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ABSTRACT

This study sought an assessment of communication strategies in inclusion of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation at Children of God Relief Institute - Nyumbani. The specific objectives of the study were: to interrogate the communication strategies used to enhance former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute; to investigate factors that inform the participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns in an organisation at Children of God Institute; to establish the contribution of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute; to establish challenges encountered by former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute. The study adopted the participatory communication theory by Habermas and Power/Interest Grid (Matrix) theory by Sharma for stakeholders to understand the influence of stakeholders in search of more resources in non-governmental organisations. The study used a mixed methods research approach. Questionnaires were used to collect quantitative data from 227 participants out of 757 of the beneficiaries. The key informant interview guide were used to collect qualitative data from 10 key informants from Children of God Relief Institute – Nyumbani. Systematic random sampling was used to sample respondents from the target population, consisting a list of 757 beneficiaries, while purposive sampling technique was used to identify 10 Nyumbani Homes Staffs for interviews. Quantitative data was analysed through descriptive and inferential statistics which was generated through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences and presented in tables, charts, and graphs while qualitative data, content analysis was used findings were presented in prose form. The study concludes that former beneficiaries are key stakeholders of the Children of God Institute and should be considered in all aspects of resource mobilisation. Their lifelong testimonies are key to influence local donations and consequently international donors. The study recommends that Nyumbani management should embrace bottom up process of communication because sticking on top-down limits them on feedback. Sticking on top-bottom demotivates the urge to freely participate in the process of mobilising resources.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Overview

This chapter consists of the background information, statement of the problem, research objectives, and research questions. It also includes the justification of the study, scope and limitation of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

The rising humanitarian issues and the complex and protracted nature of many of these crises have heightened the urgency of strengthening the interventions of development and humanitarian strategies (UNICEF, 2016). According to United Nations Children Fund, there is need for sustainable development goals which should be estimated at over 15 years. The set goals expand chances for partnering and engagement of larger stakeholders, interest groups, governments and the business fraternity. There are resources basically for the most vulnerable who are children, women, disabled and the aged from governments, private sector, local and Global sources. Though donations from traditional donor countries are being redirected to address new contexts. The current donors have directed their focus to more fragile contexts like insecurity and desert stricken areas. Their target is to alleviate challenges of hunger, health and protect the most vulnerable.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (2016) presents stakeholder participation as a concept meaning anyone, and or any group that has interest or may be disadvantaged by a decision. Stakeholders are people who have influence in a particular intervention towards a community problem. NOAA (2016) asserts that people’s perceptions, views, beliefs and existing knowledge can pose profound effect on any project realisation. NOAA (2016) had to conduct stakeholder
analyses to power knowledge; experiences, culture and understanding of the issue of stakeholders to influence policy and decision to enable them manage coastal resources in America. The inclusion of other people in this undertaking is a response to previous traditional top-down way of decision making. It was realised that decision making in natural resource protection required stakeholder’s involvement due to varied interest and fundamentally any decision could affect them. Objectives of an organisation can be affected due to stakeholder exclusion (Rourke et. Al, 2016). Rourke, Higuchi and Hogg attribute the success of Canadian Health Service Research foundation to stakeholder participation. This was felt in policy decisions and change initiatives. By involving them, stakeholders develop a confidence in a project, share common ideas, beliefs and satisfaction with the intended change or goal realisation. A rising concern is limited evidence in describing stakeholder involvement and motivation especially among volunteers. There is not enough proof on what sustains their participation as resourceful entities. Nonetheless, stakeholder participation enables implementing organisation to bring out firm and ‘accepted’ outcomes or decisions, get citizens support that is essential for project initiation and sustainability, and resolve conflicts amongst stakeholders and foster relationships amongst them.

However, with values enlisted and argued upon, stakeholder participation can be expensive, time consuming, confrontational, intense labour consequently causing delays in passing crucial matters to be passed for project implementation (NOAA, 2016). Tasks involved in identifying the right stakeholders require deeper knowledge in stakeholder analysis, audience categorisation which is an initiative to group individuals according to common characteristics. This facilitates smooth roles and duty allocation as per individual’s educational level, professional skills, age and gender. Though Stakeholder management is not an easy task. The main argument is how they are related to the organisation’s anticipated goals. Specific needs and management efforts should prioritise
those stakeholders that are believed to be more relevant to organisation’s long term goals (Arckerman & Eden, 2011).

In the efforts of abating the developmental challenges in the society, stakeholder’s participation at every level of project initiation is as significant for the realisation of project goals and the eventual sustainability after the donors close the funding (Usadolo & Caldwell, 2016). Usodolo and Cadawel (2016) agree that in a community set up, there is varied and diverse knowledge and values that has to be factored and consequently amount to a fruitful stakeholder involvement. As a funder and implementing officers, one has to consider existing norms that can hinder any step affecting a communal change initiative. Stakeholder involvement results in strong sense of belongingness, and acceptance over the entire process and this brings out clear outcomes. There is sufficient evidence that suggests mutual relationship amongst stakeholders that it increases their efforts in the intervention and provides a ground for new relationship development. Usadolo and Caldwell adds that the stakeholders appreciate and legitimise and learn to appreciate each other’s views.

In Brazil particularly under the leadership of Dilma Rousseff and her predecessor, Luis Inacio Lula da Silva, they incorporated the imagination of activists, development experts and professionals alike. These stakeholders discussed crucial debates about upcoming municipal budgets and budgetary constraints. Citizen inclusivity in this nation reduced slums and upgraded the former municipalities in famous and renowned Brazilian cities. (Nylen, 2011).

Chandra (2010) in his work “Participatory Rural appraisal,” critiqued the ideas of the experts and of those who had power over community based projects. He has often argued on the value of realising the real challenge by giving a listening ear to the people at the grassroots. Many programmes destined for African have faced numerous challenges at initial stages to
implementation and project hand over due to stakeholder’s participation gaps. The donors and experts implemented what they had thought was right for the communities but not the underlying challenges affecting the people.

There is need for guidance for better outcome in any intervention by creating a dialogic environment where the affected communities or citizen would have their way and comment on any local and international interventions (Melkote, 2003). This in itself gives a development expert a good beginning in understanding cultural issues, societal ethical observations, and local leadership. It cuts costs when you involve and engage the local experts who are well known to the community. People will easily own the program and if it is a behaviour change programmes, it will be easy for the community to disclose information to their own than a ‘foreigner’ (Chandra, 2010). By knowing the community logistics, the project manager or the organisation through the local administration may be given a space or land to initiate their project hence resource mobilisation.

Organisations need resources to run their budget amongst them salaries, research should be done for decision making, funding and donation marketing through banners, brochures and paid social platforms. Resource mobilisation is a key function to sustain organisations programs and therefore non-profit main function is to search for alternative sources of funding. With significant knowledge of how non-profit are formed, (IDRC, 2010) suggests that either the individual or a group of individuals should understand and stick to the institution’s mandate and mission of an organisation. It may experience challenges when the stakeholders takes on the role of interpreting the vision better than the idea originators.
Usadolo and Caldwel, (2016) substantially supports that Stakeholder involvement is key, because this is a step in a successful intervention, resource acquisition and project sustainability. When the community is involved in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, they gain knowledge along the way which is essentially valued at project closure. For example if there a water project, there should be manpower for maintenance and operation because the implementing organisation will not remain on site forever. Imagine in such a situation that there are no men and women who cannot sustain or maintain the project then this means the community will again suffer water shortage.

Previously in modernisation era, development experts like some of our African leaders more often ignored main stakeholders and constructed schools, hospitals and roads later realising that security or food were the underlying community challenge. Apart from Tanzania under Mwalimu Julius Nyerere and other communist states, at independence who chose development through the grassroots levels, many African leaders held the opposite view. To carry their country’s vision, they chose the colonial media and transport infrastructure and largely colonial state leadership styles (White, 2009).

They still embraced the dominant linear model of communication where feedback was not in consideration for system upgrade. Such countries have suffered from dictatorship which in most cases has led civil wars and unstable economies such as Algeria, Chad and the Republic Central Africa. Considering the salient value of stakeholder participation, researchers in Africa are out in the field with the central theme of finding validity of the indigenous knowledge, traditional forms of organisation and traditional mode of communication for this is a necessary and key contributor to any project implementation (Usadolo & Caldwel, 2016).
Kenya had a several unrests due tribal and power politicking. It is indeed worthy for an external professional to have a clear need assessment of the area and the community before initiating any program purported to help alleviate the existing need and this is enhanced by societal empowerment (Tufte & Mefalopulos, 2009). Clarity in stakeholder analyses leads to win in a community’s will to end a vice or change towards a favourable behaviour. When citizens are fed up with a social behaviour like drug abuse in youth, rampant crime, incorrigible government misappropriations or inadequate health and educational resources often attempt to organise and mobilise to decry their will in “bottom-up” approach to social change (Salmon, Laleah, & Lori, 2010).

Stakeholder participation in Kenya is enshrined in the 2010 promulgated constitution as among the main principles of governance. Devolution in Kenya intended to compel the government communication, services and development programs to the grassroots. In as much as there are a number of interpretations of participation, the main objective of devolution was empowerment and inclusion in the new County development initiatives and resource acquisition (Chandra, 2010).

Makueni, Kakamega and Kisumu counties have successfully embraced the stakeholder participation which has shown the individual responsibility and talks of how their counties are doing well as compared to other Counties. The Makueni County officers traverse the county under the patronage of governor Kibwana to listen and identify persons who are taken as spokesmen of communities to plan, supervise and implementation of any county initiatives. The county inclusively implemented the mango juice, milk factory and currently a maternity health facility. The residents are proud of value addition especially on mangoes which were initially sold cheaply to brokers for larger Kenyan markets. In a recent past appraisal discourse, Makueni emerged top in effective project implementation counties in Kenya. This was echoed and supported by inclusion
of the county residents in needs assessment, decision making process, costing, monitoring and project implementation (Chandra, 2010). Nonetheless, other counties are yet to fully embrace stakeholder participatory approach to development, it is a prerequisite that has to be prioritised because this is a constitutional directive.

Lemuya et al, (2018) contents that resource acquisition is mainly a sociological subject in the study of social paradigms that emerged in years 1970s. This insists on the ability of a movement of groups to marshal resources and to influence and mobilise more people towards accomplishing the movement’s goals. These goals may be to alleviate poverty in a suffering community, countering an epidemic or to educate and eradicate an unwanted behaviour that may be detrimental in future.

In spite of that, social movements are regarded as tough and irrational, resource mobilisation sees them as rational social institutions, created and made popular by social actors with a goal of taking a political dimension. This views are well supported by the traditional collective behaviour theory. The study had focus on beneficiaries of Nyumbani Children’s Home which provides life-saving care and a loving home to a number not less than 150 HIV-positive children in Kenya. From new-borns until they attain ages of 23, the children are offered care at the Nyumbani Home until they are healthy and self-reliant.

Ever since this organisation was founded in 1992, Nyumbani Children’s Home offers a holistic approach. The children are well guided through a life-changing process which includes comprehensive medical, nutritional, life-skills, psychological, educational, and spiritual care.

When the organisation is certain that the children stable in conditions, they are then transitioned back into communities in Kenya by identifying willing parents or relatives and encouraging extended family to be close to them and to pay them visits during the holidays. They learn skills,
are educated on personal hygiene, and receive life skills training so that they can support themselves after they leave Nyumbani care.

The affected Children and small babies are often referred to Nyumbani in desperate conditions, many disowned by their family members because of shame associated with HIV/AIDS. They come mostly from Kenya and general east African countries. Children are directed to Nyumbani by health facilities and a community outreach programs like Lea Toto cantered at Kangemi in Nairobi County. Those that are severely affected are referred to COGRI Respite Centre, where they are treated and brought back to health and returned to their families, who are first trained in the children’s unique nutritional needs.

1.2 Problem Statement

A number of organisations have had their objectives met through foreign and locally mobilised resources. Substantial success in development initiatives in the community relies on the community inclusion, transparency, accountability, trust, efficiency and effectiveness of communication to link ideas and opinions of all partners in the project process (Tufte & Mefalopulos, 2009). Effective communication therefore enables community to transmit relevant and crucial information towards the realisation of the organisational objectives and set goals (Lunenburg, 2010).

Development communication experts are keen on these interventions to realise maximum results with minimum available resources. The requirement and ethics in this field acknowledges that it is the right and duty of the experts to inclusively assess the need, plan, design, implement, monitor and evaluate the activities of the purposed program. In the same vein, development communicators are expected to report reliable and believable information; checked along the way for stakeholder
participation which can be carried as an evidence of spot impact evaluation, responsibility, for further funding, donor retention and project sustainability (MC Dermott, 2013).

In the ideal situation organisations carefully recruit professionals who are good at writing funding proposals. However, these humanitarian institutions thought of provision of evidence of impact either through a documentary or attendance of donor meetings with beneficiaries to effect trust, responsibility and accountability. Such presentations are likely to influence the congregants to stand with an organisation in any quest for further funds. The organisation’s strength, weakness, opportunities and threats rests in their work as reflected in the beneficiaries who are the end product. It is indeed the duty of the organisation to showcase all evaluation reports but the key one in this study is the impact evaluation report which will indicate and stand out as a positive gesture for further funding (Kanani, 2014).

This study found former beneficiaries’ effectiveness to influence resource mobilisation either positively or negatively to either cost or benefit the affected community or organisation a matter of concern. Therefore the study sought to establish the influence of former beneficiaries Participation on resource mobilisation at Children of God Relief Institute (CGORI) – Nyumbani.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The General Objective of the study was an assessment of communication strategies in inclusion of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation at Children of God Relief Institute (CGORI).

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

1) To interrogate the communication strategies used to enhance former beneficiaries participation in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute
2) To investigate factors that inform the participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute

3) To establish the contribution of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute.

4) To establish challenges encountered by former beneficiaries as they participate in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute.

1.4 Overall Research Question

The overall research question was: what are the communication strategies in resource mobilisation at Children of God Relief Institute (CGORI)?

1.4.1 Research Questions

1) What are the communication strategies used to enhance former beneficiaries participation in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute?

2) What is the contribution of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute?

3) What are the factors that inform the participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute?

4) What are the challenges encountered by former beneficiaries’ as they participate in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute?

1.5 Justification of the Study

The study outcome will guide policy makers on crucial decision making processes for better project implementation. This will be after the researcher has tackled salient elements associated
with former beneficiaries’ participation, stakeholder analysis and segmentation, which stage would be necessary for inclusion of a particular stakeholder. The researcher analysed critical literature and theoretical approaches to substantiate most needful information of communication strategies in inclusion of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation.

1.6 Significance of the Study

Many NGOs implementing in different places in needy locations require this information to shape their approaches to stakeholder inclusion in every project level. Stakeholder participation seemingly being a funding pre-requisite and donors are keen in sustainable programs.

The ever growing scholarly world needs this information to add up to existing knowledge upon its publication.

1.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study

The study focused on former beneficiaries of Children of God Institute located in Nairobi County, Lang’ata Sub County Lang’ata Constituency in Karen town. The focus was on former beneficiaries of Children of God Institute, program managers, Program Researchers and local administration.

The study on the influence of former beneficiaries’ participation in Resource Mobilisation was only be limited to Children of God Relief Institute and not any other non-governmental organisation. Another limitation was getting participants to visibly participate in the study as it was perceived that some participants would develop fear due to organisational culture and the organisation’s protocols. This was resolved through formal application to the organisation on the intended study in the organisation.
Further the organisations was perceived to have tight schedules since it was the headquarter of all its programs. Consequently, with proper and timely appointment bookings, the organisation management in most cases created time and the requested persons for the study.

1.8 Operational Terms

**Former beneficiaries** – this is a group of people who were raised, educated and either employed by Children of God Institute or secured employment elsewhere.

**Latin American Countries** – South America Countries

**COGRI Respite Centre** – This is Centre in Nyumbani Children specifically for the most malnourished children due to HIV and AIDS
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview
This chapter discusses theories upon which the study is grounded and the literature review surrounding the topic of discussion.

2.2 Former Beneficiaries’ Participation

2.2.1 Former Beneficiaries
The former beneficiaries’ approaches, perceptions, beliefs, and knowledge can have intense effect either positively or negatively on the outcome of an institution’s resource planning. When management scientist defend the rational foundation for management, in many cases it is the leadership of an institution that is burdened by institution’s resource mobilisation decisions that decide how authentic a decision is and influence how management will be effective.

Former beneficiaries are a group of people who are enrolled in a program of either care, study or career training and endured to completion. They are later either absorbed by the care giver organisations, university, and other companies or self-employ themselves. They are key stakes and ‘shareholders’ of any non-governmental or institution. Organisations should realise and utilise this organ and forge a tool to support their quest for funding.

NOAA (2016) defines stakeholders as anybody who wants to be. Generally stakeholders are people who have interest in or are affected by a project or organisation’s decision. They also have power or influence in a situation. For instance the institution’s management who have power on every activity that should be effected. This group holds the present and the future of the organisation. Secondly the development partners. This particular group supports the organisation
with finances, infrastructure and volunteer services. Other significant stakeholders include government (central and county government in Kenya), grassroots leaders, the community, beneficiaries and other development agencies in the region.

The stakeholder’s interest can be monetary, personal, economic, political, and cultural or can come up through other hosts of push and pull factors. NOAA challenges that it is not only the knowledge of who a stakeholder is, this is to identify the right stakeholder who matters on the alarming community or societal problem. Stakeholder identification is the first step in finding who fits or matters to the implementing agency’s programme.

In as much as there is no generally effective process to include stakeholders, researchers and other development partners contends that stakeholder involvement is key and has numerous advantages amongst support for agencies and their decisions, important local knowledge about the problem, increase in public understanding of an issue, agencies will understand flaws in existing management strategies and creation of new relationships with stakeholders. However, stakeholder inclusion has its challenges. Stakeholder involvement can be costly due to professional services required in stakeholder analysis, time consuming since it is a process, labour intensive, confrontational and in the end delay decision-making (Bal, Bryde, Fearon, & Ochieng, 2013).

Additionally if not well managed, stakeholder involvement can effect and actualise new conflicts or escalate existing ones. The public can attend a group discussion with attitudes, perceptions, beliefs and this can have intense effects on the outcome of a discourse and this is why NOAA suggests that this process needs a stakeholder analysis professional to oversee it with minimal negativity. Though stakeholder inclusion is necessary, there is no consensus on which methods
and procedures of stakeholder identification. Bal et. al, (2013) agree that no “one-size-fits all” approach and suggests a number of techniques most commonly used in this process.

This study will focus on former beneficiaries of Nyumbani Home (COGRI). These are young men and women who joined to Nyumbani family at a tender age, malnourished desperate state and have been provided a holistic life training, given comprehensive health care and taught on nutrition planning, educated and now working in various organisations in Kenya and overseas.

2.2.2 Participation

Irazabal (2009) traces the concept of participation and its influence from the impact of modernisation to developing Nations of the South. At modernisation, City planners had centralised government services which limited developmental growth of other Municipalities which led to massive emergence of slums. Attempts were made to lift urban life through World Bank financing which was done in self-help groups. One was to show the capacity to payback. Therefore citizens did not engage in building new structures but modify existing houses to add up rooms to accommodate expanding family members from rural areas and the increasing number of children.

These established informal settlements grew up to families added more rooms, verandas, terraces, and often times disrupted the initial housing planning by creating new houses on rooftops. The towns were strained by poorly disorganised infrastructure, which led to overwhelmed roads and complicated the entire service delivery in urban centres. Consequently, extreme conditions of density and overcrowding have also resulted into the incidences of drugs, robbery, prostitution, domestic violence and urban violence. Such towns are usually poorly served with necessary services and in most cases lack proper schools and other amenities. There are high rates of injuries
and fatalities given their proximity to highways with speeding motorists that lack pedestrian crossing (Irazabal, 2009).

However, the situation seemed to worsen due to certain collapse of industries and local firms in Rio and other Latin American cities, which was followed by increased drug-related engagements, and lack of educational equality to citizens that created more drastic, social disintegration amongst citizens of the cities’ peripheral slum communities and its middle-and upper-class urban residents which spurred civil conflicts. Nylen (2009) Colombia has been battling with internal unrests for a long time due the widening gap between the rich and poor. Lack of participatory approach to solve the informal settlements led to formation of rebel groups who constantly fight the government which for a long time had led to unstable government and economic instability in the region. The non-participatory physical planning of communities versus “slums” led to deeper social, racial and economic inequality reflective of broader national patterns.

Cambodia has been undergoing political reforms and has a lengthy history of implementing its health services through Non-governmental Organisations (Gilfillan & Fee, 2017). They however found out that the NGOs exerted influence in establishing and facilitating participative committees by selective membership, resources and meeting schedules. The committees then were used to lobby and mobilise community leadership to accept and work towards the implementing organisations priorities rather than community identified needs. This implied that the NGO came in as a third party and insisted on a space for its agendas. Gilfillan & Fee (2017) asserts that is of salient value for a government to involve its citizen in any decision-making process to be partake in democratic theory and this is emphasised in the notion of “new institutionalism” and the plan of good governance.
According to (Tufte & Mefalopulos, 2009) there is no agreed definition of participation. Some scholars’ approach to participation, contents that mobilisation is bringing people to a common purpose to cut on adjust hierarchies of knowledge, power and economic distribution while others see it as reach and inclusion of ideas and opinions of relevant groups in the initiation to execution of a development programme. The common understanding of participation is the involvement of ordinary people in development process ultimately leading to change. From an institutional perspective, participation is used as a tool to achieve intended goals defined by a professional who is external to the target community. However, there is emerging consensus for maximum involvement in the early phases of a development program both in research and design interventions.

Latin American Countries which had dictatorship leadership were later taken by democratic governments which worked on educating citizens’ openness and inclusive politics. This framework presented a participatory model which facilitated citizens’ agencies civic education and focus on identity rights. This model proved to be successful for other Latin states and local governments. Examples of renowned participatory planning experiences in Southern American states include Porte Aegre Participatory budgeting, Venezuelan and Ecuadorian communal councils, Bolivian indigenous planning, and Costa Rican scenario and ecotourism planning (Nylen, 2011).

Irazabal (2009) and Nylen (2011) suggests for Latin America and the Caribbean, it would be beneficial to manage learnt lessons from the past and present participatory experiences to have a deeper focus to the levels of success, replicability and outcomes from the experiences. Mexico has been advancing creation of local management offices from 1980s. These agencies are the nerve for the professionalisation of staff personnel to address issues associated with planning and to
enlarge citizen inclusion and the narrative of citizenship education. These agencies form the Mexican Network of great Cities towards the future and Sustainability (Red Mexicana de CiudadesHacia la Sustentabilidad), which hosts national planning annual meetings to exchange learnt experience and expertise among members and from invited global experts. Out of those congresses an annual planning book is developed and published for future references.

White (2009) presents a central argument on why African states lag behind in economic issues. White blames the shortage of able indigenous cultural, very little in personal creativity and theoretical creativity, and the endless political fights and political malfunctioning due to the ignorance and disowning African institutions of leadership which was the best and could be modified with the central ideas of African societies. White (2009) indicate a number of dynamics which emanated from the modernisation era contrary to centripetal model which necessitated African people to participate in initiatives that brought a sense of ownership and belonging to the projects that has proven sustainability after the implementing organisations close up the projects. White and S.J agrees that interventions should begin at the grassroots level because this is where nationhood is constructed and communalisation.

The term “centrifugal” shows a process which starts from the inner and flows out through an orderly structure to the periphery. The centre periphery structure of communication in African centrifugal structure of communication in Africa began with imperialism and the fight for Africa as a means of political control, economic sabotage, and cultural domination of the European nations. The colonial masters tried to include locals in decision-making into the Centre structure through indirect Rule and set in motion a process of cultural hegemony in schools (Nylen, 2011). The colonial rulers positioned their administrative staff on the periphery to gather information which was later broadcast back to the people through technical means. Politically; this system
meant no feedback and accountability to the natives of the land. That was the main feature of centrifugal model. The communication model used was linear with a message going through a medium but no feedback for desired effects.

Feeney, et al. (2017) in a study carried on participatory medicine taken in health facilities, it is a new evolution in the health sector that allow patients and anyone involved prescriptions or administration of medicine to be considered as partners, who expands knowledge and, together with experts, make decisions regarding their future in healthcare. Stakeholder inclusion is not a one day event, it is a process that questions ones communication skills, patience and strategic management skills. Indications show that people have the right and duty to participate individually and collectively in the initiation, brainstorm, implementation and evaluation of their health care (Tufte and Mefalopulos, 2009).

(Gilfillan and Fee, 2017) in their study proved the case for a reasonable evidence in the health research that embraced robust participatory with clear evidences of participatory and deliberative of the larger Democratic theory. Beyond the increase in participation, deliberative approach is opposed to a democratic approach that does not involve the combination of participatory elements. Consequently, both variables agree to a position that political inclination and decision-making calls for free and citizens equality that listen to one another, with reason to reflect on matters, give reasoned positions that will enable them understand resolutions of others and are ready to review their initial preferences during the process of brainstorming.

2.2.3 Stakeholder Participation

Among different conceptions about stakeholder and participation, the two ideas are largely embraced by development agencies and professionals. Stakeholder inclusion organisations or
project management is in most cases considered from two angles. In a normative approach, stakeholder involvement is regarded as a salient of ethics and this is in consideration of the rightful interests of the identified stakeholders. First, from a behaviour perspective, stakeholder involvement is regarded as an ethical matter when it considers the real interests of the identified project locals or area natives, accelerating a stakeholder-oriented responsive model policy in the institution (Usadolo & Caldwel, 2016). The normative view provides an ethical and moral environment that gives not only economic clarity but also the human centred judgement of the organisation in its focus. Second, and in contrast, is the instrumental angle, which is aimed to find out how stakeholder inclusion can be put in use to actualise the performance intentions of an organisation. The driving approach aims at interrogating how stakeholders can be brought in as a tool in purposeful decision making to realise expected objectives. This approach warrants the identification of the organisation’s unity with its beneficiaries, the specifications of every stakeholder’s interests, and the raising of management awareness of institutional decisions, processes, and policies to realise the organisation’s goals.

A stakeholder is an individual, a congregation of people or institution that has interest that can affect and effect, or concern in an organisation. Stakeholders can affect or be affected by the organisation’s undertakings, short term and long-term goals, objectives and its policies (NOAA, 2016). In any developmental approach, individuals, groups and organisations should be selected, and considered in as valued persons to be well informed of challenges associated with development as perceived by other beneficiaries of an organisation. This presents a platform to dialogue and identify their space and inputs in the process of resolving a hitch. Consequently, they are helped to achieve the set goals and the eventual program maintenance hence sustainable development. In the sound operations of an organisation, stakeholders’ identification and segmentation should be
carried out early enough in an organisation to get to understand a list of key stakeholders. This supports the institution to solicit practical ideas, attitudes and perceptions towards indented change (Tufte & Mefalopulos, 2009). The information gathered from the stakeholder identification process, enables the organisation group relevant ideas and distinguish how every staff can contribute towards the targeted organisational mission and vision.

The perception of earlier organisations strategy was merely for profit optimisation, financial muscle and generating value for stakeholders. In the contemporary discourse, a unique approach on stakeholder theory, collaboration, management and value addition within the stakeholder circles has evolved alongside this old theory to provide a number of views to the organisation’s operating environment (Inha, 2015).

Manyani and Bob (2018) the issues of stakeholder inclusion in the agenda of the effect of climate change dates back even before the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 which culminated to the adoption of the United Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This is an Intergovernmental forum on Climate Change which informs that the UNFCCC was put in place to task the global community on the issue of mitigation on greenhouse gases to a very low percentage that is not harmful to the environment. Catastrophic events resulting from climate change such as floods and drought have become inevitable. Currently, climatic change effects are being experienced globally to the local level like in northern Kenya.

Manyani and Bob (2016) and NOAA (2016) assert that-stakeholders should be guided and given opportunity to participate genuinely to construct, discuss and promote varied options. UNFCCC benefitted from stakeholder inclusion in their meeting in 1992 as it was observed at Article 6 of the UNFCCC. All stakeholders were called in a public participation to brainstorm on climate
change and its effects. Manyani & Bob (2016) summarises that climate change requires everyone input and this climatic agenda lies in multi-sectoral approaches. Thus, the ascertainment of stakeholders’ position and their influence in climate variations and change adaptation is of great concern in the present study.

The success expected from rural development projects is always challenging and complex, partly due to the need to meet the personal expectations of a number of stakeholders. There are individual interests, cultural impediments and political positions to deal with. In light of this, the diversity of rich knowledge and values of the local community have to in consideration and it is important to ensure stakeholder involvement is given a hand in any decision-making processes and implementation (Tufte and Mefalopulos, 2009). Stakeholder involvement in decision making is an absolute right and that’s why it is considered an operational framework embraced and adopted by community development leaders and currently regarded as a funding condition from donor agencies (Usadolo and Caldwell, 2016).

There is enormous evidence that mutual engagement between stakeholders accelerates individual activeness in projects rolled in rural areas. This platform necessitates new relationships that emerges as a result of the previous ones and they appreciate the authenticity of individual’s ideas. (Usadolo and Caldwell, 2016). This necessitates resilience and harmony implementing decisions with the sole aim effective participatory implementation. One of the arguments that has been used to justify stakeholders’ participation is that it results in a strong sense of belonging and ownership a better influence for further resource mobilisation and smooth project roll up (Gilfillan & Fee, 2017).
According to Manyani and Bob (2016) the government development institutions and non-governmental institutions asserts that rural development initiatives are reliable avenues to channel a number of services to create resilience and accelerate awareness in rural areas, it is therefore key to consider the available best strategies and practices in stakeholder involvement.

2.3 Former Beneficiaries’ Participation and Resource Mobilisation

2.3.1 Understanding Resources

Bweya (2018) sees resources as the needful inputs used in the day to day in a program activities and these, physical resources, human, social resources and financial resources

Non-governmental organisations employ a number of strategies to facilitate their efforts in acquiring resources to sustain the economic demands. UNICEF has resource acquisition approach that scans for the available and hidden opportunities to attract more flexible and predictable long term funding, to be able to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable audience who in the UNICEF case are children. It considers the ever changing aid focus, which is sought by both the growing partnership landscape and the direction and challenges posed by world economic and financial realities. There are countries which in their own governance have managed to develop in a way to enable be declared middle economies. At this stage of an economy most countries are perceived to be able to sustain their challenges. Therefore the rising Private sector is assumed to provide a flexible fund that run development initiatives. In a middle economy, many middle-income countries are now at risk of being partly reversed due to changes in the global economy (UNICEF, 2016).
2.3.2 Understanding Mobilisation

Mobilisation is a process of bringing together persons, groups, companies, and organisations for the pursuit of collective objectives for intended goals. Resource mobilisation is the process by which resources are sought by the implementing organisations or institutions & provided by donors & partners (Bweya, 2018).

Lojock, Mulongo, and Maelo (2018) interrogates and asserts that Resource mobilisation is the series of approaches and initiatives executed by Social Movement Institutions in order to channel resources for the implementation of social movement causes. This is the process of gathering required resources to enable the organisation execute anticipated projects and other humanitarian interventions. Resource mobilisation is not equal to fundraising per se rather it is getting a range of resources, from any willing providers (or donors), through pragmatic approaches.

2.4 The Role of Communication Strategies in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns

According to Lunenburg (2010) communication has a range importance, because every management roles and duties revolves within formal or informal interaction. All management functions, monitoring, and or evaluation, organisational leadership will be realised only in a communicative environment. This can confirm the fact that everyone’s communication tactics or approaches has either positive or negative effects to both individual and organisational success. The beneficiaries need to employ a very strategic communication skill to donors either local or international. It is their duty and being the main actors in this institution then they should be well placed to recall every bit of benefit from Children of God Relief Institute - Nyumbani. It is therefore reasonable to ascertain that the main hindrances force to organisational success is deficiency in meaningful communication.
Nonetheless, effective communication approaches are key to one's success as the manager of an organisation. Personnel at leadership level should be well versed by various report writing skills, interpersonal, group and public communication. This enables efficient and effective delivery of a funding proposal, report or confident defence of the same if called upon for questioning. Communication can be seen as a process of exchanging meaning and mutual agreement from one individual to another (Maina, 2014).

2.5 Contribution of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation

International Development Research Centre (2010) indicates in its observation space is facing challenging moments. The unpredictable funding support from donor nations leave some parts of the developing countries with less or no development support while other parts with more. This has necessitated organisations to employ a number of strategies to mobilise resources (UNICEF, 2016).

According to Canada’s International Development Research Centre (IDRC), humanitarian institutions find themselves in a delicate position when they rely on single or few donors, since their usual sources with time will not be, sufficient. Donor mapping shows that donors and funding agencies are now more focusing on large organisations. They award huge grants to few organisations and less or none to medium and small humanitarian organisations. This then posits that overreliance on international funding is likely to be insufficient, and complicates financial muscle and sustainability of development organisations (IDRC 2010). The sustainability of development research institutions depends on the organisation’s strategies to craft strategies that will boost their budget deficiencies and serve as an attempt to curb the changing funding trends, and develop the will power to explore alternative sources of financial support (UNICEF, 2016).
The development experts are aware of the dilemma in funding patterns and forging approaches on lasting solutions. Non-profits, non-governmental institutions, and charities have long been comfortable with the support of few sponsors now find themselves in a dilemma of where next year’s financial budget will come from, or how certain programs are going to be sustained over the long period of time, or how capacity building can be financed when grant monies are limited to programmatic work (Kanani, 2014). Organisations have realised that they need to change course from accustomed sources, and learn how to develop resilience on resource acquisition. (IDRC 2010).

Resource mobilisation require extensive consultation with donors and actors and this includes site visits, face to face discourse telephone and skype interviews with relevant leadership and development experts from organisation that carry a shared focus and interest in humanitarian sphere (Kanani, 2014). Kanan appreciates the importance of feedback in the process of mobilising organisational resources. It is through such a communication that an organisation will adjust to donor specification or sent relevant additional documents or substantial reports to qualify a fund.

2.6 Factors that Inform Resource Mobilisation Campaigns

One of the important assignment during campaign development is the control of the relationship between the interests of an organisation and stakeholders in relation to its set goals. There should be enough research to bring out clarity to this practice of stakeholder management so that institutions can effectively manage their stakeholders to enable them realise their expected goals (Arckerman & Eden, 2011).

NOAA (2016) interest groups of stakeholder participation regard a stakeholder as “anyone who wants to be.” Stakeholders’ interests in an intervention or project can be monetary rewards,
professional selling, personal, or cultural attachment and protection, or may emanate from a number of other accumulated motivations.

A number of questions about stakeholder’s identities have been pointed out but the main focus is on how the organisations manage their stakeholders with satisfaction so as to realise their strategic goals. Studies have shown that stakeholders are managed by the entire organisation in resource mobilisation since top management designs the entire organisation’s strategy. It is within their mandate to attend to the strategic management of stakeholders if it aims to ensure the approach’s robustness (Arckerman & Eden, 2011).

United Nations Relief Works Agency (2016) however the main objective of a resource mobilisation strategy is to obtain enough resources necessary for running the day to day affairs of the institution. The development of a strategy is done in consultation with a number partners to ensure the approach is feasible. UNRWA puts forth several strategies to enable an organisation remain active in resource mobilisation factoring in external threats amongst stakeholder inclusion in strategy framework. These strategies include deepening relations with existing organisation donors. This is a traditional donor who is expected to continue to provide substantial funding. The relationship enables the organisation to learn to map changing national financial allocation and policies, concerned decision makers, and the budgetary and allocation processes that will assist in identifying specific threats and opportunities to access funding streams. Any other reports from closer stakeholder relations will be utilised through targeted outreach to governments, ministries and parliaments, to accurately frame UNRWA, its mandate and its importance to regional stability (URWA, 2016).
Secondly UNICEF (2016) and UNRWA (2016) indicate that recognition of its partners in the region raises bilateral togetherness accordingly and contends that this strategy will cement partnerships in the region for further resource support. Thirdly proposes that there should be agency’s senior management in key states in the region to engage with relevant authorities to they understand the agencies mandate. These are key stakeholders in the region if their support and decision to support or not to will affect regional and global support to the agency. In this approach, UNRWA managed to secure a funding base in Brazil that later saw it become advisory member to the Advisory Commission. Lastly asserts that senior management of the agency or organisation should engage the emergent Donors through decision making in capitals with the central goal through political engagement of the Organisation’s Directors if it is the case of Children of God Institute and other senior management. This will enable the organisation to feed into local offices across the world with centrality in support of the most vulnerable in their respecting and or isolated nations in the world. This strategy adds to specific purposed outreach and engagement to influence and reinstate other donors who stopped its resource support. In the case of UNRWA their ultimate wish was to win back Canada as their core partner and this commissioned the agency to set up offices in New York to coordinate these intentions.

2.7 Challenges of Former Beneficiaries’ Participation in Resource Mobilisation

There a number of challenges where diverse groups are brought together or interlinked for a common course. Stakeholder inclusion can be costly and in cases or likely is rarely budgeted or minimally allocated finances. Stakeholder participation as indicated in NOAA (2016) takes much time, labour-involving, likely confrontations, and eventually lead to delay or alter decision-making process. Additionally, if not well catered and or considered, stakeholder participation can cause more confusions and escalate conflicts.
Nonetheless, Irazabal (2009) unlike Mexico, Colombia government officials did not involve its Citizenry in its developmental projects and city organisation. Ever since Colombia has had a government that has been under attacks from militants who reside from within. Internal displacement and unstable economy are the current tough challenges the government is concentrating on. Irazabal (2009) comments on how Brazil and Mexico have maximised on Stakeholder involvement which has led to a stable and promising political and economic stability. Similarly organisations that implement its plan through participatory process enjoys a sustainable execution of its budget and a project roll over. This is an indicator that where there is stakeholder inclusion in a decision making process, there is a high level ownership and full participation in implementation phase.

Similar scenarios have been witnessed in African countries where the president’s word is the only command contrary to the ideas of citizens (Usadolo & Caldwell, 2016). Lack citizen inputs found in the sub-Saharan region are Uganda and Burundi whose economies are struggling to sustain annual budgets. A lot of misplaced priorities occur due to ignorance of critical grassroots knowledge, social setting and their economic sustainability ventures. In Kenya, in Marakwet County, an NGO put up some schools when the problem was peace among warring communities. Since the fighting is ongoing, the school building lies in the bushes of Marakwet without pupils who ran for their lives to seek refuge in churches and other safe havens. Baseline research informs of salient issues that can guide any implementing organisation of priorities of affected community.

2.8 Theoretical Framework

This study focused on two theories, namely: Participatory Communication Theory and Grid Matrix Theory.
2.8.1 The Participatory Communication Theory

The theory of participatory communication presents a communication framework based on dialogue and empowerment. Influenced by Habermas (2007) on communicative action, the theory focuses on dialogue with the notion that it facilitates equal idea and knowledge sharing between implementing organisation and the beneficiaries of the intended outcome. Given a chance for brainstorming with the implementing experts, the community feels valued and ultimately it is the sole objective of any humanitarian organisation to empower them to withstand any similar shocks in the future (Tufte & Mefalopulos, 2009).

Claridge (2004) agrees that participation is an old concept that is and should be embraced in this contemporary time. This concept is a representation from the western, which embraced top-bottom approaches that were dominant which slowed development in South American countries. This experience necessitated more people centred methodologies to local challenges. The challenges of this model at that time were feedback. There were no feedback to the periphery and this hindered development from the third world states (Crozier, 2007). Scholars have different perspectives as to where participatory theory originate. Claridge is of the opinion that participatory theory is a result of history from the intentions of first world agenda, the need in developing the community wellbeing, and the outcome of social work and community. (Crozier, 2007)

Claridge (2004) and Tufte and Mefalopulos, (2009) acknowledges the importance of participation because the developing world have deepened in extreme poverty in the narrative of development. For any beneficial implementation of a project, everybody needs to be consulted in development ideas, implementation and values from the initiatives. (Feeney, et al., 2017) observes that an individual is a unique entity who can make unique inputs to a decision making process. (Chandra, 2010) indicates that the idea of participatory is to bring development to the people.
Scholars confirms that development cannot just be transferred from first world tradition to the periphery but should emerge from the natives’ traditions and cultures. Participatory theory refutes the ideas of modernisation paradigm that stands for universalistic framework of development; and instead defends people’s culture oriented development change strategies. However, others see participatory process as a social evolution in given society in a certain environment. This participatory process certainly demands for genuine participation of the rural community and the contextualise development works in their local cultures and organisations (Ali & Sonderling, 2017).

2.8.2 Power/ Interest Grid (Matrix) Theory for Stakeholders

The theory of power/ interest Grid (Matrix) by Sharma (2010) also known as Power/Interest Matrix, is a model that assists an institution to segment project beneficiaries with increasing power and interest in the program. This theory directs the institution to target the key stakeholders who are more influential to your project or largely the organisation’s objectives.

Ideally it is the duty of the organisation or project manager to know his or her people along the project line. The list of stakeholders is finally drawn when the process of identification has been subject to an analysis (NOAA, 2016). The challenge along the way is to decide whose interest to serve first. Of course everyone should be made happy or comfortable if the objectives are to be met but in most cases it is not just possible. Instead, you have to select who should be given priority and you will go along with them (Sharma, 2010).

There are stakeholders in every intervention and proactive identification should be the first steps. Secondly you can now use the power interest grid to help in dealing with relevant stakeholders. Sharma (2010) advices that before you begin any project, jot down a list of anyone who is related to the project. The list varies depending on the work and your position within the organisation.
Stakeholder power interest grid classifies stakeholders as either “low” or “high” giving four states for each beneficiary - low/low, low/high, high/low, and high/high. The design of the grid is that ‘power’ on the vertical axis and ‘interest’ on the horizontal. Low interest low power is the list that most organisations are least concerned with but should not be ignored completely though they are naturally at the lower part of the list (Sharma, 2010) and (NOAA, 2016). This particular group of stakeholders can be included in ‘monitoring’. Sharma alludes that you should keep an eye on this group of stakeholders but do not spend much time here but engage them when necessary.

Sharma (2010) indicates that the low interest and high power deserves serious attention and time in as much as they are not interested in your project at that moment. It is then up to you to understand the stakeholder so that you don’t become a bother nonetheless, you have to see him or her. High interest and low power is another group that want information about the project but have no power influence. You certainly do not ignore this group because high interest could influence to provide material or labour resources. Sharma suggests that one should not spent much time on this group to neglect the high interest / high power stakeholders. This group should be given as much information as possible to satisfy their interest.

However, proper acknowledgement of every stakeholder gives implementing organisation an upper hand in its quest for more funding. Satisfaction of individual stakeholder’s interest is key in project and consequently the sustainability of the entire organisation.

The above two theories are however a sign of the influence of stakeholder participation in resource mobilisation in a project cycle. In spite of the major theory being participatory communication theory the other theory of Power/ interest grid also support the aspect of stakeholder participation, where not only people are informed they are involved from the onset of the intervention to realise the set objectives.
2.8.3 Review of the Study Theories and its Criticism

The study focused on two theories: the theory of power interest grid matrix by Sharma (2010) and participatory communication theory influenced by Habermas (2007). The researcher chose the two theories because they all revolve and are directly involved in the study. The sole reason to use participatory theory as a theoretical framework, was moved by the research questions and the study approaches which appeared necessary for the theoretical origin of participatory communication for development. That means the study aimed to study the view and practicality of inclusive communication which is key for the participatory communication theory. The power and interest matrix grid theory has been involved in the study because it indicates the importance of all stakeholders in a project or in an organisation. The power /interest grid theory is involved in the research study as it highlights more who is a stakeholder and total concern to everyone involved in a project. Therefore the researcher agree that the two theories have substantial similarities between them and therefore offer needful interpretation of key concepts in the study.

Sharma (2010) theory of power interest grid indicates that all stakeholders are key though they carry different roles at different stages of development of a project. On the other hand, the participatory communication theory claims with no particularity that development as a participatory process of societal social change for the purpose of community development. Development in this context is not anything one need to import for developing nations, rather it should emerge and accelerated by indigenous people. (Ali & Sonderling, 2017).

Power and interest Grid theory believes in categorisation of stakeholders though cements that no category should be denied attention. On the other hand, with regards to participatory communication, development compared with a participatory process of social change within a given community where combined effort is key no matter your position in the society. This
participatory process needs serious and purposeful involvement of the local community and make sure development works and fits into local cultures and settings (Tufte & Mefalopulos, 2009).

The role of development scholars and researchers who have insistently incorporated participation into essentially top-bottom development paradigms have been regarded as carefully strategising to engage in and reviving glories in modernisation theory to actualise the ills of dominant paradigm. When put into practice, this will be suspicious in embracing participatory communication. In reference to critical scholars of development theories, it is certain that the conspiracy in the participatory theory is a passive coordination of efforts, at worst, manipulative intentions done only to advance the western agenda. In fact, one development scholar argues that any embrace of participation elements is likely to trigger domination of the western lifestyles to disrupt cherished cultural and moral values. However, this will manifest if we include it into our development agenda due to its historical association with the colonialists political hegemony (Servaes & Lie, 2002).

Under this model, it is said stakeholders take ownership of communication and experiences empowering results. These contemporary visions of development communication have been referred to as “perfect” and “smart” participation, as opposed to the imperialist centred, pseudo participation interrogated above (Servaes & Lie, 2002).

Lastly, the standpoints and directions of idealistic scholars have been supported with equally optimistic interpretations of participation by researchers who offer more concrete directions for development discourse. For instance, most stages in development initiatives - subjecting the entire project to baseline research that guides identifying problems, setting goals and objectives, planning procedures and assessing actions—have been identified, each one as a key requirement of the full involvement of expected beneficiaries (Arckerman & Eden, 2011). This critical observation led has
policy reformulation to reorganise major social institutions, such as the media organs, perhaps to bring communication structures to spearhead participatory communication for development approaches (Gilfillan & Fee, 2017).

Participatory strategies picked up well in the 1980s and 1990s and have evolved into a rich field clearly opposing most embraced practical models and theories of the modern development decades (Servaes & Lie, 2002). Nonetheless, it is apparent that current development practitioners regardless of theoretical confirmation of the relevance of participation are implementing projects without some sort of participatory. (Huesca, 2002).

However, participatory communication theory is criticized in its idealistic approach to addressing power tensions inherent in society (Crozier, 2007). Crozier has levelled criticism on the theory for its focus on dialogue and empowerment for the creation of a working environment for knowledge sharing. He argues that dialogue as a tool for empowerment is not sufficient to address societal socio-economic challenges faced by the needy in participatory contexts. Crozier feels there more that participatory is solution oriented approach. Besides dialogue approach, the poor people need resources and expertise knowledge which will enable them to access socio-economic resources.
2.9 Conceptual Framework

**Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework**

Figure 2.1 shows the conceptual framework where former beneficiaries are the independent variable, communication strategies are intervening variables while resource mobilisation are the dependent variables. The employed and unemployed former beneficiaries are connected to Children of God Relief Institute solely through communication. In one way or the other, these group need updates of their former home but might be constrained by communication strategies Children of God employs to keep them abreast of what is taking place in the institution. Effective communication will create a bond between the institution and the former beneficiaries who in turn develop a sense of belonging. In such a state of recognising themselves with COGRI, there will be automatic reflection on when they are called upon to effect any resource mobilisation campaign.
2.10 Summary of literature

From the reviewed literature, stakeholder participation is a strategy that is capable of providing an amicable working environment in a project and consequently the implementing organisation. It is a task that compels the organisation to carefully select and approve who matters most and at what time. It is indeed an enabler of a smooth running in any project implementation. It is a process that in as much as it is a prerequisite of any project process, it is in itself a way of appreciating the community’s acceptance of the project, creating a sense of ownership by beneficiaries, resource mobilisation and strategic approach to project sustainability.

Chandra (2010) challenges and reasons for either failure, slow implementation, stagnation or total refusal of project take off happens due to lack of stakeholder inclusion. It is indicated that if people are not involved in any project decision making and misunderstanding on what they stand to gain from the project, then this may pressure the implementation to take time or close completely. If you are familiar with every project associates (stakeholders), their real needs and anticipations, it will maximise the probability of the project’s success and sustainability thereafter. Ignoring any main stakeholder, you are likely to encounter challenges in the next stages of project implementation which will certainly lead to delay in project implementation, over budget, and in extreme cases, it may result into premature project termination. And all are never the same, everyone has unique needs and expectations. Therefore, you should treat every stakeholder as per to their requirements and anticipations. Failure on that, the project’s success can be jeopardised (Sharma, 2010).

Inclusion of stakeholders minimises doubts on matters accountability, responsibility and since they are in position to defend any information of the intervention and answer or pose questions
whenever there are issues that are not in tandem with the project goals. Stakeholder involvement ascertains people centred results because they have clarity on the entire project cycle. In case an organisation aims at people centred results, then it is of utmost importance that the organisation strategically embrace a practical stakeholder participation (Bal, Bryde, Fearon, & Ochieng, 2013).

However, one salient pointer that stands out from the reviewed literature is the value an organisation can get from stakeholder participation in development initiatives. Undertaking this study, the researcher aims at filling this gap by undertaking a critical analysis of stakeholder’s participation in resource mobilisation. Constitution of Kenya (2010) binds all of us to embrace people centred development through participation in our respective counties.

2.11 Research Gap
Several reviewed studies in relation to stakeholder participation on the area of resource mobilisation sought to look at varied understanding of stakeholder inclusion and their value in a development project (Manyani & Bob, 2018).

The reviewed study by Muniu, Gakuu and Rambo (2018) were able to illuminate the challenges facing resource mobilisation. However the research focused on Resource mobilisation and water sustainability while the present study focuses on stakeholder participation as a key component in resource mobilisation.

Several revelations have been brought forth nonetheless, no single study focused on influence of stakeholders in resource mobilisation. Substantial reviewed literature largely focused on environmental and business settings and very little on non-governmental institutions. It is expected that many researchers will direct their interest to humanitarian agencies with the same strategies from the environmental approach to ease poverty and human suffering around the globe.
The study found out that studies had little or no literature on concepts that minimises the gap on relationship between the former beneficiaries and resource mobilisation. Finally, the researcher sought for the impact of lack of stakeholder participation beyond the resistance by the beneficiaries on development intervention.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview
This chapter presented the research methodology that was adopted by the study. It highlights on
the research design, population and sampling, data collection, reliability and validity of the
instrument, data analysis and presentation and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design
The study employed descriptive research design where data was coded, subjected to Statistical
Package for the Social Sciences, developed frequencies and percentages which were interpreted
by the research as per the objectives. The percentages and frequencies were inferred and presented
in graphs, tables and charts.

3.3 Research Approach
This study employed mixed methods research approach that integrated both quantitative and
qualitative approach (Creswell, 2014). It focused on collecting, analysing and integrating
quantitative and qualitative data. Mixed methods was considered suitable because it attempts to
make legitimate the multiple uses of approaches, rather than restricting or limiting the researcher
in one approach. It also helps in interpreting data, studies research subjects in their context and
considers real time meaning that people feel as per their situation (Kumar, 2011).

3.3.1 Quantitative Approach
In quantitative method, specific focus is on survey and experimental designs. This is due to its
positivist’s philosophical assumptions for determining the agreement between and among
variables is central to respond to hypotheses and questions through surveys and through
experimentation. The reduction to a quantifiable set of variables, meaningfully managed through
design or Statistical Package for the Social Sciences process, provides necessary information or observations for testing a theory. Objective data is developed through scientific observations and measures. This study relied on a survey design which provided frequencies and percentages perceptions, attitudes, or opinions of former beneficiaries by studying a sample of that population. Subjecting the coded data to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences to develop frequencies and percentages which, the researcher generalised or drew inferences to the population. (Creswell, 2014).

### 3.3.2 Qualitative Approach

Qualitative methods demonstrate a varied approach to research study than in quantitative inquiry. The process in the two approaches is similar, and the underlying difference is that qualitative methods rely on answers to an interview and observable data, have narrative or prose form analysis and concludes on varied designs. Qualitative methods is uniquely characterised by its natural setting where data is collected where participants experience the elements of the study. Secondly, the researchers are the key instruments. This is so because the researcher is solely tasked to collect data himself or herself through interview schedules, observing certain characteristics or conducting an interview to participants. Researchers use interviews, observations and audio-visual information rather than relying on a single source of data. Lastly, without noting on inductive and deductive data analysis through abstracting themes to bring forth the required information, participants meaning worth noting because the researcher is after the knowledge of the participant on the subject of the study (Creswell, 2014).

### 3.4 Population and Sampling

The population of the study was 757 (Children Of God Institute - Nyumbani Homes). The study focused on 757 former beneficiaries and 6 program managers, 2 program researchers and 2 local
administration (chief and assistant chief). The study targeted the members of management, local administrators and former beneficiaries. According to Kumar (2011) a population is a set of people, services, elements, and events, group of things or households under investigation. Kumar (2011) describes target population as having the characteristics which the researcher intends to generalise. In this definition, Kumar assumes that study population of interest has similar characteristics. Currently the total number of former beneficiaries is 757. Systematic random sampling was employed to get the former beneficiaries sample from the 757 while Purposive sampling technique was used to get key informants from 6 program managers, 2 programme researchers and 2 local administrators. This method gives member equal chances of participation (Creswell, 2014).

Table 3.1: Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Programs</th>
<th>Target Population (beneficiaries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children of God Institute (Karen)</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administration (Chief and Assistant Chief)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>767</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target population of this study was 767 comprising of 757 beneficiaries and 6 program managers, 2 programme researchers, and 2 local administration (Chief and Assistant Chief).

3.4.1 Purposive Sampling

Purposive sampling is also known as purposeful or judgemental sampling. In this type of sampling the researcher selected a sample which was representative from the population and informative
about the topic of study which was 10 in total. This based on the researcher’s knowledge study population and a judgement was made on elements that were to be selected to give the salient information to respond to the research questions. The selected elements represented the views of the group or are information-rich for the research study. This technique is common with qualitative than quantitative inquiries (Gandeebo, 2015). The technique used to sample 6 programme managers 2 programme researchers, and 2 local administrators as a study key study informants.

3.4.2 Systematic Random Sampling

Systematic random sampling is more of the simple random sampling technique. The researcher listed all the elements or members of the population and then decided on a sample size. How, the selected sample comprised of the ‘n’ part in the sample frame. To avoid bias, the first unit or element was selected through random sampling. Systematic random sampling is commonly used when the study involves large survey studies. For instance, in order to have a systematic sample size of 5 from a population of 75, take every $75/5 = 15^{th}$ element for the sample (Gandeebo, 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Programs</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size (30%)</th>
<th>Sampling Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children of God Institute- Nyumbani</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Systematic Random Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Managers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purposive Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Researchers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purposive Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief and Assistant Chief</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purposive Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>767</strong></td>
<td><strong>237</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Sample Size

The sample size of the study was 237 as indicated on table 2. This is after subjecting the total population to 30%. Gandeebo (2015) states that a sample size of 30% is regarded as the minimum form of statistical analysis.

3.6 Data collection

Questionnaires and interview guide were used for collecting both quantitative data and qualitative respectively. Questionnaires which contained both open ended and closed ended questions were used. The researcher administered them personally on a drop and pick up basis. Children of God Relief Institute - Nyumbani personnel and beneficiaries were considered for both questionnaire and interview using sampling method described by the researcher.

The interview comprised of at least 10 people who are key informants in the organisation. The interview was planned well in advance by the researcher visiting the organisation and organisation’s program site prior to the interview. A data request letter, which had been approved by the University, was attached to the questionnaire and schedules for the interview, as a way of introducing the researcher, explaining the objectives of the research and an affirmation on confidentiality to the participants. A discussion guide was used during the focus group discussions (Kumar, 2011).

3.6.1 Questionnaires

The questionnaire is a research tool used to collect data in a quantitative research approach. It has a list of questions designed to illuminate or obtain information from respondents regarding a particular issue of interest. A questionnaire changes the research objectives into specific questions and the answers will provide data for inferences. A questionnaire is an efficient way to collect
statistically quantifiable information (Gandeebo, 2015). The researcher gave each of 227 former beneficiaries a questionnaire and later collect filled copies for analysis.

3.6.2 Interview Guide

An Interview is a process in a qualitative research approach used to generate views and opinions from respondents. In qualitative study interviews, the researcher guides participants in face-to-face interviews, telephone interactions, or commits a focus group to interviews mostly with six to ten interviewees in each group. The interviews are fully unstructured and generally with open-ended questions that are few in number (Creswell, 2014). The tool used to carry out a successful interview is an interview schedule (Gandeebo, 2015). The researcher used the interview guides to fill in the responses of the 6 program managers, two program researchers and 2 local administrators.

3.7 Reliability and Validity of the Instruments

For validity and reliability of the instrument, pilot study was done. Reliability was done using test retest method where the questionnaire was administered and re-administered after a week. The questionnaires was subjected to a review by the supervisor who advised on both changes and recommendations on the instrument to ensure their validity.

3.8 Data Analysis and Presentation

Quantitative data employed survey design which compels analysis using descriptive statistics. This involved frequencies and percentages. The data collected was edited and coded. The analysed data was then be presented using tables, graphs and charts. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used in generating the descriptive and inferential statistics. For qualitative data, content analysis was be used. This involves grouping data into themes as per the variables of the research study. The findings were presented in prose form.
3.9 Ethical Considerations

In conducting this research, the rights of the respondents was respected and protected. Individual privacy was protected with utmost research ethics in the course of this study. For instance, an official permission to carry out this research was sought from the Children of God Relief Institute authorities. The respondents consent was sought with the option of accepting or declining to participate in the study. Upon proposal defence, the researcher was given the certificate of field work from the University of Nairobi (Appendix 3). Respondents’ identity remained confidential. Furthermore, the researcher acknowledged all sources of information consulted by way of citations and referencing. The collected data was analysed and presented before the school of journalism defence panel who pointed parts to be corrected. Later the thesis was subjected to a plagiarism checker (Turntin) and awarded the Certificate of Originality (Appendix 4). Additionally, the full document was reviewed and awarded the Certificate of Correction (Appendix 5). Finally, the researcher made commitments not to use the study for any other purposes other than the academic one.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Overview

This chapter presents analysis of data and interpretation of the findings. The data analysis and the interpretations were done as per the research objectives, which were: to investigate factors that inform the participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns, to establish the contribution of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation, to interrogate the communication strategies used to enhance former beneficiaries participation in resource mobilisation campaigns, to establish challenges encountered by former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation. 

The researcher used mixed methods of analysis which comprises of quantitative and qualitative. Under qualitative analysis, the researcher used thematic analysis while on quantitative analysis involved descriptive analysis. The collected data was summarised via the descriptions of graphs, tables, and pie charts.

4.2 Response Rate

From the sample of 237 respondents, 164 questionnaires were filled and returned giving it a rate of 69%. Although 31% of the respondents were unable to participate, those that participated were adequate to give the desired feedback (Gandeebo, 2015).

Table 4.3: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filled and returned</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not returned</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author: Researcher 2019
4.3 Background Information

The study sought to find out the demographic information of the respondents which included gender, age of the respondent, occupation, level of education and marital status.

4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender. Gender issues are generally significant in the choice of occupation, responsiveness, availability on-call given that male and females are socially oriented differently predisposing them to differ greatly on gender roles. The results were as shown by the figure 4.2
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**Figure 4.2: Gender of the Respondent**

Figure 4.2 indicates that 37% of the respondents were female and 63% of the respondents were male. This indicates that majority of the former beneficiaries of the children of God Institute – Nyumbani are male. Given that the locale of the study was in Nairobi County, many beneficiaries who are male are either employed within the institution or in destined for jobs in Nairobi County and its environs. Consequently Key informants were found to be mainly male given that male are
believed to work for long hours, sustains security challenges since many of the institutes programs are in slum areas.

4.3.2 Age of the Respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their age. The results were as shown by figure 4.3
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**Figure 4.3: Age of the Respondents**

Figure 4.3 shows that 63.4% were aged between 25 and 29 years, 26.8% were aged between 20 and 24 and 9.8% were aged between 30 and 34. This depicts that majority of the respondents who participated in this study were between 25 and 29 years. This is a prime age of the beneficiaries who should either be working or searching for employment.
4.3.3 Marital Status of the Respondents

Figure 4.4: Marital status of the Respondents

Figure 4.4 indicates that 80% of the respondents who are the majority were not married while 20% were married and none of the respondents were, Divorced, Separated, and Widowed. Given that 63.4% were aged between 25-29 years, many of them are at an age of establishing their own sources of income and fully engaged in securing jobs than giving marriage an upper hand. However, some of the respondents are still in colleges and others just completed.

4.3.4 Education level of Respondents

In addition, the respondents were asked to indicate their levels of education. The results were as shown by figure 4.5
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Figure 4.5: Education level of the Respondents

Figure 4.5 depicts that 58.5% of the respondents had post-secondary diploma, 20.7% of the respondents had secondary and below level of education, 18.3% had Post-secondary certificate and 2.4% of the respondents did not respond. This indicates that majority of the beneficiaries of Children of God Institute had Post-secondary diploma. The Key informants had diploma and other professional qualifications.

4.3.5 Fields of Interest of the Respondents

Author: Researcher 2019

Figure 4.6: Career Fields of Interest for Children of God Institute
Figure 4.6 depicts that 37.8% selected nutrition and dietetics, 20.7% sales and marketing, 15.9% community development, 9.8% law, 4.9% Hotel industry, 4.9% did not respond, 3.7% customer services, and 2.4% Engineering. Majority of the respondents had nutrition and dietetics as the field of interest considering that Children of God institute is an orphanage to Children affected or orphaned by the HIV AIDS pandemic.

4.3.6 Years of Work

Author: Researcher 2019

Figure 4.7: Years of work

Figure 4.7 indicates that 55% of the respondents are currently not working while 45% of the respondents worked between 1 and 2 years. The higher percentage of the respondents currently not working was because majority of them just completed colleges and challenges of getting jobs in Kenya was another issue.
4.4 Communication Strategies Used to Enhance Former Beneficiaries Participation in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns at Nyumbani

Table 4.3: Communication Strategies in Resource Mobilisation

**Key:** *Strongly Agree (SD); Agree (A); Undecided (U) Decided (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Communication Strategies Used to Enhance Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation</th>
<th>SA f</th>
<th>A f</th>
<th>U F</th>
<th>D f</th>
<th>SD f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Efficient communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial which is enhancing participation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We are regularly kept abreast of forthcoming resource mobilisation activities through constant communication</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Resource Mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hinders inclusive participation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use of new and emerging technologies such as social media has enhanced our participation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We are not allowed to freely give feedback</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel that communication here is from top down</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gossip is at all-time high due to inadequate communication</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author: Researcher 2019

Table 4.3 shows that regarding whether efficient communication between organisers and former beneficiaries was cordial, majority at 47% observed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is not cordial, 12% of the respondents strongly disagreed that efficient communication between organisers and former beneficiaries was cordial, 14% of the respondents
agreed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries was cordial, 26% of the respondents were undecided on communication between organisers and former beneficiaries was cordial, 29% of the respondents disagreed that efficient communication between organisers and former beneficiaries was cordial, 18% of the respondents strongly disagreed that efficient communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial. Therefore, communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is not cordial.

On whether the former beneficiaries are regularly kept abreast, majority of the respondents at 61% disagreed, 19% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries were kept abreast of the forthcoming resource mobilisation activities through constant communication, 20% of the respondents were undecided on whether former beneficiaries were kept abreast of forthcoming resource mobilisation activities through constant communication. Therefore, the former beneficiaries were not regularly kept abreast of forthcoming resource mobilisation activities through constant communication.

Further 73% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hindered inclusive participation, 22% of the respondents were undecided on whether resource mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hindered inclusive participation while 5% of the respondents disagreed that resource mobilisation meetings are not properly which hindered inclusive participation. The majority 73% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hindered inclusive participation. Therefore, resource mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hindered inclusive participation.

However, majority at 75% of the respondents agreed that the use of new and emerging technologies such as social media enhanced their participation, 36% of the respondents were undecided on the
use of new technologies like social media to enhance their participation, further 52% of the respondents disagreed on the utilisation of new and contemporary technologies such as social media to enhance their participation. Therefore, the respondents embrace new and contemporary technologies such as social media to enhance former beneficiaries’ participation.

On whether they were not allowed to freely give feedback, 58% of the respondents disagreed that they were not allowed to freely give feedback, 24% of the respondents agreed that they were not allowed to freely give feedback, 18% of the respondents were undecided that they are not allowed to freely give feedback. From the response statistics, the former beneficiaries were freely allowed to give feedback.

Majority of at 61% of the respondents disagreed that they felt communication was from top down, 29% of the respondents agreed that they felt communication was from top down, 10% of the respondents were undecided on whether they felt communication at children of God Relief Institute was from top down. Therefore the former beneficiaries felt there was top down and bottom up communication.

Regarding gossip at work, 72% of the respondents agreed that gossip was at all-time high due to inadequate communication, 10% of the respondents were undecided on whether gossip was at all-time high due to inadequate communication, 18% of the respondents disagreed that gossip was at all-time high due to inadequate communication. Therefore, there was gossip in most of the time due to inadequate communication.
One of the Program manager had the following to say;

We have tried as much as possible to make sure our former beneficiaries are as close to us as possible….they are our children after all. Some of them came here when they were toddlers just like your blood children you would like to be in constant communication…. We therefore suggested to them to get one of them to coordinate their assemblies. They took Ignatius who always attend some of our meetings and present the concerns of our former beneficiaries (Program I, 25/07/2019)

The second Program manager had the following to say;

They (former beneficiaries) talk to us most often. They contact us anytime they have issues beyond their control….yes they have our numbers….hahaha….your children have your phone number? They walk in as they wish. No restriction at all. They well connected through the alumni data base.. Before I forget, we do have meetings…quarterly in a year and they are invited. These meetings bring them together and to know how each one is doing. They are so free with Nyumbani management (Program manager II, 27/17/2019)

The two program managers confirmed that the former beneficiaries are given good space to interact with the institution’s management.

Lunenburg (2010) concurs with the findings that communication is key, because there is no management function that can strive without strategic communication. Whether you have sufficient consideration of management principles, organisational leadership should prioritise communication with and through people. This is a signal that every individual’s communication approaches affect both personal and organisational competitiveness. The management of Children of God Relief Institute and beneficiaries need to employ strategic communication skills to donors either local or international. It is their duty and being the main actors in this institution then they should be well placed to recall every bit of benefit from COGRI- Nyumbani. It is perhaps apparent to agree that one of the most restraining force to organisational competitiveness and growth or change is a lack of clear and consequently affective communication tact.
Moreover, there is inherent value in good communication skills and this should be known to every manager of an organisation for its existence in an ever competitive world. Personnel at leadership level should be well versed by various report writing skills, interpersonal, group and public communication. This enables efficient and effective delivery of a funding proposal, report or confident defence of the same if called upon for questioning. Communication can also be understood as the process of exchanging meaningful information and common understanding between individuals. This means there should be a relationship development. In such an environment, communication can be actualised (Maina, 2014)

4.5 Contribution of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation at Nyumbani

The second objective was to find out the contribution of the former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation
Table 4.4: Former Beneficiaries’ Participation in Resource Mobilisation

Key: Strongly Agree (SD); Agree (A); Undecided (U) Decided (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Contribution of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I wholeheartedly participate in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have never participated in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My opinions are considered during resource mobilisation forums</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Former beneficiaries are fully involved</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resource mobilisation forums are fruitful</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I always look forward to the next resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.4 shows 76% of the respondents disagreed that they wholeheartedly participated in resource mobilisation activities, 22% of the respondents agreed that they wholeheartedly participated in resource mobilisation activities, 3% were undecided on whether they wholeheartedly participated in resource mobilisation activities. Majority of the respondents at 76% that they wholeheartedly participated in resource mobilisation activities. Therefore the former beneficiaries did not participate wholeheartedly in resource mobilisation activities.

Further, 52% of the respondents agreed that they never participated in resource mobilisation activities, 44% disagreed that they never participated in resource mobilisation activities, 4% of the respondents were undecided on their participation in resource mobilisation activities. Despite the fact that the majority agreed that they never participated in resource mobilisation, a reasonable number of former beneficiaries agreed that they participated in resource mobilisation activities.
A number of respondents at 56% disagreed that their opinions were considered during resource mobilisation forums, 18% of the respondents agreed that their opinions were considered during resource mobilisation forums, 26% of the respondents were undecided that their opinions were considered during resource mobilisation forums. Therefore, former beneficiaries opinions were not considered during resource mobilisation forums.

Regarding former beneficiaries involvement, 49% of the respondents disagreed that former beneficiaries are fully included in resource mobilisation, 37% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries are fully included in resource mobilisation 13% of the respondents were undecided whether former beneficiaries are fully involved in resource mobilisation. As much as there is a more representation of former beneficiaries who disagreed that they are not involved, the statistics show that there is a reasonable number of former beneficiaries who are involved in resource mobilisation.

On Contribution of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation, 71% of the respondents disagreed that their presence is treasured, 12% of the respondents agreed that their presence is treasured, 17% of the respondents were undecided on whether their presence was treasured. Therefore, the presence of former beneficiaries was not treasured.

Further 62% of the respondents disagreed that resource mobilisation forums are fruitful, 16% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation forums are fruitful, 21% of the respondents were undecided resource mobilisation forums being fruitful. As much as 16% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation forums are fruitful, majority at 62% disagreed that the forums are fruitful. This is can be due lapses in communication strategies which prompts former beneficiaries to get part of the communication through gossip. That meant resource mobilisation forums were not fruitful.
Regarding next resource mobilisation activities, 46% of the respondents agreed that they always look forward to the next resource mobilisation activities, 17% of the respondents were undecided whether they always looked forward to the next resource mobilisation activities, 37% disagreed that they always looked forward to the next resource mobilisation activities. Therefore the former beneficiaries looked forward to the next resource mobilisation activities.

Programme manager III

Our former beneficiaries are always there whenever called upon. They come though not all….some are employed and married far away. A challenge may come to those who are not employed and would wish to attend any of our functions. You know employment is a problem all over Africa. Those who are clever go on doing businesses and utilise skills acquired during their time at Nyumbani….and I assure they are doing well (Program manager III, 29th July 2019).

Programme manager IV

They provide services…. by the way Nyumbani is not all about money…even supporting the young ones here is needed…and by the way some of our former beneficiaries are permanent employees. And they are doing well having gone through here…they know the system very well…that is a resource we can’t get anywhere (Program manager IV 29th July 2019)

The findings concurred with International Development Research Centre (2010) that indicates that development researchers face interesting times. The ever changing of donors and financing agencies that end up leaving some regions of the third world with less support while others with more. This has necessitated organisations to employ a number of strategies to mobilise resources (UNICEF, 2016).

According to Canada’s International Development Research Centre (IDRC), humanitarian institutions find themselves in complicated situations since they are accustomed to particular funders may not be reliable with time. Donor mapping shows that funding agencies are now more focused larger institutions or organisations, awarding grants to large organisations with less
support available for medium and small organisations. As IDRC observes, dependence on foreign donors proves to be insufficient, and compromises financial muscle and sustainability of development organisations (IDRC 2010). This calls for organisations to craft and explore alternative funding sources for them to adapt changing donor trends (UNICEF, 2016).

The mystery of funding patterns is not blurred to development researchers. Non-profits, non-governmental institutions, and charities all over have long been comfortable with the patronage of a few sponsors now are in limbo wondering where the subsequent budget will come from, or how a specific programs are will be sustained over planned impact period, or how capacity building can be funded when grants are limited (Kanani, 2014). This has been a wake call to non-profits and NGOs realise that there is need to refocus their funding patterns to measures that will keep the organisations activities running. The organisations have now engaged in income generating within their premises and to cast a wider net to fetch variety of funding agencies (IDRC 2010).

Resource mobilisation require extensive consultation with donors and actors and this includes site visits, face to face discourse telephone and skype interviews with relevant leadership and development experts from organisation that carry a shared focus and interest in humanitarian sphere (Kanani, 2014). Kanan appreciates the importance of feedback in the process of mobilising organisational resources. It is through such a communication that an organisation will adjust to donor specification or sent relevant additional documents or substantial reports to qualify a fund.

### 4.6 Factors That Inform the Participation of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns in an Organisation

The first objective of the study was to investigate factors that inform the participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns in an organisation at Children of God Institute.
Table 4.5: Beneficiaries’ Participation in Resource mobilisation

Key: Strongly Agree (SD); Agree (A); Undecided (U) Decided (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Factors that inform Participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns</th>
<th>S.A. f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A. f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>U. f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D. f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S.D f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have no time to participate in resource mobilisation campaigns</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I do not have spare money to give to Children of God Institute</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not think they deserve my money</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not have perquisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I believe children of God institute is the one that need to support me</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>As a stakeholder, I’m never involved in resource mobilisation</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is no stakeholders’ forum to coordinate resource mobilisation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author: Researcher 2019

Regarding factors that inform participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns, 78% of the respondents disagreed that they had no time to participate in resource mobilisation campaigns. This should inform the management of the Children of God Relief Institute that the former beneficiaries have time for resource mobilisation. However, 20% of the respondents agreed that they had no time to participate in resource mobilisation. 3% of the respondents were undecided that they had no time to participate in resource mobilisation campaigns. Therefore, the former beneficiaries had time to participate in resource mobilisation campaigns.

Considering that 55% of the respondents were not employed, 60% of the respondents had no spare money to give to Children of God Relief Institute, 12% of the respondents were undecided that
they had no spare money to give to Children of God Relief Institute, 28% disagreed of the respondents agreed that they had no spare money to give to Children of God Relief Institute. Therefore a large percentage of former beneficiaries had no spare money to give to Children of God Relief Institute.

On factors that inform participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation, 85% of the respondents disagreed that they did not think children of God Relief Institute deserved their money, 3% of the respondents agreed that they did not think that Children of God Relief Institute did not deserve their money, 12% of the respondents were undecided that CGRI deserved their money. The former beneficiaries have a perception that COGRI deserves their money. This is a positive gesture from the former beneficiaries.

Further, 68% of the respondents disagreed that they had no prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation, 9% of the respondents were undecided whether they had prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation, and 23% of the respondents agreed that they had no prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation. Therefore, former beneficiaries have prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation.

Regarding COGRI supporting former beneficiaries, 60% of the respondents disagreed that they believed Children of God relief Institute was the one that needed to support them, 33% of the respondents believed Children of God Institute was the one that needed to support them, 7% were undecided on the believe that Children of God was the one to support them. The former beneficiaries of Children of God Relief Institute do not believe COGRI needed to support.

Further, 68% of the respondents agreed that as stakeholders they were never included in resource mobilisation, 4% of the respondents were undecided on whether as stakeholders, they were never
included in resource mobilisation, 28% of the respondents disagreed that as stakeholders, and they were never involved in resource mobilisation. Therefore, former beneficiaries were never involved in resource mobilisation.

However, 76% of respondents agreed that there was no stakeholders’ forum to coordinate resource mobilisation, 12% of the respondents were undecided on whether there was stakeholders’ forum that coordinated resource mobilisation and 12% of the respondents disagreed that there was no stakeholder’s forum to coordinate resource mobilisation. From the analysed data, there was no strategic forum to coordinate resource mobilisation events.

Another Program manager mentioned the following:

No no.....when you call them they come.....next event I will invite you....they love this place….it is their home….the turnout is always overwhelming and we are happy.

Our compassionate approach is what earns us a favour to these former beneficiaries associate with us like exactly parents…and they are happy (Program Manager V, 2nd August 2019).

Similarly findings by Arckerman and Eden (2011) who reasons that one of the important assignment during campaign development is the control of the relationship between the interests of an organisation and stakeholders in relation to its set goals. There should be enough research to bring out clarity to this practice of stakeholder management so that institutions can effectively manage their stakeholders to enable them realise their expected goals.

A number of questions about beneficiaries have been pointed out but the main focus is on how the organisations manage them with satisfaction so as to realise their strategic goals. Studies have shown that stakeholders are managed by the entire organisation in resource mobilisation since top management designs the entire organisation’s strategy. It is within their mandate to attend to the
strategic management of stakeholders if it aims to ensure the approach’s robustness (Ackerman & Eden, 2011).

United Nations Relief Works Agency (2016) however the main objective of a resource mobilisation strategy is to obtain enough resources necessary for running the day to day affairs of the institution. The development of a strategy is done in consultation with a number partners to ensure the approach is feasible. UNRWA puts forth several strategies to enable an organisation remain active in resource mobilisation factoring in external threats amongst stakeholder inclusion in strategy framework. These strategies include deepening relations with existing organisation donors. This is a traditional donor who is expected to continue to provide substantial funding.

The relationship enables the organisation to learn to map changing national financial allocation and policies, concerned decision makers, and the budgetary and allocation processes that will assist in identifying specific threats and opportunities to access funding streams. Any other reports from closer stakeholder relations will be utilised through targeted outreach to governments, ministries and parliaments, to accurately frame UNRWA, its mandate and its importance to regional stability. An intellectual discourse with academia, and the national policy groups will also form a key component to engender supportive political environments for the Agency and its operations (URWA, 2016).

Secondly UNICEF (2016) and UNRWA (2016) indicate that recognition of its partners in the region raises bilateral togetherness accordingly and contends that this strategy will cement partnerships in the region for further resource support. Thirdly proposes that there should be agency’s senior management in key states in the region to engage with relevant authorities to they understand the agencies mandate. These are key stakeholders in the region if their support and
decision to support or not to will affect regional and global support to the agency. In this approach, UNRWA managed to secure a funding base in Brazil that later saw it become advisory member to the Advisory Commission. Lastly asserts that senior management of the agency or organisation should engage the emergent Donors through decision making in capitals with the central goal through political engagement of the Organisation’s Directors if it is the case of Children of God Institute and other senior management. This will enable the organisation to feed into local offices across the world with centrality in support of the most vulnerable in their respecting and or isolated nations in the world. This strategy adds to specific purposed outreach and engagement to influence and reinstate other donors who stopped its resource support. In the case of UNRWA their ultimate wish was to win back Canada as their core partner and this commissioned the agency to set up offices in New York to coordinate these intentions.
4.7 Challenges Encountered by Former Beneficiaries’ Participation in Resource Mobilisation at Nyumbani

Table 4.6: Challenges Encountered by Former Beneficiaries’ Participation in Resource Mobilisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Challenges of Stakeholders Participation in Resource Mobilisation</th>
<th>S.A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frequent resource mobilisation activities have resulted to fatigue among former beneficiaries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Former beneficiaries are not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resource mobilisation actors are not flexible to other fundraising strategies such as Internet Fundraising</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Former beneficiaries perceive resource mobilisation as a foreign donor affair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>There are no skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No adequate self-sustaining projects and hence there is overreliance on external funding which is exhausting</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *Strongly Agree (SD); Agree (A); Undecided (U) Decided (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)*

Author: Researcher 2019
Table 4.6 shows that 59% of the respondents disagreed that frequent resource mobilisation activities resulted to fatigue among former beneficiaries, 6% of the respondents agreed that frequent resource mobilisation activities resulted to fatigue among former beneficiaries, 34% of the respondents were undecided on whether frequent resource mobilisation activities resulted to fatigue among former beneficiaries. The former beneficiaries are not fatigued by resource mobilisation.

In regard to stakeholders challenges in resource mobilisation, 62% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries were not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation, 17% of the respondents were undecided on former beneficiaries that were not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation, 21% of the respondents disagreed on former beneficiaries were not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation. The management of Children of God Relief Institute should work on the perception that former beneficiaries were not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation.

Further, 77% of the study participants agreed that former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities, 18% of the respondents were undecided on the fact that former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities and 5% of the respondents disagreed that former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities. Therefore former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities.

However, 77% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation actors are not flexible to other fundraising strategies such as internet fundraising, 15% of the respondents were undecided on resource mobilisation actors not being flexible to other fundraising strategies such as internet, 9% of the respondents disagreed that resource mobilisation actors are not flexible to other fundraising
strategies such as internet fundraising. This depicts that resource mobilisation actors are not flexible to other fundraising strategies.

In the former beneficiaries’ perception in resource mobilisation, 44% of the respondents disagreed that former beneficiaries perceived resource mobilisation as a foreign donor affair, 38% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries perceived resource mobilisation as a foreign donor affair, 23% of the respondents were undetermined that former beneficiaries perceived resource mobilisation as a donor affair. This indicated that the former beneficiaries’ perception is positive towards engaging COGRI resource mobilisation activities.

On challenges of stakeholders’ participation in resource mobilisation, 53% of the respondents disagreed that there were no skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation activities, 33% of the respondents agreed that there were no skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation, 15% of the respondents were undetermined whether there were no skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation. Therefore, there were skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation activities.

Further, 54% of the respondents agreed that there were no adequate self-sustaining projects and hence there was overreliance on external funding which is exhausting, 30% of the respondents were undetermined that there was no adequate self-sustaining projects and hence there was overreliance on external funding which is exhausting, and 17% of the respondents disagreed that no adequate self-sustaining projects and hence there was overreliance on external funding which was exhausting. Focusing on majority respondents 54%, this indicates that Children of God Institute has no adequate self-sustaining projects hence there was overreliance on external funding which is exhausting.
There are many... group dynamic challenges are many... to bring them together or to make themselves reason as one is a challenge like in any other groups... I think most of them do not have aneroid phones to network through social media like WhatsApp, Facebook etc... And some are in regions that got network issues... one more big challenge is unemployment in our former beneficiaries... hakuna kazi bwana (No job Mr)... but we have absorbed some of our beneficiaries.

The findings concur that there a number of challenges where diverse groups are brought together or interlinked for a common course. Stakeholder inclusion can be costly and in cases or likely is rarely budgeted or minimally allocated finances. Stakeholder participation as indicated in NOAA (2016) is consumes much time consuming, labour-involving, often confrontational, and ultimately lead to delay or alter decision-making process. Additionally, if not well managed and or considered, stakeholder involvement is likely to cause more confusions and escalate existing conflicts.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Overview
This chapter provides a summary of the findings of the research and additionally presents conclusions in regard to the research findings. Besides, it also features certain inputs made by the study to this field of knowledge as well as putting forth a number of recommendations to be factored in order to effectively establish an assessment of former beneficiaries’ communication strategies in resource acquisition at Children of God institute -Nyumbani. Consequently the chapter offers suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
5.2.1 Communication Strategies Used to Enhance Former Beneficiaries Participation in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns at Children of God Institute

The study found that efficient communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial, majority at 47% observed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is not cordial, 12% of the respondents strongly disagreed that efficient communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial, 14% of the respondents agreed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial, 14% of the respondents agreed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial, 14% of the respondents agreed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial, 14% of the respondents agreed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial, 14% of the respondents agreed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial, 14% of the respondents agreed that communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is cordial. Therefore, communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is not cordial.
On whether the former beneficiaries are regularly kept abreast, the study found that majority of the respondents at 61% disagreed, 19% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries are kept abreast of the forthcoming resource mobilisation activities through constant communication, 20% of the respondents were undecided on whether former beneficiaries were kept abreast of forthcoming resource mobilisation activities through constant communication. Therefore, the former beneficiaries are not regularly kept abreast of forthcoming resource mobilisation activities through constant communication.

Further the study found that 73% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation meetings were not properly regulated which hinders inclusive participation, 22% of the respondents were undecided on whether resource mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hinders inclusive participation while 5% of the respondents disagreed that resource mobilisation meetings are not properly which hinders inclusive participation. The majority 73% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hinders inclusive participation. Therefore, resource mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hinders inclusive participation.

However, the study found that majority at 75% of the respondents agreed that the use of new and emerging technologies such as social media enhanced their participation, 36% of the respondents were undecided on the use of new and emerging technologies such as social media to enhance their participation, further 52% of the respondents disagreed on the use of contemporary and new technologies such as social media to enhance their participation. Therefore, there is use of new and contemporary technologies such as social media to enhance former beneficiaries’ participation.

On whether they were not allowed to freely give feedback, 58% of the respondents disagreed that they were not allowed to freely give feedback, 24% of the respondents agreed that they were not
allowed to freely give feedback, 18% of the respondents were undecided that they were not allowed to freely give feedback. From the response statistics, the former beneficiaries were freely allowed to give feedback.

Majority of at 61% of the respondents disagreed that they felt communication was from top down, 29% of the respondents agreed that they felt communication was from top down, 10% of the respondents were undecided on whether they felt communication at children of God Relief Institute was from top down. Therefore the former beneficiaries felt there was top down and bottom up communication.

However, the study found that 72% of the respondents agreed gossip was at all-time high due to inadequate communication, 10% of the respondents were undecided on whether gossip was at all-time high due to inadequate communication, 18% of the respondents disagreed that gossip was at all-time high due to inadequate communication. Therefore, there was gossip at all-time high due to inadequate communication.

5.2.2 Contribution of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation at Children of God Institute

The study found that 76% of the respondents disagreed that they wholeheartedly participated in resource mobilisation activities, 22% of the respondents agreed that they wholeheartedly participated in resource mobilisation activities, 3% were undecided on whether they wholeheartedly participated in resource mobilisation activities. Majority of the respondents at 76% that they wholeheartedly participated in resource mobilisation activities. Therefore the former beneficiaries did not participate wholeheartedly in resource mobilisation activities.
52% of the respondents agreed that they never participated in resource mobilisation activities, 44% disagreed that they never participated in resource mobilisation activities, 4% of the respondents were undecided on their participation in resource mobilisation activities. Despite the fact that the majority agreed that they never participated in resource mobilisation, a reasonable number of former beneficiaries agreed that they participated in resource mobilisation activities.

A number of respondents at 56% disagreed that their opinions were considered during resource mobilisation forums, 18% of the respondents agreed that their opinions were considered during resource mobilisation forums, 26% of the respondents were undecided that their opinions were considered during resource mobilisation forums. Therefore, former beneficiaries opinions were not considered during resource mobilisation forums.

Regarding former beneficiaries involvement, 49% of the respondents disagreed that former beneficiaries are fully involved in resource mobilisation, 37% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries are fully involved in resource mobilisation 13% of the respondents were undecided whether former beneficiaries are fully involved in resource mobilisation. As much as there is a more representation of former beneficiaries who disagreed that they are not involved, the statistics show that there is a reasonable number of former beneficiaries who are involved in resource mobilisation.

Regarding the issue of presence, 71% of the respondents disagreed that their presence is treasured, 12% of the respondents agreed that their presence is treasured, 17% of the respondents were undecided on whether their presence was treasured. Therefore, the presence of former beneficiaries was not treasured.

Further 62% of the respondents disagreed that resource mobilisation forums are fruitful, 16% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation forums are fruitful, 21% of the respondents were
undecided resource mobilisation forums being fruitful. As much as 16% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation forums are fruitful, majority at 62% disagreed that the forums are fruitful. This is can be due lapses in communication strategies which prompts former beneficiaries to get part of the communication through gossip. That meant resource mobilisation forums were not fruitful.

Regarding next resource mobilisation activities, 46% of the respondents agreed that they always look forward to the next resource mobilisation activities, 17% of the respondents were undecided whether they always looked forward to the next resource mobilisation activities, 37% disagreed that they always looked forward to the next resource mobilisation activities. Therefore the former beneficiaries looked forward to the next resource mobilisation activities.

5.2.3 Factors That Inform the Participation of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns at Nyumbani

Regarding factors that inform participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns, the study found that 78% of the respondents disagreed that they had no time to participate in resource mobilisation campaigns. This should inform the management of the Children of God Relief Institute that the former beneficiaries have time for resource mobilisation. However, 20% of the respondents agreed that they had no time to participate in resource mobilisation. 3% of the respondents were undecided that they had no time to participate in resource mobilisation campaigns. Therefore, the former beneficiaries had time to participate in resource mobilisation campaigns.

Considering that 55% of the respondents were not employed, 60% of the respondents had no spare money to give to Children of God Relief Institute, 12% of the respondents were undecided that they had no spare money to give to Children of God Relief Institute, 28% disagreed of the
respondents agreed that they had no spare money to give to Children of God Relief Institute. Therefore a large percentage of former beneficiaries had no spare money to give to Children of God Relief Institute.

On factors that inform participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation, 85% of the respondents disagreed that they did not think children of God Relief Institute deserved their money, 3% of the respondents agreed that they did not think that Children of God Relief Institute did not deserve their money, 12% of the respondents were undecided that CGRI deserved their money. The former beneficiaries have a perception that COGRI deserves their money. This is a positive gesture from the former beneficiaries.

Further, 68% of the respondents disagreed that they had no prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation, 9% of the respondents were undecided whether they had prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation, and 23% of the respondents agreed that they had no prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilization. Therefore, former beneficiaries have prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation.

Regarding COGRI supporting former beneficiaries, the study found that; 60% of the respondents disagreed that they believed Children of God relief Institute was the one that needed to support them, 33% of the respondents believed Children of God Institute was the one that needed to support them, 7% were undecided on the believe that Children of God was the one to support them. The former beneficiaries of Children of God Relief Institute do not believe COGRI needed to support.

Further, 68% of the respondents agreed that as stakeholders they never took part in resource mobilisation, 4% of the respondents were undecided on whether as stakeholders, they were never included in resource mobilisation, 28% of the respondents disagreed that as stakeholders, and they
were never involved in resource mobilisation. Therefore, former beneficiaries were never involved in resource mobilisation.

However, 76% of respondents agreed that there was no stakeholders’ forum to coordinate resource mobilisation, 12% of the respondents were undecided on whether there was stakeholders’ forum that coordinated resource mobilisation and 12% of the respondents disagreed that there was no stakeholder’s forum to coordinate resource mobilisation. From the analysed data, there was no strategic forum to coordinate resource mobilisation events.

5.2.4 Challenges Encountered by Former Beneficiaries’ as They Participate in Resource Mobilisation at Nyumbani

The study found that 59% of the respondents disagreed that frequent resource mobilisation activities resulted to fatigue among former beneficiaries, 6% of the respondents agreed that frequent resource mobilisation activities resulted to fatigue among former beneficiaries, 34% of the respondents were undecided on whether frequent resource mobilisation activities resulted to fatigue among former beneficiaries. The former beneficiaries are not fatigued by resource mobilisation.

In regard to stakeholders challenges in resource mobilisation, it was found that 62% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries were not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation, 17% of the respondents were undecided on former beneficiaries that were not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation, 21% of the respondents disagreed on former beneficiaries were not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation. The management of Children of God Relief Institute should work on the perception that former beneficiaries were not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation.
Further, the study found that 77% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities, 18% of the respondents were undecided on the fact that former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities and 5% of the respondents disagreed that former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities. Therefore former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities. However, 77% of the respondents agreed that resource mobilisation actors are not flexible to other fundraising strategies such as internet fundraising, 15% of the respondents were undecided on resource mobilisation actors not being flexible to other fundraising strategies such as internet, 9% of the respondents disagreed that resource mobilisation actors are not flexible to other fundraising strategies such as internet fundraising. This depicts that resource mobilisation actors are not flexible to other fundraising strategies.

In the former beneficiaries’ perception in resource mobilisation, the study found that 44% of the respondents disagreed that former beneficiaries perceived resource mobilisation as a foreign donor affair, 38% of the respondents agreed that former beneficiaries perceived resource mobilisation as a foreign donor affair, 23% of the respondents were undecided that former beneficiaries perceived resource mobilisation as a donor affair. This indicated that the former beneficiaries’ perception is positive towards engaging COGRI resource mobilisation activities.

On challenges of stakeholders’ participation in resource mobilisation, the study found that 53% of the respondents disagreed that there were no skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation activities, 33% of the respondents agreed that there were no skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation, 15% of the respondents were undecided whether there were no skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries
to participate in resource mobilisation. Therefore, there were skilful staff to mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation activities.

Further, the study found that 54% of the respondents agreed that there were no adequate self-sustaining projects and hence there was overreliance on external funding which is exhausting, 30% of the respondents were undecided that there was no adequate self-sustaining projects and hence there was overreliance on external funding which is exhausting, and 17% of the respondents disagreed that no adequate self-sustaining projects and hence there was overreliance on external funding which was exhausting. Focusing on majority respondents 54%, this indicates that Children of God Institute has no adequate self-sustaining projects hence there was overreliance on external funding which is exhausting.

5.3 Conclusions

The study concludes that;

5.2.1 Communication Strategies Used to Enhance Former Beneficiaries Participation in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns at Nyumbani

The management of Children of God Institute is not well guided by the best principles of communication strategies which were key to resource mobilisation. The communication strategies, former beneficiaries’ mobilisation strategies were unreliable which resulted to gossip as an alternative means to get information.

5.2 Contribution of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation at Nyumbani

That the management of the children of God institute has a willing group of former beneficiaries who are ready to support the institution and look forward for any resource mobilisation activities. The management should work hand in hand with the former beneficiaries and involve them in
resource mobilisation strategies development. Through participation, former beneficiaries will identify themselves with the institution wherever they will be which, is a valuable form of publicity and furthering network to other organisations.

5.2.3 Factors that Inform the Participation of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns at Nyumbani

The management of Children of God relief institute does not at all-time include former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation despite having time to partake in resource mobilisation campaigns. This inclusion creates ownership of the institute which may illuminate a feeling of sacrifice when resource mobilisation calls are sent to them.

The management does not forge strategies which enable them to coordinate resource mobilisation strategies and organise life-skills forums to minimise the feeling in the former beneficiaries that they still needed help from the institution.

The management does not invest time to find employment for the trained former beneficiaries and more so to enhance hands-on skills to enable them manage the high rate of unemployment amongst them.

The management does not fuse the communication gaps between the organisers and former beneficiaries. In addition to that, the management has not provided good leadership and communication regarding resource mobilisation meetings. Nonetheless, the management should also strategise on the use of the new and emerging technologies such as social media had enhanced participation in resource mobilisation activities.
5.2.4 Challenges Encountered By Former Beneficiaries’ as They Participate in Resource Mobilisation at Nyumbani

The management do not have a clear plan of their resource mobilisation functions to minimise fatigue among former beneficiaries. The management does not fully embrace other resource mobilisation strategies like internet fundraising and online donor recognition. However they should also invest in capacity building on resource mobilisation skills and to reduce the perception that resource mobilisation activities are foreign donor affairs. Children of God institute has good staff to run its affairs.

Former beneficiaries are key stakeholders of the Children of God Institute and should be considered in all aspects of resource mobilisation. Their lifelong testimonies are key to influence local donations and consequently international donors. The former beneficiaries are involved in resource mobilisation meeting but their feedback is not considered which has discouraged their wholeheartedly participation. The former beneficiaries are willing to take part in resource mobilisation activities. However they feel their presence in these activities not treasured.

5.4 Recommendations

5.4.1 Factors That Inform the Participation of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns at Nyumbani

The management of Children of God relief institute should at all-time include former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation. This inclusion creates ownership of the institute which may illuminate a feeling of sacrifice when resource mobilisation calls are sent to them.
The management should forge strategies which will enable them to coordinate resource mobilisation strategies and organise life-skills forums to minimise the feeling in the former beneficiaries that they still needed help from the institution.

The management should find a way to secure employment for the trained former beneficiaries and more so to enhance hands-on skills to enable them manage the high rate of unemployment amongst them.

5.4.2 Contribution of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation at Nyumbani

The management team should appoint the active member of the former beneficiaries to coordinate former beneficiaries. This will keep them abreast of anything regarding resource mobilisation campaigns, meetings, reduction of gossip and associated capacity building workshops.

Children of God institute should Integrate former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns for this can prompt them especially the employed and those in their businesses to off their personal support and commitment to the course of resource mobilisation.

5.4.3 Communication Strategies Used to Enhance Former Beneficiaries Participation in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns at Nyumbani

The management of Children of God Institute should improve on feedback as resource this will lead to a motivated team of former beneficiaries, improvements or adjustments on resource mobilisation strategies.

Children of God institute should improve in internet aided Communication channels. They should check on group emails, WhatsApp group formation to get faster information sharing to former beneficiaries.
The Nyumbani management should embrace bottom up process of communication because sticking on top-bottom limits them on feedback organ. Sticking on top-bottom demotivates the urge to freely participate in the process of mobilising resources.

5.4.4 Challenges encountered by former beneficiaries’ as they participate in resource mobilisation at Nyumbani

The management should have a clear plan of their resource mobilisation functions to minimise to fatigue among former beneficiaries. The management should embrace other resource mobilisation strategies like internet fundraising and online donor recognition. However they should also invest in capacity building on resource mobilisation skills and to reduce the perception that resource mobilisation activities are foreign donor affairs. Children of God institute has good staff to run its affairs. However, the institute should get skilful personnel to coordinate and mobilise former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation activities

Former beneficiaries are key stakeholders of the Children of God Institute and should be considered in all aspects of resource mobilisation. Their lifelong testimonies are key to influence local donations and consequently international donors. The former beneficiaries are involved in resource mobilisation meeting but their feedback is not considered which has discouraged their wholeheartedly participation.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies

A similar study should be carried out in other non-governmental organisations since their approaches to humanitarian issues are different from those of Children of God Institute. The research recommends that further studies should focus on former beneficiaries’ inputs towards resource mobilisation. Further research should also focus on the factors that influence resource
mobilisation in non-governmental organisations. Finally, this research should be conducted in other non-governmental organisations to enable generalisation and authentication of the study finding across the Non-governmental organisations fraternity.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Dear Participants:

The purpose of this interview is to gather relevant data in order to understand the influence of stakeholder participation in resource mobilization in Children of God institute - Nyumbani. I am requesting you to share your genuine experiences to enhance the success and validity of this research. Please note that your personal details will not be revealed and the responses you provide will only be used for academic purposes.

SECTION A:

Demographic Information

A1. Gender:

1. Male [ ]
2. Female [ ]

A2. Year of Birth…………

A3. Marital Status

1. Single/ never married
2. Currently married
3. Divorced
4. Separated
5. Widowed

A4. Highest education level attained
1. Secondary and below
2. Post-secondary certificate
3. Post-secondary diploma

Others (Specify) ................

A5. Fields of interest ..................

A6. Years of work

1. Currently not working [ ]
2. 1-5 years       [ ]
3. 6-10 years     [ ]
4. 11-15          [ ]
SECTION B:

3) To interrogate the communication strategies used to enhance former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication strategies used to enhance Former Beneficiaries’ Participation in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Efficient communication between organisers and former beneficiaries is very cordial which is enhancing participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We are regularly kept abreast of forthcoming resource mobilisation activities through constant communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resource mobilisation meetings are not properly regulated which hinders inclusive participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of new and emerging technologies such as social media has enhanced our participation in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We are not allowed to freely give feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel that communication here is from top down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gossip is at an all-time high due to inadequate communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. In your own opinion, what other roles does communication strategies play in enhancing former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation campaigns?
SECTION D:

Factors That Inform the Participation of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation Campaigns in an Organisation

Put a tick [√] in the most appropriate space to indicate your level of agreement using the scale given below: Strongly Agree (1) Agree (2) Undecided (3) Disagree (4) strongly Disagree (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that inform former beneficiaries’ Participation in Resource Mobilisation Strategies</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have no time to participate in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I do not have spare money to give to Children of God Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not think they deserve my money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not have prerequisite skills to participate in resource mobilisation for Children of God Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I believe Children of God Institute is the one that needs to support me and not the other way around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As a stakeholder, I am never involved in Children of God Institute’s resource mobilisation campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is no stakeholders’ forum to coordinate resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. In your own opinion, which factors are likely to inform your participation in resource mobilisation campaigns?

SECTION C: Contribution of Former Beneficiaries in Resource Mobilisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution of former Beneficiaries’ Participation in Resource Mobilisation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I wholeheartedly participate in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have never participated in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My opinions are considered during resource mobilisation strategy forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Former beneficiaries are fully involved in preparations for resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Our presence in resource mobilisation activities is treasured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel that the resource mobilisation planning meetings are fruitful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I always look forward to the next resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In your own opinion, what are your contributions in resource mobilisation campaigns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E:

Challenges of former beneficiaries’ participation in Resource Mobilisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges of former beneficiaries’ participation in Resource Mobilisation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequent resource mobilisation activities have resulted to fatigue among former beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are no adequate self-sustaining projects and hence there is overreliance on external funding which is exhausting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Former beneficiaries are not considered to be moneyed enough to participate in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Former beneficiaries are rarely involved in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The resource mobilisation actors are not flexible to other strategies such as internet fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Former beneficiaries perceive resource mobilisation activities as a foreign donor affair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There are no skilful staff to mobilize former beneficiaries to participate in resource mobilisation activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. In your own opinion, what are the other challenges facing beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation campaigns?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you
Appendix 2: Interview Guide for the Study

Dear Participants:

The purpose of this interview is to gather relevant data in order to understand the influence of former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute - Nyumbani. I am requesting you to share your genuine experiences to enhance the success and validity of this research. Please note that your personal details will not be revealed and the responses you provide will only be used for academic purposes.

1) What are the factors that inform the participation of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute?

2) What is the contribution of former beneficiaries in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute?

3) What are the communication strategies used to enhance former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation campaigns at Children of God Institute?

4) What are the challenges encountered by former beneficiaries’ participation in resource mobilisation at Children of God Institute?

Thanks for your time
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