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ABSTRACT

This study intended to determine the factors influence the sustainability of community based projects. This study aimed to highlight the factors that influence the sustainability of community based projects. The beneficiaries of the project will be Project managers and coordinators of the Community Based Organizations. The study will also contribute to literature on community empowerment and development. It further outlined and discussed the extent to which the factors influence the sustainability of community based projects to effectively let the project coordinators in programs geared towards community development have a grip of how they can be able to achieve maximum sustainability of their projects. The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one introduces the study and gives the objectives of the study. Chapter two reviews existing literature on the study topic and identify the knowledge gap. Chapter three gives the research methodology for the study. Chapter four deal with data analysis, presentation, interpretation and discussion. Lastly, chapter five gives a summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

The study used both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The target population was CBOs based in Kitui County. Primary data was collected for the study using self-administered questionnaire and the study used a quantitative method of data analysis. The respondents were given a three day period to fill the questionnaires and a contact were given to them in order to facilitate communication between them and the researcher if need be. The results are based on a response rate of 90% (n=50).The study concludes that governance, resource mobilization capacity, CBO formation process and effective internal management affect the sustainability of CBOs. This study recommends the following to ensure maximum CBO sustainability. Firstly, CBOs should ensure that their operations and daily routine are not interfered by politicians and other leaders. Secondly, CBOs should seek guidance from consulting firms on proposal writing, budgeting and funds management to ensure that sufficient funds for CBO sustainability. Thirdly, CBOs should always comply with government’s rules and regulations governing their registration to avoid the current situation in Kenya where by CBOs and NGOs are being deregistered for non-compliance. Lastly, CBOs should ensure effectiveness in communication and networking to push their operations and programs to the next level.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study
For a long time, Community Based Organizations (CBOs) have performed a key role in complementing initiatives of governments towards meeting the basic needs of its citizens not only in Kenya but also in Sub Saharan Africa. A fundamental premise of community-engaged projects is that community-based organizations have credible, legitimate, and intimate understandings of the assets, concerns, values and activities of their constituents and communities. Examples of projects implemented by CBOs include health, water, sanitation and hygiene, education, income generation, recreational activities and environmental projects among others (Charamba, 2002).

Most social economic challenges facing developing countries have been well handled through Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Faith Based Organizations (FBOs) and CBOs. Wanjohi (2010) cites that CBOs in Africa have contributed to disease prevention and control through ensuring the existence of a broad and multi-sectorial approach to national disease management programs. In his study, Fisher (2002) concluded that CBOs fill service delivery gaps at the community level and are an appropriate channel for taking vital health services to communities. Fishers conclusions were later echoed by Speer and Perkins (2006) in their work on CBOs, which found out that strong, sustainable community-based organization, are an important constituent for ensuring program impact, sustainability at community level.

According to the Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services of Kenya (MGSCSS) (2008), there are around 90,000 CBOs in Kenya. Most of these organizations are membership-based organizations that offer services to their members as much as they give back to the society. They are often non-profit organizations which are based locally within the communities and they play a critical role in creating a ground for individuals to share their problems and resources. These organizations serve to bridge the gap between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have-nots’ of the society (Cliff, 2005).
The success stories of CBOs in Kenya have been met with a number of shortfalls. Most of the CBOs lack sustainability of their projects and they mostly leave some projects hanging hence failing to meet its objectives. Past studies on the sustainability of CBOs in Africa show that the main sources of finance for these organizations are contributions from the members of the organization, society and donors. Although CBOs have made efforts to mobilize resources towards the implementation of these projects, it is noted that weak resource base has remained a major challenge that has contributed to stagnated or collapsed of noble initiatives (Speer and Perkins, 2006).

In Kenya, only 25% of the registered CBOs are active and implementing various projects at micro level, the rest have remained inactive due to inability to mobilize the required resources for implementing their mandates. Monitoring and Evaluation experts as well as Development Anthropologists have also attributed poor performance or failure of community based projects to the leadership of CBO projects, community participation, project management training and funding. On the other hand, Rural Sociologist cite that members' participation in group projects, project leadership and resource mobilization approaches, especially human resource, are crucial project implementation determinants and that if well-handled can lead to utmost sustainability of community based projects (Buxton, Charles and Prewitt, 2003).

1.2 Statement of the problem
Communities have always tried to organize themselves to plan, start and implement many projects of their own that is of their common interest, without waiting to be probed by the government to do so. Today, CBOs are important vehicles of social development and a great contribution to the development agenda of the Vision 2030 in Kenya. However most of these organizations are not able to exist for more than two years (Wanjohi (2010). While some of these projects succeed, a considerable number of them fail along the way before reaching the intended destination. Consequently, the collapse of these CBO may mean that their projects end prematurely and do not meet the objectives or the goals. This is an indication of poor performance of the projects initiatives (Speer and Perkins, 2006).
The reasons for the success of some of the project, and failure of some of them are not quite clear. Previous studies attributes the major issues facing these projects to project management processes, local and team leadership and financing issues ((Mullaly, 2002; Mathie, 2006). The implication of these issues is that they do not allow CBOs to put in place sustainable interventions that can effectively contribute to the well-being of communities. For the projects to succeed, the issue of sustainability calls for maximum attention. It is worth noting that the attainment of any form of sustainability is not an endeavor of a single day, but a lifelong process. Despite of the increasing number of community based projects failing to achieve optimum sustainability; no study has focused on factors that influence the sustainability of such projects. It is against this backdrop that this study aimed to bridge this knowledgeable gap by investigating the factors that influence the sustainability of community-based projects with a focus on community-based projects in Kitui County.

1.3 Purpose of the study
This study intended to determine the factors influencing the sustainability of community based projects.

1.4 Research Objectives
The objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To establish the extent to which governance influences the sustainability of community based projects in Kitui County.
2. To determine how resource mobilization capacities influence the sustainability of community based projects in Kitui County.
3. To determine how the CBO formation process influence the sustainability of community based projects in Kitui County.
4. To establish how effective internal management influences the sustainability of community based projects in Kitui County.

1.5 Research Questions
The following were the research questions:
1. How does governance influence the sustainability of community-based projects in Kitui County?

2. To what extent does resource mobilization capacity influence the sustainability of community-based projects in Kitui County?

3. How does CBO formation process influence the sustainability of community-based projects in Kitui County?

4. To what extent does effective internal management determine the sustainability of community-based projects in Kitui County?

1.6 Significance of the study

This study aims to highlight the factors that influence the sustainability of community-based projects. The beneficiaries of the project will be Project managers and coordinators of the Community Based Organizations. It will further outline and discuss the extent to which the factors influence the sustainability of community-based projects and effectively let the project coordinators in programs geared towards community development have a grip of how they can be able to achieve maximum sustainability of their projects. Finally, the research will contribute to the existing literature on capacity building and community empowerment.

1.7 Delimitation of the study

This study used seventeen community-based organizations in Kitui County as a sample. According to the District Social Development Assistant report, Kitui County has one hundred and Sixty eight fully registered CBOs and has been in operation for at least two years. The target population included project coordinators, project managers, finance officers and liaison officers in the selected CBOs. The study was carried out between July 2015 and September 2015. The variables in the study were the factors that influence the sustainability of community-based projects namely governance, resource mobilization capacity, CBO formation process and effective internal management.

1.8 Limitations of the study

Two major challenges were likely to affect the outcome of the study. Firstly, the County road network is poor and dusty. This may have been a challenge during data collection since most of
the CBOs are situated in areas that are in accessible by road. However, Motor bikes were used to access the remote areas of Mutomo (Kitui South) Kathivo (Kitui West). Secondly, the respondents might not be willing to give full details in fear that the information may be used for other purposes apart from research. This was overcome by informing the respondents that all information will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

1.9 Assumptions of the study
The assumption was that the respondents would be honest and answer the questions correctly and truthfully. The study also assumed that the CBOs in Kitui County were a representation of other CBOs within the country.

1.10 Definitions of significant terms used in my study
Community Based Organizations (CBOs)
In my study, CBOs refer to groups that exist within a community (either interest or place) with a local focus, with a predominantly voluntary nature, and separate from the core activities of state and business organizations.

Community
In my study, a community refers to a social group of organisms sharing an environment, normally with shared interests. There are three types of community: community of place, community of interest and community of persons organizing around a particular issue on an ad hoc basis. This study is mainly concerned about the community of place and the term will therefore be used as such in the rest of the document.

Community development
In my study, community development refers to the planned evolution of all aspects of community well-being (economic, social, environmental and cultural). It will also refer to the process whereby community members come together to take collective action and generate solutions to common problems.
Formation
In my study, formation is the process of creation or establishment of CBOs, by people from the community with a common goal.

Governance
In my study, governance relates to the processes of interaction and decision-making among the actors involved in a collective problem that lead to the creation, reinforcement, or reproduction of social norms and institutions.

Resource Mobilization
In my study, resource mobilization is the process of acquiring resources and to mobilize people towards accomplishing the movement's goals. Resources can be funds, information, knowledge (Achieved through capacity building).

Internal management
In my study, internal management means when management is controlled internally by the organization. This means that only organization’s staffs are main members of that management. And not people from outside the organization.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)
In my study, NGO refer to a legally constituted organization created by natural or legal persons with no participation or representation of any government. NGOs are classified on the basis of orientation such as charitable (relief, welfare) and development (service, participatory, empowering) and by level of operation such community-based organizations, national NGOs and international NGOs.

1.11 Organization of the study
The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter one introduces the study and gives the objectives of the study. Chapter two reviews existing literature on the study topic and identify the knowledge gap. Chapter three gives the research methodology for the study. Chapter four deal with data analysis, presentation, interpretation and discussion. Lastly, chapter five gives a summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
In this chapter, the findings of previous studies on sustainability of community-based projects are discussed. The chapter begins by introducing an overview community based organizations then highlights the factors that influence the sustainability of community based projects. The chapter then gives the conceptual and theoretical framework and concludes by identifying the knowledge gap.

2.2 Concept of sustainability of CBO’s
Humans have, since the Neolithic Agricultural Revolution and maybe even before then, been a consumer rather than a replenisher of environmental resources. Sometimes, the environmental pressures forced people into making these changes in the first place (growing human population being one of those pressures) and often eventually they had to move on to somewhere new where the environmental could better sustain them and their practices, or make further changes to their existing environment. There was no real concept of sustainable living, even if the people of the distant past understood that soil had a maximum fertility that could be exhausted and replenished with livestock. (Diamond, J. 2005)

Sustainable development is a concept that is used in our daily talks but difficult to define. The Bruntland Commission memorably defined it in its 1987 report (Our Common Future) as „development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Bank, 2005). Most authors perceive Sustainable Community Based Development Project differently. Roy (2003) viewed development as for the people and by the people. His argument was that, the essence of sustainable development is determined by the people, which can be attributed to change of peoples” attitudes, leading to a change in their habits. It took many years of intensive work to reach a global consensus on the elements of sustainable development, but it was finally achieved in 1995 at the World Summit on Social Development, This definition brought together what is popularly known as the three E’s Environment, Economy and Equity. In this context, the main concern in characterizing a sustainable development was that which
had a capacity to help the poor maintain and improve their natural capital (natural resources), while
developing their human capital (human resource development).

Sustainability is generally based on a simple principle: Everything that we need for our survival
and well-being depends, either directly or indirectly, on our natural environment. Sustainability
creates and maintains the conditions under which humans and nature can exist in productive
harmony, that permit fulfilling the social, economic and other requirements of present and future
generations (Muungano women umbrella Group, 1990). Sustainability is important to making
sure that we have and will continue to have, the water, materials, and resources to protect human
health and our environment. CBOs need to have sustainability of their projects in all areas they
exist (Wanjohi, 2010).

2.3 Governance within the Community Based Organizations structure
Governance relates to processes and decisions that seek to define actions grant power and verify
performance (Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services, 2005). In CBOs,
governance plays a key role in project sustainability but has had several shortcomings.

2.3.1 Governance efficiency in CBO operations
Poor Governance has been recognized not only in CBOs but also within NGOs. Knowledge of
good governance varies widely in Africa, with some countries not aware why CBOs are required
to have committees or what their roles and functions should be. Speer and Perkins (2006) cite
that it is difficult to achieve good governance with founders who wished to own their CBOs for
their own purposes. On the other hand, Fisher (2002) attributes good governance to a crucial
fundamental of CBO accountability and transparency. According to him, many CBOs
mismanage their resources, quite often with the involvement and encouragement of their
committees that eat their CBOs resources. In complex CBOs, finding committees members can
be difficult if you are not willing to pay them or provide allowances. Hence, poor governance
affects the day to day running of the CBO in the long end affecting the sustainability of ongoing
projects (Mullaly, 2002).
2.3.2 Political Interference on the running of CBOs activities

In some regions, in particular South Rift and North Eastern in Kenya, CBO leaders have cited the interference of local politicians and civic leaders as a major hindrance to their work. Where CBOs are involved in sensitive issues, such as land disputes, local leaders can threaten CBOs with de-registration. CBOs are not aware that the Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services of Kenya - and potentially the NGO Council - are there to protect them from such intimidation. The influence of political leaders affects the running of CBOs, funding and the entire implementation of projects. In Kenya, the political leaders may influence the funding from Constituency Development Fund (CDF) and other donors in and outside the locality. This in turn affects ongoing projects and future projects (Wanjohi, 2010)

2.3.3 Power sharing in the management structure

There exists a debate on how to engage with CBO capacity in a developmental way. CBO development does not take place within a neutral setting. Consequently, there may be no sufficient approaches to address power imbalances inherent to the development industry. For CBOs to fully reach their potential and contribute to meaningful development the aid system needs to be turned on its head in terms of which processes count most where. Instead of CBOs remaining at the bottom of the aid chain, processes on the periphery need to move to the center. For example, a movement should take place such that socially embedded and trusted methods and rules of mutual support amongst people who are poor become a normative guide and measure for donor practice (Wilkinson-Maposa, 2009). Further, in a context marked by power inequality, development cannot remain an apolitical act, which assumes that all the parties involved could cope with the more equitable society that they strive for. This perspective also has implications for practitioners who need to carefully reflect their own power in the relationship with CBOs. By accepting the status quo in the aid sector, where donors and larger NGOs exert power over CBOs, professionals contribute to the reproduction of a system marked by inequality – and therefore need to question their own political role in it (Mullaly, 2002).

Obviously, these changes argued for above should not simply turn around power imbalances, so enabling new leaders to exert power over others. Instead the shift needs to acknowledge interdependence and relationships. Such an understanding may enable development challenges to
be addressed in a more holistic and sustainable way than has so far been possible in disconnected and often polarized contexts (Wanjohi, 2010).

Bringing stakeholders together will not level power imbalances or create a sense of interdependence per se. Hence it is necessary for CBOs to develop capacities to relate to and network with stakeholders who currently appear as more powerful. Dialogue – in the sense of fostering a deeper understanding of interdependence and the need for collaboration – may be a powerful way of overcoming polarizations and power asymmetries in society (UNDP, 2006). However, where a genuine will to open up to each other and risk one’s own power base is not present, contestation may be the only means whereby change can happen. Hence, all these approaches need to entail a political understanding, enabling each organization to analyze the context in which it operates and therefore decide where to position itself and whether and how to act upon contextual issues (Fisher 2002).

2.4 Mobilization for resources by CBOs
Community Based Organizations’ rely on resource mobilization on their daily operations. Below literature reviews the processes and challenges to resource mobilization

2.4.1 Funding of projects
Today, CBOs are expressing difficulty in finding sufficient, appropriate and continuous funding for their work. They find accessing donors as challenging as dealing with their funding conditions. They perceive there to be certain cartels of individuals and CBOs that control access to donor funds (Muungano women umbrella Group, 1990). They have limited resource mobilization skills and are often not looking for funds that are available locally, preferring to wait for national and international donors to approach them (UNDP, 2006). There is a high dependency of donors and a tendency to shift interventions to match donor priorities.

CBO’s are subject to the same financial constraints as other nonprofits. Financial support may come from individual donations, fundraising efforts, grants via funding agencies, or directly from other nonprofits. As with the workforce, donors to CBO’s are often internally and goal motivated, and funding can be subject to constraints or specific instructions as to how it can be
spent. Funds are often directed at program or mission specific goals, and with this, there will be no financial, project and organizational sustainability (Jacobson 2001).

Most CBOs are generally without basic resources such as offices, office furniture and computer equipment. Lack of offices negatively impacts their standing in the community such that members of the community tend not to take them seriously (Craig, 2005). It also negatively impacts their operations as they lack a decent and regular meeting place for their members and beneficiaries, and a proper place to keep their records. Without an office, office furniture is not an issue. But even where they are offered some space, say in a local school or clinic, usually they are without basic furniture. In the majority of cases, they do not have computer equipment. This compromises their ability to prepare proper documentation reports, correspondence, and project proposals (Wanjohi, 2010).

2.4.2 Level of management knowledge and skills
The key difference between knowledge and information is that knowledge gives us the power to take action. We can use it. The major benefit of knowledge management is that information is easily shared between staff members, and that knowledge isn't lost if someone goes on vacation, gets sick, or leaves the organization.

Many CBOs have been found to have limited knowledge and skills relating to governance systems, finance and administration systems, documentation, fundraising and general organizational management. While not every CBO needs all these items, however, the more formal it becomes, the more it would benefit from access to and use of knowledge and skills in these areas. Knowledge and skills in specific areas affects the CBOs operations hence influencing the sustainability of the projects (Mullaly, 2002).

2.4.3 Level of CBOs capacity building
CBOs recognize that many of them have limited technical and organizational capacity. Few CBOs are able or willing to pay for such capacity building. Weak capacity has been identified in fundraising, governance, technical areas of development, and leadership and management. Some CBOs feel that the existence of quality standards would assist them to develop the required
capacities. In addition, the speed of technology changes is also a challenge particularly in areas of IT capacity. Limited capacity in the long run affects the sustainability of the projects in a negative way (Wanjohi, 2010).

To overcome challenges of limited capacity, Wanjohi (2010) proposes the use of volunteers by CBOs. Developing countries like Kenya have huge supply of idealistic, young, energetic and well educated graduates who are unemployed or underemployed. Many of them are searching for opportunities to serve their country and get work experience (Muungano women umbrella Group, 1990). There are also many older experienced professionals willing to give their time to CBOs. Finally, there are opportunities to appoint international volunteers to fill vacancies that would otherwise require unavailable funds to fill. In developed countries, student exchange programs also offer CBOs low cost human resources that can support research, documentation and staff capacity building initiatives (Mullaly, 2002).

2.4.4 Networking opportunities
Mattessich and Monsey (1992) have done the most extensive reviews of the literature on CBO networks built around social services. They defined collaboration as “a mutually beneficial and well defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve common goals”. Collaborations are “more durable and pervasive relationships,” the authors suggest, and they “bring previously separated organizations into a new structure with full commitment to a common mission.

More studies on CBOs have identified Poor Networking as a major challenge. It is the cause of duplication of efforts, conflicting strategies at community level, a lack of learning from experience and an inability of CBOs to address local structural causes of poverty, deprivation and under-development (Frank and Anne, 1999). In addition, negative competition for resources also undermines the reputation of the sector and the effectiveness of CBO activities at community level. As a result there is a great deal of suspicion among CBOs, secrecy and lack of transparency (Mwita, 2001). Many CBOs, large and small, intervene at community level without any community mapping and implement projects without due regard to ongoing community initiatives by other CBOs operating within the locality. This has been as a result of the CBOs
fighting for donor funding and in the long run creates CBO politics where one CBO fights another, one with resources but no community presence and on the other hand another CBO with community presence but no resources (Wanjohi, 2010).

2.4.5 Approaches to development programs

Communities have assets, wisdom, labor, time, and skills to be applied to their own development programs. Communities are now willing to work for their own development. Invest in community institution building, train local people; enable them to plan, implement and evaluate their own development programs, and to access available local resources. Innovative local solutions to local problems always attract support. For their part, donor organizations are generally unwilling to give money directly to CBOs (Fugere, 2001). One of the reasons often cited is the institutional incapacity of the CBOs to handle the money and the complex transactions that go with the funding requirements of the donors. As Magadla (2008) says, donor funding is usually accessible only to organizations able to produce fancy proposals that [are] registered, long-established, and experienced in dealing with large sums of money (Mwita, 2001).

While these requirements are relative and should not be barriers per se, in practice they automatically exclude the generality of CBOs. Magadla (2008) goes on to say that it is harder for donors to fund a large number of small organizations than a small number of large organizations. So, to reduce their own workload, they tend to fund larger organizations – which sometimes then pass on funding to smaller organizations. Thus not having enough capacity to handle the CBOs, donor organizations wholesale their funding to NGOs hoping that they in turn would retail it to the communities and CBOs (Mullaly, 2002).

Some donor organizations have now realized the ineffectiveness of this wholesaling approach. That while they fund NGOs on the basis of proposals professing intentions to carry out interventions at the community level, the amount of trickle down is usually far smaller than they had hoped for. As a result they have begun to explore the possibility of by-passing the intermediary NGOs and going directly to the communities themselves (Fisher 2002).
2.5 Formation of CBO processes and policies
Organizational structure and government policies have had a great impact on humanitarian Organizations’ not only in Kenya but in all countries where they exist. Registration process is always governed by a number of policies and the same dictates the funding capacity of each individual organization.

2.5.1 Registration regulations
Many developing countries are trying to make CBOs, NGOs. One-way in which CBOs are pressured to be like NGOs is through the mechanisms for registration with the government. In any government, registration is important because it enables the organization to carry out transactions only open to legal or natural persons such as canvassing for money from the general public, donor organizations and other financiers. In Zimbabwe, for instance, an organization can register as a private voluntary organization (PVO) or as a Trust. In either case, every organization planning to register must develop a constitution, which should show, among other things, ownership, structure, powers, roles and responsibilities of different organs of the organization (NANGO 2006). This is also a requirement for registration in Kenya (Mwita, 2001). While a constitution as a body of rules of operation is not a strange proposition to many CBOs, it is the specific organizational features to be reflected in the constitution that complicate the issue for most of the CBOs. These include, for example, the governing board which invariably includes prominent citizens who are not members of the CBO. Another such feature is the secretariat, headed by the director who as an employee of the organization expects to be paid for his/her services. Not many CBOs need these complications as all they need is to get on with the business of dealing with the issues that prompted their formation. Of those that need these structures and systems, not many have the capacity to put them in place. And of those that both need them and have the capacity to put them in place, often they do so at great expense to their founding principles. As a result, many of them end up performing below their potential, mired in conflict, or breaking up completely hence affecting the sustainability of the projects (Mullaly, 2002).
2.5.2 Community Involvement

Active participation of project participants is necessary and important for a number of reasons. Only the beneficiaries know and understand their needs and priorities best. 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. Related to the issue of participation are issues of ownership and sustainability. Before these concepts came into the mainstream of development discourse and practice, development organizations would ‘deliver’ pre-packaged development to recipient and passive communities with they (the communities) themselves having nothing to contribute. For example based on their own judgment as experts, they would drill and install boreholes for the local community and expect the local community to catch on at the flick of a switch (as it were), and start to benefit from the project. And when they left, they expected the infrastructure to remain in a state of repair and to continue serving the community. In most cases, however, neither did the communities benefit nor did the infrastructure survive the end of outside involvement as the local community did not own the project. Hence, lack of beneficiary participation in the projects affects project sustainability (Wanjohi, 2010).

In any community development there is need for cooperation between the organization and the community. Most of the communities which community based projects operates in are characterized by social problems, which include poverty, unemployment and other social evils. In view of the prevalence of the socio-economic problems and geo-physical characteristics, the people in these communities have limited options for their development needs. Consequently these people remain backward and the mass living in these backward pockets are affected socially and physically. This has resulted in the shaping of their behavior in tune to the prevailing conditions. Poplin’s (2009)

2.6 Effective internal management within CBOs

Running of community based organizations needs proper strategic planning, reconnaissance and visibility studies at all levels of project management (Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services, 2005). This part reviews the essential processes in effective management.
2.6.1 Strategic planning for CBOs

Strategic planning is a systematic process aimed at identifying and addressing specific issues in a participatory manner in order to attain the desired outcomes. The process takes into consideration contextual environmental issues and has specific goals and objectives.

There are many benefits of strategic planning: It helps avoid competition and enhances opportunities for partnership with other organizations, It provides others with a clear idea of what the organization does, It is good for beneficiaries, It helps in identifying goals, missions, and visions for the organization, It creates a sense of ownership, It promotes a commitment to good results, It encourages support from donors and other organizations, There is transparency in working systems among participants and it helps in the evaluation of time and work. (Core Initiative 2007).

Very few CBOs have strategic plans, which would enable them to have ownership over their mission, values and activities. This leaves them vulnerable to the whims of donors and makes it difficult to measure their impact over time (Tvedt, 1998). In addition, without a strategic plan or what is today commonly known as integrated development plans, many CBOs fail to achieve sustainability of their projects and this over time leads to the collapse of the organization (Mullaly, 2002).

2.6.2 CBOs Communication structures

Effective communication is essential in any organization. Organizations that communicate tend to be more successful. Usually it is the job of managers to ensure successful communication. Like all other management functions it is important to think about communication in a deliberate and conscious way. The following guidelines will help you to ensure strong internal communication (Camay, P 1997)

CBOs recognize that there is very poor communication within the humanitarian sector. The majority of CBOs have little or no access to reliable email and internet connections; they receive almost no literature on development issues and are generally out of touch with issues of global,
regional and national importance. Poor communication between the organizations affects their project implementations hence impacting the sustainability of entire projects (Wanjohi, 2010).

2.6.3 Leadership structures

A not so obvious limitation that besets many CBOs is the lack of leadership. CBOs are potentially a very important cog in the community development wheel in terms of both doing their work and interfacing with the other community development actors. They are an asset both to their communities and to the other community development actors. Unfortunately not many CBOs are aware of this, mainly due to lack of leaders able to appreciate the bigger picture. As a result, they are usually not very strategic in their programming and interaction with the other community development actors (Mullaly, 2002).

Related to this lack of effective leadership is the parochial nature of the community development work of many CBOs. Usually a CBO focuses on one issue in a community to the exclusion and almost oblivious of other yet related ones. Thus they treat community problems in isolation, often without even interfacing with the next CBO working on that other issue (Tvedt, 1998). Unfortunately community issues and problems are interlinked. Thus addressing one issue in isolation without reckoning with this interconnectedness is often an exercise in futility. Rather, one needs to take a holistic approach, to see the bigger picture, to think global and act local, for greater impact and sustainability. This takes a leadership with a vision which is a rarity in many organizations, not least in CBOs (Wanjohi, 2010).

Also related to this lack of effective leadership are that many CBOs taking a short term materialistic view of their work and relationship with donors and NGOs. This applies more to those CBOs formed at the instigation of the NGO or donor organization. They tend to underrate their contribution to the program work, and therefore sell themselves short in their relationship with their benefactors (Strachan and Peters, 1997). Although poverty also comes into play here as they take the view that little is better than nothing, limited leadership is the main challenge. Also they and others have caught onto the donor syndrome that now pervades many development circles where the general feeling is that nothing can be done without donor funding. By doing so, they do a disservice to themselves and their communities (Mullaly, 2002).
2.7 Theoretical foundation of the study
While there may be any number of theories related to community empowerment with implications for direct practice, this study believes that the theory of Community Development is perhaps the most practical framework for community workers seeking lasting change for individuals and the communities and societies in which they live. It focuses on the centrality of oppressed people in the process of overcoming externally imposed social problems. Community projects, at their foundation, shares much in common with the tenets of Community Development (Strachan and Peters, 1997). Mendes offers definitions of both which succinctly point to the similarities as well as the unique distinction. Community based projects are defined as professional interventions to address situations of community distress and crisis by shaping and changing the environment in which people live. Community development is defined as the employment of community structures to address social needs and empower groups of people (Mendes, 2008).

The unique focus on the employment of community structures in the process of change stems from Community Development Theory’s roots in sociology, as opposed to the psychology-based theories of micro level social work practice (Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services, 2005). When these structures and the community’s people are appropriately engaged and empowered, the role of the community project coordinators in a Community Development framework lands heavily on the facilitator side of the expert-facilitator continuum. Community Development Theory is presented in this study as a framework capable of bridging the gaps in community based organizations; the tenets of this theory have implications for the ways community based organizations approach their project implementations as well as the ways in which they seek to make large-scale change within a community (Mullaly, 2002).

Theory of Change defines all building blocks required to bring about a given long-term goal. This set of connected building blocks—interchangeably referred to as outcomes, results, accomplishments, or preconditions is depicted on a map known as a pathway of change/change framework, which is a graphic representation of the change process. Built around the pathway of change, a Theory of Change describes the types of interventions (a single program or a comprehensive community initiative) that bring about the outcomes depicted in the pathway of a
change map. Each outcome in the pathway of change is tied to an intervention, revealing the often complex web of activity that is required to bring about change as envisaged by community based projects. (http://www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/#1 Retrieved on 28.07.2013)

2.8 Conceptual framework
These provide a way of thinking about, explaining phenomena or presenting how complex issues interact. Conceptual frameworks serve as guidelines for dealing with complexities. They provide a lens through which to view phenomena
Figure 1: Conceptual framework
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2.9 Knowledge gap

This part shows the identified problem and the knowledge gap that needed to be addressed.

Table 2.1: Knowledge gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified problem</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most studies conducted on general community development approaches and no study has focused on Kitui County</td>
<td>Need to do a study on Kitui County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many community based projects have been implemented but majority have failed to meet their goals are their rate of been abandoned is always high</td>
<td>Need to identify the factors that affect the sustainability of the organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance, resource mobilization capacity, CBO formation process and effective internal management</td>
<td>Need to investigate how these issues can be addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter examines in detail the methodology adopted in carrying out the study. It covers the following aspects: research design, target population, sampling procedure, methods of data collection, validity and reliability, operational definition of variables, and methods of data analysis.

3.2 Research Design
The study used both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The research design used in this study was a descriptive survey that seeks to examine the factors that influence the sustainability of community based projects. Descriptive research design is used to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately (Richey and Klein, 2007). Descriptive studies involve collecting data that test the validity of the hypotheses regarding the present status of the subject. Kotzab, Seuring, Muller and Reiner (2005) remark that a descriptive design is used to determine the ‘who, what, when, where, and the how’ of a research topic. From a project management research point of view, Christou (2012) asserts that survey research is a predominant method that has been consistently validated by past studies. This underscores the choice of a descriptive survey design in conducting the present study.

3.3 Target Population
A population is defined as the total collection of elements about which we wish to make some inferences (Stillwell and Clarke, 2011). According to Engelhardt, Kohler, and Prskawetz (2009), a population element is the subject such as a person an organization, customer database, or the amount of quantitative data on which the measurement is being taken. For this study, the target population was CBOs based in Kitui County. The study used the population based in Kitui County that is involved in planning and management of the CBOs projects. The total population of the study is one hundred and Sixty Eight (168) CBOs based in Kitui County (CGK 2014).
3.3.1 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

Sampling procedure may be defined as a systematic process of individuals for a study to represent the larger group from which they are selected (Singh, 2008). According to Cargan (2007) a sampling frame is a list of elements from which the sample is actually drawn and is closely related to the population. For this study, the sampling frame came from the list of registered CBOs listed in the Gender and Social Development office.

According to Mugenda (2003) a sample size of 10% - 30% of the total population is adequate for a study in descriptive research. For this study, the correspondents were selected by simple random sampling technique, with the guide of research randomizer generator that generated the specific 50 Correspondents from 17 community based organizations. The 50 correspondents’ consisted of project managers, field officers and project coordinators. This sample was considered be a representative of the total population.

3.4 Data Collection instrument

Primary data was collected for the study using self-administered questionnaire. A questionnaire is a general term including all data collection techniques in which each person is asked to answer the same set of questions in a predetermined order (Silver et al., 2012). Richey and Klein (2007) define a structured questionnaire as a formal list of questions designed so as to get the facts. The questionnaires had both open ended and closed ended questions. Close-ended questions deal with numerical values while open-ended questions allow for explanation and expression of feelings.

A likert scale allows the respondent to rate a question on a scale of choices given. A likert scale is great for allowing respondents to rate a specific item (Cargan, 2007). The likert scale is adopted by the researcher since the researcher needs the respondents to give an opinion on particular items of the study. The likert scale is selected for aesthetic quality and ease of use (Silver et al., 2012).

The respondents were given a three day period to fill the questionnaires and a contact were given to them in order to facilitate communication between them and the researcher if need be. The questionnaires were interpreted to some correspondents since the literacy levels of the targeted
population was low hence could not comprehend English well. The questionnaires were collected from the population by the researcher and a record of each be kept to ensure that all questionnaires distributed are received.

3.5 Validity
According to Kathuri and Pals (1993) validity refers to the appropriateness of the measure for specific inferences that result from the scores generated by the measure. To test for validity of instruments, the instruments were presented to the supervisor for guidance. The advice, suggestions and recommendations were incorporated in the final document of the research instruments. This further improved the content and face validity of the instruments. During the field survey, the following among others were put in place to ensure validity.

i) Checking one informant’s descriptions of something against another informant’s description of the same thing.

ii) Learning to understand and, where appropriate, speak the vocabulary of the group being studied.

iii) Writing down the questions asked (in addition to the answers received). This helped to make sense at a later date out of the answers recorded earlier, and this helped reduce distortions owing to selective forgetting.

iv) Recording personal thoughts while conducting observations and interviews. Responses that seemed unusual or incorrect were noted and checked later against other remarks or observations.

v) Documenting the sources of remarks whenever possible and appropriate. This helped make sense out of comments that otherwise seemed misplaced

3.5.1 Reliability
Reliability refers to the consistency of measurement and is frequently assessed using the test–retest reliability method (Walliman, 2001). Reliability is increased by including many similar items on a measure, by testing a diverse sample of individuals and by using uniform testing procedures. This study adopted test-retest reliability and was measured by having the respondents answer a set of questions and having them answer the same set of questions later.
The researcher selected a pilot group of 18 correspondents from the target population to test the reliability of the research instrument. The pilot data was not be included in the actual study. The pilot study enabled the researcher to familiarize with the study area and its administration procedure as well as identifying items that required modification.

Internal consistency reliability is the extent to which items in a single test are consistent among themselves and the test as a whole (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2006). The reliability of the questionnaires was tested using Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient. Mugenda, and Mugenda, (1999) recommend a threshold level of 0.70 for an acceptable reliability Coefficient.

3.6 Data collection procedure
The proposal was presented before the University of Nairobi examination panel for defense. Upon approval of the proposal, the researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the University of Nairobi and a research permit from the National Commission for 30 Science, Technology and Innovation as pre-requisite for data collection.

The primary data collection method was the most suitable for this study and entailed the use of questionnaires. This is due to its advantage of allowing the researcher to get first-hand information from the respondents. In this case, the researcher self-administered the questionnaires. The questionnaires had both open ended and closed ended questions to capture the objectives of the research. Close-ended questions deal with numerical values while open ended questions allow for explanation and expression of feelings.

3.7 Methods of Data Analysis
This study used a quantitative method of data analysis. To ensure easy analysis the questionnaires were coded according to each of the research questions to ensure accuracy during the analysis process. Descriptive statistics such as the simple frequency distributions were used. The data to be collected was mainly quantitative in nature and due to the nature and size of the organizations under the study and the research being conducted; the raw data required minimal manipulation. It was summarized and categorized in a frequency distribution table out of which graphical and chart presentations were generated to give visual image of respondent responses.
Presentations were done by use of graphs, tables, charts and pie charts. MS Excel spreadsheet, will be used for the initial tabulation, analysis and drawing of charts based on the respondents responses. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Student Version 17.0 which is a unified and comprehensive package was used to analyze the collected data thoroughly and conveniently for the likert scale questions.

3.8 Ethical Considerations
All key informants and respondents were informed of the purpose of the research and how the information gathered is to be used. Adequate and clear explanation on the purpose of the study to each respondent was provided. The study also sought the respondent’s permission to participate in the study while assuring them that their participation was voluntary. All the participants were assured of total confidentiality and that the information they provided would be used for research purposes only. The study endeavored in maximizing good outcomes for science, humanity, and the individual research participants and minimized and avoided unnecessary risk, harm, or wrong to anyone involved. Respondents were treated with respect and courtesy, including those who were not autonomous like small children and people who had mental retardation or senility.

3.9 Operational Definition of Variables
This part gives a summary of variables, indicators, measurements and data collection methods guiding the study.
Table 3.1: Operational Definition of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Data collecting method</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine the sustainability of community based projects</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Are the CBOs projects able to sustain themselves long after the funding</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>The success of projects long after funding</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Mean, Percentage, mode, Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish if governance affects the sustainability of community based projects</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Does Political and government leaders interfere with the governance of the CBO</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Interference of CBO governance by political and government leaders</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Mean, Percentage, mode, Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine if resource mobilization capacity affects the sustainability of community based projects</td>
<td>Resource mobilization capacity</td>
<td>Funding Knowledge and skills Networking Development Approaches Capacity building</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Getting enough funding for the projects Skilled staff for proposal development</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Mean, Percentage, mode, Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine if the CBO formation process determines the sustainability of community based projects.</td>
<td>CBO formation process</td>
<td>Compliance with relevant registration provisions Involvement of the project beneficiaries</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Possession of all registration details Partnership with other organizations</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Mean, Percentage, mode, Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish if effective internal management determines the sustainability of community based projects.</td>
<td>Effective internal management</td>
<td>Strategic planning Communication Leadership</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Effective communication within the organization</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Mean, Percentage, mode, Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the findings and results of the study in the order of the research objectives. It begins by analyzing the demographic characteristics of the sample, investigates how the sample understands factors influencing sustainability of community based projects. The results are based on a response rate of 90% (n=50).

4.2 Response rate
This part shows the response rate from the correspondents of the study.

Table 4.1: Response rate
The following table shows the response rate for the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that response rate was high at 90%. Only 10% of the administered questionnaires were returned unanswered or with errors. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a response rate of 60% is good and that of 70% and above is very good. Thus, the return rate of this survey was relatively higher and was therefore deemed acceptable for the study. The relatively high questionnaire return rate was attributed to the fact that most of the questionnaires were guided as most respondents could not fill by themselves either due to illiteracy levels or being occupied.
4.3 Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

This part shows the demographic characteristic of the population under study.

4.3.1 Field of specialization of the organization

This part shows the area of specialization for the CBOs under study.

Table 4.2: Field of specialization of the organization

The following table shows the area of specialization for the CBOs under study. The organizations were Youth based, Food sustainability, Business and entrepreneurship, Medical aid, Humanitarian aid, Peace building and conflict management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth based</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food sustainability</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and entrepreneurship</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical aid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian aid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace building and conflict management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that majority of the organizations (44%) deal with food sustainability followed by business and entrepreneurship (16%). Youth based organizations and humanitarian organizations were at 11% and 13% respectively. The least organizations were medical and peace building organizations at 9% and 7% respectively. The highest number of CBOs dealing with food sustainability can be attributed to the arid nature of the region. Kitui area is a semi-arid region with unreliable rain with majority of the residents having one meal a day. The CBOs dealing with Business and entrepreneurship are mainly under Faulu Kenya, K-Rep bank and Kenya Women Finance Trust (KWFT). The lowest number of organizations dealing with Peace
building and conflict management may be attributed to the absence of conflict within the county since independence.

**4.3.2: Years of work at the organization**

This part shows the years the respondent has worked with the organization.

**Table 4.3: Years of work at the organization**

The following table shows the respondents working duration with the organization in terms of years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3 and 5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows that 44% of the employees had worked for over 5 years at their organizations. This was followed by those who had worked for a period between 3 and 5 years (40%), and 1-2 years (9%). The least group of workers were those who had worked for less than 1 year (7%). This shows that the CBOs had staff that has enough experience for their sustainability. Experience of over five years means that the staff had faced both external and internal shocks in various project executions and have learnt and put mitigation initiatives in place. Hence stand a better chance in enhancing the sustainability of the CBO. In addition, the presence of respondents with 20 years of experience shows that there has been CBOs in the county over the last twenty years.
4.3.3: Current position in the organization
This part shows the current position of the respondent in the organization.

Table 4.4: Current position of the respondents
The following table shows the respondents position within their respective organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field officer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that project managers constituted 71% of the respondents. The others are field officers and administrative officers at 22% and 7% of the sample respectively. Project managers and field officers form the foundation of CBOs and impact their sustainability to a great extent. This means that much of the staff is focused on the project implementation processes hence taking control of all executions in the field.

4.4 Respondents understanding on how organizational structure affects sustainability of community based organizations
This part shows how the respondents understanding on how organizational structure affects sustainability of community based organizations.
Table 4.5: Respondents understanding on how organizational structure affects sustainability of community based organizations

The following table shows respondents understanding on how organizational structure affects sustainability of community based organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Extent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Extent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Extent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 show that 44.4% of the respondents have some knowledge on sustainability of CBOs. This may show the extent to which the staffs are able to manage the CBOs over the years. This means that the respondents are aware of what entails sustainability of CBOs hence stands a better chance in propelling the organizations to the next level. The lowest number may be from the newly employed respondents with a working experience of less than five years.

4.4.1 Respondents perception on organizational structures that affects sustainability of community based organizations

This part shows respondents perception on organizational structures that affects sustainability of community based organizations
Table 4.6: Organizational structures that affects sustainability of community based organizations

The following table represents respondents’ perception on organizational structures that affects sustainability of community based organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational structure within the organization affects the efficiency of operations</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>3(6.6)</td>
<td>30(66.6)</td>
<td>10(22.2)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5(11.1)</td>
<td>5(11.1)</td>
<td>25(55.5)</td>
<td>15(33.3)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values in parentheses ( ) are row percentages, while values outside parentheses are frequencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 shows that about 33% of the respondents strongly agreed that political and government leaders such as Chiefs dictate on how the CBO management run the organization and this affects sustainability of community based organizations. About 60% of the respondents agreed that organizational structure within the organization affects the efficiency of operations hence affects sustainability of community based organizations. None of the respondents disagreed that duty sharing in the organizational structure of the organization affects sustainability of community based organizations. Less than 4% of the respondents disagreed that organizational structure within the organization affects the efficiency of operations.

On ranking the factors on the basis of mean, the factors, in order of popularity, were rated as political and government leaders such as chiefs dictate on how the organization is run, duty sharing in the organizational structure of the organization and organizational structure within the organization affects the efficiency of operations.

The study sought to find out how organizational structures within CBO affect the sustainability of CBOs. The study found out that one of the key factors in organizational structures affecting CBO sustainability is political interference on the running of CBOs activities. This matches literature by Wanjohi (2010) that cites that in situations where CBOs are involved in sensitive issues, such as land disputes, local leaders can threaten CBOs with de-registration. He adds that CBOs are not aware that the Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services of Kenya - and potentially the NGO Council - are there to protect them from such intimidation. The findings also support literature by Wilkinson-Maposa (2009) which proposes that for CBOs to fully reach their potential and contribute to meaningful development the aid system needs to be turned on its head in terms of which processes count most where. The literature further adds that instead of CBOs remaining at the bottom of the aid chain, processes on the periphery need to move to the center. The study has revealed new organizational structures that affect CBO sustainability namely political influence by politicians, government officials and officials at the NGO Council of Kenya.
The issue of political and government leaders such as Chiefs dictating on how the organisation is run impacts the sustainability of the organization to a great extent. In addition, political leaders may determine which organization is to be funded and which one not to.

4.5 Respondents perception on funding factors that affect sustainability of community based organizations

This part shows respondent’s perception on funding factors that affect sustainability of community based organizations.

Table 4.7: Funding factors that affect sustainability of community based organizations

The following table represents Respondents perception on funding factors that affect sustainability of community based organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The funding of projects affects resource mobilization</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>3(6.6)</td>
<td>5(11.1)</td>
<td>30(66.6)</td>
<td>5(11.1)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of management knowledge impacts resource mobilization</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>40(88.8)</td>
<td>3(6.6)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building impacts resource mobilization for projects</td>
<td>1(2.2)</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>5(11.1)</td>
<td>30(66.6)</td>
<td>7(15.5)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization has networks and partnerships with other organizations</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>10(22.2)</td>
<td>5(11.1)</td>
<td>4(55.5)</td>
<td>5(11.1)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches used by the organization impacts resource mobilization</td>
<td>3(6.6)</td>
<td>4(8.8)</td>
<td>6(13.3)</td>
<td>26(57.7)</td>
<td>6(13.3)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values in parentheses ( ) are row percentages, while values outside parentheses are frequencies.*
Table 4.7 shows that about 13% of the respondents strongly agreed that approaches to development programs used by the organization impacts resource mobilization. About 60% of the respondents agreed that the funding of projects affects how the organization mobilizes its resources and the level of the organization capacity building impacts resource mobilization for projects. Only 2.2% of the respondents disagreed that the level of the organization capacity building impacts resource mobilization for projects. About 11% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the organization has networks and partnerships with other organizations.

On ranking the factors on the basis of mean, the factors, in order of popularity, were rated as the level of management knowledge and skills impacts the mobilization of resources for projects, the level of the organization capacity building impacts resource mobilization for projects, the funding of projects affects how the organization mobilizes its resources, approaches to development programs used by the organization impacts resource mobilization and the organization has networks and partnerships with other organizations.

The study sought to find out how CBOs mobilization for resources affects the sustainability of CBOs. The study found out that level of management knowledge and skills is crucial in sourcing for funds in CBOs. This matches literature by Mullaly (2002) which cites that many CBOs have limited knowledge and skills relating to governance systems, finance and administration systems, documentation, fundraising and general organizational management. The study also found out that the source of funding impacts resource mobilization and this matches literature by UNDP (2006) which cites that many CBO have limited resource mobilization skills and are often not looking for funds that are available locally, preferring to wait for national and international donors to approach them. However, the study has found new funding factors that affect sustainability of CBOs such as unfair proposal appraisal and approval by most donor agencies influence by politicians on which organization or program to be funded especially by CDF and lastly late disbursements of funds.
The level of management knowledge and skills impacts the mobilization of resources for projects and this has been of great concern to a majority of CBOs. With this in mind, it means that the CBOs are capable sourcing and managing.

4.6 CBO formation processes and policies that affect sustainability of community based organizations
This part shows respondent’s perception on CBO formation processes and policies that affect sustainability of community based organizations.

Table 4.8: CBO formation processes and policies that affect sustainability of community based organizations
The following table represents respondent’s perception on CBO formation processes and policies that affect sustainability of community based organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration regulations on CBOs</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1(2.2)</td>
<td>1(2.2)</td>
<td>40(88.8)</td>
<td>3(6.6)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement and participation</td>
<td>1(2.2)</td>
<td>1(2.2)</td>
<td>1(2.2)</td>
<td>39(86.6)</td>
<td>3(6.6)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in parentheses ( ) are row percentages, while values outside parentheses are frequencies.
Table 4.8 shows that about 88.8% of the respondents agreed those registration regulations on CBOs and this affects CBO formation processes and policies which in turn affect sustainability of community based organizations. About 86.6% of the respondents agreed that community involvement and participation hence affects sustainability of community based organizations. None of the respondents strongly disagreed that Registration regulations on CBOs affects sustainability of community based organizations. 2.2% of the respondents disagree that Community involvement and participation affects sustainability of community based organizations.

On ranking the factors on the basis of mean, the factors, in order of popularity, were rated as registration regulations on CBOs and community involvement and participation.

Today, registration regulations on CBOs in Kenya have taken new dimensions as a result of terrorism. If the governments decide to deregister a certain organization for non-compliance grounds, then the target population fails to benefit.

The study sought to find out CBO formation processes and policies that affect the sustainability of CBOs. The study found out that registration regulations can greatly impact the sustainability of CBO. This matches literature by NANGO (2006) which cites that every organization planning to register must develop a constitution, which should show, among other things, ownership, structure, powers, roles and responsibilities of different organs of the organization and many CBO do not comply to this are either denied to register or are deregistered after non-compliance. The study also found out that community participants and active participation of project participants is necessary and important in CBO sustainability. This matches literature by Wanjohi (2010) which cites that only the beneficiaries know and understand their needs and priorities best and 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. The study has realized new policy process such as networking, partnership, government regulations and religion.
4.7 Leadership and management within CBO effects on sustainability of community based organizations

This part shows respondents perception on how leadership and management within CBO affect sustainability of community based organizations.

Table 4.9: Leadership and management within CBO effects on sustainability of community based organizations

The following table represents respondent’s perception on how leadership and management within CBO affect sustainability of community based organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning has an impact on the management of the organization CBOs</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>39(86.6)</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication structures and Controls are key component for the organization internal management</td>
<td>1(2.2)</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>4(8.8)</td>
<td>32(71.1)</td>
<td>6(13.3)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership structures within the CBO impacts leadership and management</td>
<td>1(2.2)</td>
<td>2(4.4)</td>
<td>5(11.1)</td>
<td>30(66.6)</td>
<td>7(15.5)</td>
<td>45(100)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values in parentheses ( ) are row percentages, while values outside parentheses are frequencies.

Table 4.8 shows that about 86.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that strategic planning for CBOs has an impact on the management of the organization and this affects sustainability of community based organizations. About 15.5% of the respondents strongly agreed that
Leadership structures within the CBO impacts leadership and management. None of the respondents strongly disagreed that strategic planning for CBOs has an impact on the management of the organization. 8.8% of the respondents do not agree or disagree that CBOs communication structures and Controls are key components for the organization internal management.

On ranking the factors on the basis of mean, the factors, in order of popularity, were rated as CBOs Communication structures and Controls are key components for the organization internal management, strategic planning for CBOs has an impact on the management of the organization and leadership structures within the CBO impacts leadership and management.

The study sought to find out how leadership and management within CBO affect the sustainability of CBOs. The study found out strategic planning for CBOs is an internal process that can greatly impact sustainability. This matches literature by Tvedt (1998) that cites that few CBOs have strategic plans, which would enable them to have ownership over their mission, values and activities and this leaves them vulnerable to the whims of donors and makes it difficult to measure their impact over time. The study also found out that CBOs Communication structures are also crucial in sustainability. This matches literature by Wanjohi (2010) that cites that majority of CBOs have little or no access to reliable email and internet connections, they receive almost no literature on development issues and are generally out of touch with issues of global, regional and national importance. The literature adds that poor communication between the organizations affects their project implementations hence impacting the sustainability of entire projects. The study has realized new processes such as education level of the leaders, leadership duration and CBO relationship with the donors.

CBOs Communication structures and Controls are very important in sustainability. Lack of proper communication channels may disrupt the running of the organization which can eventually lead to the collapse of the organization.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the summary of findings of the research, draws conclusions and makes recommendations for factors affecting sustainability of community based organizations.

5.2 Summary of Findings
Significant findings that arose from the study are:

5.2.1 Governance
Under governance, factors that affects sustainability of community based organizations in order of popularity were; political and government leaders such as chiefs dictating how the organization is run, duty sharing in the organizational structure of the organization and organizational structure within the organization affects the efficiency of operations. The questionnaire had provision for the respondent to add other factors. Of the factors added by the respondents, they were all related to the above factors. For instance, the respondents cited political influence by politicians, government officials and officials at the NGO Council of Kenya.

5.2.2 Resource Mobilization
The factors that affect sustainability of community based organizations in order of popularity were; level of management knowledge and skills impacts the mobilization of resources for projects, the level of the organization capacity building impacts resource mobilization for projects, the funding of projects affects how the organization mobilizes its resources, approaches to development programs used by the organization impacts resource mobilization and the organization has networks and partnerships with other organizations. The questionnaire had provision for the respondent to add other factors. The respondents cited unfair proposal appraisal and approval by most donor agencies influence by politicians on which organization or program to be funded especially by CDF and lastly late disbursements of funds.
5.2.3 CBO formation processes and policies
The CBO formation processes and policies that affect sustainability of community based organizations in order of popularity were; registration regulations on CBOs and community involvement and participation. The questionnaire had provision for the respondent to add other factors. The respondents cited networking, partnership, government regulations and religion.

5.2.4 Internal leadership and management
Leadership and management factors within CBO which affect sustainability of community based organizations in order of popularity were; CBOs Communication structures and Controls are key components for the organization internal management, strategic planning for CBOs has an impact on the management of the organization and leadership structures within the CBO impacts leadership and management. The questionnaire had provision for the respondent to add other factors. The respondents cited education level of the leaders, leadership duration and CBO relationship with the donors.

5.3 Conclusions
Communities have always tried to organize themselves to plan, start and implement many projects of their own that is of their common interest, without waiting to be probed by the government to do so. Today, CBOs are important vehicles of social development and a great contribution to the development agenda of the Vision 2030 in Kenya. This study has revealed that several factors affect the sustainability of CBOs. Poor Governance has been recognized not only in CBOs but also within NGOs. Knowledge of good governance varies widely in Africa, with some countries not aware why CBOs are required to have committees or what their roles and functions should be. Speer and Perkins (2006) cite that it is difficult to achieve good governance with founders who wished to own their CBOs for their own purposes. Community Based Organizations’ rely on resource mobilization on their daily operations hence funding is crucial. Organizational structure and government policies have had a great impact on humanitarian Organizations’ not only in Kenya but in all countries where they exist. Registration process is always governed by a number policies and the same dictates the funding capacity of each individual organization. Running of community based organizations needs proper strategic planning, reconnaissance and visibility studies at all levels of project management.
Hence, this study concludes that governance, resource mobilization capacity, CBO formation process and effective internal management affect the sustainability of CBOs.

5.4 Recommendation
This study recommends the following to ensure maximum CBO sustainability.

5.4.1 Project Managers
Project managers in charge of CBOs should ensure that their operations and daily routine are not interfered by politicians and other leaders. Politicians use such organizations as battle fields that fuel envy and hatred among communities. This can easily affect the sustainability especially funding of the CBO negatively since many donors may pull out based on their political affiliation.

5.4.2 Project Coordinators
Project Coordinators in charge of CBOs should seek guidance from consulting firms on proposal writing, budgeting and funds management to ensure that sufficient funds for CBO sustainability. This will ensure that they are equipped with the necessary knowledge and kills suitable for proposal wring and project execution.

5.4.3 CBO Management
CBOs management should always comply with government’s rules and regulations governing their registration to avoid the current situation in Kenya where by CBOs and NGOs are being deregistered for non-compliance. Lastly, CBOs should ensure effectiveness in communication and networking to push their operations and programs to the next level.

5.5 Suggestion for Further Research
The study has identified the factors that affect sustainability of CBOs. However, this study calls for a further investigation of each single factor to ensure that the issue of sustainability is fully addressed not only in CBOs but all in other NGOs.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Diana Mwende Nyamu
P. O. BOX 2177-00606
Nairobi
Tel: 0725262957

Dear Respondent,

RE: RESEARCH ON FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF COMMUNITY BASED PROJECTS IN KITUI COUNTY

I am a final year Master of Arts student at the University of Nairobi, specializing in Project Planning and Management. As part of my course, I am required to carry out a research on the above topic.

I will be grateful if you could spare sometime from your busy schedule and fill in the questionnaire. All the information provided will be purely used for academic purposes and your identity will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Kindly do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire.

Yours faithfully,

Diana Nyamu
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF COMMUNITY BASED PROJECTS IN KITUI COUNTY

This research is meant for academic purpose. You’re kindly requested to provide answers to these questions honestly and precisely as possible. Responses will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Please tick [✓] appropriate or fill in the required information on the spaces provided.

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Name of Organisation

2. Field of specialisation of the organization
   [ ] Youth based
   [ ] Food sustainability
   [ ] Business and entrepreneurship
   [ ] Medical aid
   [ ] Humanitarian aid
   [ ] Peace building and conflict management

3. Years of experience in the organization
   [ ] Below 1 year
   [ ] Between 1 - 2 years
   [ ] Between 3 - 5 years
   [ ] Over 5 years

4. What is your position in the organization?
   [ ] Administration
SECTION B: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE WITHIN THE COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS

5. To what extent do you understand organizational structure in community based organizations? Please rank between 1-5 (5 being the highest).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Small Extent</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Some Extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. To what extent do you think the following factors affect governance structure in community based organizations? Please rank between 1-5 (5 being the highest priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure within the organization affects the efficiency of operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and government leaders such as Chiefs dictate on how we run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. In your opinion what other factors would you add to the above?

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

SECTION C: LOOKING FOR FUNDS AND RESOURCES

8. To what extent do you think the following are factors that affect funding? Please rank between 1-5 (5 being the highest priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The funding of projects affects how the organization mobilizes its resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of management knowledge and skills impacts the mobilization of resources for projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of the organization capacity building impacts resource mobilization for projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has networks and partnerships with other organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to development programs used by the organization impacts resource mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. In your opinion what other factors would you add to the above?

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

SECTION D: CBO FORMATION POLICIES

10. To what extent do you think the following are factors that affect rules in forming CBOS?
    Please rank between 1-5 (5 being the highest priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration regulations on CBOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement and participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In your opinion what other factors would you add to the above?

................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................
12. To what extent do you think the following are leadership and management factors affecting sustainability of community based organizations? Please rank between 1-5 (5 being the highest priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Agree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning for CBOs has an impact on the management of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs Communication structures and Controls are key components for the organization internal management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership structures within the CBO impacts leadership and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. In your opinion what other factors would you add to the above?

...
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RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Factors influencing sustainability of community based projects in Kitui County,” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Kitui County for a period ending 31st December, 2015.
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