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ABSTRACT

Project sustainability is the key encounter fronting many unindustrialized nations. Enormous quantity of schemes employed at huge charges often inclines to encounter problems with sustainability. All chief supporters have raised their concerns towards the sustainability of projects after implementation. The objective of this research was to establish the factors that influence the sustainability of donor funded projects citing Mission of Hope International at Mathare slums in Nairobi County. The key objectives of the study were to establish how monitoring and evaluation influences the sustainability of donor-funded projects, to establish how shareholder opparticipation influences the sustainability of donor funded projects, to determine how management commitment influences the sustainability of donor-funded projects and to establish how achievement of desired goals influences the sustainability of donor-funded projects. A case study design was used in the study. The target population composed of 326 respondents. The study used a sample size of 163 respondents who constituted of 43 staff of Mission of Hope International, 20 local community leaders and 100 community achieved through random stratified sampling design. Questionnaires were used as the key gathering apparatus in the study. Questionnaires were deemed appropriate as they ensured confidentiality of the respondents. A preliminary study was carried out to pretest the strength and reliability of instruments of data collection. The supervisor’s opinion was obtained to ensure content validity of the research instrument. The half-slit method was used to approximate the reliability of the instruments. The data collected from the field was analyzed using Statistical Package of social disciplines version 20 and expressive data such as mean proportions and average deviation was used and also inferential statistics was used. Data was presented using cross tabulation tables to facilitate comparisons and conclusions. The closed ended response questionnaire used a five point likertgauge. Majority of the defendant of the management committee majority of the respondents felt that number of meetings done with a mean score of 3.5 (moderate) which a forms the bases of the implementation of the projects, were of the view that the number of reviews done with a mean score of 3.4 (moderate) which indicate project ownership and sustainability. Majority of the respondents on project sustainability showed that high school attendance with a mean score of 3.9 (little extent). However, they also felt that Monitoring & evaluation was fully participatory with community involvement with a mean score of 2.7 (agree). Thus the implementation team involved community/group members in project identification/Conceptualization with a mean score of 2.8 (agree). Community was involved in project implementation through cost sharing with mean score of 2.6 (agree). Community was involved in financial transactions of group account with a mean score of 3.4 (unaware). Lastly they also felt that community was not involved in sharing of benefits of donor funded water project with a mean score of 3.2 (unaware).

The study also concludes that most of the residents were involved in the management of donor funded projects. Community capability building was lacking before the commencement of the projects and therefore the public lacked suitable expertise for administration, lacked information of policy guiding principle on the management of schemes and there was weak planning from the management. The study, therefore, recommends more efforts to encourage more capacity building of stakeholders especially the community of Mathare in the project development and execution nourishing the schemes. Research recommends more studies to be carried out on this issue to inaugurate whether there are features influencing the sustainability the post donor funded projects.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study
There has been a rising demand for results from projects funded by donars in the 21st century (IIRR, 2012). Available statistics shows that the success of these donor financed projects continues to face serious challenges. Donors continue to invest huge sums of money in financing food security intervention projects. Despite that, the beneficiaries of these projects continue to suffer severe food shortages. Indeed, even as the contributors set the rules for venture observing and assessment, for instance, the ten stages to an outcomes based checking and assessment to accomplish supportability, little is being proficient (World Bank, 2004).

While NGOs and government agencies are expected to deliver on the project expectations by the donors, Jennings (2009) advices that donors should ensure that the community (recipients) association in all M and E exercises all through every one of the phases of the undertaking lifecycle are accomplished. Training to the beneficiaries to develop their capacity to be involved productively in the M & E is important for the projects maintainability. This ought to guarantee the financed ventures address group needs and furthermore enable adequate group participation to guarantee that there is venture ownership, maintainability and achievement. A free body ought to be set up by the benefactor to be charged with consistent review to every one of the exercises as sketched out in the undertaking proposition, M and E framework and consistence to givers' guidelines (Makoba, 2010). It is therefore essential that the beneficiaries must request for addition in all project exercises and involvement in drafting progress reports to donors to guarantee sustainability.

From an anthropological and sociological point of view, projects are mainly communal involvements in a specified communal system, arousing social practices which vary at least to some degree the communal organizations and establishments of the involved scheme and the societal conduct of its supporters (Meyer, 2002). Consequently, expansion specialists should make sure that the social systems adapt to the varying social trends in
the social-based schemes to improve project sustainability. Ingle (2005), says that for an undertaking to accomplish sustainability, it requires to be actualized utilizing a key technique The planned methodology joins four rule parts, future presentation: expecting things will transform, and needing to increase aids that can be gotten in the midst of and from that change. Also, outside forces: perceiving the assortment of the task condition and the many measurements which affect on venture results, including invention, governments, culture, and financial matters. Thirdly, natural fit: making arrangements for a persistent fit flanked by the undertaking and its environment, including mission, objectives, systems, structures, and assets; and process introduction: planning and administration needs develop in an iterative sequence of cognizant and thoughtful gaining for a fact as the facts changes.

While the developments with the employment of the projects is screening substantial development, the tendency with post-implementation sustainability is somewhat unsatisfactory and less schemes are being constant. This implies that while these countries are incurring huge expenditures in implementing projects, poor sustainability reduces the returns expected of these investments (UNDP, 2000). The United States of America development policy encourages effective monitoring of both its local and international funded programs (Stein, 2010). This is expected to promote unending evaluations that looks at giving all stakeholders, primary comprehensive evidence on the development or interruption of the continuing evaluated action. It is an omission of the enactment phase of the action. The aim is to determine whether the outputs, deliveries and schedules prearranged have been achieved so as achievement to be occupied to correct the deficiencies as quickly as possible (Young-Hoon, 2005). This will ensure that the projects continue to be done properly.

Observing and assessment of donor sponsored schemes in India has helped to establish the significance of the schemes which involves examining the schemes, credentials of the implementation procedure and objective clarification. Stergakis (2011) advises that the M&E is also meant to establish what difficulties were documented leading to the formation of those schemes and what were the purposes of the schemes and what methodologies were being cast-off during employment. The procedure also investigates
the scheme events and their assistances to the public. The analyses include issues of payee consent and local foundation embargo. Last but not least as pointed out by Prabhakar (2008) the analysis include an evaluation of the effects of the projects and their influence towards their purposes while also considering the sustainability of the projects in all the step involved in the projects throughout employment.

Since most African Countries depend on external support for most of its growth programmes the encounter, as noticed by Hwang and Lim (2013) thus, is to make these expansion sequencers sustainable so that there is enhancement in the survives of the targeted people. This involves commissioning effective monitoring and evaluation strategies that will enhance effort to reach and empower the socially and economically poor communities to implement sustainable projects. Effective monitoring and evaluation of these projects will advise on strategies adequate to produce the level of financial action required by the target communities. Also, these strategies should also be necessary for bearable efficiency lessening and lessen continuous dependency on donor subsidy (Chin, 2012).

In South Africa, Manageability has experienced huge research by characteristic researchers and environmentalists to promulgate the matter of shrewd utilization of assets, equally sustainable and non-inexhaustible, so they are completely accessible in right amounts to forthcoming ages (Lyson et.al,2001); Treurnicht (2000). Much of this has remained in the arena of supportable expansion. A research done by Joaquineon expansion sustainability over public contribution related scheme catastrophe with feeble established connections, shortage of resources and low labor force inspiration Joaquine (1994).Dempster (1998) and David et al (2006) characterizes sustainability as the capacity of a movement or framework to persevere. For this research reason, supportability is characterized as the capacity of contributor helped projects to make frameworks that proceed to interface and effect on the recipients even after the projects are wound up.
While there is a high percentage of projects success in many African countries, on the other hand despite many poverty intervention programs there is a continuous financial susceptibility in countries such as Malawi despite the many donor funded projects (MGDS, 2009). This condition is opposing to the anticipation that every donor has on any detailed package or scheme’s interference. Although the anticipation as noted by Naidoo (2011) is that any interference should produce supportable welfares and impressions on the inhabitants, luck of effective monitoring and evaluation process affect the whole project’s performance. With the poverty persistence, it is important to discern whether or not the growth ingenuities started with the plans are being continued after accomplishment of the scheme.

A general absence of formal checking and assessment exercises for UK Aid Funded Projects keeps the accumulation and dispersal of lessons gained from pilot projects and the usefulness of the formation of necessary feedback loops from such lessons learned to become an input in the future project and their overall sustainability (Sebastian, 2007). While there are basic expectation of any project, it has been noted that for any projects and activities to be successful and sustainable, they need to be focused largely on project delivery based on the set out targets, and should also be specific to the project itself.

In Uganda, Busiinge (2008) notes that donor’s necessity to cautiously plan participation of scheme receivers’ in design and employment of communal improvement schemes. He adds that this will go a lengthy way to accomplish scheme possession by the recipients and the local government. He further suggests that in the event that NGO and Government co-financing is accomplished, the permanency of scheme may be accomplished.

Okun (2009) in his investigation of Factors influencing Sustainability of Donor subsidized activities in parched and semi-dry zones in Kenya; states that, there is need to teach and engage the community on the supportability of tasks to guarantee that they can articulate the objectives and targets of the undertaking and drive them forward after
withdrawal of benefactor financing. He adds that, the beneficiaries must be consulted during project conception, preparationand implementation process.

Missions of Hope International is an NGO that was established in 2004 at Mathare slums to provide education and training to the disadvantaged people in the community. This was due to the increased Poverty, theft, unemployment and school drop outs in the area. With Time MOHI has been able to establish branches in Korogocho, Kariobangi, Huruma and Babadogo. It sponsors education to the children who are not able to afford primary and secondary education, it also trains the community on entrepreneurship and business skills. In 2011 MOHI initiated sustainability initiatives such as water bottling, Agribusiness, medical clinic, etc.

1.2 Statement of the problem
Most projects fail because of late detection of possible reasons for failure. Projects continue to perform below expectations raising concerns from donors and other stakeholders because they are no longer sustainable Hodgkin (1994) in a WASH Mechanical Explosion, The Sustainability of Donor-Assisted Rural Water Supply Projects explained supportability as the capacity of an improvement project to keep up or grow a tributary of rewards at a programmed flat for a broadened history after scheme inputs have clogged. Including sustainability into project design would result in a win-win condition for both project recipients, investors and other shareholders. Activities in Kenya have kept on performing inadequately with respect to sustainability (World Bank, 2004).

Very viable projects continue to be unsustainable given that they are unable to enjoy stakeholder and donor support as in many cases they do not meet their objectives and the desired results by the project sponsors. Projects in Kenya have been poorly appraised on sustainability by the Operations Evaluation Department (OED) of the World Bank as matched to other East African countries Kenya got a general rating of 49 percent on manageability of donor financed ventures in the period 1999 to 2002 when equated to Uganda’s and Tanzania’s assessment of 59.5 percent and 70.1 percent correspondingly.
Past East Africa, Ghana had a rating of 64.7 percent in a similar period (World Bank, 2003).

Therefore sustainability of donor funded projects is crucial for stakeholder satisfaction, continued donor support and projects going concern. There has been difficulty in achieving sustainability and reliability of projects which is the capability of a given scheme to continue being viable after exterior provision is ended (Ruffing, 2007).

Williams, (2003) takes note of that dissatisfaction of collections and different cohorts to take up obligation for have made cluster activities to dive into huge monetary clusters undermining the maintainability and thus debilitating them to snatch procedures every day. Admassu et al., (2002) clarifies that a vital factor for the suitability of tasks is the legitimate contribution of locals as lively associates and corresponding collaborators whose uncertainties and involvement are inherent for the projects affluence.

The findings from studies have shown that most of the approaches have been focused on the general aspect of evaluation and monitoring of projects to achieve sustainability. Therefore this research will pursue to establish the aspects that affect the sustainability of donor sponsored schemes in Kenya. A case of Mission of Hope International at Mathare slums in Nairobi County, despite of the organization having sustainability initiatives the project is unattainable. The enrollment for primary and secondary education has reduced and the number of trainings done on business skills and entrepreneurship has highly reduced. The organization has also reduced the number of staff due to financial challenges.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this research was to inaugurate the elements that influence the sustainability of donor funded schemes a case study of Mission of Hope International at Mathare slums Nairobi County.
1.4 Research Objectives
The study was guided by the following objectives:

1. To determine how monitoring and evaluation influences the sustainability of donor financed projects with reference to MOHI.
2. To establish how stakeholder’s participation influences the sustainability of donor funded projects.
3. To determine how management commitment influences the sustainability of donor funded projects.
4. To establish how achievement of desired goals by the target community influences the sustainability of donor financed projects.

1.5 Research Questions
The research pursued to address the subsequent research questions below:

1. How do monitoring and evaluation influence the sustainability of donor-funded Projects?
2. How does stakeholder participation influence sustainability of donor financed projects?
3. How does management commitment influence the sustainability of donor financed projects?
4. How does achievement of desired goals by the target community influence the sustainability of donor-funded projects?

1.6 Importance of the Study
This research may enable donor funded projects to develop a useful and practical model that may help the project management in donor funded projects to become mindful of issues that are significant for project sustainability. It may also enable the other organizations to include the features of sustainability at the design phase of a project by providing knowledge on the sustainability process and strategy to ensure that they are able to maintain and attract donors for continued projects sustainability. This study may benefit the targeted communities and nations given that they may own the projects hence
ensuring sustainability of these projects which are generally geared towards improving the lives of the local communities and nations.

This research study may also help future researchers interested in this area with relevant literature by providing them with a more exhaustive understanding on the elements that affect the sustainability of donor financed projects with reference to Mission of Hope International at Mathare slums in Nairobi County. The study may help the government to determine the best way they can carry out an effective evaluation and monitoring process on their donor financed projects to ensure that they are sustainable by attracting continued donor support and sustainability of future projects.

1.7. Delimitations of the study
The research was only limited to Mission of Hope International at Mathare slums in Nairobi County and may not have reflected the activities in other donor funded projects and therefore may be difficult to be adapted by other donor funded projects. The researcher made the study to be as detailed as possible to reflect the general happenings in other donor funded projects.

1.8 Limitations of the Research
The research was met by stiff and unapproachable organization strategies where the respondents were not free in noting the inquiries posted to them, to counter this, the researcher guaranteed the administration that the findings of the study won't be utilized somewhere else and was only for scholarly purposes.

Also, a few respondents were threatening and unwilling to give the required data by the researcher. The specialist guaranteed them that the data and answers given by them were classified and would not be spilled to anybody. To counter this, the researcher ensured the respondents namelessness and privacy and consoled them that answers were just for study purposes only.

Finally, the researcher faced financial constraints in gathering the evidence from all the respondents. This is because the study required a lot of finances to cover the
scope. The researcher used research assistants to help in dropping and picking the questionnaires and do the data collection in one day hence avoiding extra bus fares costs in making other trips.

1.9 Basic Assumptions of the Study
The researcher presumed that the defendants could agree and make time to fill in the questionnaires and that the information given was accurate and correct. The study also assumed that respondents were objective without bias.

1.10 Definition of substantial rapports used in the research

Monitoring and Evaluation Procedure that helps improves routine and achieves outcomes. Its objective is to expand present and forthcoming administration of productivities, consequences and influence. It is mostly used to assess the performance of projects. It looks at the long-term effects of a scheme and discloses what worked, what did not, and what should be carried out inversely in forthcoming schemes.

Management commitment It is the behavior participation by the arch level executives in a tenacious and critically consistent aspect or course of action of an organization. In position management it includes; terrain up and acting for on a how things stack up committee, creating case policies and objectives, availing staple and learning by doing, overseeing implementation at for the most part levels of the university, and evaluating and reviewing the procedure in meet of results achieved.

Stakeholder involvement Parties who are actively engaged in a project from the beginning to the end of a scheme.

Achievement of Desired goals by Target community This is the end results that a community involved in a particular project envisions, plans and commits to achieve by the time the project comes to an end.
Sustainability of Sustainability denotes to the ability of a project to continue in donor funded operation to attain its tenacity for the extensive time likely after projects the donors withdraw their provision.

1.11 Organization of the study
The research is systematized in episodes where chapter one consists of the context of the study, declaration of the problem, purpose of the research, importance and limitations and delimitation of the study that may be experienced during information gathering. It also encompassed description of terms and the organization of the study while chapter two includes literature assessment that looks at the works of the previous researchers who have made studies in the same area, critical review and the summery of the study. It also includes the conceptual framework. On the other hand chapter three includes information gathering processes and the tools to be used in finding data that were used in this investigation; the method of data analysis, the study design, objective inhabitants and scope, including the sampling technique to be used in the research. Chapter four includes data analysis and explanation while chapter five includes precipitate of discoveries, conclusions and recommendation.
CHAPTER TWO
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview
This chapter covers past relevant works from other investigators who have researched the same area. It aims at identifying and evaluating opinions, awareness, qualities and conclusions of several studies that have been carried out in the past in this area.

2.2 Sustainability of Donor Sponsored Projects
Sustainability in projects notes the capability of the project to remain in maneuver to realize its aim for the extensive time possible after the financiers withdraw their provision (Martha, 2013).

Project sustainability is reliant on the extent of self-sufficiency established in objective societies and on the communal and partisan obligation in the expansion schemes (Blewitt, 2008). Sustainability can be achieved primarily by capacity development on the clientele at individual, social, institutional and system levels. According to How let and Nagu (2001), for the sustainability of a project, there must be an increasing consensus at national and donor levels, that is involvement of all beneficiaries in the project design and the implementation is crucial.

Many projects are run throughout the world and they have shown a paradigm shift from self-sufficient to donor funded dependency and as a result sustainability of the same has been wanting. Ingle (2005), demonstrated that supportability envelopes traditional methodologies while including a more drawn out term point of view. This more extended term point of view welcomes other, less conventional contemplations for project distinguishing proof and determination. Ingle (2005) additionally featured that, for a scheme to accomplish sustainability, it should be done via a vital methodology. The planned methodology assimilates four primary essentials, forth coming alignment: First, presumptuous things will convert, and scheduling to exploit reimbursements which can be consequent in times of and from that change; Secondly, exterior importance: identifying the assortment of the project environment and the numerous proportions which influence on scheme results, including technology, politics, society, and economics; environmental fit: planning for a continual fit between the project (both benefits and delivery organization) and its environment, including assignment, objectives, approaches, arrangements, and assets; and
process Alignment: scheduling and administration primacies evolve in an iterative sequence of cognizant and thoughtful learning from involvement as the actuality varies. From a global perspective, the donor financed projects are involved in a wide range of undertakings and programmes at national and regional levels all aimed at improving the well-being of poor people.

2.2.1. Monitoring and Evaluation and sustainability of donor sponsored projects
Effective monitoring of donor sponsored schemes determines a lot on whether the project will continue to attract donor support given that this is important to sustain the projects. Assessment studies illustrates that it is common for inadequate consideration to be assumed at scheme ground work to plans work out for monitoring, and the lack of an elaborately positioned out plan inspires scheme work force to give it low priority(Schwarz, 2009). It is the imprint that field work force think of all revenues and reports as being unsolicited tasks that interject the actual effort but this need to change to ensure that the staff understands the significance of M& E and its importance in the completion of the project.

Achievement by the project on the desired goals is crucial for the sustainability of any project and this can be achieved. Krafain (2011) the effects of monitoring and evaluation on teaching methods in a computer skill development program in Soweto pointed out that monitoring and devaluation ensures that the projects goals and objective derived from the communities’ desired outcome is met. Monitoring and devaluations ensures that if it is empowerment of the communities, then they are achieved according to the expectations of the community.

Sustainability of donor projects is crucial for the development of targeted communities, nations and ultimate beneficiaries and depends on the continued donor support which can be achieved through an effective monitoring and evaluation process for existing projects. Many benefits come with monitoring and evaluation of donor funded project especially in developing countries. Seligal (2010) on the assessment of the impact of aids programs in Mozambique admits that the agreement is that evaluation, like monitoring, is essential.
it permits teachings to be learnt leading to enhancement of projects in future. Unlike observing, it is not done with adequate strictness. This may erode the very necessity of the process leading to in sustainability of even very good intended projects.

In some cases donors are times confused on which projects should continue to receive their support. While project performance should give guidance on the continued donor support for various projects, Agwanda (2011) on factors affecting project funding in economic empowerment projects confesses that few organisations feel that they have the incomes to appraise every scheme they are involved in, and so evaluation, mainly ex-post evaluation, inclines towards projects with problems. While this happens sometimes, it is not good for the sustainability of the project given that donors want accountability for the funds they donate.

On the other hand, Phillips (2010) admits that small agencies are mostly cautious to use the time of project team in assessment when they could be going on with the subsequent scheme. Superior organisations have distinct assessment units that experience the difficulty which makes the impartiality of these entities difficult making them unable to impact the functioning sections under various projects that are undertaken by them.

Various agencies involved in donor funding needs to understand the need to monitor and evaluate projects that they are undertaking to increase accountability in these projects.

Delivery is the final measure of a successful project. A scheme is normally cracked down into numerous deliverables, with the final deliverable being the completed scheme itself. To each one of these milestones is a signpost on the side of the road. Karimi (2012) on factors affecting the project success warned that without steady and appropriate conveyance, the project will become vanished and progressively more challenging to attract donor support. Therefore the role of M&E can never be over emphasized but should be understood for the sustainability of these projects.
2.2.2. Stakeholder Involvement and Sustainability of donor funded schemes

Stakeholder Participation is crucial for the sustainability of donor funded projects and this can be attained through effective Participating. Participatory approaches can be engaged to assure the involvement of all the stakeholders, the formation of contracts flanked by them, and the establishment of appropriate information at every stage and for different purposes. Evidence is a crucial element for liability as it is only when people are able to know the assets presented, how they are being channeled and how choices are being made, that they can feel as part of the project (Sen, 2008). Proper involvement brings about accountability from all the stakeholders. Cornwall (2010) says that when key shareholders can hold other shareholders accountable, supremacy swings to them. This will contribute to more accountability at all levels of the project.

Capability building is a significant step in getting the society ready for justifiable improvement. It instigates at introduction stage of the scheme, where the societies are both directly and indirectly involved. Administrations can figure the capability and the involvement of the civic on how to handle community-based projects after financiers exit. Such teachings can also be carried out by the administration, institutions of higher education, exploration centers, and other private institution. Community members need more understanding and expertise to collaborate and assist in setting up priorities so that they can deal with the project for sustainability tenacities. The writer emphasizes that capability building is an endowing tool which enables the community to manage setbacks on their own, rather than relying on the help of the administrations or supporter.

Stein (2010) avers states that people’s involvement provides an occasion to inaugurate new habits of control, reporting, joint responsibility in development interventions and overall strategy support. The people’s involvement also helps in enhancing the understanding of the role of the a number of stakeholders involved and the drawback of the methodological and economic resources that exist to address the problems of the poor (ibid.). Bamberger & Cheema (1990) states that society involvement is among the major factors contributing to sustained community project because, the scheme cannot stance on its own without the community.
The targeted community is one of the most important stakeholders in any project and they are important for these projects sustainability though a lot depends on the monitoring and evaluation of the projects. Adhiambo (2013) on the issues upsetting the efficiency of donor sponsored schemes in endorsing improvement in Kibera stressed that including the community means people having active roles in the schemes like captivating part in pronouncement making and distribution from the beginning of the project and run through to its scheduling, organization, provision, and appraisal.

Stakeholders should be tangled in the strategy, scheduling, instigating and observing of the schemes for their sustainability. It is this kind of participation that will fix all those involved in the schemes and make them answerable to each other and will certify permanence and sustainability of happenings. Christian (2013) advices that the beneficiaries must be made to feel that the project is their own and not dictated and controlled from somewhere else. Once a sense of belonging has been achieved then the project can effectively run thereby registering high levels of performance. The likelihood for sustainability increases as the level of involvement of implementing organizations and beneficiaries in the design stage is increased.

Sisia, (2010) elements that contributes to the achievement or catastrophe in communal schemes pointed out that sustainability of any community based project depended on honest communal involvement, possession and resistor, scheduling for monetary feasibility, transparent and answerable supremacy, management and decision making assemblies, observing and assessment so that societies and others can share and learn from involvement amidst others. These elements if booked into account will ensure the scheme prospers and if not the scheme will not thrive. Checks and balances of donor funded projects are crucial for project sustainability. In-Chin (2012) advices that there is need to embolden more participation of investors particularly the community that the projects target in the scheduling and enactment the project in order to raise the likelihood of satisfying the schemes. This can be done through reassuring associates to elect the leaders in the schemes and not leaving the duty of administration to the supporters or the guarantors.
Therefore an essential element for the sustainability of schemes is the open association of native persons as lively participants at the same time identical cohorts whose anxieties and involvement are inherent to the scheme's accomplishment. The community sponsor determines whether a business becomes firm, at which point swiftly and strongly it consolidates, and how it responds and adapts to equal changing needs. It is therefore having to do with that involving craft union communities’ begins at the planning most of the decisions are made roughly what quality of business is required. Sustainability cannot be achieved without their moving and shaking and vow and by means of this, stakeholder hit or miss is suited to be efficient to notice the sharps and flat actors who should be engaged in every point of long row to hoe management cycle.

Bamberger & Cheema (1990) emphasizes that community involvement is among the major contributing details for sustained person in the street function for the duty cannot coming to a standstill on its seize without the society. While distinctive aspects that draw the person in the street development project sustainable boost, system, programme operations, fact-finding and consider, competitive apportionment and examination, family relation, human bill, alliance and location.

2.2.3. Management Commitment and Sustainability of donor funded projects

Management commitment in donor funded projects still remains an issue of concern for projects sustainability. Management of these projects may be held accountable through monitoring and evaluation process to ensure that these projects are sustainable. While there are other factors that influence increased funding for various projects, accountability issues on donor funded projects in Kenya have not received the necessary attention they deserve as shown by the review for many donor funded projects (Dinsmore, 2014).

Accomplishment of any constitute of long row to hoe sustainability is not a speculate of a single day, for all that it is a life-search for pot of gold process (Wanjohi, 2010). Community-based projects are half caste and require multifaceted authority art (Weinberg, 2008). For business sustainability to be full the institutions and authority engrossed in long row to project implementation from the person in the street to public or international levels are established to be empowered in skepticism of reference, skills and
basic material (human and capital) for smooth undertakings of activities for sustainability of projects. The World Bank (2008) describes empowerment as the manner of out the woods the thing of tribe or groups to the way one sees it decisions and to standardize those decisions facing desired actions and outcomes. Central to this rite are actions that set up both the individual and taken as a whole assets, and take turn for better the aptitude and honesty of the management and the institutional point of view which governs the manager of these assets.

According to McDade (2004), useful management guarantees that efficient local basic material and power are ready to be drawn to repeat the duty at the second where above resources are unavailable. Espinosa, et al. (2007) is of the re action that duty awareness is carrying a lot of weight in the person in the street based long row to project is forever associated by en masse of performance which in start is associated by all of sustainability. Good management goes past deformed skills (Kirksch, 2000) to mechanical and gift needed to closely implement the function (Little, 1993). This diamond in the rough claims that institutional and management power is a tool for backwards and forwards duty implementation because it encourages unity of the family members in all the processes of undertaking implementation making heirs and assign revert empowered.

Mzibwi (2010) on the aptitude of monitoring and book review of construction business in Tanzania intended that an ex-post notice as a choice by an judgment unit or by sub-contractors tends to be preferably open-minded, anyhow the as a matter of fact realized is done afterwards the event approach that it is bilateral upon records and reports, which are probably to be unwritten, impaired, occupied, or petty comprehensive than the notice twosome would wish. The management interruption knowing that the duty will be evaluated make out be matched to the riches of the projects and secure that it performs better.

The greater the business management is given one word the in a superior way sustainable a duty am within one area become. Management price tag which cut back be multiplied on monitoring and evaluation is consistent for the wealth and the completely
sustainability of the project. For increased funding, Wanjigi (2013) on the benefits of evaluating project performance in non-governmental halls of knowledge in Kenya advices that the projects contend the requirement for management below the line on the sustainability of donor funded projects.

In zoo projects contained in each Ojwang (2013), community people should be deep in thought in monitoring and evaluation so apart from build their thing in directing their arrest development projects. This calls for in a superior way price tag at management laid on the line within the projects and can brought pressure to bear the sustainability of the project. More discipline is impaired for the project management for eclipse performance and crave for commitment for the project high on the hog and forever and a day sustainability.

2.2.4. Achievement of desired goals by target community and Sustainability of donor funded projects

Availability of resources important factors in project sustainability that is needed for societity-based schemes. This way of doing thing, choosing staple that should be ready to be drawn for the anticipated infinity, drawing together the misfortune of undertaking failure heretofore it starts continually, discipline to insufficient inescapable materials. In practically cases, this will produce pinpointing mistaken secondary sources of the materials that gave a pink slip be pressed facing action. Insufficient donation reduces a project’s thing to be continuing (Bamberger & Cheema, 1990).

Secure donation is a prompt aspect in crucial whether a long row to hoe is sustainable. Local cuisine projects toil to require two types of funding: corruption to hold them uphold and setting apart to put up a smoke screen night and day costs. Both are equally having to do with notwithstanding profuse projects clash setting apart for running costs indeed difficult to obtain. As a confirm, projects have regularly to reinvent themselves in case they qualify still for set-up funding. Some projects are trapped in this cycle; this is
not unaccompanied time-consuming but hinders the by seat of one pants development of the project. This is to what place generating increasing levels of income on trading may threw in one lot with some nation food projects improperly from this bi bike of funding dependence.

There is a gat a handle on something agreement that useful monitoring omnipresent the long row to hoe is crucial, and by the same token that should be regularly adequate. It has been discovered that name of projects which are full at workout are scanty likely to be helpful than spongy projects which boot adjust to hurt gained as the long row to hoe develops (Oakley et al, 2008). This implies that there intend be a consistent and fair programme of thinking over, keeping record and record keeping the progress. This in propel means that there intend be complete contact by all of the beneficiaries, and by the same token defined indicators of performance.

Various questions needs to be considered during the project life to ensure that the project meets the desired change in the targeted community or nation. One of the main question that needs to be properly addressed is what new ideas are developing and, which concepts may advocate fluctuations to the scheme. Effective monitoring and devaluation will advise on whether it is necessary to introduce new technology, the beneficiary reaction and where it also help in establishing issues concerning the sustainability of the project. In cases of technology introduction Lewis (2012) advices that the uptake needs to be closely monitored in case the technology needs modification or can be improved. This can only be done if close monitoring is done.

Wanjala (2013) while carrying out a study on the importance of M& E of community based projects admitted that numerous schemes cannot exactly identify who has benefited and by how much or in what way. This does not indicate the schemes are ineffective, but that existing methods of appraisal and evaluation are too limited. Butcher (2013) advices that there is a need for more thinking on how to appraise projects for institutional development, sustainability, and eco-friendly impression.
Manikutty (2011) sharing on importance communal involvement: message from familiarities in five water and hygiene schemes in India stated that observing is used to check the advancement based on set goals in case of community based projects. This is done by scrutiny if the projects are effective and activities are going on as planned. Workshops and seminars are monitored by reviewing the number of participants through the number of distributed items in the same. To monitor the community groups, the venue of meeting and the participants who attend is taken into account.

Effective monitoring is crucial for all projects either at community or national levels. The project supervisor has a crucial part to play in the monitoring procedure and ensuring that the project achieves its goal and objectives. The role of the supervisor in promoting growth is to ensure that benefits are being effectively delivered to the intended group/nations and supervision is viewed as a process of guiding functions intended to promote the achievement of the project goals (Daniels and Bailey, 2013).

Cattani and Florian (2011) advising on community based projects organization and strategic management, stated that the main question that needs to be properly addressed is what new ideas are developing and, which concepts may advocate fluctuations to the scheme. Effective monitoring and devaluation will advise on whether it is necessary to introduce new technology, the beneficiary reaction and where it also help in establishing issues concerning the sustainability of the project.

2.3 Theoretical Framework
The research project will be based on programme theory which describes how an interference (a scheme, a policy a programme, a approach) is unspoken to add to a manacle of outcomes that produce the planned or definite influences. Quinn Patton one of the proponents of stated that it can comprise optimistic effects (which are useful) and undesirable influences (which are unfavorable). It can as well demonstrate the other factors which put in to producing impacts, such as context and other projects and programmes (Harrison and Dennis, 2004). Diverse types of figures can be used to represent programme hypothesis. These are frequently referred to as logic models, as they
show the overall logic of how the intervention is understood to work. One of the main question that needs to be properly addressed is what new ideas are developing and, which concepts may advocate fluctuations to the scheme. Effective monitoring and devaluation will advise on whether it is necessary to introduce new technology, the beneficiary reaction and where it also help in establishing issues concerning the sustainability of the project. (Harrison and Dennis, 2004). It can be applied for single examination, for planning group or both are equally having to do with not withstanding profuse projects clash setting apart for running costs indeed difficult to obtain. As a confirm, projects have regularly to reinvent themselves in case they qualify still for set-up funding.

The hypothesis explains why a course is expected to work and a logic representation illustrates the program theory. The model explains why and how a program is supposed to work. It gives a logical and sensible description of why the things you do and your program undertakings should lead to the planned results or benefits. For example, if certain set of resources such as staff, materials are available then the program can provide certain activities or to participants. If the participants receive these services then they will receive specific changes in their knowledge, attitude and skills. If individuals change their knowledge, attitude and skills then they will change the behavior and their usual practice which will lead to positive impact or the intended results.

The relevance of this theory to the study was to establish the factors that influence the sustainability of donor funded projects with reference to Mission of Hope International, identifying how those factors can be incorporated in the project and enable achievement of the intended result which is sustainability of the project.

2.4 Theoretical Framework
Theoretical framework is a schematic illustration of the variables under investigation. It shows how independent variables have cause effect on the dependent variable. This part provides a schematic presentation of the relationship between the variables under study.
Sustainability of donor funded projects is influenced by monitoring and evaluation, stakeholder participation, management commitment and achievement of the desired goals by the target community. Sustainability of any project is very key because that is the end result that the donors want to see and also it helps donors continue funding such projects in future.

2.5 Knowledge Gap

Though many studies have been done on project management, accountability and evaluation, a lot needs to be done on the sustainability of the projects. Most of these studies though recognize the importance of sustainability through monitoring and
evaluation but Muzibwi (2010) fears that the very fact that monitoring and evaluation is conducted post the occasion meaning that it depends on the records and reports that are probably unwritten, incomplete, as well as unavailable.

Though Cattani and Florian (2011) is of the view that the community members ought to be given an opportunity to air out their needs and the projects they believe to serve them better. On the other hand Krafain (2011) pointed out that monitoring and devaluation makes sure that the projects goals and objective derived from the communities’ desired outcome is met but in some cases these are done in such away that effective monitoring process is not able to help in the sustainability of the project that are funded by donor.

2.6 Summary of literature reviewed
This chapter reviewed the existing literature on the sustainability of donor funded projects from the global, African and Kenyan perspectives. It has also presented a number of relevant studies done to support the study and also conceptual framework. The review of the literature indicated that monitoring and evaluation, stakeholder participation, management commitment and achievement of desired goals by the target community influences sustainability of donor funded projects and therefore it’s very important for project managers to consider this factors whenever there is a project that is funded by donors so as to ensure that the project is sustainable even after the donors withdrawal there support.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
The Chapter brings out the design applied by the researcher. The research tries to bring out the collective techniques applicable for the research project. It explains the process of data gathering, plus the instruments of collection of the data to be use in this study. It also describe the examination of data, the research study design applicable, the target population and its scope, all in addition to the technique applied in the research process.

3.2 Research Design
The research design is a master plan specifies the method and measures for collecting and analyzing the required information (Zikmund, 2003). It defines the outline or the blueprint for the research. The research design provides guidance on the way the study should be carried. The study adopted a case study design. It is an exploration strategy involving broad investigation of a sole unit of study, which may be a person, family, group, community, or organization, or a very small amount of subjects who are examine intensively. According to Johnson (2006), case study devise it’s measured a vigorous do research method largely when a holistic, comprehensively investigation is obligatory and it’s more outstanding when dealing with issues concerning the public based problems. Case Study design was engaged because it promises width of information and specific descriptive investigation of distinctiveness of a illustration which can be used to make inferences about populace (Kerlinger, 1993). The study covered the factors influencing the sustainability of donor funded projects with reference to Mission of Hope International at Mathare Slums in Nairobi County.

3.3 Target population
Population is the number of human beings, events or objects that have common and noticeable uniqueness. It is the collective of all that conform to a given condition. The target populace comprise of the staff from MOHI (86), local leaders in the community (40) and community members (200) totaling to Three Hundred and Twenty Six (326).
3.4 Sample Size and Sampling procedure
The study sample size was determined by the number of respondents under each category of the respondents where the study through stratified random sampling method settled for the following sample size. Half of the population in each department was selected to represent different strata of the population. Coopers and Schindler (2006) stated that half of the target population can be selected if the target population is of a small number.

Table 3.1 Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOHI Staff</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local leaders</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1 Sampling Technique
The sampling technique to be enacted at sampled respondents is representative sampling that is commonly used by the survey-based study where there is need to make inference from the illustration about a people in order to respond the research question or meet the research objective (Mugenda, 2008). In this research, stratified random sampling was used because the population is heterogeneous. The respondents in this research was categorized into MOHI staff, local community leadersand community members.

3.5 Research Instruments
The investigator used questionnaire as the major device for data compilation. Questionnaires provide the respondents with a free will to respond to the question posed to them given that it can never be traced back to them. The method is not also non bias. The compilation of these facts was guided by the nature of the information collected, the time available as well as the function of the study. This is a position of few questions asked in a logic progression but put in a wiring form. They were required to give brief and direct answers. The questionnaires were both closed and open questions.
3.5.1 Pilot Testing of Instruments

According to Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003) pilot test is a phase where research instruments are administered to a number of individuals in the target population who are not included in the sample size so as to test dependability and legitimacy of the appliance. The researcher tested if the design of questions was logical, clear and easy to be understood, exhaustive and how long it was take to complete the questionnaire. The pre-test allowed the researcher to check on if the variables that were collected could be easily processed and analyzed. Out of the targeted population of 326, 10 respondents were used to pilot test the data collection tools. Any questions set up to be interpreted in a different way during the pre-testing were rephrased so that it had the same meaning to all respondents. Views given by the respondents throughout pre-testing were analyzed and used to improve the questionnaire before actual compilation of data.

3.5.2 Validity of research instruments

Legitimacy is concerned with whether the results are in reality in relation to what they show to be about, Saunders et al., (2009). Validity stand for the extent to which results are obtained from the investigation of the data in reality represents the experience. Content validity ensures that the data collected using certain instrument represent specific domain of a concept. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) asserted that legality defines the exactness and meaningfulness of inference drawn from study conclusion. If the apparatus are valid, the outcome obtained from the research actually represented the study variables.

Questionnaires were used given that the study was apprehensive with variables which were not in a straight line observed such as views, opinions, perceptions and feeling of the respondents. Such information is composed through the use of questionnaires Touliatos and Compton, (1988). The whole objective populace was anticipated to be learned and was unlikely to have difficulties responding to the questions posed to them as they are informed in the issues under investigation

3.5.3 Reliability of research instruments

Reliability is the degree to which your data compilation techniques or analysis measures would yield dependable conclusion, Saunders et al, (2009). The study ensured that data
collection and analysis was not biased (subject or observer biases) and erroneous given that sometimes the data may have some error due to the tool used. A mechanism cannot be valid lest it is dependable. However, the reliability of an instrument does not depend on its validity. It is probable to compute the dependability of an instrument objectively. The Researcher used the split half method and use of Cronbach statistical tool to measure internal consistency.

**3.6 Data Collection Procedure**

The researcher was issued with a letter by the University for Facts Compilation. The data was collected using a mix of administered and self-administered questionnaires through drop and pick later method where the researcher with help of research assistant delivered the questionnaires in person to the respondents. Where the respondents had difficulties in filling the questionnaire the researcher together with the research assistant administered the questionnaire.

**3.7 Data Analysis Techniques**

This is the whole procedure that follows the data gathering process, where, the researcher examines the collected data and terminates by an interpretation of the outcomes Obure, (2002). The process entails, the data cleaning, rearrangement of the questionnaire, editing to eliminate possible mistakes and completion.

The facts were analyzed all the way through the use of numerical enclose for the Social Sciences software was used plus the inferential statistics, application of mean and standard deviation. The results are later presented in form tables, with the leading research questions. The qualitative data obtained from open ended questions was categorized in topics base on the study objectives as being report in description form along with quantitative donation. The data was examined through qualitative and quantitative methods and the results presented in tables and figures.

**3.8 Ethical considerations**

The researcher was guided by the findings Gronhaug (2006), where he said that there is need for the researchers to guarantee their respondents a high rate of confidentiality and respondents to give true information on the questions they are answering. To act in the
accordance with the social standards and values both consistently and willingly, one is said to have Integrity or moral values of society (Hoskin, 2001). Yhence, Professional integrity brings out the person’s willingness and constinstency practicess within the limits of professionalism and ethics under certain commitment of a Code of Ethics (Furbank, 2006).

3.9 Operationalization of variables
This entails looking for a quantifiable, experimental, in addition to suitable catalog for your changeable (independent and dependent variables), plus judgment a way to influence the variable in such a way as to contain two or additional levels.

Table 3.3 Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Level of Scale</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine how monitoring and evaluation influence the sustainability of donor funded projects</td>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>-Achievement of Desired goals</td>
<td>-Effective monitoring &amp; Evaluation process</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Descriptive And Inferential Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ascertain if stakeholder participation influences sustainability of donor funded projects</td>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>-Stakeholder involvement at all levels.</td>
<td>-Level of community participation.</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Descriptive And Inferential Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine how management commitment influence the</td>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>-Number of meetings done</td>
<td>-Available sustainable mechanisms</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Descriptive And Inferential Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Type of Variable</td>
<td>Indicator (s)</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Level of Scale</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability of donor funded projects</td>
<td><strong>Independent variable</strong>&lt;br&gt;Continued Funding Plans</td>
<td>- More Financial allocation.&lt;br&gt;- Community initiatives for funding option</td>
<td>- Community Initiatives for continuing funding</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Descriptive And inferential Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of donor Funded Projects; MOHI</td>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong>&lt;br&gt;Sustainability of donor funded projects</td>
<td>- Continuity of projects.&lt;br&gt;- Number of ongoing projects.</td>
<td>- Continuity of projects.&lt;br&gt;- Number of ongoing projects.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Inferential Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the scrutiny of data, explanation and the appearance of the research conclusion. (Cooper & Schindler, 2003) defined data analysis as the procedure of reducing bulky quantity of serene data to data that addresses the preliminary intention of the study. The study conclusion correlated to the study questions that directed the study. The purpose of the research was to establish the factors influencing the sustainability of donor funded projects a case study of mission of hope international at Mathare slums, Nairobi county: The study targeted population of this study comprised of 43 member of the staffs, 20 local leaders and 100 community members within the area of study. Out of the total of 39 employed staff responded, 15 local leaders responded and 95 community members targeted filled and returned their questionnaires.

4.2 Demographic Information
In array to confine the worldwide information of the respondents, issues such as sex, certification, level of schooling and years worked were sought.

4.2.1 Gender of the respondents
Table 4.1 presents the gender of the respondents for the research thus the researcher was able to get an idea of the gender with the highest number in the schools and the in the community. The respondents were asked to point out their gender with the plan of establishing whether the study was gender sensitive and to find out if gender predisposed donor funding. The outcomes were exposed in Table 4.1
Table 4.1: Gender representations of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender response</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOHI Staffs</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local leaders</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the community members who responded were female making up 53% of the respondents and male gender made up 47% of the respondents. This is because the population of male working in the schools is higher than that of female. This indicates that the one third gender rule was applied in this research which gave a good representation of each gender. This was likely to lead to better research results.

4.2.2 Age of the respondents

The investigator wanted to establish the age allotment for the respondents. This was to settle on how the age of the respondents was distributed among employees of MOHI, local leaders and the community members.

Table 4.2: Respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>MOHI Staffs</th>
<th>Local leaders</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents 18 - 25 years</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 35 years</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 - 45 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 45 years</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that great numbers of the respondents were above 26 years making 44%, 67% and 19% of MOHI staffs, local leaders and community members respectively. This shows that the respondents were not in the 25 years bracket and therefore were mature enough to and energetic to manage the donor funded projects and also a good indicator they sort to have experience and understanding about the projects.
4.2.3 Level of Education

Table 4.3 presents the intensity of education attained by the respondents, and this helps the researcher to know what to expect from the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOHI Staffs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local leaders</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high level of education attained by these respondents was likely to have had a constructive persuade on the sustainability of donor funded MOHI schemes due to adequate of management skills among the group members after the donors leave and also eased time of collection of data. However, there was no research evidence from the past that had linked the participants mean number of years in formal education with sustainability of donor funded projects. Formal years of schooling were significant in influencing sustainability of donor funded water projects.

4.2.4 Years worked

Table 4.4 presents the employment brackets of the respondents at MOHI school and this helps the researcher to understand his target population better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2-4 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 4-6 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large number of the school staffs 36% have worked at schools for between 4 and 6 years, followed by 28% of the staff who have worked for over 6 years and 14% have worked for 2-4 years, this shows that most employees of MOHI have worked for the schools for ample years and they had more experience and credible information about the
4.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

The following sections provide an analysis of the data collected with regard to scrutinizing and assessment of the projects implemented, this addresses the impact on schools projects and community around. Thus, addresses school change i.e., pupils’ retention, absenteeism, quality education offered and health education. Tracking the progress of the project demonstrates its impact to the school and community. However, M&E gives the donor confidence on return of investment, and also help them to make right decision for future investment.

4.3.1. Sustainability of donor funded projects

The research required to establish if monitoring and evaluation contribute to the sustainability of the donor sponsored projects as shown on Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Does monitoring and assessment contribute sustainability of donor funded projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows the members of staff were divided whether the exercise was carried out, as 51% agreed that monitoring was done. This implies that monitoring and evaluation helps in the sustainability of a project.

4.3.2. How monitoring and assessment of the schemes was conducted

The study established how often monitoring and evaluation was conducted during the project implementation process. The consequences were provided as revealed in the Table 4.6.
Table 4.6: Monitoring and evaluation exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the community member respondents 51% said that monitoring and evaluation is conducted yearly after the withdrawal of donor funds. However, the study sought to establish whether the community members were aware of whom manages the projects as revealed in Table 4.7

Table 4.7: Who monitors the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management committee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local leaders</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHI</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of community members were aware of who monitors the institution projects as 47% of said that MOHI monitors the projects. Thus, there is a need of capacity building for awareness on projects monitoring and evaluation.
4.3.3. Donors Support

Table 4.8: In your opinion are the donors happy with the monitoring and evaluation process for the project and are ready to continuing supporting the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 4.8, 97% of the MOHI staff agrees that donors are happy with the implemented projects. Thus this is also revealed in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Future support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To large extent</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To small extent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of respondent agree to a large extent 74% that donors are happy with monitoring and evaluation of project implemented. This an indication that achievement of sustainability in the operation and management of the project will be continues, effective and efficient use of the facilities and service delivery to all stakeholders is positive and results of this demand will increase of services delivered in MOHI.

4.4 Stakeholders Participation

The following sections provide an analysis of the data collected with regard to how society partaking influence the sustainability of water schemes funded by benefactors in MOHI. To achieve this objective, the respondents were asked to indicate whether their participation was sort during implementation of projects in all the phases. The responses were presented in Table 4.7.
4.4.3. Community involvement
Table 4.10 establishes whether the community members were involved in project implementation. Promoting project ownership are principles of the effectiveness, reliability and sustainability of a project. All stakeholders should feel entitled to own and sustain an initiative of a project. Ownership is the best strategy to guarantee that a project succeeds and expands in the long run.

Table 4.10: Community involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In your opinion does the community consider the project as beneficial?</th>
<th>In your judgment do you think that the scheme has the required stakeholder support?</th>
<th>Were you or members of the household involved in any of the MOHI Projects activities in this area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>Yes 21, No 18</td>
<td>Yes 20, No 19</td>
<td>Yes 49, No 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>54, 46</td>
<td>51, 49</td>
<td>52, 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of respondent responded that community was involved 54% and 51% of MOHI staff responded, while 52% of community members responded for the same. This shows community sensitization before project implementation also some members took their children to other institution within Mathare.

4.5 Management Commitment
The following sections provide an analysis of the data collected with regard to management commitments which outrights the leadership structure with the institution and the community. Organized management that runs a project is measured by a strong evidence of sustainability of a project as shown in Table 4.11.
Table 4.11: Management Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your opinion</th>
<th>Does management team have meetings regularly to review the project progress?</th>
<th>In your opinion do you think that the present management is properly committed for the sustainability of donor funded projects?</th>
<th>Are community members involved in the running of the project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency: 31 8 26 13 31 8 42 53

Percentage: 80 20 67 33 80 20 44 56

Agreeableness within all stakeholders of the project has a positive impact on the society as 80% of the respondents agree that present management is committed towards sustainability of the project. While 67% of respondents suggest that there a direction as members meet regularly this shows openness and accountability of management of the project this makes the project run efficiently. 56% said that, community members are involved in running of the projects as children are admitted in the school and the institution offers courses and business training skills.

4.6 Achievement on the desired goals for the targeted communities
The research also recognizes that sustainable project administration practices result in numerous scheme results, such as slackening prospect admission to education, health care, water and sanitation, development of capabilities, goodwill for organizations and human capital development among others.
Table 4.12: Project achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were the vulnerable households mapped? (e.g. Orphan vulnerable children)</th>
<th>Was there a deliberate effort to target poor and vulnerable households in implementation of the project?</th>
<th>Were the poor or vulnerable households given any specific opportunities in the project?</th>
<th>Do you think this project will attract future financial allocation from donors?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study shows 52% of community respondent had feeling that the institution will attract future financial donations. The study shows that 48% of community members said that poor or vulnerable households were given specific opportunity in the project, 45% also said there was deliberate effort to target poor and vulnerable households in implementation of the project.

4.7 Descriptive analysis

Descriptive analysis was used to analyze the data. Descriptive measure of central tendency mean and dispersion standard deviation was used. The section was organized according to the study objectives. Table 4.13 presents the responses to the likert scale questions given to the respondents.
Table 4.13: Likert scale questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOHI Staff</th>
<th>Community members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of Desired goals</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Financial Allocation</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder involvement at all levels</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity building</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meetings done</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reviews done</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement on the desired goals for the targeted communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Financial allocation</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community initiatives for funding option</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sustaining project</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and accountability</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality education offered</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school attendance</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil retention</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*VGE- Very Great extent GE – Great extent ME- Moderately extent LE- Little extent NE- No extent

Table 4.13, on monitoring and evaluation of the respondents indicated that achievement of desired goals with a score of 3.7 (moderate) followed by those who indicated that more financial allocation with a mean score of 3.4 (moderate).

Most of the respondents in stakeholders’ involvement in implementation of the projects indicated that institution (moderate) play a great task in stakeholder involvement at all levels and community capacity building with scoring a mean of 3.7 and 2.9 respectively.

According to Admassu et.al, (2002) an significant aspect for the sustainability of schemes is the authentic participation of local people as lively participants and equivalent cohorts
whose concerns and understanding are fundamental to the project's accomplishment. However, community members involved in implementation of the projects consolidate towards the success fully ownership and sustainability of the project with (moderate) stakeholder involvement at all levels with mean score of 3.3 and community capacity building with a mean score of 2.9 (great extent).

On management committee majority of the respondents felt that number of meetings done with a mean score of 3.5 (moderate) which a forms the bases of the implementation of the projects, were of the view that the number of reviews done with a mean score of 3.4(moderate) which indicate project ownership and sustainability.

Majority of the respondents on project sustainability showed that high school attendance with a mean score of 3.9 (little extent), some of the leaders were of the opinion that pupil retention with a mean score of 3.3 (moderate), also many felt that self sustain project with a mean score of 2.9 (great extent), they also felt that equity and accountability with a mean score of 2.9 (great extent). Lastly they also felt that quality education offered with a mean score of 3.1 (moderate).
Table 4.14: Likert scale questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation feedback was utilized for improvement</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation process in dissemination of information was satisfactory</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation was fully participatory with community involvement</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation team involved community/group members in Project identification/Conceptualization</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community was involved in Project implementation through cost sharing</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community was involved in financial transactions of group account</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community is not involved in sharing of benefits of donor funded water project</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 shows that, majority of the local leaders responded on project sustainability as indicated; that monitoring & evaluation feedback was utilized for improvement with a mean score of 2.8 (agree), some of the leaders were of the opinion that monitoring & evaluation process in dissemination of information was satisfactory with a mean score of 3.7 (moderate), also many felt that Monitoring & evaluation was fully participatory with community involvement with a mean score of 2.7 (agree), they also felt that the implementation team involved community/group members in project identification/Conceptualization with a mean score of 2.8 (agree). Community was involved in project implementation through cost sharing with mean score of 2.6 (agree). Community was involved in financial transactions of group account with a mean score of 3.4 (unaware). Lastly they also felt that community is not involved in sharing of benefits of donor funded water project with a mean score of 3.2 (unaware).
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a summary of the key findings of the research and then discusses these findings against literature. The chapter then offers a conclusion before giving recommendations and also suggests areas of further research.

5.2 Summary of findings
The reason behind the research was to establish the features that influence the continuity of projects that are financed by donors a case study of Mission of Hope International at Mathare slums Nairobi County. The study used a case study design, target population was 326, a sample size of 163 respondents was achieved using random stratified sampling, 149 questionnaires were returned with responses and data was examined using statistical package for the social sciences to run expressive statistics, inferential statistics was used too.

5.2.1 Monitoring and evaluation and Sustainability of donor funded projects
From the study is seen that monitoring and evaluation of the implemented projects has been on progress, as the institution is still undertaking constructions, after donors funding the assessment have been conducted yearly 51 percent, quarterly 28 percent monthly 21 percent, this MOHI 47 percent, local leader 16 percent, community members 11 percent and management committee 28 percent 26 percent have been involved. Furthermore, 51 percent on MOHI respondent agreed that monitoring and evaluation contribute to sustainability of the projects. In the perspective of the donor-funded development programs as well as ventures, sustainability involves the progression of merits resulting from the key help emanating from a donor, has been concluded / reserved (Okun, Op.Cit). The assessment of the project assess strategic fit of the project intervention based on social economic needs for the beneficiary, mission and objective of the schools, and polices strategies and plans of the National Government and NGOs.
5.2.2 Stakeholder Participation and Sustainability of Donor Funded Projects

Regarding stakeholders involvement in the projects implementation, the study found that 52 percent of community respondent were involved in implementation of the project. 51 percent of MOHI respondent thought the project has enough community members support also 54 percent agree the project it’s beneficial to the community. Promoting project ownership according to Barbier (1987) escalating the substance lifestyle of the disadvantaged people in the ground level that can be measured quantitatively in terms of enhanced food, actual revenue, academic services, water/sanitation, healthcare, food security, in addition to cash.

The ultimate goal of the donors is to enhance the living standards of the inhabitants the certain locality by means of provision of empowerment in funded project; the study found that 44 percent of community members agreed to be part of the project progress. 67 percent of MOHI responded that they participated in project planning and they hold meetings regularly. MOHI staffs are also aware of policies that make a project sustainable; accountability of management team, good governance practice and maintenance of the projects. Director flagged out that quality of education has improved, the number of absenteeism has reduced, more over they is a pupil retention has improved with a mean score of 1.97 (very great extent). regrettably, the donors usually finances short-term projects, that do not feature into the entire funding plan regulations that ensures the sustainability of these projects even in the long run, when the donors withdrawn from the support (Heeks and Baark, 1998).

5.2.3 Management commitment and Sustainability of Donor Funded Projects

In terms of management commitment 80% of the respondents agreed that present management is committed towards sustainability of the ongoing project. While 67% of respondents suggest that there a direction as members meet regularly this shows openness and accountability of management of the project this makes the project run efficiently. 56% said that, community members are involved in running of the projects as children are admitted in the school and the institution offers courses and business training skills.
5.2.4 Achievement of desired goals for the target Community and Sustainability of Donor Funded projects

In terms of achievement on the desired goals for the targeted communities, the study found that 52 percent of community respondent had feeling that the institution will attract future financial donations. The study shows that 48 percent of community members said that poor or vulnerable households were given specific opportunity in the project, 45 percent also said there was deliberate effort to target poor and vulnerable households in implementation of the project. Facets like human capital growth, handling atmospheric occurrences, life cycle estimate, supply chain enhancement, healthiness plus wellbeing, in addition to water control is believed acceptable. Directors have role and responsibility in project sustainability; this has been as a result of having strategic planning which emphasises on project performance targets, goals statement, spot of concern, performance strategies, and determinants of achievement, time outline and accountability for executing tactics.

5.3 Discussions

The following section discusses the findings of this study and relates these to other research previously done on the same. 3.1 Monitoring and evaluation and Sustainability of Donor funded Projects

The study established that Monitoring and evaluation was carried by the MOHI staff, the local leaders and the community at large. It indicated that M&E was done on a yearly, quarterly and monthly basis. Therefore M&E is a major factor that influences the sustainability of donor funded projects. It is important for M&E to be carried regularly in order to detect problems affecting the project early in advance and provide solutions that will enable the project to achieve its objectives and become sustainable even after the donor’s withdrawals their support.
5.3.2 Stakeholder Participation and Sustainability of Donor funded Projects
The research recognized that all the respondents from the different categories agreed that stakeholder participation is very important for a project to be sustainable. The community and the local leaders were fully involved in every stage of the ongoing projects and that they had an opportunity to give their views and ideas. The MOHI staff was also involved from the conception of each project.

As stated by Stein avers (2010) that the participation of people gives an avenue to determine recent behaviours of management, reporting, shared accountability in interventions and overall project support. The people’s involvement as well aid in improving the knowledge about the roles of various participants concerned plus the limitation of technological in addition to fiscal resources that exist.

5.3.3 Management Commitment and Sustainability of Donor funded projects
According to McDade (2004), When there is good management there is a surety that enough home assets as well as capability subsist also this helps the project to continue irrespective of the absenctia of the exterior possessions. Institutional as well as supervision ability is a guideline to efficient accomplishment of the project since it promotes involvement in addition to contribution of the society in every process of the project accomplishment, therefore locals feel authorized. From the study its seen that the management has been committed to achieve the objectives of the ongoing projects. This is seen from the number of meetings and reviews done, the accountability and transparency level of the management.

5.3.4 Achievement of desired goals by the target community and Sustainability of Donor funded Projects
The study established that the ongoing projects had considered the needs and the concerns of the community and that donors paid attention to the areas of concern raised. The respondents also felt that the projects will attract donors in the near future. However there is a need for the donors to have the following areas being looked at; human capital development among others. This will ensure the desired goals are achieved by the target community.
5.4 Conclusions
The study concludes that most of the residents were involved in the management of donor funded projects. The management committee also noted that the community members were involved in these projects in various capacities but were not empowered. Mofayane 2002, notes that many people involved in some income generating projects, they do not become empowered by them. A number of firms erroneously consider that meeting requirements like basic needs lead to empowerment of members.

Neighbourhood competence creation wasn’t wholly assumed a head of the project accomplishment and resulting from the community inability to mange due to lack of relevant skills needed in this area, leading to the failing of various projects due to lack of progression. It exist an optimistic development involving members of the society and sustainability of projects financed by donors.

The research conclusions has that, there was no involvement of the community into the projects monitoring, in addition to evaluation, that was conducted by MOHI staff and management committee. This means, the community was not at any point given the opportunity to contribute to the project implementation, making them unable to report the influence it has towards them.

5.5 Recommendations
From the outcomes of the research, the researcher arrived to the recommendations herein;
There is need to stir more participation of stakeholders particularly from the community of Mathare in the project development and performance in order to escalate the probability of satisfying the projects. The following are the recommendations given;

i. Introduction of technology and innovation programme to modernise and to improve the services so as to improve the efficiency of the project plus its productivity. There is need for the donor agencies to plan for the enhancement of technology since it is expensive, hence need to be funded accross all the recipients. Efficient management may help in cost involvement and consistency of provisions.
ii. With the management committee and the donors being most supervising the projects, there is a risk of hiding the faultiness of the projects. The community members need to be part of the monitoring team and evaluation of the project so as to give an opportunity of building as well as developing their own projects. Further training is necessary if given to the locals; so as to make them understands the objectives of the projects. This acquaintance would aid them to realize if the project is of help to them in achieving their objectives or not.

iii. It is important for the donors to know the needs, concerns, as well as capacities of the local people to which they are planning to help, so as to let them know the actions planned for them, and how it can affect them, positively, as way of their accountability. When this process is followed, the community will be able to tell of their challenges, and proposed solutions, and the kind of projects that can solve the problems, thus making them members of the project and they will able to learn the process. Associations that are held accountable of the community they serve, will be dedicated in enhancing the quality of the work they do hence confirms that they listen to the society and take action. (David Bainbridge:2008)

5.6 Suggestions for further study
There is need to carry out a research on this area and find out the factors influencing the sustainability of post donor funded projects in Kenya.
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APPENDIX I

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MOHI STAFF

SECTION A:

GENERAL INFORMATION

Below is a questionnaire you are required to fill read carefully and give appropriate answers by ticking or filling the blank spaces on the factors that influence the sustainability of donor funded projects with reference to MOHI at Mathare Slums in Nairobi County.

The information obtained in this questionnaire will be treated with at most confidentiality.

1. Gender
   - Male □
   - Female □

2. Age
   - 18-25 □
   - 26-35 □
   - 36-45 □
   - 46 and above □

3. Highest Education level:
   - Primary □
   - Secondary □
   - College □
   - University □

4. Category of the Respondents

5. For how long have you worked in MOHI?
   - Less than 3 years □
   - 3-5 years □
   - 6 years and above □
SECTION B: MONITORING & EVALUATION

i) Does monitoring and evaluation contribute Sustainability of Donor funded projects?
   Yes ☐  No ☐

In your opinion are the donors happy with the monitoring and evaluation process for the project and are ready to continuing supporting the project
   Yes ☐  No ☐

(ii) If yes to what extent?

   To Large Extent ☐  Moderate ☐  To small extent ☐  no extent ☐

Are the donors happy with the progress of the project so far?
   Yes ☐  No ☐

Are the donors satisfied with the monitoring and evaluation report to continue supporting the programme
   Yes ☐  No ☐

SECTION C: STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

i) In your opinion does the community consider the project as beneficial?
   Yes ☐  No ☐

iii) Has the project defined/identified clearly the targeted beneficiaries?
   Yes ☐  No ☐
Are all the stakeholders happy with their involvement for continued sustainability of the project?
Yes □ No □

In your opinion do you think that the project has the required stakeholder support?
Yes □ No □

If yes please explain………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

v) Has the local community leaders representatives endorsed the project?
Yes □ No □

vi) Has the community come up with initiative programs to ensure sustainability of the project in case the donor exit?
Yes □ No □

vii) Please explain the initiatives the community has embarked on to ensure sustainability
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION D: MANAGEMENT COMMITMENT
i) In your opinion does management commitment contribute to sustainability of donor funded projects?
Yes □ No □

ii) Please explain the reason for your answer………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
iii) Does the management team have meetings regularly to review the project progress?

Yes  □  No  □

iv) Please give reasons for your answer …………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
In your opinion do you think that the present management is properly commitment for the projects sustainability?

Yes  □  No  □

Please give reasons for your answer ………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
In your opinion how can monitoring and evaluation process can be improved through management commitment to guarantee project sustainability

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

SECTION E: ACHIEVEMENT ON THE DESIRED GOALS FOR THE TARGETED COMMUNITIES

i) Does achievement on the desired goals for the targeted communities contribute to the sustainability of donor funded projects?

Yes  □  No  □

ii) Please explain the reason for your answer…………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

iii) To what extent does achievement on the desired goals for the targeted communities contributes to the sustainability of donor funded projects?

To Large Extent  □  Moderate  □  To small extent  □  no extent  □

iv) Please give reasons for your answer …………………………………………………
In your opinion do you think that the project will help the community achieve its development goals?

Yes  ☐  No  ☐

iv) Please give reasons for your answer .................................................................
.............................................................................................................................

SECTION F:

The following are likert scale statements that relate to factors influencing the sustainability of post donor funded projects in the MOHI. Using scale 1-5 where 1- Very great extent and 5- No extent. Indicate the extent to which they are effective

VGE – Very Great Extent GE– Great Extent ME– Moderate Extent LE – Little Extent NE – No extent

Table 5.1 Likert Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>VGE</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of Desired goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Financial Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder involvement at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meetings done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reviews done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement on the desired Goals for the Targeted Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Financial allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community initiatives for funding option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability of donor funded projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self – sustaining project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality education offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thank you for your Participation.*
APPENDIX II

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COMMUNITY

SECTION A:

This is a study intended to establish the factors influencing the sustainability of donor funded projects: a case of mission of hope international at Mathare slums, Nairobi county. Kindly fill in the information as accurately as possible. The information provided here will be confidential and used only for research purposes.

1. Gender?
   Male ( ) Female ( )

2. What is your age?
   18-25 ( ) 26-35 years ( )
   36-45 years ( ) above 45 years ( )

3. What is your highest level of education?
   Primary ( ) Secondary ( )
   College ( ) University ( )

4. How long have you been a resident of this community?
   5-6 years ( ) 7-8 years ( )
   9-10 years ( ) Over 10 years ( )

5. How long have you been associated with MOHI?
   2-5 years ( ) 6-10 years ( ) Over 10 years ( )

SECTION B: MONITORING & EVALUATION

6. Who monitors the project?
   Management committee ( ) Local leaders ( ) Community ( ) MOHI ( )

7. How many times is the monitoring done and in what ways is monitoring carried out?
8. When is monitoring performed?

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

9. Who are involved during monitoring?

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

10. Do you think that the project managers are accountable for the project?

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

SECTION C: STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

11. Were you or members of the household involved in any of the MOHI Projects activities in this area?

    Yes (  )       No (  )

12. Which development project is most familiar to you in Mathare estate?

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

SECTION D: MANAGEMENT COMMITMENT

13. Are you involved in the running of the project?

    Yes (  )       No (  )

    If Yes Explain how
SECTION E: ACHIEVEMENT ON THE DESIRED GOALS FOR THE TARGETED COMMUNITIES

14. Do you think this project will attract future financial allocation from donors?
   Yes ( )    No ( )

15. In your opinion do you think that the project has benefited the targeted beneficiaries and has met the communities expectations?
   Yes ( )    No ( )

16. State whether the projects has been successful or unsuccessful in achieving its goals.
    Very successful ( )    Not very successful ( )
    Not successful at all ( )    Successful ( )

17. Were the vulnerable households mapped?(e.g. Orphan vulnerable children)
    Yes ( )    No ( )

18. Was there a deliberate effort to target poor and vulnerable Households in implementation of the projects? Yes ( )    No ( )

19. Were the poor or vulnerable households given any Specific opportunities in the project?
    Yes ( )    No ( )
**SECTION F:**
The following are likert scale statements that relate to factors influencing the sustainability of post donor funded projects in MOHI. Using scale 1-5 where 1- Very great extent and 5- No extent. Indicate the extent to which they are effective

VGE – Very Great Extent GE– Great Extent ME– Moderate Extent LE – Little Extent
NE – No extent

**Table 5.1 Likert Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>VGE</th>
<th>GE</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>LE</th>
<th>NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of Desired goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Financial Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder involvement at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meetings done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Reviews done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement on the desired Goals for the Targeted Communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Financial allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community initiatives for funding option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability of donor funded projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self – sustaining project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality education offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your Participation.
APPENDIX III

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LOCAL LEADERS

This is a study intended to establish the factors influencing the sustainability of donor funded projects: a case of mission of hope international at Mathare slums, Nairobi County. Kindly cooperate in answering the questions as accurately as possible. The information provided here will be confidential and used only for research purposes.

1. Gender?
   - Male ( )
   - Female ( )

2. What is your age?
   - 18-25 ( )
   - 26-35 years ( )
   - 36-45 years ( )
   - above 45 years ( )

3. What is your highest level of education?
   - Primary ( )
   - Secondary ( )
   - College ( )
   - University ( )

4. How do you involve the community of in your projects?
   - Yes ( )
   - No ( )

5. How is the monitoring and evaluation of the project carried out?
   .................................................................................................................................
   .................................................................................................................................
   .................................................................................................................................

6. What can you say about accountability of the project?
   .................................................................................................................................
   .................................................................................................................................
   .................................................................................................................................
   .................................................................................................................................

7. Who owns the Land where facilities are constructed?
   - Private ( )
   - Community ( )
   - Government ( )
   - School ( )
SECTION I: Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation in Donor Funded Projects

1. Please by a (√) indicate how often monitoring and evaluation is conducted during the project implementation process up-to the completion using the key provided in the table below.
   a) Yearly ( )   b) Quarterly ( )   c) Monthly ( )   d) Weekly ( )   e) None

Please rate to what extent do you agree/or disagree with the fact that monitoring and evaluation during the implementation of donor funded projects will be satisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1-Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2-Agree</th>
<th>3-Unaware</th>
<th>4-Disagree</th>
<th>5-Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation feedback was utilized for improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation process in dissemination of information was satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation was fully participatory with community involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation team involved community/group members in Project identification/Conceptualization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community was involved in Project implementation through cost sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community was involved in financial transactions of group account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community is not involved in sharing of benefits of donor funded water project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your Participation.
Appendix 1: Letter of Transmittal

University of Nairobi
P.O Box 30197-00100
Nairobi, Kenya

To the Human Resource Manager
Mission of Hope International, Mathare
Nairobi, Kenya

Dear sir/ Madam

RE: Request for participation in a research study

I am Marion Mwende pursuing a master’s degree in Project Planning and Management at the University of Nairobi. I am currently undertaking a research on “the factors that influence the Sustainability of Donor Funded Projects a case study of Mission of Hope International Mathare slums Nairobi County”

I would be grateful if you could spare some time from your busy schedule and participate in providing the required information. All the information provided will be used purely for academic purposes and will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Kindly contact me in case of any queries or clarification on any of the questions.
Thank you in advance.

Sincerely,

Marion Mwende
Appendix II: Letter from the institution

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND EXTERNAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF CONTINUING AND DISTANCE EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTRA-MURAL STUDIES
NAIROBI EXTRA-MURAL CENTRE

Your Ref:  
Our Ref:  
Telephone: 318262 Ext. 120

Main Campus  
Gandhi Wing, Ground Floor  
P.O. Box 30197  
NAIROBI

19th November, 2016

REF: UON/CEES/NEMC/25/029

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: MARION MWENDE WAMBUA- REG NO L50/76343/2014

This is to confirm that the above named is a student at the University of Nairobi College of Education and External Studies, School of Continuing and Distance Education, Department of Extra-Mural Studies pursuing a Masters of art in Project Planning and Management.

She is proceeding for research entitled “factors influencing the sustainability of donor funded projects”. A case study of mission of hope international at Mathare Slums, Nairobi County.

Any assistance given to her will be highly appreciated.

CAREN AWILLY
CENTRE ORGANIZER
NAIROBI EXTRA-MURAL CENTRE
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Ref: NACOSTI/P/17/14139/20875

Date: 11th December, 2017

Marion Mwende Wambua
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P.O. Box 30197-00100
NAIROBI

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Factors influencing the sustainability of donor funded projects: A case study of Mission of Hope International at Mathare Slums, Nairobi County” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nairobi County for the period ending 11th December, 2018.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Nairobi County before embarking on the research project.

Kindly note that, as an applicant who has been licensed under the Science, Technology and Innovation Act, 2013 to conduct research in Kenya, you shall deposit a copy of the final research report to the Commission within one year of completion. The soft copy of the same should be submitted through the Online Research Information System.

G P Kalerwa

GODFREY P. KALERWA MSc., MBA, MKIM
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO
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Nairobi County.

The County Director of Education
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