictable movements hamper the provision of services to nomadic pastoralists (Sanford, 1978, cited in Swift, Toulmin, & Chatting, 1990). Geographical remoteness makes the provision of necessary infrastructures costly and unattainable. The nomadic pastoral lifestyle, inadequate access to modern community services and hostile environment, which hampers development of infrastructures, have made the Maasai stick to their cultural values. Katalanos (1994) notes that one of the challenges of sticking to cultural values is that it do affect the utilization of resources.
The Akamba people on the other hand are among the most disoriented cultural entity in Kenya, struggling within a rather transient and inconstant social milieu. The Akamba Cultural Trust (ACT) was founded out of this realization by a group of young public-spirited Akamba intellectuals and activists keen on facilitating a cultural revival within the community. The activities of ACT are currently coordinated in Nairobi but primarily implemented in Ukambani region.

The term cultural dynamics is used here to include the assumption that cultural differences have an impact either negative or positive in projects if no special actions for managing cultural diversity are taken. However the direct connection cannot be drawn between existing impacts and project outcome. Of course positive impact means positive outcome of work, for example innovative project team can make technological breakthrough, but this might still mean that the original objectives of project are not met, for example marketing goals. Cultural diversity is only one factor affecting on project outcomes and yet its significance is not clear.

Projects are restricted by time and changing culture or affecting on it takes time. Project might end up having its own project culture that covers the impacts of other cultures. In a project as well as in other organizations only the visible factors of cultures can be changed and not trying to change the deeper levels of cultures; values and beliefs, and underlying assumptions. The case studies showed that this might cause a danger to undervalue the impacts of culture in following projects (Katalanos, 1994). Project participants might think that problems were already solved earlier. Dynamic nature of cultures lead that the possible changes that appeared are not static either.

One of cultures’ characteristics is that the impacts cannot fully be seen beforehand. Cultures are linked to many external factors, for example legal, environmental and social environments. Cultural diversity is not necessarily a risk at all hence no positive or negative impacts can be gained or prevented. Often cultural diversity is not seen as risk at all, not positive or negative. But when cultural diversity is considered to be one of the risk factors, the obvious starting point in projects is to recognize the nature of cultural diversity and cultural dynamics, hence risk of cultural diversity and its impacts. The recognition of cultures as positive risk should not be forgotten. (Ndolo, 2011).
2.3 Empirical Review

There have been a number of valuable studies of project management. According to the literature, a lot of studies have attempted to explore project implementation success. However, most of these studies have focused on the factors that contribute to project failure in general. Much of the research has mainly focused on what causes delays in project implementation and cost overruns.

Alajoutsijarvi (1996), focused on the time and cost overruns in the power projects in Kenya. He attributed project failure to factors ranging from delayed payments, clients delay in disbursement of funds by financiers to approval of the project by the technical people, (Sumner, 1999), studied project failure in the context of cost. He also attributed it to poor communication among the client and the project team members, inadequate financial resources, lack of motivation, tendering methods and poor project definition and project organization, environmental conditions, quality of project management, lack of proper project definition and infrastructure.

Locally, studies that have been carried include Mwadali (1996) who did a case study of Kenya Railways Projects on analysis of major factors that afflict project management; Muchai (2008) who did a case study of Universities in Nairobi on the use of Project Management Models In Web Design Projects; and Olilo (2007) who did a survey of project management techniques in retail outlet development at the Westgate Centre.

The beekeeping industry contributes to the welfare of individual beekeepers through the use and sale of hive products. It also contributes to the wider rural economy, not only through the pollination of crops, but also through trade (Patterson 2006). According to the study livestock sub-sector of which bees are part, contributes about 10% of Kenya’s GDP. Apiculture alone contributes about 1.89% of this amount (Muya, 2004). Kigatiira (1976) through research reported that capacity building especially on improved beekeeping technology encourages better bee management and aims at higher success than can be hoped for by the exclusive use of traditional methods.
As summarized by Kamato (2007) Local ownership of projects and stakeholder collaborative monitoring process is critical. When individual organizations conduct their projects independently, little or no success is recorded. If communities are to take ownership of projects collectively, they make and implement decisions, and then they must be participants in developing the project process.

According to Ndolo (2010) research recollection from social interactions with people from different cultural communities in Kenya is that cultural perceptions and response to interventions vary from community to community and is some cases from clan to clan. In addition to cultural beliefs, values and practices, cultural communication patterns also do affect people’s related behavior and beliefs and their perception to different interventions of project implementation.

One of the key assumptions underlying proposition of projects is that financing structures do not affect its implementation because it’s assumed that the financier will be totally responsible. Yet the change in project finance provides strong prima facia evidence that financing structures do, indeed, matter, Esty (2003). According to the study by Esty, an analysis of sponsoring firms and project companies illustrates how financing structures affect project implementation decisions and subsequent cash flows.

2.4 Research Gaps

As mentioned earlier in the problem statement, many projects in beekeeping in Kenya have not successfully met the desired objectives. Most of the projects either fail after final handover to the community due to reasons not yet documented. Although various studies carried out identify a number of reasons, most of them are focused towards projects that are not nature dependent like beekeeping. Clear understanding of the issues involved in beekeeping project implementation and their analysis is of great importance to this research. This Research will therefore fill the gap of the other studies carried out. An analysis of the factors influencing implementation of ALLPRO beekeeping project in Kajiado and Mwingi district is therefore critical.
2.5 Conceptual Framework

The researcher will investigate the four variables in relation to implementation of ALLPRO beekeeping projects. On stakeholder Involvement the study will find out whether stakeholders were involved in the whole project cycle and the response and impact of the involvement. The indicators on this variable will be satisfaction level of involvement and financial contribution.

Based on financing the research will investigate the satisfaction level of the beneficiaries and stakeholders including the time and scope of financing. On the variable the study will find out how regular the financing was and the challenges faced by the project implementers.

Beekeeping is a peculiar industry that requires change of attitude and approach to cultural practices. One key component of ALLPRO projects is capacity building and the study will investigate the level of transfer of skills and knowledge and its effect on the communities’ values and practices in relation to beekeeping.

Cultural beliefs, values and practices are important aspects in project implementation to all those involved in the project. This study will ascertain how cultural values of the beneficiaries affected the implementation especially because the area of project operation was dominated by communities with different cultural backgrounds in relation to beekeeping.
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Figure 2.2: Conceptual Framework (Source: researcher, 2012)
The conceptual framework shows various intervening variables. These are factors beyond the control of the project implementation process. They include Climate change which is unpredictable, political situation in the project area, human environmental degradation and leaders of the groups (beneficiaries).

The main indicators of effective ALLPRO beekeeping implementation include increase in income generation, adoption of new techniques of beekeeping husbandry, adequate and timely budget financing and the satisfaction level of stakeholders’ involvement.
3.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the methodology that was used in undertaking the study. It covers the research design and the research method that was used. In particular, issues related to research design, the population, the type of data collected, sampling frame, sample and sampling techniques, data collection instrument, data collection procedure, pilot test, validity and reliability of the instrument, and the data analysis and presentation.

3.2 Research Design
The study adopted descriptive research design. A descriptive research design determines and reports the way things are (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Creswell (2003) observes that a descriptive research design is used when data are collected to describe persons, organizations, settings or phenomena. Descriptive design is ideal as the study was carried out in a limited geographical scope and hence is logistically easier and simpler to conduct considering the limitations of this study (Mugenda 2008). The design also has enough provision for protection of bias and maximized reliability (Kothari, 2008). Descriptive design uses a preplanned design for analysis (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). In this study measures of central, dispersion and distribution were applied.

3.3 Study Population
According to Cooper and Schindler (2008), population refers to an entire group of objects/individuals having common observable characteristics. It’s also described as an aggregate of all that conforms to a given specification (Kothari, 2008). The general population of this study included three ALLPRO Project implementers, thirteen stakeholders and one hundred and eleven beneficiaries from the two districts (Mwingi and Kajiado).

3.4 Sampling Technique and Sample Size
Cooper and Schindler (2011) assert that a sample is a subset of a population. According to Kothari (2004) and Mugenda (2003) in a descriptive survey a sample enables a researcher to gain information about a population.
The sampling frame describes the list of all population units from which the sample will be selected (Cooper and Schindler, 2003). It is a physical representation of the target population and comprises all the units that are potential members of a sample (Kothari, 2008). To meet the expectation of the sampling theory, the target population was identified to enable probability for selecting a random combination. The sampling technique that was used was simple random for groups (beneficiaries). The sample size was at least 50% of the sampling category. The researcher randomly selected 56 beekeeping groups, did a census on all the 13 stakeholders, one implementer from each of the two districts and the overall ALLPRO project coordinator to make a sample of 72 respondents.

Table 3.1 Sampling Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample percentage</th>
<th>Number of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100% (census)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100% (census)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary groups</td>
<td>Kajiado-62</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mwingi-49</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Data collection and procedure

3.5.1 Research Instruments

Creswell (2002) defines data collection as means by which information is obtained from the selected subjects of an investigation. The primary research data was collected using a semi-structured questionnaire. This had both closed-ended and open-ended questions as annexed in Appendix I in order to investigate factors influencing project implementation of beekeeping ALLPRO projects in Mwingi and Kajiado. The Questionnaire was best suited for this study because it provided a high degree of data standardization. Again, it adopts generalized information amongst any population and is useful in a descriptive survey study (Chandran 2003). Too, observations supplemented the data collection using questionnaires. These questionnaires were provided to the respondent by the enumerators, filled and
collected for data analysis. This approach and the choice of tools of data collection, saved on time and funding level. The target respondents were the National project coordinator, District livestock production officers, managers of the various stakeholders and the leaders of beneficiary groups.

3.5.2 Reliability and Validity

Reliability is the consistency of a set of measurement items while validity indicates that the instrument is testing what it should (Cranach, 1951). Reliability is the consistency of your measurement, or the degree to which an instrument measures the same way each time it is used under the same condition with the same subjects. In short, it is the probability of your measurement. A measure is considered reliable if a person’s score on the same test given twice is similar. It is important to remember that reliability is not measured, it is estimated. Reliability does not, however, imply validity because while a scale may be measuring something consistently, it may not necessarily be what it is supposed to be measuring.

Validity is the strength of our conclusions, inferences or propositions. More formally, Patton (2002) define it as the best available approximation to the truth or falsity of a given inference, proposition or conclusion. To validity of the questionnaire, a pilot test on the two districts, in the target population who are not included during data collection, will be done so as to establish whether the questionnaires measures what it purports to measure.

3.5.3 Pilot Study

Cooper and Schindler (2010) indicated that a pilot test is conducted to detect weaknesses in design and instrumentation and to provide proxy data for selection of a probability sample. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a pilot study is conducted when a questionnaire is given to just a few people with an intention of pre-testing the questions. Pilot test is an activity that assists the research in determining if there are flaws, limitations, or other weaknesses within the interview design and allows him or her to make necessary revisions prior to the implementation of the study (Ngechu, 2004). A pilot study was undertaken on 10 people to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The purpose of this pilot test was to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire and enabled the researcher to amend the questionnaire as appropriate so as to target the respondents.
3.6 Data Analysis and Presentation

Mugenda (2003) explains that data editing, classification and tabulation are the process of bringing order, structure and meaning of the mass information collected. He further notes that data editing examines the collected new data to detect errors and omissions for correction to ensure accuracy and consistency. The raw data collected from the field through primary data are never well organized for interpretation. Data classification reduces data into homogeneous attributes that enables the researcher to get meaningful relationships.

In this study, the data collected was edited and coded as per the variables which are stakeholder involvement, capacity building, financing and culture. This coded data was then classified and tabulated for processing. The data was then analyzed with the aid of SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) using descriptive statistics and presented using frequency tables, pie charts and bar charts as was appropriate.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1: Introduction

This chapter shows the results of the study and their analysis. The analysis is carried out by use of the scientific package for social sciences (SPSS). Mwingi and kajiando districts are geographically diverse in terms area of coverage. The researcher got the information from the respondents in seven of the nine divisions i.e., Kyuso, Mumoni, Ngomeni, Nuu, Mui, Migwani Tseikuru in Mwingi and six of the seven in kajiando, i.e. Central, Isinya, Loitokitok, Magadi, Mashuru and Namanga. The stakeholders were mostly found at the main towns of the two districts and a few had field offices where we collected the data. Two of the implanters were at the district headquarters and one at Project headquarters Nairobi. All the beneficiaries were visited in their farms, ranches, communal lands or at homesteads. Ten enumerators were used to collect information and the responds were recorded on the spot. In cases where no response was obtained, it was due to absence in our anticipated location.

4.2. Background Information
4.2.1 Response Rate

Out of the 72 questionnaires that were given out to the respondents of ALLPRO project only 9 were not returned. This indicates that the response rate was high and therefore the findings of the study will not be invalidated. This is as summarized in table 4.1 below. There was 100% response from implementers while the response from beneficiaries and stakeholders was 89% and 77% respectively.
Table 4.1 Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of respondent</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Implementers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Stakeholders</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Beneficiaries</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)

4.2.2 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Out of the 63 responds, 73% were males while 27% were found to be females. They all ranged from 18 years and above on age. On observation, most of the respondents in Kajiando owned communal lands where they kept bees whereas in Mwingi, there was more of individual ownership. A number of groups also contracted land for their beekeeping where the project was implemented.

4.2.3 Position of Respondents

The respondents of the implementers’ category were heads of Livestock production in the study area districts 67% and the Project coordinator at the headquarters. Most of the stakeholders were local Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO, s) - 40% and Community Based Organisations (CBO)-30% operating in the area. 72% of the beneficiaries were group leaders (table 4.2).
Table 4.2 Position of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Position of respondents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementers</td>
<td>DLPO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>NGOS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Group leader</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farmers/Beekeeper</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)
### Table 4.3 Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 above</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: (Research data, 2012)*

The table above indicates that majority (65.1%) of the respondents were aged between 35-55 years with 35-45 years having 36.5% and 46-55 years with 28.6%.
4.2.5 Gender of Respondents

Table 4.4 Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)

There was 73% of the respondent being males compared to 27%, as shown in the table above. No female respondent was an implementer of the ALLPRO project. Most of beekeeping in Mwingi was dominated by the men, whereas Kajiado had slightly more female participating in beekeeping.

4.2.6 Education Level of Beneficiaries

The majority of beneficiaries of ALLPRO project at Mwingi and Kajiado had primary education, accounting for 48%, while those with secondary comprised 28% of the respondents (Table 4.4 and Figure 4.4). Of the respondents, 4% and 14 % had attained university and any
other education respectively. However, 6% of the interviewed beneficiaries gave no response. Numbers of beneficiaries with different levels of education were significantly different (p < 0.05)
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Source: (Research data, 2012)

Figure 4.1 Education Level of Beneficiaries

4.3. Indicators of Implementation

4.3.1 Financing

The study investigated the level of funding to the bee keeping project. Most of respondents (64%) in Mwingi and Kajiado felt that funding was inadequate (Table 4.3 and Figure 4.3). This number was significantly higher (p < 0.05) than those with contrary opinion.
Table 4.5. Respondent’s opinion on whether project financing was adequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)

4.3.2 Stakeholder Involvement

Out of the 10 ALLPRO Project stakeholders in Mwingi and Kajiado that were interviewed, only 20% were involved in the process of implementation Figure 4.3. Only 2 respondents acknowledged participation in the project.

Most respondents (80%) were of the opinion that there was low stakeholder involvement in the implementation of ALLPRO project in both Mwingi and Kajiado districts. The few that were involved were in cooperated midway and many others declined because they were not involved in the planning of the projects.
4.3.3 Timing

The beneficiaries' of ALLPRO project gave opinion on the timeliness of project implementation process. It was found out that most of them, 38%, thought the process was either on time or not on time (Table 4.6 and Figure 4.6). The rest that is 24% said that the process was not on time always.

Source: (Research data, 2012)
4.3.4 Proper Training

Beneficiaries of ALLPRO in Mwingi and Kajiado were further asked if they received proper training. Most of them, 66%, stated that they were given proper training while 34% indicated that they didn’t receive such training (Table 4.5 and Figure 4.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)

4.3.5 Income Generation

ALLPRO Project beneficiaries were asked to comment on the effect of the project in terms of income generation. Most of the respondents, 58%, acknowledged that they witnessed increased income from the project (Table 4.7 and Figure 4.7). However, 36% and 6% either incurred no change or a decrease in income respectively as a result of project implementation.
Figure. 4.4. Status of income generation for beneficiaries from the project.

4.3.6 Adoption of Technologies

The study sought to know where beneficiaries of Mwingi and Kajiado ALLPRO projects acquired bee keeping skills. The majority, 46%, indicated that they were trained by the ALLPRO project. Another 30% cited training from other stakeholders. Only 24% utilized tradition knowledge (Table 4.8 and Figure 4.8). ALLPRO project trained a significantly higher (p < 0.05) number of beneficiaries.
According to the respondents the skill obtained included hive making, beekeeping managements, apiary setting, value addition and marketing of hive products.
4.4. Independent Variables

On the independent variables the questionnaire was administered by the researcher to the respondents. A five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly agree” (5) to “strongly disagree” (1) was provided next to some statements that required opinion rating.

4.4.1 Stakeholder Involvement

Though the study found out that stakeholder involvement is low (20%), most respondents agreed that Stakeholders’ involvement enhances participation of the beneficiaries in project implementation. There was also a higher agreement by respondents that stakeholders can often be insightful and useful in improving project planning and operation. However there was a neutral feeling that Stakeholders can be seen as consultants to a project.

Table 4.7. Respondent’s opinion on the role of stakeholder involvement in enhancing project implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement on stakeholder involvement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders' involvement enhances participation of the beneficiaries in project implementation.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders' involvement enhances participation of the beneficiaries in project implementation.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers should be communicating with and involving stakeholders to determine their concerns concerning a particular project.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions from stakeholders can be insightful and useful in improving project planning and operation.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders can be seen as consultants to a project.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)
4.4.2 Financing

Most respondents (61%) agreed that project financing has been the preferred form of financing for development and smooth implementation of projects however 70% of respondents said that project financing may encounter social and environmental issues that are both complex and challenging, particularly with respect to projects in the rural set up with 30% having the opinion that projects can also be exposed to the risk of political and cultural interference.

Table 4.8. Financing Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing Statement</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project financing has been the preferred form of financing for development and</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smooth implementation of projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Financing includes understanding the rationale for project financing, how</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to prepare the financial plan, assess the risks, design the financing mix, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raise the funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-base is required regarding the design of contractual arrangements to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support project financing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project financing may encounter social and environmental issues that are both</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex and challenging, particularly with respect to projects in the rural set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing beekeeping projects not only requires lenders to commit for long</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maturities, but also makes them particularly exposed to the risk of political and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural interference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)
4.4.3 Capacity Building

The research indicated that 68% of the respondents agreed that capacity building strengthens the skills, competencies and abilities of people and communities in developing societies so they can overcome the causes of their exclusion and suffering.

Table 4.9 Capacity Building Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on capacity building</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building Strengthens the skills, competencies and abilities of people and communities in developing societies so they can overcome the causes of their exclusion and suffering.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building can be used to reorganize and capacitate project team, communities or individuals.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building may relate to leadership development, advocacy skills, training/speaking abilities, technical skills, organizing skills, and other areas of personal and professional development.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building helps the project managers to measure how well they are achieving their targets.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building gives satisfaction level of methods and skills impacted on beneficiaries.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)
4.4.4 Cultural Factors

The study on ALLPRO project in Mwingi and Kajiado also looked at factors associated to culture that affect project implementation. Income was cited by most beneficiaries, 44%, as the major driver for project implementation as shown in Table 4.9 and Figure 4.9. Another 34% attributed the same to gender while 22% indicated that the role in the family has an impact on project implementation.

Source: (Research data, 2012)

Figure. 4.6. Culture values that affected the implementation of the project
### Table 4.10. Cultural Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Statements</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The behavior of a project team is conditioned by the culture from which its members originate.</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural factors are all patterns of collective behaviour that influence the project but which are impossible to control through project management.</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects are restricted by time and changing culture or affecting on it takes time.</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultures are linked to many external factors, for example legal, environmental and social environments.</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Research data, 2012)

### 4.5 Variance of factors

The ALLPRO project study sought to establish the key factors affecting project implementation. The following information was obtained from respondents. The respondents were asked to state what was most important. The majority, 33.3%, of the respondents identified financing as the key driver. Stakeholder involvement and capacity building were also cited by many respondents, 29.2%, and 25% respectively. Only 12.5% prioritized culture factors (Table 4.10 and Figure 4.10)
Source: (Research data, 2012)

Figure 4.7. Rating of factors that affected the implementation of the project

Other factors that were cited by respondents include, monitoring and evaluation, environmental degradation, project management (leadership) and climate change
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

The results showed that there was low stakeholder involvement (20%) in the contribution to the implementation of the ALLPRO beekeeping project. It shows the two communities of Kamba and Maasai as beekeepers are traditionally unwilling to compromise traditional ties for modern technologies and culture was found to have greatly influenced implementation in both districts. Majority of the respondents identified financing as the key driver. Stakeholder involvement and capacity building were also cited by many respondents, while a number prioritized culture factors. Other indicators that influenced implementation included, proper timing, training and adoption of appropriate technologies for the project. Based on these findings, project coordinators need to find ways to adjust project implementation programmes to involve stakeholders and cope with cultural characteristics of the target beneficiaries.

5.1.1 Background Information

The response rate was found to be 87.5% of the sample. The researcher found out that most of the respondents were males (73%) as for the gender. The position of the respondents was having managerial capabilities because they were either managers or leaders of the groups. The age range found to be mostly between 35-55 years i.e. over 60%. An evaluation of the beneficiaries indicated that 48% of them held primary education and these were the majority. 58% of the beneficiaries acknowledged that they witnessed increased income from the project and also 46% agreed that they got their skills on beekeeping from the ALLPRO project.

5.1.2 Stakeholders

In the ALLPRO project only 20% of the stakeholders were involved in project implementation. Many stakeholders (67%) strongly agreed that stakeholders’ involvement enhances project performance. These tallies with Ogawa (2004) who highlighted the several factors that influence performance of projects to include: stakeholder involvement, project initiation, project planning, project implementation and monitoring and evaluation.
5.1.3 Financing
Finance was rated as a major factor by 33% of respondents affecting project implementation followed by stakeholder involvement 29.2 and capacity building 25%. It was found out that the funds or the financing received by ALLPRO projects are inadequate. This is reinforced by the fact that 64% of the respondents felt like the financing were not enough to implement the projects effectively and efficiently while only 36% agreed that the funds were appropriate. This is not astonishing as Michael (1994) established that project financiers may encounter social and environmental issues that are both complex and challenging, particularly with respect to projects in the emerging markets.

5.1.4 Capacity Building
In the ALLPRO project, beneficiaries have different beekeeping skills acquired from ALLPRO trainers, traditional skills of beekeeping as well as from other stakeholders. According to the stakeholders and implementers, a significant number of them received training. Forty six percent stated that they received training from ALLPRO projects, and 34% were trained by other stakeholders in beekeeping. This is determined by the available need for training as majority of ALLPRO beneficiaries (48%) have Primary education while only 4% have university level training.

5.1.5 Cultural Factors
Though it was established that among the factors affecting implementation culture contributed 12.5% as compared to other factors for example finance 33%, stakeholder involvement 29.2, and capacity building 25, it has been recognized that culture impacts so much on the outcome or success of any project. ALLPRO project beneficiaries have been trained on the modern ways of beekeeping entailing a 66% of all stakeholders. Even so a number of them (24%) still use traditional skills of beekeeping. This depicts that,

Cultural differences can have various impacts in projects. They vary during different project phases and between project types. Impacts can be negative, positive, and everything between. Evidence from the conducted case studies showed that sometimes there was not any impact at all even if the differences existed. Big question is when these impacts have an importance on
project outcome either it is negative or positive.

ALLPRO project beneficiaries stated that cultural values affect project implementation. The study found out that some cultural values to include the income of the individuals 44%, gender 44% and family roles 22%.

5.2 Conclusion

The insignificant proportion of stakeholder involvement in the ALLPRO beekeeping project shows lack of genuine commitment to all stakeholders. Patterson (2006) asserts this as critical for success in any beekeeping project. Projects would be of more benefit to the poor if the stakeholders were involved from the start, in identification and design to implementation.

Ogawa (2004) also agrees that lack of stakeholder involvement hinders participation of the beneficiaries which weakens their capacity to monitor and evaluate projects’ utilization of funds hence leading to poor performance. In this light, stakeholders can be seen as consultants to a project. (Vink et al, 2008) and Peelle, (1995) suggested that communication and stakeholder involvement should be a continuous activity conducted at a facility level and then augmented during periods of change or crisis when major decisions are being considered. Stakeholder involvement is therefore most effective when it avoids jargon and encourages stakeholders to describe their underlying concerns and issues. Establishing a common ground can facilitate the resolution of difficult issues Humphrey (2004).

The analysis of the results shows that most of the respondents say finance is the key to successful implementation of the project. They too agree that Project financing may encounter social and environmental issues that are both complex and challenging, particularly with respect to projects in the rural set up and emerging markets. (Michael E. M, 1994). Majority of the respondents concurred that Project Financing includes understanding its rationale preparing the financial plan. The respondents also note that in the case of ALLPRO project the financing was inadequate.
ALLPRO projects have agreed with Ede (2005) by at least giving proper training to 66% of their population. Eade (2005) observed that capacity building is an ongoing process through which individuals, groups, organizations and societies enhance their ability to identify and meet development challenges. It often refers to strengthening the skills, competencies and abilities of people and communities in developing societies so they can overcome the causes of their exclusion and suffering.

Culture as a factor had great influence in both districts on the use of information technology and the communicating function of decision documents such as a project plan. Because a single organization cannot accommodate a culture, organizational factors such as centralization, bureaucracy and task orientation, as well as whether an organization operates in a private or a public environment are also factors that should be analyzed in order to understand the development process of a project (Ndolo 2010). In the example given by Phillip and Bhavnagri (2002), the Maasai have been rigid and opposed to learning about the western ways that are being imposed upon them.

In summary therefore beekeeping projects undertaken by the ALLPRO project in Kajiado and Mwingi districts, enhanced income generation potential of small holders. The technologies adopted promoted the conservation and utilization of natural resources that are rapidly being depleted. Factors such as project financing, stakeholder involvement, capacity building and culture were identified as the main factors influencing the implementation process.

5.3 Recommendations

The study found out that there was low stakeholder involvement and recommends that to be a good corporate citizen, project leaders should be communicating with and involving stakeholders to determine issues concerning a particular project. There are costs associated with conducting these activities; however, costs to the project can be even greater if stakeholders take action against the project (e.g., hurting the project’s image through a media campaign, holding up permits, suing the project leaders). On a positive note, ideas and suggestions from stakeholders can often be insightful and useful in improving a project’s planning and operation in the designated area.
There is need to consider reviewing the principles of project financing based on implementation experience, and in order to reflect ongoing learning and emerging good practice. These principles are intended to serve as a common baseline and framework for the implementation of the projects with regard to internal social and environmental policies, procedures and standards related to its project financing activities. Providing adequate finance and on time serves well in a successful implementation on any project.

On capacity building, impact in terms of providing skills through this ALLPRO project approach was clear as the majority of the respondents adopted the technologies. This can be improved on so that the percentage on the adaptation level can be increased. It is equally important for project implementers targeting different cultures to understand what their clients believe and consider effective as well as acceptable. Understanding a culture’s perception is useful in discovering major aspects of the clients’ worldview (O’Neil, 2006).

If projects are to be the main engine for economic growth and prosperity of any nation, as most policy makers generally espouse, policymakers should help by ensuring that the correlates identified as impacting on success of projects are found in the project environment. For example, there should be proper zoning laws to ensure that projects are started where they can expand to other areas.

Project managers should look at the factors over which they have control and make sure they are present in their projects. For example, the possession of a good plan which is communicated to all stakeholders early so that there is a clear understanding and involvement.

5.4 Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this research suggest the need for further studies. Future similar studies should consider an approach that employs a larger sample so as to ensure greater accuracy of the findings. Given the absence of a strong research culture in Kamba and Maasai, using lengthy questionnaires may intimidate respondents and be ultimately counterproductive. In view of the reluctance of respondents to complete long questionnaires, future researchers are advised to deploy questionnaires containing less factors or statements. This would enhance the probability
of on-the-spot responses. Project implementation research can also be carried on other communities to ascertain the effects of culture on the same as the main variable.

In view of the Government’s affirmative action policy for marginal areas, training institutions can be urged to introduce training and education programmes targeted at current and prospective beekeepers. Another area of research is the potential application of a model of project implementation where culture influences project implementation to a considerable degree and a further confirmatory research done to provide a degree of possible universal recognition thereby encouraging other researchers to use the model in future project implementation.

Future researchers could extend the study to include a number of other variables such as community attitude, government fiscal and monetary policies, etc. Further, with a larger sample size, more disaggregated analysis could be carried out. For example, analysis could be done at the community level to see if the factors are consistent across all communities.
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Appendix 1a: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR IMPLEMENTERS

This questionnaire is to collect data for purely academic purposes. The study seeks to carry out an analysis of the factors influencing implementation of ALLPRO beekeeping project in Kajiado and Mwingi District. All information will be treated with strict confidence. Do not put any name or identification on this questionnaire.

Answer all questions as indicated by either filling in the blank or ticking the option that applies.

Please Indicate

SECTION I: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Date of the interview: ..................... Questionnaire No......................

2. Position of respondent
   National PC ( )
   DLPO ( )

3. Age: 18 - 25 [ ] 26 - 35 [ ] 36 - 45 [ ] 46 - 55 [ ] 56 and above [ ]

4. Gender: (Male) / (Female)

5. Division/Station.................................................................

6. What are the major activities as an implementer
   Coordination ( ) Actual implementation ( ) Technical support ( ) Training or
capacity building ( ) Cultural adaptation and community mobilization ( )

7. Effective implementation indicators

Financing
   i) Was financing of project adequate -------YES/NO
ii) Was it provided on time -----------------------YES/NO

Stakeholder involvement
i) Were stakeholders involved in the project implementation process YES/NO
ii) If YES indicate their level of involvement as a percentage -------------------

Timing
Was project implementation within the scheduled time?

ON TIME ( ) NOT ON TIME ( ) (NOT ALWAYS ( )

Provision of proper training
i) Did you provide any training on beekeeping? YES/NO
ii) Was the training adequate YES/NO
iii) Was the training appropriate YES/NO

Provision of new technologies
What new equipment, skills and techniques did you provide through this ALLPRO beekeeping project in:

Mwingi
a) -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
b) -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
c) -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
d) -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Kajiado
a) -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
b) -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
c) -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
d) -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
SECTION II: STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

9. Were stakeholders involved in implementation of this project?
   (i) Yes   (ii) No

10. What role did they play?
   i) ..............................................................................................................................
   ii) ..............................................................................................................................
   iii) ..............................................................................................................................
   iv) ..............................................................................................................................

11. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on stakeholder involvement? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement on stakeholder involvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ involvement enhances participation of the beneficiaries in project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects leaders should be communicating with and involving its stakeholders to determine their issues concerning a particular project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions from stakeholders can often be insightful and useful in improving project planning and operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders can be seen as consultants to a project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more active a project is in involving stakeholders and understanding their issues and concerns, the more time a project has to consider this feedback in making critical decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. What is your recommendation for future projects on the involvement of stakeholders?

SECTION III: FINANCING

13. As a coordinator of project implementation to what extent do you agree with the following statements on financing? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on financing</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project financing has been the preferred form of financing for development and smooth implementation of projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Financing includes understanding the rationale for project financing, how to prepare the financial plan, assess the risks, design the financing mix, and raise the funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge-base is required regarding the design of contractual arrangements to support project financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project financing may encounter social and environmental issues that are both complex and challenging, particularly with respect to projects in the rural set up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing beekeeping projects not only requires lenders to commit for long maturities, but also makes them particularly exposed to the risk of political and cultural interference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. What challenges did you face in the financing process of this project?

ADEQUACY ( ) TIMELINESS ( ) OPERATIONAL LOGISTICS ( )

15. What is your recommendation for future project financiers?

______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________

SECTION IV: CAPACITY BUILDING

16. Capacity building is very crucial in projects to what extent do you agree with the following statements on capacity building? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on capacity building</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building Strengthens the skills, competencies and abilities of people and communities in developing societies so they can overcome the causes of their exclusion and suffering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building can be used to reorganize and capacitate project team, communities or individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building may relate to leadership development, advocacy skills, training/speaking abilities, technical skills, organizing skills, and other areas of personal and professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building helps the project managers to measure how well they are achieving their targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building gives Satisfaction level of methods and skills impacted on beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION V: CULTURAL FACTORS

17. Cultural Factors especially in the kamba /Maasai affect project implementation to what extent do you agree with the following statements on culture? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The behavior of a project team is conditioned by the culture from which its members originate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural factors are all patterns of collective behavior that influence the project but which are impossible to control through project management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects are restricted by time and changing culture or affecting on it takes time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures are linked to many external factors, for example legal, environmental and social environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How in your own opinion can projects learn or adapt culture in project implementation?

SECTION VI: FACTORS AND VARIANCES

19. The implementation of a beekeeping project is influenced by the above factors among others. Please indicate in a scale of 1 to 5 the success contribution of each of the following factors. Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Please make a recommendation on any other factor ---------------------------------------------

21. Other (Specify) -----------------------------------------------------
Appendix 1b: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAKEHOLDERS

This questionnaire is to collect data for purely academic purposes. The study seeks to carry out an analysis of the factors influencing implementation of ALLPRO beekeeping project in Kajiado and Mwingi District. All information will be treated with strict confidence. Do not put any name or identification on this questionnaire.

Answer all questions as indicated by either filling in the blank or ticking the option that applies.

Please Indicate

SECTION I: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Date of the interview: ....................... Questionnaire No ....................... 

2. Position of respondent

   NGO ( )
   INSTITUTION ( )
   CBO ( )
   OTHER (SPECIFY) ---------------------------------------------

3. Age: 18 - 25 [ ] 26 - 35 [ ] 36 - 45 [ ] 46 - 55 [ ] 56 and above [ ]

4. Gender: (Male) / (Female)

5. Division/Station.................................................................

6. What are your major activities as a stakeholder in this ALLPRO beekeeping project?

   Coordination ( ) Actual implementation ( ) Technical support ( ) Training or
capacity building ( ) Cultural adaptation and community mobilization ( )

8. Effective implementation indicators

   i) Was financing of project adequate -------. YES/NO
   ii) Was it provided on time ------------------. YES/NO?
iii) As a stakeholder, were you involved in implementation of this project? 
YES/NO?

iv) Indicate your level of involvement as a percentage -------------------

9. To what extent do you agree with the following statements on stakeholder involvement?
Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement on stakeholder involvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ involvement enhances participation of the beneficiaries in project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects leaders should be communicating with and involving its stakeholders to determine their issues concerning a particular project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions from stakeholders can often be insightful and useful in improving project planning and operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders can be seen as consultants to a project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more active a project is in involving stakeholders and understanding their issues and concerns, the more time a project has to consider this feedback in making critical decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What is your recommendation for future projects on the involvement of stakeholders?----------------------------------

11. As stakeholder in the project implementation to what extent do you agree with the following statements on financing? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree
Project financing has been the preferred form of financing for development and smooth implementation of projects.

Project Financing includes understanding the rationale for project financing, how to prepare the financial plan, assess the risks, design the financing mix, and raise the funds.

A knowledge-base is required regarding the design of contractual arrangements to support project financing.

Project financing may encounter social and environmental issues that are both complex and challenging, particularly with respect to projects in the rural set up.

Financing beekeeping projects not only requires lenders to commit for long maturities, but also makes them particularly exposed to the risk of political and cultural interference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on financing</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project financing has been the preferred form of financing for development and smooth implementation of projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Financing includes understanding the rationale for project financing, how to prepare the financial plan, assess the risks, design the financing mix, and raise the funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge-base is required regarding the design of contractual arrangements to support project financing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project financing may encounter social and environmental issues that are both complex and challenging, particularly with respect to projects in the rural set up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing beekeeping projects not only requires lenders to commit for long maturities, but also makes them particularly exposed to the risk of political and cultural interference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. What is your recommendation for future project financing?

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

SECTION II: CAPACITY BUILDING

13. Capacity building is very crucial in projects to what extent do you agree with the following statements on capacity building? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree.
Statements on capacity building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on capacity building</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building Strengthens the skills, competencies and abilities of people and communities in developing societies so they can overcome the causes of their exclusion and suffering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building can be used to reorganize and capacitate project team, communities or individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building may relate to leadership development, advocacy skills, training/speaking abilities, technical skills, organizing skills, and other areas of personal and professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building helps the project managers to measure how well they are achieving their targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building gives Satisfaction level of methods and skills impacted on beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION III: CULTURAL FACTORS

14. Cultural Factors especially in the Kamba /Maasai affect project implementation to what extent do you agree with the following statements on culture? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree.
The behavior of a project team is conditioned by the culture from which its members originate.

Cultural factors are all patterns of collective behaviour that influence the project but which are impossible to control through project management.

Projects are restricted by time and changing culture or affecting on it takes time.

Cultures are linked to many external factors, for example legal, environmental and social environments.

15. How in your own opinion can projects learn or adapt culture in project implementation?

SECTION IV: FACTORS AND VARIANCES

16. The implementation of a beekeeping project is influenced by the above factors among others. Please indicate in a scale of 1 to 5 the success contribution of each of the following factors. Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Please make a recommendation on any other factor
Appendix 1c: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BENEFICIARIES

This questionnaire is to collect data for purely academic purposes. The study seeks to carry out an analysis of the factors influencing implementation of ALLPRO beekeeping project in Kajiado and Mwingi District. All information will be treated with strict confidence. Do not put any name or identification on this questionnaire.

Answer all questions as indicated by either filling in the blank or ticking the option that applies.

Please Indicate

SECTION I: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1) Date of the interview: .................... Questionnaire No..........................

2) Position of respondent

Group leader ( )
Farmers/Beekeeper ( )
Others (specify) .................................................................

3) Age: 18 - 25 [ ] 26 - 35 [ ] 36 - 45 [ ] 46 - 55 [ ] 56 and above [ ]

4) Gender: (Male) / (Female)

5) Division/Station.................................................................

6) Education level of respondent: Primary ( ) Secondary ( ) University ( ) none ( )

others (Specify).................................

7) What are the major beekeeping activities of your Group?

Keeping bees ( ) Manufacturing of equipments ( ) Trainers ( ) Honey
Processor ( ) Trader ( )
8) Effective implementation indicators

Financing
   i) Was financing of project adequate ------- YES/NO
   ii) Was it provided on time --------------- YES/NO

Stakeholder involvement
   i) Were stakeholders involved in the project implementation process YES/NO?

Timing
   Was project implementation within the scheduled time?
      ON TIME ( ) NOT ON TIME ( ) NOT Always ( )

Provision of proper training
   i) Were you trained on beekeeping YES/NO
   ii) Was the training adequate YES/NO?
   iii) was the training appropriate YES/NO

Income generation
   i) How has ALLPRO beekeeping project affected your income
      INCREASE ( ) DECREASE ( ) NO CHANGE ( )
   ii) What is your commend on income levels

Adoption of new technologies
   What new equipment, skills and techniques did you acquire from the project?
      a)----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
      b)----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
      c)----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
      d)----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

8) To what extent do you agree with the following statements on stakeholder involvement?
   Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree
Statement on stakeholder involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ involvement enhances participation of the beneficiaries in project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects leaders should be communicating with and involving its stakeholders to determine their issues concerning a particular project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions from stakeholders can often be insightful and useful in improving project planning and operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders can be seen as consultants to a project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more active a project is in involving stakeholders and understanding their issues and concerns, the more time a project has to consider this feedback in making critical decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) What is your recommendation for future projects on the involvement of stakeholders?

SECTION II: CAPACITY BUILDING

10) Capacity building is very crucial in projects to what extent do you agree with the following statements on capacity building? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree
**Statements on capacity building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity buildingStrengthens the skills, competencies and abilities of people and communities in developing societies so they can overcome the causes of their exclusion and suffering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building can be used to reorganize and capacitate project team, communities or individuals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building may relate to leadership development, advocacy skills, training/speaking abilities, technical skills, organizing skills, and other areas of personal and professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building helps the project managers to measure how well they are achieving their targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building gives Satisfaction level of methods and skills impacted on beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) How did you acquire beekeeping skills and knowledge? (Tick)

a) Trained by ALLPRO project (   )

b) Trained by others stakeholders (   )

c) Traditional training (   )

d) Any other (   )
SECTION III: CULTURAL FACTORS

12) Cultural Factors especially in the kamba /maasai affect project implementation to what extent do you agree with the following statements on culture? Use a scale of 1-5 where 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 neutral; 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The behavior of a project team is conditioned by the culture from which its members originate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural factors are all patterns of collective behaviour that influence the project but which are impossible to control through project management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects are restricted by time and changing culture or affecting on it takes time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures are linked to many external factors, for example legal, environmental and social environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) Were your values as community affected during implementation of the project?
   i) YES
   ii) NO

14) If yes explain how-
   i) Income,  
   ii) Gender,  
   iii) Role in the family 

14) How in your own opinion can projects learn or adapt culture in project implementation?
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SECTION IV: FACTORS AND VARIANCES

15) The implementation of a beekeeping project is influenced by the above factors among others. Please indicate in a scale of 1 to 5 the success contribution of each of the following factors. Use a scale of 1-5 where 1= strongly disagree; 2= disagree; 3 neutral; 4= agree and 5= strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16) Please make a recommendation on any other factor

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Appendix IV: List of the participants

LIST OF THE PROJECT IMPLEMENTERS, STAKEHOLDERS AND GROUPS

1) IMPLEMENTERS

National Project Coordinator (ALLPRO)
Mwingi District Livestock Production Officer
Kajiado District Livestock Production officer

2) MWINGI STAKEHOLDERS AND GROUPS INVOLVED IN BEEKEEPING

STAKEHOLDERS

1) ICIPE (International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology
2) Honey Care
3) Genesis
4) Africa Beekeepers Limited
5) TARDA (Tana and Athi River Development Authority)
6) World Vision

GROUPS

CIDC
Mwiwano SHG
Syuvuvwa SHG
Muuo wa Kathaalani SHG
Kiviko Women Group
Mavauni Ukilyo SHG
Kamatili Women Group

Katanga FFS
Kwa Mathis Women Group Katuti parents
SHG Kwa Lava women group
Nzalaani Bee keepers SHG
Kyeni kya Kasyathu W.G
Kyeni kya Mbui W. G.
3) KAJIADO STAKEHOLDERS AND GROUPS INVOLVED IN BEEKEEPING

STAKEHOLDERS
1) Neighbours Initiative Alliance
2) German Agro Action
3) Masan Community Development
4) ASAL Lands Management

GROUPS

Olkenkei women group
Oloshaiki women group
keeping society - Enkorika
Ilmeejooli/Parmuat women group
Olong’osuani women group
Kikkuro/Oloontulgum
Maturu bee keeping group

Olmotaro women group
Illasit youth group

Oloontulgum
Enyorata-oroturok bee
Enkaroni women group
Kikkuro  bee keeping group
Ilmotio-Torosei
Naseremi  women group
Rombo-Loitokitok.
Illasit-Loitokitok.
Olborsoit youth group
Lenoko Naibosho Education
Nasaru- maa women group
Orinie youth group
Ilmeeyu women group

Lenkobei community
Umoja women group