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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>Community development assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International fund for Agricultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPMA</td>
<td>International Project Management Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>None governmental organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>Social development officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHG</td>
<td>Self-Help Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

While funding opportunities for groups has been increasing especially with grants from the Kenya government and other sources, there is a huge disparity between the implemented granted self-help groups and the sustainable ones in Matungulu sub county, Machakos County. The study sought to fill this gap by assessing the influence of grant management practices on sustainability of self-help group projects that benefit from government grants in Matungulu sub-county, Kenya. The study was guided by objectives: to determine how effective grant design as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county; to establish how strategic planning as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county; to examine how training as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county and to access how monitoring and evaluation as a grant management practice influence sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county. The study is based on the following assumptions: those respondents would provide honest and reliable responses which would lead to unbiased conclusions that grants management practices influences sustainability of self-help projects, that the self-help group officials are also knowledgeable enough to apply grant management practices. This study adds value to the self-help groups especially by suggesting how to improve on their grant management practices and consequently sustain their projects. It would also help the Ministry of labor, social security and social services as well as the county government in making policies that would guarantee proper grant management and sustainability of granted projects. The study applied Resource based view theory by Wernerfelt which suggests that competitiveness can be achieved by innovatively delivering superior value to customers. A conceptual framework shows the relationship between variables. The study targeted 35 self-help groups which had benefited from grants; with a total target population of 568. Using Krejcie and Morgan table the sample size was 234 respondents who included the self-help group members, the social development officer and volunteers. The data was collected using questionnaires and interview schedule. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS as a tool and the results presented through tables and percentages followed by discussions for each of the findings. The study established that most groups lived beyond the grants period. However, they still survive on minimal resources and are yet to really grow their capital to the most sustainable levels. The researcher also established some good practices like stable and rotational leadership meaning that the group projects are not personalized. Some have also tried to diversify and have alternative sources of funds which increase the chances of sustaining their projects. Regular training and monitoring and evaluation need to be enhanced in order for the groups to reap maximum benefits. The study recommends that; employing social development officers as their role is very critical in empowering local self-help groups through training, monitoring and evaluation of group projects and even design of group projects. Regular training and monitoring and evaluation need to be enhanced in order for the groups to reap maximum benefits and the amount of grants should be increased and be provided in phases to boost the self-help group activities, this will reduce incidences of projects failing due to inadequate funding.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

According to IFAD Strategic Framework (2007-2010), sustainability of a project can be defined as the ability to ensure that the institutions supported through projects and the benefits realized are maintained and continue after the end of the project external funding. There has been an increasing focus on and understanding of the design and implementation phases of projects as part of efforts to make projects more successful and work more efficiently (IFAD, 2007). Whereas the trend with implementation is showing significant improvement, the trend with sustainability is rather disappointing, as fewer projects are being sustained. This means that the expenditure incurred during implementation is not commensurate with the benefits accrued (TANGO International 2008c, 2008d, 2008e).

During the 22nd World Congress of the International Project Management Association (IPMA) in 2008, IPMA Vice-President Mary McKinlay stated in the opening keynote speech that ‘the further development of the project management profession requires project managers to take responsibility for sustainability’ (McKinlay, 2008). In her view, project managers need to take a broad view of their role and to evolve and take responsibility for the results of the project, including the sustainability aspects of that result. The relationship between project management and sustainability has also been explored in academic research (Eid, 2009; Gareis et al. 2009; Taylor, 2008, Labuschagne and Brent, 2006) as one of the (future) developments in project management.

Besides the sustainability challenge, there are unique sets of conditions that act to enhance or constrain the potential for local economic development. These conditions include human capital, social capital, employment opportunities, investment opportunities and local innovativeness (Sarker, 2004; Abel & Deitz, 2011; Andriopoulou
& Tsakloglou, 2011). Some communities with better conditions are presumed to be in a better off position while some have a bare minimum of these conditions and hence suffer from poor local development. One of these innovations has been the establishment of self-help groups by marginalized groups.

Self Help Groups are considered as one of the most significant tools to adopt participatory approach for the economic empowerment of women. It is an important institution for improving the life of women on various social components. The basic objective of a self-help group is that it acts as the forum for members to provide space and support to each other. Self-help groups comprise of very poor people who don’t have access to formal financial institutions. It enables its members to learn to cooperate and work in a group environment (Gupta & Gupta, 2006:23). According to Rananathan, (2007), a self-help group is a small economically homogeneous affinity group of 10 to 20 persons who come together to save small amounts regularly, mutually agree to contribute to a common fund, have collective decision making, or resolve conflicts through collective leadership and mutual discussion. Several researchers for instance, Anand, (2002); Chavan and Birajdar, (2009); Nidheesh, (2009); Sujatha, (2011); Aruna and Jyothisrayi, (2011), have reported that self-help groups (SHGs) contribute in other areas of economic development and growth such as poverty eradication, social transformation and empowerment.

With the understanding that government does not have the resources to provide for all their needs is the driving force towards this move which has been successful and has led to the growth of such self-help groups (Ali, 2006; Ayuba, 2006; Paul, 2011). Therefore, self-help groups exist for development purpose, particularly in the rural areas not only in Kenya but also in other developing countries. There are socio-economic benefits attached to such groups in that they enable rural people to accumulate savings and access credit which banks are increasingly willing to lend (Wilson, 2002). Self-help groups have made a lasting impact on the lives of people, particularly in the rural areas and have improved the quality of lives of many and there is an increase in their consumption expenditure.
Further still, (Khatibi and Indira, 2011) observed that SHGs today plays a vital role in poverty alleviation through empowerment.

In the United States, grants most often come from a wide range of government departments or an even wider range of public and private trusts and foundations. According to the Foundation Centre, these trusts and foundations number in excess of 88,000 and disperse in excess of $40 billion every year. Grants offered include education grants for those attending Post-Secondary Education Institutions as well as Research grants involving human and animal subjects. National Science Foundation (NSF) gives grants to small groups of investigators who carry out research at their home campuses. The funded projects rank highest in merit review process which is carried by panels of independent scientists, engineers and educators in the relevant field of study.

In Europe, self-help groups are given grants to run projects if they meet the following criteria: That address a community issue, Provide a long term benefit to the community, Support cooperative values and principles, ideally be innovative in its approach. There are several funding providers to self-help groups among them Reaching Communities which finances projects that respond to needs by communities which actively involve them, Award For All Program which is a National Lottery funded scheme providing grants for small community based projects with the aim of bringing real improvement to community and to the lives of people most in need. Others include Lloyds Bank Foundation, Church and Community Fund, Community Cash Bank Initiative, Cemex Community Fund etc

A similar approach has been used in India where groups are designed not only as a strategy for poverty alleviation but also to increase women's access to resources and their power in household decision-making (Sundram, 2001, cited in Mohindra, 2003). In India, development depends to a large extent on the development of its 833 million rural populations. Many studies in India concluded that for sustainable development to be achieved empowering rural population especially women were an important paradigm of development process (Heggade et al, 2006). The self-help group movement made the
empowerment of rural communities successful and has continued to support rural empowerment in India (Heggade et al, 2008). The women self-help groups for example have been supporting women entrepreneurship in the villages (Kamaraj, 2009). The self-help groups have largely benefited from government grants program and linkages to financial institutions. Currently, the approach of empowering rural communities through self-help groups is slowly gaining momentum in Africa, especially with donors.

In Nepal, many of such groups have been introduced and they function not just for microfinance but also for community development. SHGs (self-help groups) in Nepal have focused their activities on multidimensional arenas like micro credit, animal husbandry, community forests, social awareness and movements, cultural activities, social and legal advocacy, eradication of social evils, literacy and vocational trainings and HIV/AIDS awareness (Sinha, 2006). These activities are expected to uplift the status of women in Nepal, but, an empirical assessment to this statement is necessary to make this expectation a valid conclusion. Not every SHG are conducting all these activities at the same time. Since, every society is different also in terms of the social problems they have, SHGs have focused upon the social problems that they are facing in their locality. Usually such groups take the affiliation of some governmental and nongovernmental organizations that support them and guide them. Support includes financial help in which the supporting organization provides them with funds at very low interest or no interest at all. Non-financial support includes capacity building like: trainings, suggestion, advices and supervision (Wangwe, 2004).

In Nigeria, the notion of self-help groups has been seriously viewed as a means of developing local communities in view of the incapacitation of the government to provide all the necessities of life for the increasing population. Various scholars have also given their input on the issue of self-help groups. For example, Ghadoliya, (2008) remarked that self-help group is an instrument for economic empowerment. It normally consists of voluntary association of poor people, preferably from the same socio-economic background that comes together for the purpose of solving their common problems through self-help. Paul, (2011) described SHGs as groups of rural poor comprising of
marginalized farmers, landless agricultural laborers, rural artisans, women folk and other micro-entrepreneurs who organize themselves for socio-economic development by raising initial capital supplemented in some cases by funds from non-governmental organizations (NGOs) as seed money for issuing small emergency loans either for consumption, production purposes, or linking up with banks usually with the help of NGOs. Although there is little evidence of grants provided by government towards self-help groups in Nigeria, literature reviewed point out to lots of grants provided by Non-governmental organizations to self-help groups. In Ghana funding alone is often insufficient in ensuring the success of self-help groups especially women groups and more training on technological transfer marketing of products is necessary for the success of these groups (Amu, 2006).

In Kenya, most communities including those organized in self-help groups; have awakened to seek ways to satisfy their own needs by embarking upon self-help projects. To be able to implement the projects, they rely on donor and grants which are provided by national government, county governments and other nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). In Matungulu sub-county, projects run by self-help groups operate profitably especially when external assistance is flowing in. However, with termination of such support the projects end up not succeeding. Noting that previous studies have failed to assess the influence of grant management practices on sustainability of projects it is definitely hard for a solution to be found. Therefore a study on this topic helped to fill the existing knowledge gap.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

From the background of the study, it is evident that project sustainability is still a major challenge in many developing countries as many of projects implemented at huge costs often tend to experience difficulties with sustainability. Findings from a study by Alexia (2006) on factors affecting sustainability of rural water supplies in Tanzania concluded that, sustainability of rural water supplies projects is clearly undermined by poor financial management the constituent element which must be addressed by all implementing agencies, donors and government. A study by TANGO International (2008) revealed that,
while the trend with implementation of projects is showing significant improvement, the trend with post-implementation is rather disappointing as fewer projects are being sustained. Other studies conducted on organizational sustainability include, Chumo, (2011) sustainability strategies adopted by NGOs in Nairobi, Kenya and Onsongo, (2012) strategies adopted by NGOs to achieve financial sustainability. Although all these studies contributed significantly to the available literature on organizational sustainability they did not specifically focus on grant management practices and their influence on the project or organizations’ sustainability. The grant management practices and their influence on project sustainability is therefore an area that is not sufficiently researched and this study is expected to contribute significantly to the existing literature on organizational sustainability.

With the establishment of Youth Development Funds and women Enterprise fund in Kenya, Several self-help groups received grants to implement income generating projects across the country including Matungulu Sub-county. Between 2010 to 2015 a total of 35 self-help groups have benefited from government grants. However, according to a report from Matungulu Sub-county development officer some projects were unable to sustain themselves as indicated by the repayment schedule of the grants disbursed to various groups (District Report 2012). The officer further observed that, most projects run by self-help groups operate profitably especially when external assistance is flowing in. The officer observed that, after the termination of external support, most of these projects either collapse or continue to operate below capacity. This has led to development partners raising concerns over sustainability of self-help group projects. With the devolution of grants to County level, grant management remains a crucial component which if well explored can increase sustainability of self-help group projects.

The overall research problem that this study tried to address is that, while funding opportunities for groups has been increasing especially with grants from the Kenya government and other sources, there is a huge disparity between the implemented granted self-help groups and the sustainable ones. The study therefore seeks to fill this gap by
assessing the influence of grant management practices on sustainability of self-help group projects that benefit from government grants in Matungulu sub-county, Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of grant management practices on sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu Sub-county, Machakos County, Kenya

1.4 Objectives of the study

This study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To determine how effective grant design as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county
2. To establish how strategic planning as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county
3. To examine how training as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county
4. To access how monitoring and evaluation as a grant management practice influence sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county

1.5 Research questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How does effective grant design influence sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county?
2. How does strategic planning as a grant management practice influence sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county?
3. How does training as a grant management practice influence sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county?
4. How does monitoring and evaluation as a grant management practice influence sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu sub-county?
1.6 Significance of the study

This study was of substantive value to the self-help groups especially by suggesting how to improve on their grant management practices and consequently sustain their projects. It would also help the Ministry of labor, social security and social services as well as the county government in making policies that would guarantee proper grant management and sustainability of granted projects. The local partners and donor community may as well use the findings to design capacity building framework for self-help groups that would in the end enhance capacity of various self-help groups to manage grants which in the end would ensure sustainability of grantees projects. Finally, the study shall also be a useful input for further research on the area of effective project grant management.

The researcher was therefore convinced that the study was worth doing as its benefits definitely outweighed the challenges arising from limited resources of time, finances and other relevant materials required to make this study successful. It was the researchers hope that once the study highlights the grant management practices and how these practices influence sustainability of projects, adequate measures would be taken to build the capacity of all self-help groups benefiting from grants would intern better their grant management practices and consequently sustain their projects. Sustained projects would therefore mean continued social and economic benefits for the members of such self-help groups and eventually alleviate suffering as a result of poverty and economic marginalization.

1.7 Basic assumptions of the study

The study was based on the following assumptions: those respondents would provide honest and reliable responses which would lead to unbiased conclusions that grants management practices influences sustainability of self-help projects, that the self-help group officials are also knowledgeable enough to apply grant management practices.
1.8 Delimitations of the study

Between 2010 to 2015 a total of 35 self-help groups have benefited from government grants. However, according to a report from Matungulu Sub-county development officer some projects were unable to sustain themselves as indicated by the repayment schedule of the grants disbursed to various groups (District Report, 2012). The officer observed that, after the termination of external support, most of these projects either collapse or continue to operate below capacity.

The study would therefore focus on influence of grant management practices on sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu Sub-county, Kenya. The main interest of the study will be limited to how effective grant design as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects, how strategic planning as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self help group projects, how monitoring and evaluation as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects, how training as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects and to establish the moderating influence of policy guidelines on grants on the relationship between grant management practices and sustainability of self-help group projects. The research would assist in understanding why most of the granted self help groups in Matungulu have sustainability challenges. There being so many funded self help groups and little sustainability of the projects after the support is withdrawn, this has brought the need to check on why sustainability is an issue.

1.9 Limitations of the study

Due to the time constrain, the researcher would not be able to reach all the self-help groups, a limitation that was mitigated by ensuring that the sample size comprises the diverse characteristics of the target population.

The researcher was also faced with transport challenges due to the vast region. This was minimized by ensuring that data is collected from each area on separate date and further by use of research assistants from those areas who guided the researcher to navigate through different areas.
The self-help group members and officials could also be biased with information for fear of negative publicity; however the researcher mitigated this by assuring them of confidentiality and by having anonymous questionnaires for respondents.

1.10 Definition of significant terms used in the study

**Sustainability of self-help group project:** Is the ability to ensure that the institutions supported through projects and the benefits realized are maintained and continue after the end of the project external funding. The indicators for measuring sustainability included multiple sources of revenues, variety of partnerships, effective programs and efficient operations.

**Effective grants design** is a process (or result) of adequate overall oversight and monitoring of donors/government assistance awards, that includes project resources, activities and results. Indicators for measuring effective grant design will include level of participation of key stakeholders and whether it addresses the actual needs of the target group.

**Strategic planning**- is a review and planning process that is undertaken to make thoughtful decisions about an organization's future in order to ensure its success and would be measured using the financing strategies, implementation plans and sustainability strategies.

**Training of groups**- Organized activity aimed at imparting information and/or instructions to improve the recipient's performance or to help him or her attain a required level of knowledge or skill. The indicators include the type of training, frequency of the training and relevance of the training.

**Monitoring and evaluation** - is a process that helps improve performance and achieve results. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. The indicators included frequency of monitoring and evaluation, availability of
monitoring evaluation reports, use of the report and personnel trained in monitoring and evaluation.

**Policy guidelines** - are guiding principles used to set direction in an organization. The indicators include the availability of internal policy framework on utilization of grants, regulatory framework for award and monitoring of grants by county and National government.

**1.11 Organization of the study**

The proposal is organized into five chapters. Chapter one covers the introductory part of the study. It comprises of the background to the study; the statement of the problem; purpose of the study, objective of the study, research questions, assumption of the study, significance of the study, delimitation, limitation of the study and definition of significant terms. Chapter two covers the review of the available literature. The literature review critically analyzed what has been done about the topic vis-à-vis the objectives. From the review of literature a knowledge gap that this study intends to fill were also identified. The chapter also comprises of the theoretical and the conceptual framework. Chapter three outlined the methodology and tools to be used in the study. It pointed out the research design to be used in the study, the target population, sample size and sampling procedures, data collection and analysis procedures and ethical consideration. Chapter four dealt with data analysis; present the findings of the study, interpretation and validation of the findings. It gives a report on questionnaire return rate and demographic characteristics of the respondents. While chapter five presents the summary of the findings, recommendations, conclusions and suggestions for further study as well as the contribution of the study to the body of knowledge.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introductions

In this chapter, the researcher presents a review of literature related to the study. It begins by exploring the concepts of grant management practices and the sustainability of self-help groups. Literature review has further been guided by the study objectives under the following sub-headings: effective grant design and sustainability of self-help groups’ projects; strategic planning and sustainability of self-help groups’ projects; training and sustainability of self-help group projects; monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of self-help group projects and policy guidelines on grants and sustainability of self-help group projects. The researcher further identified theoretical framework that is applicable to the study and came up with a conceptual framework.

2.2 Concepts of grant management practices

According to Helen, (2012), a “grant” is a generic term applied to funding or other incentives provided to individuals or bodies (including community groups, statutory bodies or commercial enterprises). According to Mango (2014) grants can be in the nature of incentives, donations, contributions, debts forgiven, rebates, tax relief and other similar funding arrangements, and may be in the form of cash or other property. However, in recognition of changing levels of demand for increasingly complex service types and emerging service delivery models, government may also consider a variety of more innovative approaches to funding service delivery.

Effective grants management is a process or result of adequate overall oversight and monitoring of grant awards that includes project resources, activities and results. Grants and other funding are provided by government and donors to support the achievement of objectives consistent with government policy. Grants may be covered by legislation or regulation or be subject to Cabinet, Ministerial or administrative discretion (Corey, 2014).
2.3 Sustainability of self-help group project

There is no standard approach for defining or conceptualizing sustainability. In some situations, it is simply ability to continue with a program or services through funding and resource shifts or losses. In others, it is about institutionalizing services or the continuation of activities and impacts; creating a legacy; including continuing organizational ideals, principles and beliefs; upholding existing relationships and/or maintaining consistent outcomes. The IFAD Strategic Framework, 2007-2010 (IFAD 2007) defined sustainability as ensuring that the institutions supported through projects and the benefits realized are maintained and continues after the end of the project. Achieving sustainable impact requires that grantees develop a planning process that accounts for local needs and seeks to realize their mission.

Andres, (2005) traces the emergence of sustainability in its contemporary form to the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) headed by Brundtland in 1983. The Commission was constituted by the United Nations and one of its core mandates was to propose long term environmental strategies for achieving sustainable development by the year 2000 and beyond. The commission came up with the Brundtland report and the report defined sustainable development as the “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs”. Since then the concept of sustainability has been accorded many definitions and interpretations, for the purpose of this study sustainability refers to the continuation of a project’s goals, principles, and efforts to achieve desired outcomes (Kimonge, 2011). A project is sustainable when it continues to deliver benefits to the project beneficiaries and other constituencies uninterrupted into future.

Sustainability relates primarily to environmental and demographic concerns but, in the light of the recent economic and fiscal crises across Europe and the USA, it increasingly includes social issues such as equality, social mobility, social renewal and financial sustainability (UNCTAD, 2014). Accordingly, connected with the growing political interest in sustainability, there has been a growing interest in the study of sustainability
both as an academic field of research and as an area of practice. As economic activity is increasingly based on projects, making these projects more sustainable can provide the building blocks for a more sustainable economy and society. Accordingly, a growing debate amongst practitioners has focused on the issue of sustainable projects.

Johnson & Rogaly, (2002) noted that NGOs were increasingly being challenged by the donors to examine the financial sustainability of their programmes. They asserted that one way to look at the financial sustainability of an organization is to look at its income compared to its costs. Financial sustainability is one way of ensuring organizations are able to provide services in the long term. The financial resources also facilitate programmes expansion and provision of emergency needs such as disaster and relief aids according to Kimonge, (2011).

2.4 Effective grant design and sustainability of self-help groups’ projects

According to Rand, (2012), the main challenge for many organizations is relying too much on external sources of funding, such as government grants that have been cut back in recent years. There is general consensus that the likelihood for sustained impact can be increased if a project plans for it from the beginning. The grant design stage comprises the first phase of planning. That is, the conceptual plans that are typically developed in conjunction with a proposal that articulates a projects overall goal, objectives and strategies to achieve intended results within a pre-defined scope and according to a logical framework or theory of change.

When a project is designed without a clear plan from the outset, resources are frequently invested in efforts that have little likelihood of being sustained beyond the project period (Kristof J. Nordin, 2014). Therefore understanding sustainability, (both conceptually and operationally) and intentionally engaging in sustainability enhancement efforts, has both strategic importance and practical application for donors, program implementers, program participants and other stakeholders. For example, if project outcomes are not sustained after the project ends they return to the pre-project state of being, meaning the donor resources have essentially been wasted and project participants (and communities
at large) may become disillusioned and/or frustrated and less likely to participate in future endeavors.

According to Choi-Fitzpatrick Jenny, Janine Schooley, Clara Eder & Blanca Lomeli, (2014), ‘sustainability lens’ can be applied to the design process in the following ways: first by prioritizing the involvement and substantive input of key stakeholders, including relevant members of the community, civil society and government; secondly by ensuring interventions are relevant to the target population and stakeholders; thirdly by developing an operational definition of sustainability (sustainability of what, for what purpose) from the beginning, together with key stakeholders. In addition, design process ensures that consensus on a project’s graduation and exit a strategy is reached from the beginning based on agreed upon criteria. Further, it helps to develop a results-oriented sustainability strategy; ensure that sustainability objectives are clearly reflected in the project’s guiding documents, including logical frameworks, monitoring and evaluation plans, timelines and budget and communicate clearly with stakeholders from the beginning about the need to plan for sustainability. Lastly but not least, at design stage organizational capacity strengthening is included at the project design stage as an integral part of increasing sustainability readiness and Design activities or services such that they can continue after the project ends, either because they are transferred to another implementing body, or through self-financing/entrepreneurial means (Choi-Fitzpatrick Jenny, Janine Schooley, Clara Eder & Blanca Lomeli, 2014).

2.5 Strategic planning and sustainability of self-help groups projects

Organizations respond to changes in the environment by formulating strategies. Strategies helps ensure that the day-to-day decisions fit in the long term interest of the organization. Macmillan & Tampoe, (2010) defined strategy as ideas and actions to conceive and secure the future. This definition highlights the fact that strategy requires thoughts about the future and effective action to realize organization objectives. However, Alexander (2005) argued that firms have not been short of strategies but have fallen short of project financing strategies (Alexander, 2005). Miller (2002) also noted
that organizations fail to implement up to 70% of their strategic initiatives due to inadequate financing strategies.

A strategic plan is continuously evaluated and controlled to ensure it remains relevant to achieving the goals of the organization (Kraus, Harms & Schwarz, 2006). Strategic thinkers are in constant pursuit of innovative ideas that create a sustainable future for their organization (Graetz, 2002). Non-profit leaders should replace outdated practices that are not relevant in today’s economy and cause inefficiency and replace them with sustainable practices. This require them to be creative and utilize their professional and personal experiences to develop solutions that answer the question, ‘How can we sustain our business?’ (Graetz, 2002). Therefore strategic thinking is vital to the sustainability of an organization and often contributes to the redevelopment or tweaking of an organization's mission statement, goals, objectives, and strategies (Nieboer, 2011).

Analoui and Samour (2012) argued that the success of a non-profit organization (NPO) often depended on formulating strategies suitable for the competitive environmental realities that the organization confronts. This belief affirms findings of a study by Estallo et al. (2006) which stated that NGOs have a mission, strategy and goals different from those organizations looking for profits. But in light of the current environment, surviving and flourishing requires responding and adjusting to the social, economic and political environments and the changes therein. Hence the conclusion that strategic planning is essential in every type of organization, be it NGO, a government, community, political or business institution.

According to the Office of Adolescent Health in Building Sustainable Programs: The Framework (2014), planning for sustainability can span a number of strategies from building internal capacity, to securing new funding, to incorporating effective programs, practices or policies into partnering organizations to ensure continuity. Sustainability also involves managing and leveraging resources (financial and otherwise) and focusing broadly on the community needs which may shift or change over time. The following eight key factors can influence whether a service, program or its activities and benefits
sustained over time: Create an action strategy, assess the environment, be adaptable, secure community support, integrate program services into community infrastructures, build a leadership team, create strategic partnerships and secure diverse financial opportunities. These factors provide a foundation from which grantees can begin to build sustainability plans. Grantees should tailor and incorporate any or all of these factors into their own unique sustainability strategy.

According to Pearson and Robinson, (2000), the strategic planning process contains tasks that include; formulating the mission, reviewing the company’s internal and external environment for strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats (SWOT), analyses the various options the company has and decide on the most desirable option for the company’s mission and selecting both long term and short term objectives. The process proceeds to implementation of the strategic choices and assessing the success or failure of the strategic choices. Ansoff explores how strategic management can be used by firms to ensure they remain competitive and respond to the changing environment as well as dealing with the surprises of the operating environment to always ensure the firm remains capable of pursuing its mission (Ansoff & McDonnell, 1990). Strategic management can therefore be summarized to be the company’s game plan which provides a framework for managerial decision making though not the very fine details, (Pearson & Robinson, 2000). The sustainability of a firm hinges on the substitutability and imitability of its critical assets (Sun and Tse, 2009), in this way Sun & Tse qualify sustainability as a core concept of strategic management.

Strategic thinking results in a strong planning process that scrutinizes every idea and leads to the implementation of a sound strategy. The implementation of a sound strategy allows an organization to continuously monitor the performance and alignment of all business groups and subsidiaries (Micheli, Mura, & Agliati, 2011, cites Dossi & Patelli, 2008). Performance management allows leaders to make strategic business decisions that are in the interest of organizational sustainability. If a business group or subsidiary is not performing to the standards that are expected of them, a decision can be made to remove
them, provide training or support, add additional resources, or replace the leadership team.

Non-profit organizations are designed to meet the social needs of their constituents. Leaders of these organizations are challenged with meeting the needs of their constituency on an unsecured, tight budget. Satisfying the funding requirements of funders and walking the fine line of financial efficiency while achieving their mission creates an organizational environment that is concerned with implementing survival tactics, which is the antithesis of strategic planning (McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Sarros, & Islam, 2010). Non-profit organizations are expected to solve their social mission with the resources that are made available to them; however, there are low expectations of them to develop a plan on how to manage those resources to fulfill their mission (Thach & Thompson, 2007). Most non-profit cultures are influenced by the assumption that a non-profit is not a business and should not have strategic goals. In addition, these low expectations are supported by the idea that non-profits do not have a profit-generating interest and should not worry about planning the same way as a for-profit organization. The intense focus on social solutions is the engine that drives non-profit operations. Unfortunately, this lends itself to convenience planning and results in an uncoordinated effort towards strategic planning (Sharp & Brock, 2010).

The strategic planning process can lead to the modification or changing of the mission of the organization and obstruct the continuity of an organizational culture (Sharp & Brock, 2010). Sharp and Block's research also discovered it is difficult for a non-profit’s workers to deal with change and ultimately resist the strategic planning process. Although the goal for non-profits is to make social investments, the return on the investment is measured by how an organization executes their strategic plan (Kelly & Lewis, 2009). Many non-profit organizations prefer to engage in convenience planning than strategic planning to avoid changing their culture. They later learn the likelihood of being successful is diminished by not having a strategic plan (Kraus, Harms, & Schwarz, 2006).
Recognizing the importance of strategic planning, this study therefore sought to determine the influence of strategic planning as a grant management practice on sustainability of self-help groups’ projects.

2.6 Training of groups and sustainability of self-help group projects

Training and development is very essential at all employee levels, due to the reason that skills erode and become obsolete over a period of time and has to be replenished (Nishtha & Amit, 2010). The success of an organization is mainly depends on its knowledgeable, skilled as well as experienced workforce (Ololube, Ajayi & Kpolovie, 2011).

Many organizations meet their needs for training in an ad hoc and haphazard way. Training in these organizations is more or less unplanned and unsystematic. Other organizations however set about identifying their training needs, then design and implement training activities in a rational manner, and finally assess results of training. Gordon, (1992) views training as the planned and systematic modification of behavior through learning events, activities and programmes which results in the participants achieving level of knowledge, skills, competences and abilities to carry out their work effectively. This was supported by Cole, (2002), that training is a learning activity directed towards the acquisition of specific knowledge and skills for the purpose of an occupation or task. In the view of Adamolekun, (1983), Staff development involves the training, education and career development of staff members.

For the project to be successfully implemented and sustained, the manager and the people working in the project must be trained on all necessary tasks identified during planning phase and post implementation phase of the project (Westland, 2007). Training offered should be of quality and must match with the project requirements to ensure effective and efficient post-implementation of the project. In order to increase chances of successfully sustainability of the project, the manager and the team members need to be trained on the project risk assessment and management, fundraising and project evaluation and monitoring (Hubbard & Bolles, 2007). By knowing what lead to project failure, we stand a better chance to forestall the pitfalls by being more proactive in our planning. To
counteract the foregoing and ensure success, the following factors should be put into consideration; risk management, project control and sponsorship (Mulwa, 2007).

Educational processes, therefore, need to be expanded as they are critical in enabling them to understand micro-credit programmes, creating a space for themselves to negotiate interests. The question we need to ask ourselves is what are the levels of information about financial processes and the functioning of self-help groups (SHGs) that the members are aware of? This calls for a greater demand for adult, non-formal education programmes (Sharma, 2008).

2.7 Monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of self-help group projects

Research indicates that stakeholders are more likely to use evaluations if they understand them and feel ownership of the evaluation process and findings. This understanding and ownership can come from active and substantive involvement in the evaluation process from the beginning to the end (Project Concern International, 2014). Monitoring and evaluation of project activities provides the grantee and grantor with better means for learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocating resources and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders. Therefore the success and sustainability of any project or program largely depend on constant feedbacks about project on going activities (Mark, Henry & Julnes, 2000). According to Standish Group Project Chaos Report, (2005), one of the reasons for project failure is lack of project monitoring and control.

From a sustainability perspective, evaluations can shed light on both the achievement of intended sustainability outcomes, as well as the factors during the project period that influenced the program’s sustainability in positive and negative ways. While monitoring is ongoing, evaluation is periodic, although both can provide rich lessons and contribute too much needed learning about what works and doesn’t work so well in sustaining impact (Scheirer, et al., 2008).

Evaluations usually involve comparisons, such as conditions before and after a project. They draw from data collected during monitoring, as well as from additional surveys or studies to assess project achievements against objectives. For this reason, sustainability
related indicators that have been included in a project’s overall M&E system and monitored over time are critical (Scheirer, et al., 2008).

2.8 Policy guidelines on grants and sustainability of self-help group projects

As all projects grant involve the use of public money, grant implementers are accountable for grants allocated and donors/providers are required to meet various government regulatory obligations contained in applicable regional and federal legislation. According to Mango, (2014), the organization’s financial policies and systems must be consistent over time. This promotes efficient operations and transparency, especially in financial reporting. While systems may need to be adapted to changing needs, unnecessary changes should be avoided. Inconsistent approaches to financial management can be a sign that the financial situation is being manipulated. According to Helen, (2012), donors and/or government to support the achievement of projects objectives consistent with government policy provide grants and other funding.

According to Helen, (2012), performance measures must relate back to the project objectives that categorized under five points: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. According to Helen, (2012), government should make sure that NGOs projects objectives and goals match the problems or needs that are related to public. It is mandatory to evaluate projects key performance in relation to the community that projects are intended to support. Hellen, (2012) further added that project relevance is a base for project eligibility that should clearly and mandatory requirements to be met by NGOs projects.

According to Helen, (2012), government should supervise every NGOs projects whether to distinguish it has achieved the project objectives and intended goal. A project monitoring strategy provides a framework for projects to evaluate the effectiveness of the grant in achieving the projects objectives, and includes assessment of NGOs project’s compliance with the provisions of the grant agreement executed between both parties. There are two fundamental aspects of effectiveness – financial acquittal and performance monitoring. Financial acquittal determines whether relevant financial accountability procedures have been complied with, while performance monitoring determines the
extent to which desired outcomes are being or have been achieved. Regular government supervisions and reviews of the results of both financial and performance measures should assist the projects grant management effectiveness both progressively over the term of the agreement and at its conclusion.

According to Helen, (2012), government should inspect and known the intended and unintended negative/positive effects of the NGOs project before they started and completed their activities. According to Alnoor et al., (2010), government should develop a framework for measuring NGOs project results that measure long-term and shorter-term impacts on negative/positive projects outcomes. According to Helen, (2012), government should explore and clearly identify NGOs projects long-term benefits that results after the project completion. According to Capable Partner Program, (2011), government should also analyze NGO projects in both underfunding and overfunding. Undercutting of the projects grants will obstructs the ability to achieve project objectives, also overfunding is likely to result in wasted or unspent funds at the end of the grant period, and may hinder efforts to promote project sustainability.

2.9 Theoretical frame work

The study applied resource based view theory.

2.9.1 Resource-Based View Theory (RBV)

The resource-based view (RBV) of Wernerfelt (1984) suggests that competitiveness can be achieved by innovatively delivering superior value to customers. The extant literature focuses on the strategic identification and use of resources by a firm for developing a sustained competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). International business theorists also explain the success and failures of firms across boundaries by considering the competitiveness of their subsidiaries or local alliances in emerging markets (Luo, 2003). Local knowledge provided by a subsidiary or local alliance becomes an important resource for conceptualizing value as per the local requirements (Gupta et al., 2011). According to Resource Based Theory resources are inputs into a firm's production process; can be classified into three categories as; physical capital, human capital and organizational capital (Crook, 2008). A capability is a capacity for a set of resources to
perform a stretch task of an activity. Each organization is a collection of unique resources and capabilities that provides the basis for its strategy and the primary source of its returns. In the 21st-century hyper-competitive landscape, a firm is a collection of evolving capabilities that is managed dynamically in pursuit of above-average returns. Thus, differences in firm's performances across time are driven primarily by their unique resources and capabilities rather than by an industry's structural characteristics (Crook, 2008)

2.10 Conceptual frame work

Kombo & Tromp, (2006), define a conceptual framework as a research tool intended to assist the researcher develop awareness and understanding of the situation under scrutiny and to communicate it.

Independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective grant design</th>
<th>Sustainability of self-help group projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on needs</td>
<td>- Multiple sources of revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory process</td>
<td>- Effective revenue generating programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning</th>
<th>- Efficient operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing strategies</td>
<td>- Variety of partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training of groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation</th>
<th>- Policy guideline on grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E tools/Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderating variable

Policy guideline on grants
Figure 2.1 Conceptual framework

The study is focusing on the influence of grant management practices on sustainability of self-help group projects. From the study topic the independent variable is the grant management practices while sustainability of self-help group project is the dependent variable. The relationship shows that the grant management practices influences the sustainability of projects, it implies that better grant management practices would lead to sustainable projects while poor grant management practices to lead to less sustainable projects. The grant management practices include the grant design, strategic planning, training and monitoring and evaluation. The conceptual framework however recognizes the key role played by the government policy as an important moderating variable in measuring the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. This implies that besides the grant management practice there is another factor which could impact positively or negatively on the projects and hence affecting its sustainability.

2.11 Summary of literature review

In today’s competitive environment, project management seeks to deal successfully with increasing challenges of project complexity, customer requirements and risks, etc. Successful implementation of grant management may increase the chances of sustainability of projects. Effective grants management is a process or result of adequate overall oversight and monitoring of grant awards that includes project resources, activities and results.

There is no standard approach for defining or conceptualizing sustainability. In some situations, it is simply ability to continue with a program or services through funding and resource shifts or losses. The IFAD Strategic Framework, 2007-2010 (IFAD 2007) defined sustainability as ensuring that the institutions supported through projects and the benefits realized are maintained and continues after the end of the project.
From the reviewed literature, there is consensus that the likelihood for sustained impact increases if a project plans for it from the beginning. The grant design stage comprises the first phase of planning. When a project design lacks a clear plan from the outset, resources are frequently invested in efforts that have little likelihood of being sustained beyond the project period (Kristof & Nordin, 2014). Therefore, understanding sustainability, and intentionally engaging in sustainability enhancement efforts, has both strategic importance and practical application for donors, program implementers, program participants and other stakeholders. In addition, design process ensures that consensus on a project’s graduation and exit a strategy is reached from the beginning based on agreed upon criteria.

Strategies help ensure that the day-to-day decisions fit in the long term interest of the organization. Macmillan & Tampoe, (2010) defined strategy as ideas and actions to conceive and secure the future. This definition highlights the fact that strategy requires thoughts about the future and effective action to realize organization objectives. Analoui and Samour (2012) argued that the success of a non-profit organization (NPO) often depended on formulating strategies suitable for the competitive environmental realities that the organization confronts. This belief affirms findings of a study by Estallo et al. (2006) which stated that NGOs have a mission, strategy and goals different from those organizations looking for profits. Recognizing the importance of strategic planning, this study therefore sought to determine the influence of strategic planning as a grant management practice on sustainability of self-help groups’ projects.

Training and development is very essential at all employee levels, due to the reason that skills erode and become obsolete over a period of time and has to be replenished (Nishtha & Amit, 2010). The success of an organization is mainly depends on its knowledgeable, skilled as well as experienced workforce.

Research indicates that stakeholders are more likely to use evaluations if they understand them and feel ownership of the evaluation process and findings. This understanding and ownership can come from active and substantive involvement in the evaluation process from the beginning to the end (Project Concern International, 2014).

Although all these studies contributed significantly to the available literature on organizational sustainability, they did not specifically focus on grant management
practices and their influence on the project or organizations’ sustainability. The grant management practices and their influence on project sustainability is therefore an area that is not sufficiently researched and this study is expected to contribute significantly to the existing literature on organizational sustainability.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter highlights the proposed research design to be adopted, the target population, sample size and sampling procedures, data collection instruments, pilot of the study, validity and reliability of study instruments, data collection procedure, data analysis and ethical consideration.

3.2 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design. Descriptive research designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, interpret and present the information for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2002). Mugenda and Mugenda, (1999) clarified that the purpose of descriptive research is to determine and report the way things are. Borg and Gall, (1989) noted that descriptive survey research was intended to produce statistical information about aspects of education that interest policy makers and educators and that survey research was a self-report study which required the collection of information from the sample. The information was collected by means of Questionnaires and Interview schedules. Descriptive survey design is preferred for this study over other research designs because of its rapid data collection and ability to help understand populations from a part of it. Similarly Orodho, (2003) explains descriptive survey as a method of collecting information by administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. This study therefore seeks to establish the influence of grant management practices on sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu Sub-county, Kenya.

3.3 Target Population

According to the Matungulu sub-county social development officer, there are 35 self-help groups which had benefited from grants between 1st January, 2010 and 31st December, 2015 which approximate membership of 542 (see Appendix VI). The study targeted 542
members of 35 self-help groups which had benefited from grants in Matungulu sub-county. Besides there are a total of 25 volunteer officers in charge of monitoring the groups and 1 sub-county social development officer hence a target population of 568. According to Kombo and Tromp, (2006), an effective population should have ideas on the topic investigated and this explains why the researcher is targeting the self-help group members who have benefited from grants, the social development officer and volunteers/assistants.

Table 3.3.1: Target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self help group members</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matungulu sub county SDO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDA</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Sample size and Sampling Techniques

Sampling is the act, process or technique of selecting a suitable smaller size of a population of a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population (Kombo and Tromp, 2006).

3.4.1 Sample size

Krejcie and Morgan (1970) came up with a table for determining sample sizes from any given population. They indicate that for a population of 568 closely corresponds with a sample of 234. Hence, the sample size of the study was 234 respondents.

3.4.2 Sampling procedures

A sample size of 234 respondents was used in the study. This has been arrived at using Krejcie and Morgan’s table for determining sample size( Appendix v) and proportionate method have been used to approximate the sample size for each group. For the self help group members, 542 has been divided by 568 then multiplied by 234 to give a sample of 223 members. For volunteer social development officers, 25 has been divided by 568
then multiplied by 234 to give a sample of 10 officers. For the DSVO, 1 has been divided by 568 then multiplied by 234 to give an approximate of 1 officer.

3.5. Research Instruments

Data collection instruments are tools used to collect data from respondents. Questionnaires and interview schedules were used to solicit data from the respondents. The study had two research instruments: a questionnaire for members of the self-help groups and community development assistants and an interview schedule for the Sub-County development officer.

Dwivedi (2006) defines a questionnaire as a device for securing answers to questions by using a set of questions. Questionnaires were used to collect data from the sampled self-help group members, group officials and volunteer social development officers. The questionnaire was translated in Kiswahili for self-help group members who may not be conversant with English. The questionnaire was organized into five distinct parts.

Part one dealt with background information of the respondents like gender, period one has been a member, information on whether the respondents group has ever benefited from grants and how the respondent can rate the overall grant management practices by their group. Part two dealt with the objective of grant design and sustainability of self help group projects. In it, the respondent will be required to tick those involved in the grant design, how he/she can rate the grant design process, explain if the project implemented by the grant address the real needs of the members.

Part three tackled the objective of strategic planning and sustainability of self help group project. The respondent was expected to give his/her opinion on whether strategic planning influences sustainability of self help group projects, how strategic planning influences sustainability of the projects from their own opinion and some of the financial strategies used by self help groups. Part four dealt with training of groups and sustainability of self help group projects. The respondents had to state if they have any prior knowledge in grant management, if they think training can lead to sustainability of self help group projects, if they had any training on grant management and how frequent
the trainings are conducted and if they think training helps in sustainability of self help group projects.

Part five was on monitoring and evaluation of self help group projects in relation to sustainability of group projects. The respondents gave information on when monitoring and evaluation of their projects starts and who monitors and evaluates the progress, if it is participatory, how their self help groups utilizes the monitoring and evaluation report and if they think regular monitoring and evaluation influences sustainability of self help group projects. Part six of the research instrument dealt with sustainability of self help groups’ projects that have benefitted from grants. The researcher seeks to know if the groups have multiple sources of revenue, whether the programs in use are effective in revenue generation, if the operations within the groups are efficient and whether there are partnerships.

3.5.1 Pilot testing of the instruments

A pilot study was carried out targeting two self-help groups’ projects in the sub-county under study which was then be excluded from the final study. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) 10% of the sample is adequate for a pilot study and hence the study used 23 respondents for the pilot study. The validity and reliability of the instruments was determined before the final study.

3.5.2 Validity of the instruments

According to Mugenda & Mugenda, (1999), validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences, which are based on the research results. In other words, validity is the degree to which results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represents the phenomena under study. Validity, according to Borg and Gall, (1989) is the degree to which a test measures what it purports to measure. According to Borg and Gall, (1989) content validity of an instrument is improved through expert judgment. As such, the researcher sought assistance of her supervisors at the University of Nairobi, department
of Extra-mural studies, who, as an expert in research, helped improve construct validity of the instrument (Omamo, 1995).

### 3.5.3 Reliability of the instruments

The reliability of an instrument is the degree of consistency with which a research instrument measures whatever it is intended to measure and yields consistent results. It refers to the extent to which findings can be replicated by another researcher (Silverman 2005). To test the internal consistency of the items listed on the instrument used, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was computed. Cronbach's alpha is a statistic coefficient (a value between 0 and 1) that is used to rate the reliability of an instrument such as a questionnaire. This method randomly splits the data set into two and a score for each participant calculated from each half of the scale. If a scale is very reliable, respondents get same scores on either half of the scale so that, correlation of the two halves is very high. The advantage with using Cronbach’s alpha is that the data is split into every possible way and the correlation coefficient for each split computed. The average of these coefficients is the value equivalent to this alpha (Cronbach, 1951). Thus Cronbach’s alpha was used to test reliability of the questionnaires to be used in the study. A reliability correlation coefficient of 0.79 was established after analysing pilot study data indicating a high degree of internal consistency among the data collected and hence allowed the researcher to administer the tools. A lower figure would require changing the questionnaires and repeating the process again. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), asserted that a reliability coefficient of 0.8 and above shows that the instruments are reliable.

### 3.6 Data collection procedures

Data collection procedure simply refers to the steps that are used in the study while collecting the data from the respondents. According to Kothari (2004) it is a step by step process that guides the study while the field work is being undertaken. Prior to the commencement of data collection, the researcher obtained all the necessary documents, including an introductory letter from the University of Nairobi. With the letter the researcher sought permit from NACOSTI. The researcher further sought authorization
from sub-county commissioner before paying a courtesy call to the social development officer in Matungulu Sub-county who introduced the researcher to the self-help groups that have benefited from grants. Using contacts list and contact provided by the social development officer, the researcher contacted the secretaries of each sampled group to book appointment for the study.

Two research assistants from Matungulu sub-county were recruited and trained on the use of instruments in order to assist the researcher in collection of data in the sampled self-help groups. All the research assistants had to meet a minimum of form four level of education with some experience in data collection and vast knowledge of Matungulu Sub-county. The researcher periodically and continuously liaised with the research assistants’ guidance during data collection. The respondents were given approximately two days to fill the questionnaires. The Interviews were conducted by the researcher herself.

3.7 Data analysis techniques

Data collected in this study was analyzed using descriptive statistics; specifically percentages and frequency tables. Responses to the questions in the questionnaire was scored and tallied, totaled and grouped accordingly in tables using SPSS. Each objective was analyzed separately, presented in form of table and percentages and conclusions made. During analysis, qualitative data from the interview schedule was included as direct quote from the respondents. The researcher finally validated the findings by quoting similar results from previous studies where applicable.

3.8 Ethical Consideration

Before the administration of the questionnaire, the researcher sought clearance from the School of Continuing and Distance Education and thereafter applied for a permit from the National Council of Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Informed consent was sought from all respondents before data collection as proposed by Bogdan and
Biklen (1998). The researcher also ensured confidentiality of the data and individual names of the respondents by keeping them anonymous.

3.9 Operationalization of the variables.
Table 3.2 Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scale of measurement</th>
<th>Research Approach</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Tools of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To determine how effective grant design as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects | Independent variable              | -Participatory process  
-Assessed needs  
-Suits identified needs                                                   | Nominal                           | qualitative          | descriptive      | Frequency tables and percentages |
| To establish how strategic planning as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects | Independent variable              | -financing strategies  
-sustainability plans                                                        | Nominal                           | qualitative          | Descriptive      | Frequency tables and percentages |
| To examine how training as a grant management practice influences sustainability of self-help group projects | Independent variable              | -Type of training  
-Relevance of the training  
-Frequency of training                                                        | Nominal                           | Qualitative          | descriptive      | Frequency tables and percentages |
| To access how monitoring and evaluation as a grant management practice influence sustainability of self-help group projects | Independent variable              | -Progress report  
-M&E personnel  
-Frequency of M&E                                                              | Ordinal                           | qualitative          | descriptive      | Frequency tables and percentages |
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the study finding which has been based on thematic and sub thematic areas drawn from research objectives. These areas are; grant design and sustainability of self help group projects, strategic planning and sustainability of self help group projects, training of group members and sustainability of self help group projects and monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of self help group projects.

4.2 Questionnaire return rate.

A total of 233 questionnaires were sent out to the respondents in the study area to fill while another 1 interview schedule was conducted to the Social Development Officer. Of these 233 questionnaires, 197 were returned for analysis. However, 22 questionnaires were incomplete and therefore could not be analyzed. The remaining 175 questionnaires accounted for 88.83% response rate. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) a response rate of 70% and above is sufficient and hence it allowed for data analysis. The questionnaire return rate was high because the researcher collected most of the questionnaire immediately they were filled.

4.3 Background information of the respondents

The researcher found it necessary to collect background characteristics of respondents including gender, level of education and years of membership in the self-help group. The data was analyzed and presented in tables 4.1
### 4.3.1 Background information of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>77.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest level of education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never gone to school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period in self help group project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whether respondents’ self-help group had benefited from grants:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating grant management practices:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table 4.1, out of 153 members of self help groups interviewed 35 (22.88%) were men and 118 (77.12%) were female. This indicates that there were more women in self-help groups than men. However, the researcher was satisfied that both genders were represented though the two thirds gender rule may not have been observed as stipulated in the constitution. This probably is because majority of the self help group are formed by women.

Table 4.1 shows that, 54 (35.29%) of the self help group member had primary level education, 65 (42.48%) had secondary level of education while 34 (22.22%) had certificate level of education. This implies that the respondents’ had acquired basic education and would therefore understand and respond to the study questions with ease.

From table 4.1, the entire self help group members interviewed had been members for varied number of years. 4 (2.61%) had been members in their groups for more than 20 year, 40 (26.14%) had been members for a period between 15-20 years, 26(16.99) had been members for a period between 10-15 years 82(53.59%) had been member for 6-10 years and only 1 (0.65) was a new member. This implies that all members were present at the time their groups benefited from grants and their responses would add value to the study and that they would share real life experiences.

The researcher only targeted the groups which had benefited from grants .This question helped to establish whether there were any members interviewed yet they had not benefited from grants. From the table 4.1, all the members of the groups had benefited from the grants.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table 4.1, 59 (38.56%) of respondents’ rated grant management by their groups as fair, 30 (19.61%) rated it as good while 64 (41.83%) rated it to be very good.

4.4 Grant design and project sustainability of self help groups project

This was the first objective of the study. The study sought to understand the people involved in grant design, how grant design process can be rated by self help group members and how grants address the real needs of the members.

The study sought to know who were involved in the design of the grants and therefore the respondents were asked to state the people involved. The results are presented in the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2 analysis of people involved in grant design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of people involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials and members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

153 (100%) of the respondents said that grant design was done by members and Officials. However, the social development officer said that some groups involved other stakeholders. In her explanation, she said that “Some stakeholders come with their own grant design for the projects they wish to fund”.

The importance of grant design in enhancing project sustainability cannot be overemphasized. Previous studies show that sustainability begins from the moment the idea is conceptualized. For instance, Kristof (2014) observed that when a project is designed without a clear plan from the outset, resources are frequently invested in efforts that have little likelihood of being sustained beyond the project period (Kristof J. Nordin, 2014).
4.4.1 Rating grant design process

The study sought to establish respondents’ rating of grant design process and the analysis presented in table 4.3.

**Table 4.3 Analysis of how grant design process can be rated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less participatory</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>22.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averagely participatory</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very participatory</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4.3, 35 (22.88%) rated design process to be less participatory, 29 (18.95%) rated it to be averagely participatory while 89 (58.17%) said it was very participatory. This shows varied views on the design process with 41.83% indicating the process was average and less participatory. When the groups do not involve members in design process they end up not addressing the real needs of its members and in the long run affect its project sustainability.

Involving group members in grant design is of paramount importance because it creates ownership of the project to be implemented as well as ensuring that the project to invest in is most likely to succeed after all factors supporting the success of the project and those against are tabled and analyzed.

4.4.2. Whether the project addressed the real needs of members

The study found it necessary to establish whether the project addressed the real needs of member of the self-help groups. The analysis of the findings is presented in table 4.4.

**Table 4.4 analysis of whether project addresses the real needs of members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>80.39</td>
<td>80.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As to whether the project addressed the members real needs, 123 (80.39%) said yes while 30 (19.61%) said no. This implies that majority of respondents felt their needs were addressed.

When asked to explain, some members had the following to say in support of the project addressing real needs;

“…the members have something to keep them occupied and they earn something in the process”

“…members borrow money from the group to address their problems and repay back with a small interest”

“…we used the grant to establish table banking and everyone borrowed and benefited”

“…some members expanded their personal projects through funding, so I can say it largely addressed member’s needs”

“…we make detergent soap and sell to our members and outsiders afterwards the benefit we get from it is divided to the members to help them by starting small business like selling vegetables”

For those who felt the groups did not address members’ needs had the following to say;

“…because it was not participatory to members, officials benefit more than members”, “officials do not give help to members”

During the interview, the social development officer had the following to say;

“The grants do not address the real needs of the members fully because the finances allocated per group were not adequate to sustain the intended activities.” While supporting the importance of grant design she was quoted saying “however I noted that some projects were able to go on beyond the grant cycle where the activities had well been thought through or in other words where there was effective design of the project”
4.5 Strategic planning and sustainability of self-help group projects

This was the second objective of the study; it seeks to establish the influence of strategic planning on sustainability of self-help group project. Respondents’ views on strategic planning and sustainability and financing strategies were the key indicator for this objective.

The study sought to establish the respondents’ views on whether strategic planning influenced sustainability of projects. The data was analyzed and presented in table 4.5

Table 4.5: Respondents views on whether strategic planning influenced project sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 153 (100%) of the respondents agree that strategic planning influenced project sustainability.

When asked to explain how strategic planning had influenced sustainability of their current project, group members had the following to say;

“…we had a good plan before we got the money; if we had not planned well we could have failed. Again the plan was addressing the members needs which motivated members to work hard for the project to succeed.”

Supporting the idea that strategic planning influences sustainability of self-help group projects, the social development officer had the following to say:

“In view of inadequate funding, self-help groups can agree on alternative sources of funding or other available grants to ensure sustainability of their projects”. She further noted that “through strategic planning groups are able to assess the market trends and move with the changes so as to remain relevant in a systemic society”
The findings have supported Micheli, Mura, & Agliati, (2011), cites Dossi & Patelli, (2008) view which states that: Strategic thinking results in a strong planning process that scrutinizes every idea and leads to the implementation of a sound strategy. The implementation of a sound strategy allows an organization to continuously monitor the performance and alignment of all business groups and subsidiaries.

When asked to list some of the financing strategies of their group projects, the members listed the following:

Table 4.6 financing strategies used by self help group projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of projects</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table banking</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making detergent soap for sell</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry go round</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member contribution</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>41.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>50.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree planting</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>64.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit from goat selling business</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>69.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry keeping</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>72.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling of mosquito nets</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>73.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable planting</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>84.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making ventilators for sell</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>94.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the summarized data above, the leading financing strategy was table banking where each member saves some money that is lend out at a small interest. Poultry farming, Vegetable farming, selling mosquito nets, group savings, selling ventilators and merry go round remain the top other sources of group financing of projects.
Strategic thinking is vital to the sustainability of an organization and often contributes to the improvement or change of an organization's mission statement, goals, objectives, and strategies (Nieboer, 2011).

Analoui and Samour (2012) argued that the success of a non-profit organization (NPO) often depended on formulating strategies suitable for the competitive environmental realities that the organization confronts. This belief was also affirmed by a study by Estallo et al. (2006) which stated that NGOs have a mission, strategy and goals different from those organizations looking for profits. But in light of the current environment, surviving and flourishing requires responding and adjusting to the social, economic and political environments and the changes therein. Hence the conclusion that strategic planning is essential in every type of organization, be it NGO, a government, community, political or business institution.

4.6 Training of group and sustainability of self-help group projects

Influence of training on sustainability of self-help group projects was the third objective for the study. The study collected data on respondents’ knowledge on grant management, views on whether training influenced sustainability, participation in trainings, frequency of trainings and reasons for not attending trainings.

In order to assess the influence of training on sustainability of self-help group projects, the study sort to establish the respondent knowledge on grant management. The data was analyzed and presented in the table 4.

**Table 4.7: Respondents knowledge on grant management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>90.20</td>
<td>90.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table 4.7, 138 (90.20%) of respondents’ agreed that they had basic grant management skills with 15 (9.80%) saying they did not have any knowledge in grant management. This means that a majority of those who benefitted from grants had knowledge and skills on how to manage the funds for maximum benefit.

### 4.6.1. Analysis of respondents views on whether training influenced sustainability

The study further established respondents’ views on whether training influenced sustainability.

**Table 4.8 Analysis of respondents views on whether training influenced sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tables 4.8 indicate that all the respondents supported the view that training influenced sustainability of self-help group projects. This findings supports the findings of (Westland, 2007) which alludes that; For the project to be successfully implemented and sustained, the manager and the people working in the project must be trained on all necessary tasks identified during planning phase and post implementation phase of the project. Training offered should be of quality and must match with the project requirements to ensure effective and efficient post-implementation of the project.

In order to increase chances of successfully sustainability of the project, the manager and the team members need to be trained on the project risk assessment and management, fundraising and project evaluation and monitoring (Hubbard & Bolles, 2007).

As to whether training influences sustainability the social development officer had the following to say;
“…training helps groups to adapt to prevailing market trends and sustain their activities. Normally we give basic training on simple book keeping, project management and value addition. One challenge is that we are limited by human resource that is why the training is not regular”

According to the social development officer the main challenges faced by the self-help groups are mostly financial management and lack of transparency and accountability which the trainings focus to address.

4.6.2. Respondents views on their participation in any technical training on grant management

The study also collected data on whether the respondents had attended any training on grant management. The analyzed data is presented in table 4.9

**Table 4.9 Respondents views on their participation in any technical training on grant management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>46.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>93.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 143 self-help group members responded to this question, 72 (50.35%) had attended a technical training on grant management while 71 (49.65%) did not have any technical training on grant management. This implies that half of group members had technical training on grant management.

For those who had benefited from training, the researcher sought to determine the frequency of those training. The findings were analyzed and presented in the table below;
A total of 98 respondent to this question, 5 (3.27%) participated in the training on weekly basis, 10 (6.54%) were training between 6 month to 1 year and 83(54.25%) had taken more than one year after the last training. 55 (35.95%) did not respond to this question meaning they had not attended any training. The main concern is the frequency of training, long period between trainings make the group members forget what they were trained or miss on new other skills that would make their work more effective.

This argument was supported by Nishtha and Amit (2010) stated that training and development is very essential at all employee levels, due to the reason that skills erode and become obsolete over a period of time and has to be replenished. On the other hand, Ololube, Ajayi & Kpolovie (2011) concluded that the success of an organization is mainly depends on its knowledgeable, skilled as well as experienced workforce. This pointed out to importance of training for success of any project or organization.

4.6.3. Reason for not having received any technical training

The study sought to determine the reasons for not receiving any technical training for some members of the self-help groups.
Table 4.11 Reason for not having received any technical training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meant for Officials only</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>22.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training opportunities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>42.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constrains</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>56.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 86 responded to this question, 35 (40.70%) said they did not benefit from the training due to the fact that it was meant for officials only, 30 (34.88%) said they lacked training opportunity and 21 (24.42%) said they lacked time to attend the training. This means that whenever training opportunities come up, all members of self help groups do not benefit from them and this could be the reason for the sustainability challenge faced in the running of the projects.

4.7 Monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of self-help group projects

This was the fourth objective of the study. The researcher sought to establish the respondents’ views on whether monitoring and evaluation was done, whether the social development officer did the monitoring of projects, whether monitoring was done throughout the project implementation and whether it involved everyone.

The study analyzed the respondents views on whether monitoring was done at grant disbursement period, the analysis is presented below.
Table 4.12: Analysis of respondents views on whether monitoring was done at disbursement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>69.93</td>
<td>69.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.12 shows that 26 (16.99%) did not conduct monitoring at disbursement, 107 (69.93%) monitored at disbursement and 20 (13.07%) were not sure. Majority of the respondents said they conducted monitoring from the time they received grants. This implies that the social development officer has put in place adequate measures to follow up on grants from the time the grant is awarded.

**4.7.1. Whether the monitoring was done by the social development officer**

The study established the person who was relied upon to provide monitoring services, for this case it sort to establish whether most self-help groups relied SDO for monitoring.

Table 4.13: Whether the monitoring was done by the social development officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>73.20</td>
<td>73.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>90.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.13 shows that 15 (9.8%) of respondents didn’t agree that that the Social Development Officer is the one who conducted the monitoring and evaluation, 26 (16.99%) were not sure and 112 (73.20%) agreed that it was the Social Development Officer who conducted the monitoring and evaluation. This implies the Social
Development Officer and community development assistants were the main monitoring and evaluation experts available to support the self-help groups.

4.7.2. Whether monitoring was done throughout the project phase

To further understand how effective the monitoring was, the study sort to find out whether the monitoring was done throughout the project implementation phases.

Table 4.14 whether monitoring was done throughout the project phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>73.20</td>
<td>73.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>86.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings shows that 112 (73.20%) agreed that monitoring was done throughout the project implementation, 20 (13.07%) said evaluation was not done throughout the project implementation and 21 (13.73%) were not sure if it was done throughout project implementation.

From a sustainability perspective, evaluations can shed light on both the achievement of intended sustainability outcomes, as well as the factors during the project period that influenced the program’s sustainability in positive and negative ways. While monitoring is ongoing, evaluation is periodic, although both can provide rich lessons and contribute too much needed learning about what works and doesn’t work so well in sustaining impact (Scheirer, et al., 2008).

4.7.3. Whether monitoring involves everyone

This question sort to establish whether the monitoring process was participatory and the findings were presented in table 4.15
Table 4.15: Whether monitoring involves everyone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>79.74</td>
<td>79.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>93.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis shows that 122 (79.74%) agreed that evaluations involved everyone, 21 (13.73) said it did not involve everyone and 10 (6.54%) were not sure. This implies that most of the group evaluations were participatory.

According to Project Concern International (2014), stakeholders are more likely to use evaluations if they understand and feel ownership of the evaluation process and findings. This understanding and ownership can come from active and substantive involvement in the evaluation process from the beginning to the end.

4.7.4. Respondents views on whether regular monitoring influenced project sustainability

The study established whether regular monitoring influenced sustainability of projects, tabulated and presented the findings in the table 4.16

Table 4.16: Respondents views on whether regular monitoring influenced project sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>96.73</td>
<td>96.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.16, indicate that 148 (96.73%) respondents agreed that regular monitoring influenced sustainability of the project and 5 (3.27%) disagreed with the same. This
implies that the respondents were aware of the key role played by regular monitoring and evaluation in sustainability of the projects.

These findings have been supported by Mark, Henry & Julnes, (2000) who say that monitoring and evaluation of project activities provides the grantee and grantor with better means for learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocating resources and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders. Therefore the success and sustainability of any project or program largely depend on constant feedbacks about project on going activities.

4.8 Sustainability of self-help group projects

The study presumed that the factors discussed under objective one to four influenced sustainability of projects. It was therefore important to measure the sustainability of the self-help groups. The indicators included the number of sources of funds, effectiveness of revenue generation, comparison of grant amount and current capital and stability or predictability of group’s leadership

4.8.1. The number of sources of funds for the self-help groups

A key indicator of sustainability that the study sought to establish was the number of sources of funds for the self-help groups, the data was analyzed and presented in table 4.17

Table 4.17: The number of sources of funds for the self-help groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that 64 (41.83%) of respondents stated that they only had one source of funding while 89 (58.17%) had more than two sources of funding.

Most of those who had only one source of funding said that they have not received any other support from the government and were relying on funds received through grants to run their projects. Their project was also their sole source of funds with majority ploughing back profits to make the project more profitable.

89 (58.17%) who said had more than two sources alluded that they had benefited from uwezo fund as well as women enterprise fund which are repayable without interest(uwezo fund) and managed to start other projects which were also giving some returns

4.8.2. Analysis of respondents views on effectiveness of revenue generation

The study sought to find out whether the projects being implemented using grants are effective in generating revenue

Table 4.18 Analysis of respondents views on effectiveness of revenue generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.18 shows that 64 (41.83%) respondents believed that revenue generation was not effective while 89 (58.17%) believed revenue generation was effective. Responses given for revenue generation not being effective include …”our project is not effective in revenue generation because we were relying mostly on rains and available sources of water to carry the project out but due to weather changes and little rainfall we could not get good returns from our horticulture project…”

51
…”the amount of funding that we got as grants was not enough start and run the project we had planned to execute with the money so we ended up executing it at low profits…”

Those of the opinion that revenue generation was effective sited reasons that their project had other sources of financing from uwezo fund as well as other non Governmental organisations. They also insinuated that, when they realize that their projects were not favored by the weather changes and competition, they changed to other activities that were more profiting and with less competition. For instance
…”when we realized our dopers could not survive in this harsh climate, we decided to sell them and buy tents, chairs and public address system for hiring during community events. Through such, we have been able to buy more tents, chairs and plots with intentions of reselling…”

4.8.3. Comparison of grant amount with groups current total capital

In order to assess the level of growth of the self-help groups, the study sort to compare the grant amount with the current total capital of each group.

Table 4.19: Comparison of grant amount with groups current total capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than grant</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.83</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal to grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than grant</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 (41.83%) of respondents said their groups had less than the grant value while 89 (58.17%) had more than the grant value. This implies that the rate of extra revenue generation was low in most of the groups. Majority of those with less current total capital compared to grants explained that the projects they had started with money granted failed and were relying on members’ contribution to carry on the project.
Johnson & Rogaly, (2002) noted that NGOs were increasingly being challenged by the donors to examine the financial sustainability of their programmes. They asserted that one way to look at the financial sustainability of an organization is to look at its income compared to its costs. Financial sustainability is one way of ensuring organizations are able to provide services in the long term.

4.8.4. Analysis of groups possibility to rotate its leadership

The study found it suitable to check on how frequent the leadership in the self help groups change. This is because with a leader who misuses funds remaining in charge for long can lead to collapse of the project as well as break ups within the members of the group.

Table 4.20 analysis of groups possibility to rotate its leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>79.08</td>
<td>79.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>153</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the 121(79.08%) of those who respondent to this question said that their groups were holding elections every 2 years while some 3 years where they elect new leaders. They also had mechanisms to remove non-performing leaders from office and replace by holding a by-election with supervision from the social development officer.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusions, recommendations and areas of further research.

5.2 Summary of the findings

The summary of findings are presented in the following sub-thematic areas: grant design and sustainability of self-help group projects, strategic planning and sustainability of self-help group projects, self-help group members training and sustainability of their project, Monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of self-help group projects.

5.2.1 Grant design and sustainability of self-help group projects

100% of the respondents’ said that grant design was done by members and officials. The same view was held by the community development assistance. However, the community development assistance said that some groups involved other stakeholders.

From the table 4.3, 22.8% rated design process to be less participatory, 18.95% rated it to be averagely participatory while 58.17% said it was very participatory. This shows varied views on the design process with 41.83% indicating the process was average and less participatory. When the groups do not involve members in design process they end up not addressing the real needs of its members and in the long run affects its project sustainability.

As to whether the project addressed the members real needs, 80.39% said yes while 19.61% said no. This implies that majority of respondents felt their needs were addressed. Importance of grant design in enhancing project sustainability cannot be overemphasized. Previous studies show that sustainability begins from the moment the idea is conceptualized.
5.2.2 Strategic planning and sustainability of self-help group projects

100% of the respondents agree that strategic planning influenced project sustainability. The leading financing strategy was table banking where each member saves some money that is lend out at a small interest. Poultry farming, Vegetable farming, selling mosquito nets, group savings, selling ventilators and merry go round remain the top other sources of group financing of projects.

5.2.3 Self-help group members training and sustainability of their projects

90.20% of respondents’ agreed that they had basic grant management skills with 9.80% saying they did not have any knowledge in grant management. The tables 4.7 indicate that all the respondents supported the view that training influenced sustainability of self-help group projects. 50.35% of group members had attended a technical training on grant management while 49.65% did not have any technical training on grant management. This implies that half of group members had technical training on grant management. Regarding the frequency of the training, a total of 98 respondents to this question, (5.10%) participated in the training on weekly basis, 10.20% were training between 6 month to 1 year and 84.68% had taken more than one after the last training.

For those who had not benefited from the training, the researcher sought reasons for the same and a total of 86 responded to this question, 40.70% said they did not benefit from the training due to the fact that it was meant for officials only, 34.88% said they lacked training opportunity and 24.42% said they lacked time to attend the training.

5.2.4 Monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of self-help group projects

The study established that some groups did not conduct monitoring at disbursement of the grants while others did not know whether it was done or not. 16.99% of respondents did not conduct monitoring at disbursement, 69.93% monitored at disbursement and 20 13.07% were not sure. This implies that the social development officer has put in place adequate measures to follow up on grants from the time the grant is awarded. However, the groups that do not benefit from monitoring at early stage would end up doing the wrong things.
The study also established that majority of the groups relied on the Social Development Officer to conduct monitoring and evaluation. The table 4.13 shows that 9.8% of respondents didn’t agree that Social Development Officer is the one who conducted the monitoring and evaluation, 16.99% were not sure and 73.20% agreed that it was the social development officer who conducted the monitoring and evaluation. This is a risk because the entire sub-county only has one social development officer and in her absence the groups would miss to conduct monitoring of its projects. The findings also shows that 73.20% agreed that monitoring was done throughout the project implementation, 13.07% said evaluation was not done throughout the project implementation and 13.73% were not sure if it was done throughout project implementation.

Regarding members’ participation in the monitoring and evaluation process, the analysis shows that 79.74% agreed that evaluations involved everyone, 13.73% said it did not involve everyone and 6.54% were not sure. This implies that most of the group evaluations were participatory.

On general views on whether monitoring and evaluation influenced project sustainability the respondents had varied views; indicate that 96.73% respondents agreed that regular monitoring influenced sustainability of the project and 3.27% disagreed with the same. This implies that the respondents were aware of the key role played by regular monitoring and evaluation in sustainability of the projects.

5.3 Conclusions

The study established that most groups have been resilient and lived beyond the grants period. However, they still survive on minimal resources and are yet to really grow their capital to the most sustainable levels. The researcher also established some good practices like stable and rotational leadership meaning that the group projects are not personalized. Some have also tried to diversify and have alternative sources of funds which increase the chances of sustaining their projects.

Regular training and monitoring and evaluation need to be enhanced in order for the groups to reap maximum benefits.
5.4 Recommendations

From the findings the study recommends that;

1. The county government should consider employing more social development officers as their role is very critical in empowering local self-help groups through training, monitoring and evaluation of group projects and even design of group projects.
2. Regular training and monitoring and evaluation need to be enhanced in order for the groups to reap maximum benefits.
3. The amount of grants should be increased and be provided in phases to boost the self-help group activities, this will reduce incidences of projects failing due to inadequate funding
4. Training of self help group members should be more regular to ensure the beneficiaries of grants are given knowledge and skills on how to utilize the grants given and how to make the projects more sustainable by employing new strategies for increase in interests to sustain it.

5.5 Suggestions for further studies

1. A similar study should also be carried out in an urban area for comparative purposes.
2. To establish the influence of various types of leadership on sustainability of projects of self-help group projects.
3. To establish the role of social development officers on sustainability of self-help group projects.
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Dear Respondents,

My name is Prudence Mbete Munyao, a student from The University of Nairobi undertaking Master’s Degree in Project Planning and management. As requirement of a master’s degree, I’m conducting a study on “Influence of grant management practices on sustainability of self-help group projects in Matungulu Sub-county, Kenya”.

This study would be of substantive value to the self-help groups especially by suggesting how to improve on their grant management practices and consequently sustain their projects. It would also help the Ministry of labor, social security and social services as well as the county government in making policies that would guarantee proper grant management and sustainability of granted projects. In this regard, your response will assist me in understanding and providing a professional position on this issue. All information will be kept confidential and to this extent all questionnaires will also be anonymous. Your honesty in answering questions will be highly appreciated and your decision to participate in the study is voluntary.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Prudence Mbete Munyao
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SELF HELP GROUP MEMBERS

Please answer all the questions by ticking in the space provided. There is no wrong or right answer. Do not write your name or your self-help group on the questionnaire. The information that you give will be treated as confidential. Thank you for accepting to take part in this study.

**Part 1: Background Information**

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

2. What is your highest level of education?
   - I have never gone to school  [ ]
   - Primary school  [ ]
   - Secondary school  [ ]
   - Certificate  [ ]
   - Degree  [ ]
   - Master’s degree  [ ]

3. How long have you been a member of your self-help group? …………………

4. Has your self-help group ever benefited from grants by either National or county government?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

5. How would you rate overall grant management practices by your group? Tick appropriate box that represents your opinion.
   - Very good  [ ]
   - Good  [ ]
   - Fair  [ ]
   - Bad  [ ]
   - Very bad  [ ]

**Part 2: Grant design project sustainability of self help group project**

6. Who are the people involved in designing grants in your self-help group? Tick appropriate box that represents your opinion
   - Officials only  [ ]
   - Members  [ ]
   - Officials and members  [ ]
   - Other stakeholders are also involved  [ ]

7. How would you rate the grant design process by your self-help group?
   - Very participatory  [ ]
   - Averagely participatory  [ ]
   - Less participatory  [ ]
   - Not participatory at all  [ ]
8. From your own experience, do you feel the project implemented by the grant addressed the real needs of the members? Yes [    ] No [    ]

Explain your answer above………………………………………………………………………………

Part 3: Strategic planning and sustainability of self-help group project

9. Do you think strategic planning by self-help groups influences sustainability of their projects?

      Yes [    ] No [    ]

Explain your answer…………………………………………………………………………………………

10. From your experience how does strategic planning influence sustainability of self-help group projects?

      ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

      ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

      ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

      ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. What are some of the financing strategies used by your self-help group

      ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Part 4: Training and sustainability of self-help group project

12. Do you have any prior knowledge in grant management? Yes (    ) No (    )

If yes, who trained you and what was it about……………………………………………………………

13. Do you think Training of self-help group members lead to sustainability of group projects? Yes (    ) No (    )

Please explain your answer……………………………………………………………………………………
14. Have you ever undergone any technical training on grant management and how to make your self-help group projects sustainable? Yes (    ) No (    )

i) If yes was the training relevant to your needs Yes (    ) No (    )

Explain………………………………………………………………………………………………

ii) How frequent has the training been: Every week (    ) every month (    )
    Every two month 2-6 month (    ) 6 month to one year (    )
    Its over 1 year (    )

If not, why have you not attended any trainings related to grant management
Tick appropriate box(es) that represents your opinion

Training only meant for officials only (    )
There were no training opportunities (    )
Time constraint (    )

15. From your own experience how does training of self-help group members influence sustainability of its projects?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Part 5: Monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of self-help group projects

16. a.) monitoring is done as soon as the funds are disbursed by the County or National government (tick appropriate box that represent your opinion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(    )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>(    )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(    )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b.) monitoring is done by social development officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(    )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>(    )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(    )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c.) monitoring of project sustainability is done throughout the grant period

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d.) Monitoring is participatory and all group members should be present during the exercise

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e.) How does your self-help group utilize the monitoring report?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

17. Do you believe regular monitoring and evaluation influences sustainability of self-help group projects? Yes ( ) No ( )

Explain your answer …………………………………………………………………………………

**Part 6: Sustainability of projects**

18. How many sources of funds does your self-help group has

None ( ) one ( ) two ( ) more than 3 ( )

19. Would you consider your group to be effective in revenue generation?

YES ( ) NO ( )

Explain ……………………………………………………………………………………………

20. Comparing your grant amount and the group’s current capital what can you say about it?

Group current capital is less than grant amount ( )
Is equal to grant amount ( )
More than grant amount ( )
Other ……………………………

21. Does your group rotate its leadership? YES ( ) NO ( ) Explain …………
APPENDIX IV: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

**Back ground information**

1. Gender: Female (  ) Male (  )

2. Organization: ……………………….   Position: …………………………..

3. How many years’ experience do you have working with self-help groups that have benefited from grants in Matungulu sub-county? ………………………

**Grant design and Sustainability of self-help group project**

4. How would you rate the grant design process by your self-help group?
   
   Very participatory [   ] averagely participatory [   ] Less participatory [ ]
   Not participatory at all [   ]

5. From your own experience, do you feel the project implemented by the grant addressed the real needs of the members? Yes [  ] No [  ]
   
   Explain your answer above…………………………………………………………

6. From your own experience how does effective grant design influence sustainability of self-help group projects
   ………………………………………………………………………………………

**Strategic planning and sustainability of self help group project**

7. Do you think strategic planning by self-help groups influences sustainability of their projects?

   Yes [  ] No [  ]

   Explain your answer…………………………………………………………

   …………………………………………………………………………………

8. From your experience how does strategic planning influence sustainability of self-help group projects?
Training and sustainability of self-help group project

9. What type of training to you provide to self-help groups which benefit from grants?

10. What is the frequency of training organized for granted self-help groups?

11. From your own experience how does the training organized for granted groups influence sustainability of projects

Challenges faced by self-help groups and solutions

12. What are some of the challenges faced by self-help groups in managing grants provided by county or National government?

13. What measures have you put in place to overcome these challenges?

Sustainability of projects

14. How many sources of funds does the self-help group under your supervision have?
None ( ) one ( ) two ( ) more than 3 ( )

15. Would you consider them to be effective in revenue generation?

YES ( ) NO ( )

Explain ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

16. Comparing the granted amount and the group’s current capital what can you say about it?
Group current capital is less than grant amount ( )
Is equal to grant amount ( )
More than grant amount ( )
Other ………………………………

17. Do the group rotate its leadership? YES ( ) NO ( ) Explain …………………
### APPENDIX IV: A TABLE FOR DETERMINING SAMPLE SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4300</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>5800</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>6600</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>8500</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** — *N* is population size. *S* is sample size.

*Source: Krejcie & Morgan, 1970*
APPENDIX V: List of self-help groups that have benefited from grants in Matungulu Sub–County, year 2010-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>NAME OF GROUP</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>YEAR FUNDED</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Waemwa ikala</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Katine quarry</td>
<td>Stones</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sauti yangu</td>
<td>Table banking</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mwamko mpya</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ndyae ngone mwaitu</td>
<td>Weaving</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Kawauni catering</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wiyumiisye katangini</td>
<td>Detergent</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Wendo wa atumia kisinga</td>
<td>Tree planting /merry go round</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mwangaza S.H.G</td>
<td>Selling nets</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ngenda women group</td>
<td>Table banking</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Jishinde ushinde (disabled)</td>
<td>Embroidery</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Maiuni agricultural group</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Wendo wa maiuni</td>
<td>Table banking</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Muimi wa w’o</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Mbusyani/kikal S.G.H</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Aka ndiwa Misyani</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Ala meetiwe na meetika</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Twene mbee S.G.H</td>
<td>Onion farming</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Kwa mwaura pioneer S.H.G</td>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kaimukuti development S.H.G</td>
<td>Table banking</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Isooni kanaani women group</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Kambusu dairy farmers</td>
<td>Dairy farmers</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization / Group Name</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Matungulu network for disabled persons</td>
<td>Table banking/preparing detergents</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>King’oti Disabled</td>
<td>Detergent making</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Mbuni disabled</td>
<td>Table banking</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Matungulu deaf</td>
<td>Weaving</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Mwanguku S.H.G</td>
<td>Root crops</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Moseo kavumbu S.H.G</td>
<td>Poultry farming</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Ndikya vandu S.H.G</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Joska tusaidiane women group</td>
<td>Dairy goat</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Canaan women group</td>
<td>Sheep rearing/merry go round</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Uiiini women group</td>
<td>Sheep rearing/detergent making</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Ithemboni youth group</td>
<td>Horticulture and field crops</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Upper manza S.H.G</td>
<td>Field crops</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Keyenee ke Muathi</td>
<td>Horticulture and field crops</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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