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ABSTRACT

Korogocho slum in Nairobi County Kenya is the fourth biggest slum in Kenya; due to the service gaps left by the Government, the slum has voluminous NGOs and charitable organizations operating there with an aim of bridging the service gaps through Community Development Project; however, their impacts do not match their numbers and resources utilized. The objectives of this study include: to establish how beneficiaries’ involvement in Community Development Projects leads to urban slum dependency, to assess how funding of Community Development Projects by NGOs leads to urban slum dependency, to establish how approaches used in Community Development Projects results to urban slum dependency, to assess influence of monitoring and evaluation of Community Development Projects on urban slum dependency. Descriptive survey research design was used in this study. The researcher collected data from respondents from the age of 15 and above. The population was stratified into 8 villages and from each village a sample of 47 respondents was selected; from the 47 respondents 44 were randomly selected from each village while 3 were key informants. The data was collected through questionnaires and key respondent interviews and analysis done using statistical package for social science (SPSS). The findings were presented in tables according to the responses collected from the field. Frequencies and percentages were also used to describe the data collected in the field. The research found out that there is minimal beneficiaries’ involvement, projects are donor funded, direct assistance approach and use of CBOs are commonly used, and organizations monitor and evaluate their community development projects. From the research findings it was concluded that beneficiaries’ involvement in all stages of development projects is crucial, donor funding results to unsustainable projects, local funding is vital to ensure local ownership and sustainability, and development should be community based and initiated by the beneficiaries while the NGOs and donors play a facilitation role. The researcher recommend that: direct assistance approach should be discouraged, organizations should seek to empower the locals with skills for self-reliance, NGOs and donors should improve on monitoring and evaluation of community development projects, government agencies should have frequent assessment of CDPs, and locals should take charge of their own development.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Hanchett (2003) observe that Bangladesh Bureau of statistics define a slum as a cluster of compact settlement of five or more households that generally grow very unsystematically and haphazardly in unhealthy conditions and atmosphere on Government and private vacant land. Criteria used by the Bureau to identify slums include predominantly poor housing, poor quality or no sewerage and drainage, inadequate drinking water supplies, insufficient or no street lighting, few or no paved streets or paths.

Enamul (2009) observes that in Dhaka Bangladesh due to the gap in provision of basic services, many NGOs are involved in slum improvement activities. NGOs programs are concentrated mainly in the area of health, education, water and sanitation and credit services. Due to dependency on donor funding and no local funding, the programmes are dictated by donors’ guidelines and designs which assumes the socio-cultural situations and perceptions of the beneficiaries leading to dependency on NGOs programs by the locals.

These programmes are unlikely to reflect the actual needs of the people. The dependency on donor funding not only make programs irrelevant to the needs of the people but also raises a question of sustainability of NGOs’ projects in the slums. Enamul points out those most local NGOs depend on foreign donations, even the Government slum
improvement programmes in Bangladesh largely rely on aid from organizations; these programmes are likely to face problems if donors withdraw their support.

According to United State Institute of Peace report (April 26, 2010), NGOs have been vital in development of Haiti for many years and their popularity increased following the tragic earthquake in January 12, 2010. Donors have preferred to channel aid through NGOs resulting to Haitians depending more on NGOs for basic services such as health and education. The report states that the number of NGOs operating in Haiti prior to the earthquake ranged from 3,000 to as many as 10,000. Due to the high number of NGOs the country has been referred as “Republic of NGOs.” Despite the vast number of NGOs in Haiti, about three fourths of the population is impoverished living on less than $2 per day. Half of the population has no access to portable water, one third has no sanitary facilities and only 10% have electricity services.

Omofonmwan, Odia (2009) observe that a number of NGOs in Nigeria are interested in various aspects of community development such as community mobilization, environment, health and sanitation, education, promotion of child’s rights law, promotion of sexuality and reproductive health, education, fight against child labor and human trafficking, economic empowerment, development of rural infrastructure, rescue and resuscitation of accident victims and capacity building service. NGOs depend largely on donation and funding from international donor or funding organizations for the execution of their projects and programmes. A sizable number of NGOs were equally found to have their activities stalled, due to lack of support from donors or funders.
Akassa community development project is a project in Niger Delta initiated by oil companies (Statoli and BP) and the Akassa community. The overall objective of the project is to achieve food security and improve living standards for the Akassa people. The project has several sub-projects which includes human resource development, natural resources management, poverty alleviation, infrastructure and capacity building. An NGO Pro Nature International (PNI) conceptualized community development model and facilitates the management of the project while the locals own and manage the project; the oil companies support the project financially.

World Business for sustainable development (2005) did an evaluation on Akassa project in 2000 and the main challenge pointed out was the culture of dependency and irresponsibility in the Niger Delta. The companies for decades have been doling out cash to the local population in order to pacify people and ensure that production can go on uninterrupted. The culture of soothing locals with cash, gifts or free services is a common phenomenon with many NGOs in their operations in the slum areas; this has greatly contributed to dependency on CDPs by locals.

Robin (2007) observed that Informal dwellings in South Africa are deficient mostly in water, sanitation, electricity, ventilation, food preparation and storage and such conditions are associated with a range of health risks including diarrhea and respiratory diseases. There are also the hazards of fire in informal settlements and residents in informal settlements are more prone to diseases. Life in Korogocho is similar to South Africa especially the health risk due to proximity of the slum to the biggest dump site in
Kenya, the Dandora dump site; children in Korogocho slum often suffer from respiratory diseases.

Shaw (2001) quoted in Robin (2007) noted that social problems, such as crime, also affect residents in informal settlements in South Africa; they lack basic policing, services and infrastructure and this increases the risk of victimization. Korogocho slum is known in Kenya to hamper dangerous gangs and residents often suffer frequent attacks from the gangs; several crimes are committed daily in the slum and the Government is reluctant to wipe out the gangs.

UN-HABITAT (2009) report “Twenty first session of the governing council” states that, in Nairobi Kenya, 60% of the population subsists in slums and squatter settlements. The 60% is crowded onto only 5% of the land without adequate shelter, clean water or decent sanitation. This gap has made slum areas famous destinations for countless number of NGOs that initiate Community Development Projects to bring community developments with an aim of improving the lives of the slum residents; most of them revolving around offering the basic services which are not offered by the Government.

Gathuti (2010) observed that development projects in Korogocho slum in Nairobi Kenya initiated by NGOs are 48%, those initiated by Government are 28% while only 10% are initiated and planned by the locals. NGOs are investing a lot of resources on urban poor yet the outcomes are minimal; Investing plenty of resources alone doesn’t empower
people what is needed is to “upgrade” first their mentality and involve them to shape their future.

Charity (2010) in her study of Korogocho socio-economic status assessed the sustainability of projects started and implemented in Korogocho slum in Kenya and most of the projects were rated medium and others as failures. The unsustainable projects were caused by, poor management and corruption leading to misappropriation of funds, among other things, tribalism and nepotism, insecurity, vandalism, alienation of the community and low level of contribution by community member.

Charity (2010) commended that the projects and interventions can only be sustainable if community is enlightened and empowered so that they are able to confront the ghosts of poverty in the slum. Local participation ensures that felt needs are served; beneficiaries will shape the project to their specific needs in ways that outsiders cannot. A sense of immediate responsibility and ownership by the beneficiaries put pressure on a project to be truly worthwhile. It creates local level awareness, competence and capacity where it did not exist before.

Jim (2013) observes that community development projects have not solved problems and they have created many others; by introducing an unrealistic set of expectations, community development programmes have often made the realization of even modest goals impossible or remote. Local NGOs operating in slum areas rely completely on donors’ funding while international NGOs depend on grants from home government or
from individuals. There is no base for local funding and donors contribute 90% of the projects funds. This has created dependency on NGOs and donors and urban poor believe donations are the only way out of poverty.

1.2 Statement of the problem
Donvat (2013) observes that International NGOs can either act as facilitators or impediment to community empowerment. NGOs in developing countries play a significant role in development as organizers and facilitators of the poor; they provide an alternative or in many cases a supplement to government provision of goods and services, but it is unclear if the role they take has positive impact of empowerment or they control and overshadow the poor ideologically or strategically.

Carrol (1992) quoted in Donvat (2013) suggest that the relationship between INGOs and the poor can be one of dependence and control as much as empowerment. In community trainings, INGOs often see themselves as advisers and teachers of the poor rather than as conduits and facilitators of community needs. Aram (2009) states that development projects are aimed at improving the standard of living of the resident population; the impacts of development projects in slum areas are questionable since there is no much improvement recorded in standards of living in the slums despite many community development projects implemented by various NGOs.
Donovat (2013) pointed out that one of the principal objectives of NGOs is the encouragement of self-management in grassroots groups but in actuality there are difficulties in maintaining the interest of the poor people in conscientization, mobilization and empowerment when they have pressing short term needs. He further observed that local NGOs struggle to please the International NGOs and they compete with one another for favors and funds; the result is weakening of urban poor solidarity preventing them from working together to find a solution to their challenges creating a form of dependency on the International NGOs.

Korogocho slum dwellers have become used of donations such that most of them do not engage in productive activities but wait to benefit from a community development project. Projects are referred as ‘murandi’ and there is a common saying ‘umepata murandi’ to mean ‘you got a project’ used to refer to someone showing signs of financial prosperity. Despite the large numbers of CDPs social economic challenges remain rampant in the slum; CDPs have created urban slum dependency instead of creating a self-reliant community.

1.3 Purpose of the study
This study sought to establish the influence of Community Development Projects by NGOs on urban slum dependency. It seeks to assess why CDP result to dependency other than empowering and building the capacity of the locals to address issues affecting their lives, resulting to many projects coming to a halt and the quality of life in slum areas remaining the same.
1.4 Objectives of the study

i. To establish how beneficiaries’ involvement in Community Development Projects leads to urban slum dependency.

ii. To assess how funding of Community Development Projects by NGOs leads to urban slum dependency.

iii. To establish how approaches used in Community Development Projects by NGOs results to urban slum dependency.

iv. To assess influence of monitoring and evaluation of Community Development Projects on urban slum dependency

1.5 Research Questions

i. How does beneficiaries’ involvement in Community Development Projects, leads to urban slum dependency?

ii. How does funding of Community Development Projects by NGOs leads to urban slum dependency?

iii. How do approaches used in Community Development Projects by NGOs results to urban slum dependency?

iv. What is the influence of monitoring and evaluation of Community Development Projects on urban slum dependency?
1.6 Significance of the study

This study was vital in supplementing the understanding of the concept of community development; which should be by the people and for the people and not initiated by “outsiders” like NGOs as Julius Nyerere observed in Arusha Declaration that community development in Tanzania then was more on “things rather than about people” and that the people themselves were kind of spectators in their own development with leadership being in the hands of unconcerned “outsiders”.

The phenomenon was the same in slum areas where community development projects were initiated and owned by NGOs and the locals were spectators who sought for opportunities to benefit from the same without much concern about achievement of the objectives of the projects. The study was an eye opener of what true community development involves. The study was useful to NGOs and other charitable organizations.

It analysis some aspects of CDPs that have crippled the performance of the NGOs in slum areas. It also sought to explore ways to make Community Development Projects successful and beneficial to the local communities without creating dependency on the same. This study brought out the role of NGOs in community development as facilitators and not initiators and owners of community development projects which result to dependency leaving the people worse than before.

The Government has a central role to play in development and should ensure NGOs are kept in check by legitimate government framework. This study was important for policy
makers and regulators; it will explore the influx of NGOs in the slums in comparison with the impact of their initiated Community Development Projects. The study gave conclusions which would aid the government on its role on evaluation of NGOs; this would ensure that NGOs offer relevant services depending on the needs of the locals.

1.7 Delimitation of the study
This study was done in eight villages of Korogocho slum in Nairobi County Kenya. Most NGOs registered in Kenya have or have had their presence in Korogocho. Most of them are human rights based spending most of their resources in advocacy and human rights awareness. A few of them engage in development activities besides advocacy and research. The satire is that in spite of the high number of NGOs operating in Korogocho since the eighties, Korogocho continues to be as poor as it were many years ago making the slum relevant for this study.

1.8 Limitation of the study
Insecurity in the slum was a challenge during data collection which was overcome by use of locals to collect the data. High expectations from slum dwellers and relevant offices to financially benefit from the researcher were also a challenge that was overcome by giving a clear motive of the research to respondents to avoid financial expectations on the outcome of the study.
1.9 Assumption of the study

It was assumed that the respondent gave honest and true information concerning community development projects in the slum. It was also assumed that community development projects in all slums are likely to be similar with Korogocho slum.

1.10 Definition of significant terms in the study

Non-governmental organizations (NGO) are neither governmental nor intergovernmental organization.

Community A group of people living in a known geographical region with shared culture.

Development Economic growth that is constantly nourished by the fruits of human development at all levels of decision making.

Sustainable development Development that continues to exist in the hands of the locals upon termination of the involvement of the donors.

Community development Collective action for social change with emphasis on empowerment and participation of the locals.

Project the overall framework to attack a multi-dimensional problem.

Program a well-conceived strategy which is implemented to address one or more dimensions of the problem.

Slum Densely populated urban areas characterized by extreme poverty and limited Government control.

Empowerment Increasing one’s authority and control over the resources and decisions that affect one’s life.
Capacity building The process of increasing ones abilities to understand and deal with their development needs in a broad context and in a sustainable manner.

Slum dependency The behavior of slum dwellers to rely on others to meet their needs.

Community development projects Development projects initiated to bring positive change in a certain community.

Beneficiaries involvement Participation of the people who are meant to benefit from a certain project or program.

Urban slum dependency Behavior of urban poor communities to rely on others such as donors for their livelihood.

Korogocho slum third biggest slum in Kenya located on Eastern part of Nairobi county

Funding means of acquiring financial resource for a certain projects

Approaches ways of doing something or a way of handling a certain task.

Monitoring and evaluation keeping track and assessing a certain project or program

1.11 Organization of the study

Chapter one of this study discuss: the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives and research questions, significance of the study, delimitation and limitation of the study, assumption of the study. Significant terms used in the study are also discussed in this chapter.

In chapter two the independent variables are discussed. Influence of beneficiaries’ involvement in CDPs is discussed; negligible involvement of beneficiaries, lack of
beneficiaries initiated programs and attitudes of the locals towards CDPs are analyzed in chapter two. Funding of CDPs is also discussed and donor based funding and programmed funding is discussed. Approaches used in CDPs which include direct assistance approach and use of CBOs are discussed in Chapter two. Influence of monitoring and evaluation of CDPs on urban slum dependency is also discussed in chapter two. Aspects of monitoring and evaluation discussed include absence of baseline information and adequate monitoring system, methodologies and indicators used and ambitious expectations by NGOs.

In chapter three research design used which include descriptive survey is discussed. Chapter three also discuss: target population, sampling procedures and sample size, research instruments, validity and reliability of the instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis technique and ethical considerations of the research. Operationalization of variables is also analyzed in chapter three.

Chapter four presents the study findings and interpretations. The analysis of data using descriptive statistics and description of data collected in frequencies and percentages are also in this chapter.

Chapter five contains summary of findings, discussion of findings, conclusion, recommendations and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO  
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
In this section literature on various variables in this study is reviewed. It focuses on: beneficiaries’ involvement in Community Development Projects, funding of Community Development Projects, approaches used in Community Development Projects and monitoring and evaluation of Community Development Projects. This section also shows the relationship between independent and dependent variables through the use of a conceptual framework; it also gives a summary of the literature review.

2.2 Influence of beneficiaries’ involvement in Community Development Projects on urban slum dependency
Kameri (2002) observed that some NGOs seem to be simply tired of the effort and continual monitoring involved in maintaining the community involvement which is a pre-requisite of sustainable projects. They are discouraged by the number of failed projects, the number of abandoned project, the number of groups who make no attempt to break their dependency on the NGOs but simply solicit for new resources year after year.

2.2.1 Negligible involvement of beneficiaries
Maruta (2010) noted that active participation of project beneficiaries is necessary and important; only the beneficiaries know and understand their needs and priorities best. Slum dwellers need to become increasingly aware of the socio-economic reality around
them, of the forces that keep them in poverty, and of the possibility of bringing about change in their conditions through collective action. Direct involvement of ordinary people in the local affairs that affects their lives is pivotal to community development.

Jeniffer, Dale (2002) acknowledged that project beneficiaries as well as those hurt by a project must be involved in decision concerning the objectives of development initiatives, the normative criteria used to evaluate the success or failure of projects and the design and implementation of projects. It is logical that the people who experience poverty should be at the centre of initiatives to address poverty. It is therefore necessary for the success of the project to involve the intended beneficiaries at every stage of the project life cycle, from identification to evaluation.

Fanjong (2002) stated that local level development provides a major force in activating the utilization of local resources and therefore constitute one of the most effective methods of promoting people’s participation in determining their own development. Jeniffer, Dale (2002) echoed same view that resource mobilization in form of materials, labor or money, might also be facilitated when beneficiaries feel they have had a hand in designing the project to which they are contributing. Beneficiaries should take a direct, active role in development decisions that affect their communities and livelihoods averting dependency on help from donors.
Joop (2013) observed that it make good sense to start from the poor themselves to take the lead and to facilitate them to make the best of it. This leads to the importance of creating conditions under which poor, illiterate, and socially exclude men and women are aware of opportunities, able to organize themselves, to be ready to challenge opposition or are empowered. Urban poor community should be given opportunity to define their own development according to their own needs, values and aspirations failure to which CDPs fails in slum areas.

Diklitch (1998) quoted in Etienne (2007) acknowledged that NGOs lack the capacity to involve the poor, accusing them of frequently operating on undemocratic lines, having only a limited impact and encouraging dependency. Aram (2009) analyzed a development project in Lesotho, “Integrated Rural Development” that was financed by World Bank and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The project aimed at livestock and range development and increase in commercial livestock production and range development was the central goal of the project.

The project did not put into account the economic and cultural context of the target population thus it did not improve the standards of living of the population. This is an implication that the beneficiaries were isolated in all stages of the project leading to unexpected outcomes and the failure of the project. Jim (2013) stated that community developments do not involve the locals but they are brought in to rubber-stamp ill-conceived projects cooked up in isolation in central offices without reference to local needs, abilities and resources. He further noted that too many centrally planned schemes
have been foisted off on the local people and turned into community development projects only as a last resort.

Entienne (2007) noted that meaningful development does not only depend on the existence of a facilitating environment but also requires certain other factors to be in place, notably usable physical resources, human and social capital and appropriate external support. He further noted that human capital encapsulates the skills, talents, leadership capacity and charisma possessed by members of a community. Community based development projects are likely to be of limited relevance and effect if local pools of social capital are not present.

Simon (1992) quoted in Entienne (2007) advocates for greater empathy and interaction between planners and communities and the integration of theory and practice. Jeniffer, Dale (2002) observed that involving community members during the early stage of the project cycle allow donors to take advantage of local knowledge and expertise. He further noted that some projects in some sectors require the participation of project beneficiaries in design, management and governance in order to assure reasonable prospects of success. Increased use of client feedback and increased participation are both part of the new demand side orientation towards improving project performance.

Samir, Innamul (2007) stated that communities seldom identify themselves with programs that are designed and provided by the government. In many cases, community participation is not even solicited in planning and implementation, which leads to
misdirected funds, lack of maintenance and low sustainability. Hence, many communities
tend to view government initiatives with a sense of distrust and feel that they do not
“own” such programs. The same case applies to programs designed and implemented by
NGOs where in most cases the locals are left out in all stages of the projects.

Thokozani (2008) maintains that NGO should function as a catalyst of the development
process and not control and manipulate the process, especially in terms of the primary
importance of participation, empowerment and sustainability. Therefore the catalyzing
functions of an NGO should aim at producing participation, empowerment and
sustainability in terms of the development process.

2.2.2 Beneficiaries initiated programs
Julia (2000) acknowledged that participatory approach may make development projects
acceptable to local communities; however, they may not assume responsibility for them
over a long term because the identification of the need and the incentive for the project
did not originate from local communities themselves. Community driven processes
initiated and managed by slum dwellers allow the urban poor to be effective
developmental force; such initiatives are more likely to meet their needs than donor-
imposed projects. For sustainable development the locals should take lead while NGOs
play support roles.
Etienne (2007) observed that communities can and must seize the development initiatives and embark on strategies which might improve their social and economic wellbeing. Beneficiaries’ initiated projects ensure that the local leadership retains control over development projects reducing dependency on the NGOs or the donors. Sen (1997) quoted in Etienne (2007) stated that dozens of top-down development projects have failed due to increased dependency and inadequate human capital to fill the role of external body when it withdraws from the project. Locals lack the will, skills and resources to continue with the project which in most cases do not march their needs.

Julia (2000) advocate for bottom up approach which according to her is a situation in which potential beneficiaries themselves take the initiative to identify problems and possible solutions with their own human and material resources and whatever outside technical, financial or political assistance that is available for them to address those problems. However, community initiated project face challenges which include lack of finance, equipments, expertise, skills and knowledge. The NGOs and other external bodies thus become important to help address the challenges.

Etienne (2007) further affirmed that if projects are to become sustainable, links with external bodies must be acknowledged and predicted on the principles that they avoid dependency, ensure local leadership is supported and that appropriate skills training is provided. Strategies which blend local initiatives with external support, whether government, commercial or NGO need to be sought. NGOs operating in slum areas should be sensitive to locals needs and development should be participative.
Julia (2000) observes that community initiated projects suggest an internal capacity for action, where the local community members have a clear understanding of, and agreement with the goals, objectives and implementation approach of projects. The projects inherently address the needs and values of project beneficiaries or implementers and thus can be assumed to be more locally sustainable. They also center more on issues of livelihood security.

Muruta, (2010) acknowledge that significant community development takes place only when local community people are committed to investing themselves and their resources in the effort; communities are never built from the top down, or from the outside in. Much as outside assistance might be required, it can only be put to good use if the community in question is already organized, self-invested and actively developing its’ own assets and capabilities.

2.2.3 Attitudes and attributes of involved community

Ted (2006) noted that once the culture of poverty has come into existence it tends to perpetuate itself. By the time slum children are six or seven they have usually absorbed the basic attitudes and values of their subculture. Therefore they are psychologically unready to take full advantage of changing conditions or improving opportunities that may develop in their life time. The mentality of dependence on community development projects has developed in the slums progressively, limiting the locals’ ability to come up with locally owned initiative to solve their local challenge and resulting to collapse of community development projects by NGOs.
Gregory (2006) observes that money alone doesn't empower people and there is need to 'upgrade' first the mentality of the people and involve them to shape their future. Slum dwellers have become used to donations and they believe they are poor and only donors and NGOs can get them out of poverty; their dependent attitudes is an impediment to community development projects. According to Gregory, People in Korogocho slum in Kenya, don’t use their energies and talents to work hard but prefer to survive begging on a day-to-day basis.

Rodgers (2000) quoted in Gregory, (2004) acknowledged that it is the deficient character of the poor along with their deviant behavior and the resultant self-reinforcing environment that restrict their access to economic viability and success. Rising rates of divorce, female headed single parent families, teen pregnancy, drug/alcohol misuse, and criminal activity are said to reflect these dysfunctional attitudes and values, relative to mainstream society, about family, education and work. These attitudes are passed onto subsequent generations leading to a vicious cycle of poverty from which few escape; same attitudes affects the success of projects in slum areas.

2.3 Influence of funding of Community Development Projects by NGOs on urban slum dependency.

One principle of programs and projects is that they need funding; they cannot accomplish anything without funds to support their activities. Funding greatly affect the success of the projects. The impacts of many community development projects are dictated by various aspects of funding for instant reliance on donor funding makes the community
lack ownership of the projects and seek for opportunities to gratify their short-term needs leading to slum dependency and also collapsing of the projects.

2.3.1 Donor based funding

USAID sustainable index for sub-Saharan Africa (2010) observed that 88% of revenue for registered NGOs in Kenya comes from foreign sources. Most registered NGOs are dependent on a single foreign donor for most of their funding, which tends to be project based. Only 0.4% of the funds raised are in the form of community contributions. USAID sustainability index (2011) observed that small NGOs and CBOs in Kenya, have well defined strategic plans that are developed strictly to align with donor interest and demands and therefore difficult to implement since the donor is fully responsible for funding the projects.

Tonny (2013) argues that outsiders may be instrumental in actually helping the community to set up projects or alternatively they may connect the community to more significant networks for enhanced marketing facilities and funding. NGOs often build local constituencies just to access funding and then rarely involve them in decision making. Donors’ contribution is vital to successful community development but the locals should be main participants especially in initiating, planning and funding the projects.
Samir and Innamul (2007) observed that many central governments or development institutions officials are still accustomed to responding mainly to internal organizational dynamics and not to demands from beneficiaries. Donors have often used various kinds of incentives to encourage communities to choose projects which conform more to external priorities than to the community’s priorities, thus limiting true community identification and ownership. Communities know better their local conditions and can therefore more appropriately decide upon what their priority problems are, resulting to successful community development.

Muruta (2010) observes that the little that Zimbabwe receives from donors does not always reflect the real needs and priorities of the communities more than it does those of the providers of the assistance and the intermediary service providers involved. This is as a result of overdependence on donors funds. The same phenomenon is common in community development projects that rely on donor funding and has no local funding.

Eric, Faisal (2007) observes that the quality of services and goods delivered by NGOs’ community development projects is non-verified by beneficiaries. The urban poor population provides little feedback on the range or quality of product delivered and beneficiaries have a weakened ability to use market forces to penalize and reward NGOs. NGOs face more direct incentives to manage donor satisfaction than beneficiary welfare since they are the funders. Donations are the only “market force” in the non-government sector industry, where donors can be viewed as desiring to improve the
quantity and quality of the product of the NGO without having their donation expropriated.

Phil (2007) observes that if an outside agency, be it central Government, an international NGO, a mission, comes to a community and constructs a human settlements facility (e.g. water supply), it is natural for the community members to see it as belonging to the outside agency. When that outside agency goes away or runs out of funds, the community members will have no motivation to repair and maintain the facility, or to sustain the service. Lack of locals’ contribution makes the locals not own the project and seek for opportunities to individually benefit from the same.

Phil (2007) further commented that unless the community as a whole has been involved in the decision making about the facility (planning and management) and has willingly contributed to the costs of its construction, the sense of responsibility or ownership will be missing. It will not be effectively used, maintained or sustained. It is impossible to build a human settlements facility or service and not expect that it has to be repaired and maintained.

Charity (2010) assessed the sustainability of projects started and implemented in Korogocho slum in Kenya and most of the projects were rated medium and others as failures. The unsustainable projects were caused by, poor management and corruption leading to misappropriation of funds, among other things, tribalism and nepotism, insecurity, vandalism, alienation of the community and low level of contribution by
community member. The community rarely participates in fund raising for the projects implemented in their areas.

2.3.2 Programmed funding

Most NGOs and donors, program their funds before they release them for community development projects in slum areas. The planning and processing takes a long period of time during which the most urgent needs of the people might change; however the funds cannot be diverted to meet the most current and pressing needs of the beneficiaries. The rigidity in implementation of the project might result to urban slum dependency since the beneficiaries will seek to benefit from the projects in a way to meet their current needs.

Mechai, Jonathan (2007) acknowledges that one challenge faced by NGOs is that many grants and donations carry restrictions on the types of expenses that they may cover. The most common restriction is to cover only direct program costs, but not the cost of support services or other overhead costs incurred by the NGO.

Valerie (2006) observed that one factor contributing to failure of aids in Haiti is donor driven projects; they offer programs targeted at a specific issues or problem and if the country wants aid then it must accept the program. Bilateral donors often require countries to purchase goods and services from donor using aid funding. Programs have been imposed on Haitians which make no difference in their lives. For instance The United States and other donors imposed elections in 1995 which was viewed by many as unfair and fraudulent.
2.4 Influence of approaches used in Community Development Projects by NGOs on urban slum dependency

There are several approaches used by NGOs in community development projects in the slum and the two main approaches used that lead to urban slum dependency includes direct assistance approach and use of Community Based Organizations.

2.4.1 Direct Assistance Approach

According to USAID NGOs sustainability index for sub-Saharan Africa (2010), NGOs in Kenya do not generally adopt business approach tending to offer their services for free. A few NGOs recover cost by charging but most NGOs serve very poor communities and consider it counterproductive to charge the poor. Slum areas are associated with poverty and this may not be necessarily the truth; direct assistance results to groups of idle and lazy people who are less inclined to work, save, invest and produce goods for sales or for domestic consumption.

Muruta (2010) say, over reliance on NGOs for service provision has devastating consequences. The residents begin to accept the NGOs as the only guide to the reality of their lives. They think of themselves and their neighbors as fundamentally deficient, victims incapable of taking charge of their lives and of their community's future. The resources invested by donors through NGOs and other intermediary service providers all of them outsiders are expected to 'trickle down' to the communities, which is not always the case.
It also negatively affects the quality of community leadership as in order to secure funding and other assistance for their communities, local leaders will be forced to denigrate their neighbors and their community by highlighting their problems and deficiencies, and by ignoring their capacities and strengths. Direct assistance may not always be genuine and in most cases they are used to pacify the locals to embrace the interest of the donors. USAID (2011) CSO sustainability index observed that services provided by NGOs in Kenya do not respond to community needs, reflect community priorities or use the best methodology; rather they reflect donor priority and interest.

Aram (2009) analyzed family planning and reproductive health project in Peru that was aimed at fighting poverty. The project was financed by USAID, World Bank and United Nation Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). Local women NGOs and the government were involved in implementation of the project. Peru women were offered free dental treatment, free haircuts and musical performances among others. All these were aimed at enticing the women to embrace contraceptives methods especially in the rural areas and poor urban areas.

Solova, David (2010) say one of the problems that NGOs face in their service delivery to the urban poor in South Africa is the lack of sustainability of such services because of the NGOs’ high dependence on external funding and their inability to recover costs through user charges. Mitlin and Satterthwaite (2004) quoted in Solova, David (2010) call for an integrated approach whereby NGOs combine community and state support
thus working with community groups to improve their conditions while nurturing their relationship with the local government.

Hulme and Edwards (1997) quoted in Solova, David (2010) also express their concern for NGOs’ focus on service delivery. They explain that the problem is not what is included, but rather what is excluded from this approach, especially the capacity of poor people to organize themselves. They therefore call on NGOs to ‘return to their roots’ to promote poverty reduction more effectively arguing that service delivery might sometimes lead to the empowerment of the NGO personnel and local leaders rather than the poor and marginalized.

According to Solova, David (2010) most of the studies that sought to analyze the impact of civil society organizations on poverty reduction in South Africa yielded ambiguous results; NGOs often succeed in extending services to the poor and in improving their livelihoods; however, the long-term socio-economic impacts of these projects are still questionable. It is also important to note that civil society is by no means a necessity for poverty reduction.

Some countries, such as China, Malaysia and Vietnam, witnessed high levels of poverty reduction despite the various state-imposed limitations on their civil society organizations. The authoritarian state in each of these countries succeeded in promoting pro-poor economic growth and improving social indicators, while limiting the space in
which civil society organizations operate. In this context, the role of civil society organizations in poverty reduction is rather minimal.

Poverty is multi-dimensional and any NGO strategy to tackle it also needs to be multi-faceted. Solova, David (2010) observed that NGOs need to move away from a needs-based approach to an integrative approach that respects the rights of the poor and helps them improve their living conditions in a sustainable way. Service delivery programs managed by NGOs should not replace government services, but rather complement and strengthen them without creating dependency on such programs.

Phil (2007) says that dependency in the community must be reduced. A donor agency should try to avoid giving the community anything for nothing; that encourages dependency. Always community members should be encouraged by stating that they can carry out the project themselves and the NGO are to offer them some skills and tips, but the work must be done by them. Applying this to financing a community project, NGO must never offer to obtain project inputs for the community.

Direct assistance is most appropriate for victims of tragedy that needs agent help or people in unorganized communities like refugees but it may have negative impact on urban poor who live in an organized community. Solutions to their problems of the urban poor are not in free services and handouts from NGOs but it lies in their potential to organize themselves to make effective decisions, and to negotiate and collaborate with the government and other partner.
2.4.2 Rampant formation and use of CBOs

Community based organizations are groups formed within a local community. These can include neighborhood committees, youth groups, women groups, religious groups, village elders among others. They are often formed for specific reasons, to find solutions to a problem that they face as a group; in slum areas they are formed to address poor service provision by the government.

Abegunde (2009) identifies different names used in different places to refer to community based organizations. These include ‘community development associations’, ‘neighborhood councils’ and ‘united community’ among others. However, CBOs are used by the urban poor as a strategy to receive aid from NGOs for the benefits of the members only and not entire community; the number of CBOs existing in an area compared to development in the area can be an indication of dependency. Joop, Berner (2007) noted that CBOs are used as labels by a clique of a few shrewd entrepreneurs to obtain benefits which are not widely shared, be it in terms of money or information.

Benjamin (2000) quoted in Joop, Berner (2007) noted that the urban poor especially the very poor are indeed still dependent predominantly on patronage hence formation of CBOs which benefit the political class and the elites in the area of the CBO’s operation. Rampant formation of CBOs is a sign of a dependant community since they are used by the elites in the slum to obtain benefits from Community Development Projects by NGOs. CBOs aim of benefiting the members is indeed an indication that their formation results to urban slum dependency.
Bangalore Urban Poverty Alleviation Programme (BUPP) was a community
development project in India (1993-1999) with an aim of empowering slum inhabitants
and creating an enabling institutional framework to facilitate participation and
cooperation between government agencies, NGOs and community organizations.
Community members elected to be leaders of the projects turned out to be an impediment
to the success of the project; they were striving to serve their personal interest and not
objectives of the program. (Joop, Berner 2007).

America and examining the effectiveness of their activities, their capacity to act as
channels for empowering the poor was questioned since most of the studied groups are
rather elitist with limited membership. He questions the credibility and authenticity of
these groups and emphasizes the limitations of this kind of civil society to promote any
sustainable change in the lives of the poor.

Sabatini noted that many such NGOs fail to promote poverty reduction as they are
opportunistic formed merely to seek out external funding and design their agendas only
to accommodate donors’ needs rather than addressing the needs of the poor. Many such
NGOs are not internally democratic and fail to promote participatory decision-making
processes even within their organizations. Similarly most CBOs are formed with
intentions to benefit from INGOs and not to address challenges facing the slum dwellers.
Solava, David (2010) observes that some NGOs deliberately create community groups, such as microfinance and women’s groups, to help the poor organize themselves and express their needs. The question however is whether the role of such ‘imposed’ community groups in poverty reduction is sustainable or not. Such are the CBOs created to justify projects imposed by the NGOs to the community which are irrelevant to the people’s needs.

Caroline, Janet (2002) have different opinion concerning involvement of CBOs in poverty alleviation programmes. According to them CBOs are an active force in civil society in Peru, demonstrating great organizational capacity; they have always been an obvious route for NGOs to become involved in the communities. NGOs work towards poverty alleviation either by strengthening the capacities of these community groups or by implementing projects with the participation and involvement of the community.

Caroline, Janet (2002) further noted that some NGOs in Peru actively contact CBOs in a community and discuss working with them, while others wait for the CBO leaders to come to them with an idea, or a request for assistance. Whatever the mechanism, according to the relationship between NGOs and CBOs is extremely important. It can be suggested that the performance of an NGO sometimes mirrors that of the CBOs; when CBOs are weakened then the NGOs lose their partners/contact with the community and as such their programme performance suffers as a result. In Peru Approximately 71% of NGOs work with CBOs.
2.5 Influence of monitoring and evaluation of Community Development Projects on urban slum dependency

Alan (1996) states that NGOs are finding it very difficult to come up with sound, cost-effective methods to show the results of their development activities, or even to demonstrate their effectiveness as organizations. These difficulties arise both from key features of the aid system, and from the nature of 'non-profits'. The challenge of monitoring and evaluation greatly affect community development projects resulting to the projects failing to meet the intended objectives and instead leaving a community that is reliant of aid.

2.5.1 Absence of baseline information and adequate monitoring systems

Community development projects are expected to have long term benefits to the slum community making it a challenge to evaluate the results. Alan (1996) acknowledged that the time scales over which results of NGO projects can be seen or measured tend to increase when moving from outputs to outcomes and then to impacts. For example, changes in infant mortality rates cannot be detected from the survival of one infant; the necessary measure is an aggregate over time.

Many NGOs depart from the concerned community even before the impacts of the projects are felt; accountability to the donor is emphasized and after reporting to the donors there is less concern about the impacts of the project and unexpected outcomes such as dependency. Evaluation especially summative evaluation is hardly done. Riddell
(1997) quoted in Rick (2001) noted that absence of adequate baseline information, is an almost universal complaint found in both NGO and donor meta-evaluations.

Goyder (1997) quoted in Rick (2001) noted another challenge in evaluation of NGOs’ projects includes base-line survey data being lost or forgotten, and unavailable to evaluation teams. Organizations monitor expenditure, activities and outputs, but not effects and impacts of the project to the concern community. Activities are measured against activity plans, expenditure against budget. These are immediate tasks where delays are visible and have consequences for those responsible.

Rick (2001) observes that staffs have to cope with the short term before they can worry about the long term. On the other hand there are external demands for information about performance, arising primarily from donors and governments. Financial reporting is required most often, and then implementation relative to plans, then much less frequently, achievement in terms of changes in peoples’ lives.

2.5.2 Methodologies and indicators used
Rick (2001) acknowledged that it is widely recognized that the achievements of many development objectives, such as empowerment, institutional strengthening and the development of civil society, are difficult to define in advance. Evidence of their achievement is not easy to agree on, and there is no one single path to their realization. Achievements of projects depend on the context and indicators of such changes are difficult to formulate; many important development events are not measurable, but they
are verifiable. Such challenges make NGOs shy off from engaging in evaluation of CDPs in the slums.

Christina (2010) identified some methodologies used by NGOs for evaluation, she identified the following: Performance indicators, the logical framework, theory-based evaluation, formal survey, rapid appraisal methods, participatory methods, public expenditure tracking surveys, cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis, impact evaluation among others. Some methods used by NGOs like self-assessment; which involve staff assessing the programs or projects then submit reports to senior management lacks impartiality and is less credible compared to use of external evaluators.

Christina (2010) observed that evaluations of NGOs’ projects lack reliable details or analysis making their findings lack credibility or become useful. Several quality assurance initiatives developed in an attempt to address this are primarily intended for donor bodies, rather than NGOs themselves. Neely (2002) quoted in John, Rick (2003) noted that numbers are emphasized in evaluating international organizations; this reassures donors that their money has been well-spent and has made a measurable difference.

In this case quantitative indicators are required; however, human change is such a complex process, such demands easily and often leads to overly complicated, heavy, expensive and unworkable systems. There is a tendency to establish too many
performance indicators or try to measure too much. This places unnecessary pressure on
the existing infrastructure and increases the difficulty of focusing on relevant
measurement. Performance indicators to be used are a challenge to many projects by
NGOs.

John, Rick (2003) states that mechanistic measures do not give a realistic answer neither
to complex questions of attribution nor as to whether any particular intervention has any
tangible impact. An over-reliance on quantitative data may mean that the real essence of
change is not recorded or understood. According to USAID (2000), measurable
indicators warn of the dangers of “false precision” associated with such measures. They
note that by their nature measures of institutional capacity are subjective. They rely
heavily on individual perception, judgment and interpretation. As a consequence they are
relative and not absolute measures, and as a result can be misleading.

Taylor (2003) quoted in John, Rick (2003) commented that to capture the changes that
are of most importance to developmental practitioners, things of quality cannot be
reduced to quantities and little boxes. This leads to considering only that part of what is
important that is easily measured. Impact assessment especially in capacity building
programs and projects may not be effectively done by NGOs.

Jaap (2006) acknowledges that in implementation stage some information is collected,
though often concentrating on production, while the initially formulated indicators are no
longer used at all. The information collected doesn’t play a role in decision making. In
the end in an evaluation of projects and programs, it is often concluded that effects cannot be measured. There is limited capacity of the programmes implementers, and also lack of methodological clarity on effect monitoring.

He further observed that existing monitoring and evaluation practices often exclude the community. Community ownership is key and should be supported by using community language, taking time to build trust, promoting community to community learning exchanges, building on community practices. According to Jaap (2006) using SMART indicators that cuts across a large number of projects in multiple countries is not feasible.

Janice (2009) acknowledged that interrelated projects make a programme; it is easy to develop a monitoring and evaluation system at project level but more often there is a question of thinking about how the measurement of indicators at individual project level can be aggregated up to show some measure of progress at programme level. In certain types of programme, where contributing projects are very similar (health, education, water supply), it may be easier to aggregate results at project level in order to provide programme level measures of progress. However, for impact level assessment – at programme level – one is usually looking for more qualitative measures of change.
**2.5.3 Ambitious expectations**

Donors and NGOs are greatly moved by the needs of the less fortunate in the society such as the urban poor and they are eager to offer solutions to the challenges the poor face. This makes them have very ambitious expectations of what they intend to achieve with their programs and projects. Riddell (1997) quoted in Rick (2001) noted that almost all the Terms of Reference for evaluations set the scene for anticipating exceedingly high expectations of what can be achieved, particularly what can be said about development impact. The logical framework for the projects (for those that have it) contain ambitious set of objectives probably used to attract funding for the project.

According to INTRAC (2000) analysis of urban NGOs, a worrying finding is that one quarter of the NGOs surveyed admitted that they are not meeting half of their stated objectives. Urban NGOs have been overambitious in their expectations, given the amateurism still present within the sector. This phenomenon is reflected in many community development projects in slum areas where the expectations of the NGOs are too high and they try to give too much to the community even above the community absorption capacity resulting to a dependent community which cannot stand on its own.

Edwards, Hulme (1996) quoted in William (1997) observed that NGOs have become the favored child of official development agencies, hailed as the new panacea to cure the ills that have befallen the development process and imagined as a magic bullet which will mysteriously but effectively find its target. Many NGOs have embraced this position given to them by the society leading to them having unrealistic expectations and
objectives. Their targets are so high to attain and in their quest to fulfill this objectives they end up creating a dependent community.

2.6 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework below shows influence of community development projects by NGOs on urban slum dependency. Community development projects form the independent variables whereas urban slum dependency is the dependent variable. The various factors exhibited by the conceptual framework include beneficiaries’ involvement, funding, approaches used and influence of monitoring and evaluation of community development on urban slum dependency.
Figure 1: Conceptual Framework
2.7 Summary of chapter two

Literature on beneficiaries’ involvement shows that active involvement of beneficiaries in all stages of the project from initiation to evaluation is crucial to the success of community development projects. Lack of beneficiaries’ involvement leads to lack of ownership and sustainability and it encourages urban slum dependency. Communities fail to identify with projects initiated by donors or projects which they were not involved in identification of. Projects initiated by locals are likely to meet their needs and it averts urban slum dependency and they are more sustainable compared to projects initiated by donors.

In regard to funding, literature reviewed shows that most NGOs rely on funds from foreign sources while negligible contributions in terms of funds originate from local communities. Donor-funded without local funding do not reflect the needs of the locals resulting to overdependence on donors funds. Grants and donations carry restrictions on the types of expenses that they cover.

Concerning approaches used in community development projects literature reviewed shows that reliance on NGOs for service provision may have negative impacts on the local community hence organizations should avoid use of direct assistance approach that encourages urban slum dependency. Direct assistance is sometimes used to pacify locals to accept donors’ interest. Some scholars view CBOs as a strategy used by elites to individually benefit from NGOs while other scholars view CBOs as an important contact between NGOs and the local communities.
Literature reviewed show that Monitoring and Evaluation is still a challenge for many NGOs. Absence of baseline information is one of the great challenges affecting NGOs in evaluation and monitoring of their projects. Achievements of many development objectives set by NGOs are difficult to define posing another challenge that make NGOs shy off from monitoring and evaluation of CDPs in the slums. Some methodologies used by NGOs lack impartiality making the findings lack credibility. Monitoring and evaluation practices by many NGOs exclude the community and most projects have ambitious expectations that cannot be achieved.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology that was used to carry out the study. This includes the research design, target population and sample selection. Data collection instruments that were used and an explanation of how the instruments were checked for both reliability and validity are given. Data collection procedures, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations are also discussed.

3.2 Research Design

According to Kothari (2007), research design is the conceptual structure within which research is conducted. Descriptive survey research design was used in this study since the researcher collected data from respondents from the field. The data was vital in bringing out significant issues on the community development projects in Korogocho slum. Descriptive survey was important for this study as information deduced from the collected data was able to describe the existing phenomenon. The major purpose of a descriptive research is description of the state of affairs whereas surveys are concerned with describing, recording, analyzing and interpreting conditions as they exist or existed (Kothari, 2007).

3.3 Target population

The target population for this study was 120,000 community members of 8 villages in Korogocho slum (report by Africa Population and Health Research Center 2009) who are
the beneficiaries of several community development projects initiated by different NGOs in the slum. Despite high number of NGOs operating in Korogocho in the last twenty years, socio-economic challenges are rampant in the slum. Life in Korogocho slum is characterised by high rate of alcohol and drugs abuse, endless insecurity, crime, illiteracy, and teenage pregnancies among others. These has made slum dwellers embrace a mentality of hopelessness which has resulted to dependence on projects by NGOs.

Donations are very common in Korogocho with one NGO distributing cooked food regularly, another offering school materials, others clothing and medications among others. The impact of these projects is a dependency culture and some of the beneficiaries are reluctant to do anything for themselves and become dependent on assistance. Organizations which equip their beneficiaries with life skills and trainings to meet part of the support they require are unpopular in the slum. The locals are interested with projects that gratify their urgent but short term needs. The culture of instant gratification has developed among residents in Korogocho leading to collapse of community development projects; making the slum an appropriate target for this study.

3.4 Sampling Procedure and sample size

The process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals selected represent the large group from which they were selected from is referred to as sampling. Scientific selection of sample was used in this study so as to generalize the outcomes. Kothari (2007) observes that the size of the sample should be neither too large nor too small; an optimal sample is one which fulfils the requirements of
efficiency, representativeness, reliability and flexibility. An optimal sample was selected for this study.

Africa Population and Health Research Center (APHRC) (2009) report shows that 62% of the total population in Korogocho (120,000) comprise of adults between 15 and 64. A sample size of 382 respondent from the population was selected through the help of Krejcie & Morgan table 1970 at 5% margin of error (degree of confidence) using 95% confidence level (see appendix 4). Sampling may be geographical in nature (Kothari, 2007). Community development projects are implemented within villages in the slum. The researcher clustered the population according to their villages and then used simple random sampling and purposive sampling to identify respondents.

A sample of 47 was drawn from each village to ensure representativeness. 44 respondents were randomly selected from each village while purposive sampling was done to get 3 key informants from each village. Key informants included members of village committees (such as slum upgrading committee, youth committees, women group leaders, village elders and CBO leaders among others), social workers of NGOs operating in the areas and local administration (chief, sub chiefs). Purposive sampling is a sampling technique that allows the researcher to use cases that have the required information with respect to the objectives of his or her study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).
3.5 Research Instruments

This study utilized two instruments for data collection. Structured self-administered questionnaire with closed questions were used to collect data from community members from different villages. The questionnaire had several sections. The first section sought to collect data on personal background of the respondents. Section two analyzed the community involvement in community development projects and how it leads to urban slum dependency, how funding of community development projects influence dependency was covered in section three, approaches used in community development projects were discussed in section four, while section five covered monitoring and evaluation of community development projects and how it impact on urban slum dependency.

Data from village committee members, social workers and local administration was obtained by use of an interview guide. The interview guide enabled the researcher to get in-depth information on implementation of community development projects in Korogocho slum. The interview guide was not divided into different sections; the questions followed a systematic order from: beneficiaries’ involvement, funding, approaches and influence of monitoring and evaluation.

3.5.1 Validity of the Instruments

Validity determines whether the research truly measures that which it was intended to measure or how truthful the research results are (Nahid 2003). Validity indicates the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Kothari, 2007).
The study applied content validity as a measure of the degree to which data was obtained from the research instruments. Validity was ensured by having the instruments reviewed by the university supervisor whose recommendations were used to review the instruments. The researcher also gave the research instruments to 5 randomly selected managers from established NGOs operating in the slum who reviewed the instruments and gave a feedback regarding the content of the instruments. Recommendations from these managers and the supervisor were included in reviewing the research instruments.

3.5.2 Reliability of the Instruments

Nahid (2003) defines reliability as the extent to which results are consistent over time and an accurate representation of the total population under study, if the results of a study can be reproduced under a similar methodology then the research instrument is considered to be reliable. According to Kothari (2007) a measuring instrument is reliable if it provides consistent results. Michael (2010) defines reliability as the extent to which a questionnaire, test, observation or any measurement procedure produces the same results on repeated trials; it is the stability or consistency of scores over time or across raters.

Split-half method was used to test reliability of tools where the sample was split into two and tests were administered to the two halves using same tool. Both questionnaires and interviews were tested. Scores from both tests were interrelated and a coefficient computed using the Spearman’s Rank Correlation method. The instruments were concluded to be reliable since a coefficient of 0.8 was obtained a good indicator that the
tools were reliable. Kothari(2007) states that the value of rank correlation nearer to +1 or -1 indicates high degree of correlation between the two variables.

The formula for the Spearman’s Rank correlation that was used is as below:-

\[
Rho = 1- \left\{ \frac{6\sum d^2}{n(n^2-1)} \right\}
\]

Where Rho is the coefficient

- \(d\) is the difference between two numbers in each pair of ranks
- \(n\) is the number of data pairs

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher reported her intentions to carry out a research in Korogocho slum to the office of Kasarani District Education officer and Korogocho slum chief. The information was passed to the sub chiefs and village elders before collection of data from community members. All questionnaires came with an introduction letter that enlightened the respondent on the nature of the research. The same letter was sent to the key informants a week before the interview. Questionnaires were filled and ready for collection a week after issue. Mugenda & Mugenda 2003 stated that a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reports, 60% is good and 70% is very good; follow up letters together with a questionnaire were to be send where response rate would have been less than 50%. The response rate in all villages was 83.8% hence no follow up was done.
3.7 Data Analysis Techniques

All questionnaires were checked for data quality before data was analyzed. This involved editing of data. Editing ensured that the raw data collected was free from errors and omissions and the detected errors were corrected. Coding was done by assigning numerals to responses for the sake of classification. Classification involved arranging data in groups or classes on the basis of similarities. Tabulation of the data was made using the frequency distribution tables and analysis done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences computer program.

Computers not only save time but also make it possible to study a large number of variables affecting a problem simultaneously (Kothari, 2007). Descriptive statistics was produced in respective items; frequencies and percentages were used in depicting the general trend of the study findings. The findings were presented in frequency distribution tables; with each table followed by a brief explanation, inferences and brief interpretations of the findings.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The respondents’ names and particulars were not disclosed, completed tools were assigned codes so that they could be linked to respective respondents. Participation by respondents was also voluntary and no one was coerced to participate; consent from participants was sought prior to their participation. The researcher organized meetings with the participants where research findings were shared. Research findings were not
shared with people who may use the information for their personal gain; this information was communicated to participants prior to start of the research.
### 3.9 Operationalization of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Level of scale</th>
<th>Tool of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To establish how beneficiaries’ involvement in Community Development Projects leads to urban slum dependency.</td>
<td>Beneficiaries’ Involvement in CDPs</td>
<td>Urban slum dependency</td>
<td>-Negligible beneficiaries’ involveme nt - Beneficiaries initiated projects -Attributes and attitudes of community involved</td>
<td>-Extent to which locals are involved in CDPs -Number of projects initiated by beneficiaries -Attributes of locals towards themselves and CDPs</td>
<td>Nominal - Ordinal - Nominal - Ordinal - mode - mode - percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess how funding of Community Development Projects by NGOs leads to urban slum dependency</td>
<td>Funding of CDPs</td>
<td>Urban slum dependency</td>
<td>-Donor based funding - programmed funding</td>
<td>-Number of projects that are proposed by donors -projects that are purely implemented through donor funding</td>
<td>Nominal - Ordinal - mean - mode - median - percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish Approach Urban slum</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Number of</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
how approaches used in Community Development Projects results to urban slum dependency

NGOs offering free goods and services
-Number of people relying on CDPs for their survival.
-Number of CBOs in charge of CDPs

Monitorin Urban slum -Baseline informatio -number of projects with -Nominal g and nder dependency n and monitoring systems base line information -NGOs with monitoring systems in place -Nominal

Table 3.1 Operationalization of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How approaches used in Community Development Projects results to urban slum dependency</th>
<th>Dependency assistance Use of CBOs</th>
<th>NGOs offering free goods and services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To assess influence of monitoring and evaluation of Community Development Projects on urban slum dependency</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation of CDPs</td>
<td>Urban slum dependency -Baseline information and monitoring systems -Vague objectives -Ambitious expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Number of projects with base line information -NGOs with monitoring systems in place -Number of projects with achievable objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Operationalization of Variables
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the study findings and interpretations. The data was analyzed using descriptive statistics in SPSS. Frequencies and percentages are used to describe the data collected in the field.

4.2 Presentation and Interpretation of Findings

This section presents the findings of the research in tables according to the responses collected from the questionnaires and key informant interviews.

4.2.1 Response rate

Questionnaires were issued in eight (8) villages in Korogocho slum, 44 questionnaires were given for every village; a total of 352 questionnaires were issued but only 295 were returned giving 83.8% response rate.
Table 4.2 Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Questionnaires issued</th>
<th>Returned questionnaires</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highridge</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregon A</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gregon B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korogocho A</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korogocho B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitathuru</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisumu Ndogo</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyayo</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>352</strong></td>
<td><strong>295</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 295 the response was very good since most of the questions directed were well answered and achieved the intended objective. The table above shows the questionnaires return rate per village which was above 50% per village.

4.2.2 Demographics

The respondents’ characteristics which include gender and age are discussed in the following sections.

4.2.2.1 Gender of respondents

Both male and female respondents participated in the research with the female respondents being 55.6% while male respondents were 44.4% as shown in table 4.3
Both male and females are beneficiaries of CDPs in their villages with females being one of the vulnerable groups targeted by NGOs projects while men are mostly the members of CBOs which are widely used by NGOs to reach to the locals.

### 4.2.2.2 Age of respondents

The findings indicate that out of the total number of respondents interviewed, the majority fell in the group of 20 to 30 years with those between 41-50 years being the least.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The age range shows that majority of the slum residents are youths as shown in table 4.4.

### Table 4.4 Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>72.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.3 Beneficiaries Involvement in CDPs

The findings reveal that Korogocho community members who are supposed to be beneficiaries of CDPs are aware of CDPs and they participate in the same but the extent of participation is minimal.

**4.2.3.1 Negligible beneficiaries’ involvement**

Majority of community members, 86.8% are aware of CDPs in their area while 13.2% are not aware of CDPs in their areas.
Table 4.5 Beneficiaries awareness of CDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding in the table 4.5 is a sign that CDPs are popular in the slum and majority of the beneficiaries are awareness of CDPs in their area.

In regard to beneficiaries/ community members who have ever participated in CDPs in their area 58.3% have ever participated while 41.7% have not participated in CDPs in their areas as shown in the table that follows. (Yes refers to those who have ever participated in CDPs while no refers to those who have never taken part in CDPs)

Table 4.6 Community Involvement in CDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that NGOs involve the locals in community development projects in their area to some extent.
Community members who take part in the CDPs majority of their participation ranges between 0-10 % which is (27.1%), 10-25% (24.1%) and 25-50% which is 14.4%. A very small percentage of the respondents have a 50-100% level of participation in Community development projects as shown in the table that follows.

**Table 4.7 Extent of community involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-25%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-95%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-100%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The community members are thus involved at a negligible extent since majority’s participation ranges from 0-10% in all stages of the projects. This results to lack of local ownership and sustainability of the projects resulting to locals depending on donors for assistance.
4.2.3.2 Beneficiaries initiated projects

According to the findings majority of projects are initiated by locals but they barely succeed due to constrain in resources while projects initiated by donors prevail due to availability of resources.

A majority of 61.7% have participated in initiating CDPs while a small percentage of 38.3% have never taken part in starting CDPs.

Table 4.8 Beneficiaries initiated CDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding in the table above is a clear indication that Korogocho community members realize the value of community projects that is why they take the initiative of starting community development projects.

In regard to the number of CDPs that they have initiated, 35.6% have not participated in initiation of CDPs, 36.9% have started 1 to 5 projects and 19% range between 6 to 10 projects, 4.4% have taken part in starting 11 to 15 CDPs and only 3% have participated in starting more than 16 projects as shown in the table that follows.
Table 4.9 Number of beneficiaries initiated projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of projects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 shows that most of the projects initiated by locals are not successful hence they rely more on projects initiated by donors which are more successful due to availability of resources.

**4.2.3.3 Attitudes and attributes of involved community**

Majority of the community members 68.8% believe in themselves and believe they have the ability to bring development in Korogocho while only 31.2% felt otherwise. Those who felt they could not bring development in their area believe that development could be brought about by Government, NGOs/donors and projects. This is shown in the table that follows
Table 4.10 Attitudes of the locals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding in table 4.10 is an indication that there is a group of community members who have poverty mentality and they believe only donations can bring them out of poverty; the attitudes of the locals has a contribution towards the success of CDPs.

4.2.4 Funding of CDPs

There are several financiers of CDPs in the slum which include NGOs, locals and the government but majority of the projects are donor funded. Majority of the respondents 62.3% were of the view that NGO’s/donors are the main financiers of community development projects as shown in the table that follows then community members and the government.
Table 4.11 Financiers of CDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financiers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor/NGOs</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donor funded projects that lack local funding follow the donors’ guidelines and may not meet the needs of the locals who have no voice in decision making. This results to lack of ownership and sustainability and it also increases urban slum dependency on CDPs.

When asked their view about the statement” Projects are fully funded by donors in Korogocho”, 60% strongly agreed, 14.6% agreed, 16.3% were not sure, 5.1% disagreed while 4.1% strongly disagreed as shown in the table that follows.
Table 4.12 Donor funded projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid strongly disagree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding in the above table is an indication that projects in the slum are donor-funded. According to the key informants donor funded projects come to a halt when the donor ‘pulls out’ since the locals do not own the projects and they lack the will and resources to continue with the project.

4.2.5 Approaches used in Community Development Projects

According to the findings direct assistance approach and use of community based organizations are widely used in community development projects by NGOs in the slum. The use of direct assistance approach has increased dependency while use of CBOs is embraced by majority of the community members.

4.2.5.1 Direct assistance approach

When asked if they have ever received any goods or services from CDPs in their villages, most of the respondents 68% have received goods and services from CDPs while only
32% have not as shown in the table that follow, (yes refers to those who have received goods/services while No refers to those who haven’t received goods/services from CDPs)

Table 4.13 Direct assistance approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding in the above table is an indication that most NGOs employ direct assistance approach where they offer goods and services to the community for free.

Table 4.14 shows that most goods and services received from CDPs are majorly: health services 19.5%, food stuffs 19.4%, money 19.1%, school fee 14.9%, clothing 13.6% and education materials 13.5%.
According to the finding in the above table the goods and services offered are mainly basic for the slum people making them dependent on CDPs; if the goods and services are offered for free on a regular basis making some of them not work for a living but rely on CDPs to meet their needs.
As per the table 4.15 nearly a large part of the respondents rely on CDPs to meet some of their needs. Among the respondents 48.8% rely on CDPs to meet up to 25% of their needs, 31.2% rely on CDPs to meet 25-50% of their needs, 13.6% rely on CDPs to meet 50-75% of their needs while 4.7% rely on CDPs to meet 75-100% of their needs.

Table 4.15 Reliance on CDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-100%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above table urban slum dependency is one of the unexpected outcomes of CDPs in Korogocho slum since most community members rely on CDPs to some extent to meet their needs.

A large percentage 61.3% of the respondents are of view that CDPs leads to development of their village while 38.7% are of the view that CDPs do not result to developments of their area as shown in table 4.16
Table 4.16 Benefits of CDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding in table 4.16 shows that the community members embrace community development projects as one way of developing the slum. It is an indication that CDPs can result development of Korogocho slum.

4.2.5.2 Use of community based organizations (CBOs)

When asked of their opinion about the statement that “CBOs benefit few members and are not aimed at development of the entire community” out of the total respondents interviewed it occurred that 27.1% were not sure if CDPs benefited the community, 22.7% disagreed while 17.6% strongly disagreed upon this whereas 15.9% and 15.3% of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed that CDPs benefited few people and are not development oriented.
Table 4.17 Benefits of CBOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that majority believe that CBOs are beneficial to the slum community and they view them positively as one of the contact point between the community and NGOs operating in the slum.

4.2.6 Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation

According to the findings majority of organizations monitor and evaluate CDPs although there is need for improvement in terms of setting realistic goals and objectives.

4.2.6.1 Baseline information and monitoring systems

On the issue of seeking baseline information before project implementation by NGOs a massive 61.2% were of the view that the organizations do seek the baseline information while 38.8% said the organizations do not seek for the same as shown in the table 4.17.
Table 4.18 Baseline information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to many locals NGOs operating in the slum seek for baseline information which is vital for monitoring and evaluation of the impacts of the projects. However, some organizations do not seek baseline information which is one of the challenge of monitoring and evaluation of CDPs in the slum.

Table 4.19 shows that 56.4% of the respondents agreed that NGOs operating in their area comeback to seek opinion about the impact of their work whilst 43.6% had the notion that NGOs don’t seek local’s opinion about their work.
Table 4.19 Monitoring of CDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finding in above table shows that majority of organization monitor their work, while a good number of organizations do not bother to monitor their work.

4.2.6.2 Objectives set and ambitious expectations

Half of the populations interviewed 50.5% were of the opinion that NGOs do not meet their set goals within the community, 15.9% were not sure if NGOs meet their goals, 15.3% agreed they do not meet as shown in the table 4.20.
Table 4.20 Meeting of goals and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the table 4.20 majority of CDPs do not meet the set objectives leaving the locals in the same situation they were before the project was implemented.

Table 4.21 Evaluation of CDPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked of their opinion concerning evaluation of CDPs by organizations, 29.9% of the respondents strongly disagree that NGO’s do not do a follow-up of their work, 9.5% were positive that they do follow-ups whereas 28.2% were not sure. Those who strongly
agreed that NGO’s do not find out the results of their work were 20.7% and another 11.6% agreed that NGOs do not evaluate CDPs in the slum as shown in table 4.21.

4.2.7 Key Informants Responses

Half of the key informant felt that there is local involvement in CDPs in Korogocho slum while the other half were of a different opinion. According to them beneficiaries are not involved and they are only used by organizations to meet the organizations needs and not the community needs. All key informants agreed that projects where locals are fully involved in all stages are more successful compared to those where locals are not involved; beneficiaries involvement makes the projects sustainable and there is locals ownership. They are motivated to protect such projects from vandalism and misuse of resources.

According to 90% of the key informants, projects in Korogocho are donor initiated and such projects are quickly established due to availability of funds although they lack sustainability; projects that are initiated by locals are minimal and they barely succeed due to limited resources. Korogocho slum dwellers do not embrace CDPs since they feel that organizations use the community for their financial benefits. They believe that they are poor and only donors can help them out of poverty. According to locals projects have a lot of resources which should benefit them at a personal level.
Projects are donor funded increasing dependency on donors and NGOs. Most projects lacks sustainability due to lack of local funding. Locals also don’t own the projects and they believe those projects belong to the relevant organization. Most organizations offer goods and services to the locals without cost increasing dependency on CDPs and laziness among locals.

Organizations seek for baseline information before initiation of projects and most of them monitor and evaluate their work through seminars, workshops and meetings with opinion leaders in the slum. Some leaders felt that some organizations do not bother to follow up their work and evaluate the impacts; they leave the projects immediately after their completion. However, most key informants were of the opinion that the objectives set by organizations are not achievable.

4.3 Chapter Summary
The chapter presents and interprets the findings of the study as per the objectives of the study. The results from the study indicate that a large population of Korogocho slum dwellers is aware of CDPs and most of them have participated in the same. Although a large percentage of projects are initiated by the locals their participation is minimal. Most of the locals believe they are capable of bringing development in the slum while minority believes in donors and projects to bring development of their area. NGOs and donors are main financiers of CDPs and direct assistance approach is used where goods and services are offered to the community without cost; goods and services offered are mainly basic.
A large percentage of 48.8 of the locals rely on CDPs to meet their needs and a large percentage of 61.3 believe CDPs results to development of their villages. Many locals felt that CBOs are beneficial to the entire community and not to few members. Many organizations operating in the slum collect baseline information before implementing a project; they monitor and evaluate their work. Half of the population is of the opinion that goals and objectives set by many projects are barely met by the end of the community development projects.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter gives a summary of the study. The discussions are thematically presented based on the objectives under study. The researcher had four main objective which include assessing the influence of beneficiary involvement, funding, approaches used, and monitoring and evaluation of community development projects on urban slum dependency. After analysis of the findings, the researcher came up with the following summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.

5.2 Summary of findings
The study had set to assess influence of Community Development Projects by non-governmental organizations on urban slum dependency: a case of Korogocho slum Nairobi County Kenya. The variables selected for the study included beneficiaries involvement, funding, approaches used, monitoring and evaluation that formed the independent variables while urban slum dependency formed the dependent variables. The research findings pegged on the responses that were based on research questions generated from the variables above.
5.2.1 Beneficiaries’ involvement

The findings on beneficiaries’ involvement in community development projects revealed that the community is aware of CDPs, 86.8% are aware of CDPs while minority 13.2% are not aware of the same. Half of the population 58.3% have ever participated in CDPs although their participation is minimal to an extent of only 0-10% in all stages of the projects. Most of the locals 61.7% have attempted to initiate CDPs and majority of the population 68.8% believe they have the ability to bring development in the area without relying on donors and NGOs, while 31.2% believe donors are the only way out of poverty.

5.2.2 Funding

Looking at funding of community development projects, majority of the projects 62.3% are donor funded leading to lack of local ownership and lack of sustainability. Donor funding makes the projects to be implemented faster than those projects relying on local funding due to availability of resources. Majority of locals 60% strongly agree that projects in the slum are donor funded increasing urban slum dependency on donors and NGOs.

5.2.3 Approaches

The findings on approaches used in CDPs indicate that direct assistance approach and use of CBOs are widely employed. Majority of the population 68% have received goods and services from a CDPs ranging from heath, money, food, clothing and educational materials while only 32% have not received any goods or services from CDPs. A large
percentage of the population 48.8% relies on CDPs to meet 25% of their needs. However, majority of the population 61.3% is of the view that CBOs benefit the entire community and not some few individuals while 38.7% are of the view that CBOs benefit few individuals in the community.

5.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

In regard to monitoring and evaluation of community development projects, the findings shows that majority of the locals 60% are of the view that organizations seek baseline information before implementation of projects while 38% are of a contrary opinion. Above half of the population 55.6% agree that organizations monitor and evaluate the projects. According to 50.5% of the population, objectives set by many organizations for CDPs are not achievable at the end of the project while minority 8.8% were of the opinion that organizations meet their set goals.

5.3 Discussion of findings

The researcher noted that the beneficiaries of community development projects in Korogocho slums are minimally involved in their own developments leading to failure of many projects. This finding agrees with Diklitch (1998) observation that NGOs lack the capacity to involve the poor, accusing them of frequently operating on undemocratic lines, having only a limited impact and encouraging dependency. Aram (2009) analyzed a development project in Lesotho, ‘Integrated Rural Development’ where the locals were isolated and the results were the failure of the project.
Minimal local involvement result to lack of local ownership of projects in Korogocho slum and the beneficiaries view the projects as belonging to the NGOs and donors. The finding concur with Samir, Innamul (2007) observation that communities seldom identify themselves with programs that are designed and provided for by the government and the same case apply to projects initiated and provided for by donors and NGOs without local participation. According to Thokozani (2008) NGOs should function as a catalyst of the development process and not control and manipulate the process; the case that is in the slum where the NGOs and donors make all the vital decisions concerning development projects.

The researcher found out that due to minimal local involvements, the beneficiaries feel ‘used’ by organizations for their own benefits and not the benefits of the community. Jim (2013) echo the same opinion, he stated that community development do not involve the locals but they are brought in to rubber-stamp ill-conceived projects cooked up in isolation in central offices without reference to local needs, abilities and resources.

Majority of projects in the slum were found out to be donor initiated and very few are initiated by locals. Donor initiated projects lacked sustainability although they were established fast due to availability of resources. This finding coincide with Julia (2000) observation that communities may not assume responsibility for donor initiated projects for a long term because the identification of the need and the incentive for the project did not originate from local community themselves.
It was also found that donor initiated projects increase dependency on donors and NGOs to bring development in the slum. This finding corresponds with Etienne (2007) who stated that beneficiaries initiated projects ensure that the local leadership retains control over development projects reducing dependency on the NGOs or the donors. Sen (2007) had similar view; he/she stated that dozens of top-down development have failed due to increased dependency and inadequate human capacity to fill the role of external body when it withdraws from the project.

The research also found out that some slum dwellers believe in themselves while others are of the view that only donors can help them out of poverty. They look up to CDPs for their survival and barely work to earn a living. Gregory (2006) observed that slum dwellers do not use their talents and energies to work hard but prefer to survive begging on a day-to-day basis. This finding is also echoed by Rodgers (2000) who stated that it is the deficient character of the poor along with their deviant behavior and the resultant self-reinforcing environment that restrict their access to economic viability and success.

On funding of community development projects, it was found that most projects in the slum are donor funded resulting to unsustainable projects and the locals do not own them. Donor funded projects were also found to increase dependency on NGOs and donors. Phil (2007) had similar view; he observed that if a project fully relies on outside agency, it is natural for community members to see it as belonging to the outside agency, when the agency leaves, the community will have no motivation to repair the facility or the project or sustain the service.
The researcher found out that direct assistance approach is widely employed by many organizations and a large population has either received goods or services without cost from CDPs. This has increased urban slum dependency on donors and NGOs. This finding correspond with Muruta (2010) observation that over reliance on NGOs for service provision has devastating consequences. The residents begin to accept the NGOs as the only guide to the reality of their lives. They think of themselves and their neighbors as fundamentally deficient, victims incapable of taking charge of their lives and of their community's future. Phil (2007) had similar opinion and stated that dependency in the community must be reduced. A donor agency should try to avoid giving the community anything for nothing; that encourages dependency.

Community based organizations are also common in the slum and it was found that they are beneficial to the entire community and their activities result to development of the slum. This finding coincides with Caroline, Janet (2002) view concerning involvement of CBOs in poverty alleviation programmes. According to them CBOs are an active force in civil society in Peru, demonstrating great organizational capacity; they have always been an obvious route for NGOs to become involved in the communities by strengthening the capacities of these community groups or by implementing projects with the participation and involvement of the community.

Findings on monitoring and evaluation show that majority of organizations do monitoring and evaluation of the projects while some organizations do not bother with monitoring and evaluation affecting the success of the projects. It was also found that most
organizations set goals that are barely achieved at the end of the project. Riddell et al (1997) noted that almost all the Terms of Reference for evaluations set the scene for anticipating exceedingly high expectations of what can be achieved, particularly what can be said about development impact.

The finding also coincide with Edwards & Hulme (1996) observation that NGOs have become the favored child of official development agencies, hailed as the new panacea to cure the ills that have befallen the development process and imagined as a magic bullet which will mysteriously but effectively find its target. Many NGOs have embraced this position given to them by the society leading to them having unrealistic expectations and objectives. Their targets are so high to attain and in their quest to fulfill this objectives they end up creating a dependent community.

5.4 Conclusion

From the research findings it was concluded that beneficiaries’ involvement in all stages of development projects is crucial for the success of projects in slum areas. It reduces urban slum dependency on NGOs and donors through CDPs. Donor funding results to unsustainable projects which seek to gratify short term needs of the locals creating dependency on CDPs; local funding ensures local ownership and sustainability of the projects is attained without creating dependency on aid. Development of slum areas should be community based and should be initiated by the beneficiaries while the NGOs and donors play a facilitation role.
Direct assistance approach should be discouraged since it increases urban slum dependency; organizations should seek to empower the locals with skills for self-reliance instead of offering goods and services for free. Community based organizations are important for development of slum areas. Finally from the findings it is important for NGOs and donors to improve on the setting of their goals and ensure they are realistic and achievable and also improve on monitoring and evaluation of community development projects to ensure they don’t result to urban slum dependency.

5.5 Recommendations

From the study findings the researcher recommends that:

1. Government agencies should have frequent assessment of CDPs by NGOs in the slum areas so as to eliminate organizations that may be using the slum community for their own interest and not the interest of the slum dwellers.

2. The locals should take charge of their own development, they should collectively identify their challenges, propose a solution and invite a donor or NGOs for facilitation if the need be but remain the owners of CDPs who make vital decisions about the projects.

3. NGOs and donors should emphasize on baseline survey and set appropriate methods of monitoring and evaluation of development projects. They should ensure that resources invested are appropriately utilized and the set objectives are met.
5.6 Suggestions for further study

The researcher suggests that further studies to be done on the following:

1. Influence of social cultural factors on sustainability of community development projects in Korogocho slum.

2. Impact of community development projects on development of Korogocho slum.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I

Letter of transmittal

Joyce Njoki Kamande,

P.O. Box 54639-00200,

Nairobi.

Korogocho Community Member,

Dear Respondent,

RE: DATA COLLECTION FOR A RESEARCH STUDY

My name is Joyce Kamande a student of Masters in project planning and management at the University of Nairobi. I am conducting a research study on urban slum dependency on community development projects by NGOs and would wish to greatly appreciate you for agreeing to participate in this study.

I request you to complete the attached questionnaire which will enable me complete this study; your name will not be mentioned or appear anywhere and the highest level of confidentiality will be observed.

I will personally collect the completed questionnaire two weeks after today or send one of my research assistants. In case of any question or clarification, feel free to contact me using mobile phone number 0734154053 or email me through njokikayalo@yahoo.co.uk

Thank you for you kind assistance.

Joyce Kamande

A Student , University of Nairobi.
Appendix II

Self administered Questionnaires

Instructions: Please answer all questions below by ticking where necessary or giving an explanation where required.

S/no……………………………

Section A: Personal Background

Village ……………………………… Gender  Female  Male

Date…………………………… …..        Age…………………………………

Section B: Beneficiaries’ involvement in community development projects

1a) Are there any community development projects in your area?

Yes  No

b) Have you ever taken part or involve yourself in community development projects by NGOs in your area?

Yes  No

c) If yes to what extent

a) 0-10%  b) 11-25%  c) 26-50%  d) 51-75%  e) 76-95%

f) 96-100%
2a) Have you ever participated in starting a community development project in your village?

Yes ☐ □  No ☐ □

b) Approximately how many projects have you and other community members started in your area?

☐ 0  ☐ 1-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ 11-15  ☐ 16 above

3a) Do you think you have the ability to bring development in Korogocho?

Yes ☐ □  No ☐ □

b) If No, who do you think will bring development in Korogocho?

NGOs / donors ☐  Government ☐  Churches ☐  Projects/mirandi ☐

Section C: How funding of community development projects leads to dependency

4) Who are the main financiers of the community development projects in your community?

a) Community members ☐

b) Government ☐

c) Donor/NGOs ☐
5) To what extent have you ever contributed your money towards a community development projects in your area?

0%  □  1-10%  □  11-25%  □  26-50%  □  51-75%  □  76-95%  □  96-100%  □

6) Applying to the key provided, indicate your extent of either agreement or disagreement to the following aspects of funding of Community Development Projects (mirandi). Tick in the appropriate box.

5= Strongly agree  4=Agree  3= Not sure  2= Disagree  1= Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects are fully funded by donors in Korogocho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors send money with a plan which cannot be changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korogocho community do not contribute money towards starting projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D: Approaches used in community development projects

7a) Have you received any goods or services from a community development project (muradi) in your village?

Yes  □  No  □
b) If yes which kind of goods or services? (Tick where applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuffs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstuffs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Approximately what percentage of NGOs in Korogocho offers free goods and services?

- 10-20% □
- 21-30% □
- 31-40% □
- 41-50% □
- 51 above □

9. To what extent do you rely (kutegemea) on Community development projects (miradi) to meet some or all of your needs?

- 0-25% □
- 26-50% □
- 51-75% □
- 76-100% □

10. Have the benefits from community development projects (miradi) led to development of your village?

- Yes □
- No □

11. Approximately how many CBOs (vikundi) exist in your area?

- 0-10 □
- 11-20 □
- 21-30 □
- 31-40 □
- 41 above □
12. To what extent do you think CBOs (vikudi) leads to development of your area?

Very little  Little  Much  Very much

13. “CBOs (vikudi) benefit few people and are not aimed at development of your area”

(a) Strongly agree  (b) Agree  (c) Disagree
(d) Strongly disagree  (e) Not sure

Section E: Influence of monitoring and evaluation on urban slum dependency

14. Do NGOs seek information about the current status of affairs before they start projects in Korogocho?

Yes  No

15. Do NGOs operating in your areas come to seek your opinion about the impact of their work in your area?

Yes  No

16. Applying to the key provided, indicate your extent of either agreement or disagreement to the following statement about community development projects. Tick in the appropriate box.

5= Strongly agree  4=Agree  3= Not sure  2= Disagree  1= Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many NGOs in Korogocho do not meet their goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs do not bother to get information from community before starting projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many NGOs do not find out the results of their work from the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation
Appendix III

Key Informant Interview Guide

S/no. Occupation.............................Position..............
Organization .....................................

1. What is your opinion concerning the beneficiaries’ involvement in community development projects in Korogocho?
2. How does the involvement or lack of involvement of the local community impacted on the success of community development projects?
3. Explain how projects are initiated in Korogocho and the extent to which beneficiaries initiate projects in comparison with projects initiated by donors.
4. What is the attitude of the community members towards themselves and towards community development projects in Korogocho?
5. What are the impacts of minimal local participation in community development projects in your area?
6. How are projects in Korogocho funded, and what are its impacts towards the community?
7. What is the effect of having projects that are proposed and funded by donors?
8. What is your opinion about providing goods and services for free to the people and what is their effect towards slum dependency?
9. Explain how NGOs collect their baseline information before starting projects, if there are NGOs who collect the information.
10. What is your opinion about the objectives the NGOs set and are they achievable?
11. How do NGOs monitor and evaluate their projects in the slum?

Thank you for your cooperation
Appendix IV

Table for determination of Sample size for a given population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>75000</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “N” is population size

“S” is sample size.

Appendix V

Map of Korogocho slum