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ABSTRACT

Food insecurity is a pressing global challenge and remains an elusive goal in many parts of the world despite the concerted efforts of governments, non-governmental and international agencies over the past years. An estimated 925 million people around the world were undernourished in the year 2010 (FAO, 2011). All nations signatory to the Millennium Declaration of the year 2000, have a goal of reducing hunger and extreme poverty by halve by the year 2015 in fulfillment of the MDG goal number one. This study was carried out to assess the factors influencing the implementation of African Christian Church and Schools food security project, a case of Maai Mahiu Ward, Nakuru County. The objectives of the study was to: establish the influence of personal attribute of the project beneficiaries on the implementation of African Christian Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward; determine the extent to which capacity building of the project beneficiaries influence implementation of African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward; determine the influence of funding of project beneficiaries on the implementation of African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward and investigate the influence of the monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward. The research study used descriptive survey design which is under quantitative approach. The 1200 farmers who are project participant represented the target population. The determination of the sample size was guided by the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) (Appendix II). According to the table, for a target population of 1200 farmers, an optimum sample size of 291 farmers is appropriate. Data collection was done using a questionnaire. The study instruments were validated prior to actual data collection by close consultation with research experts and peer students. Obtained raw data were systematically organized, coded, analyzed through descriptive Statistics with aid of computer software, Statistics Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) and finally presented using percentage and frequency distribution tables. The Research findings showed that demographic characteristics; gender, age, marital status and family size had a great influence on implementation of ACC and S food Security Project. The study also found that education level does not directly influence implementation of ACC and S Food Security Project but capacity building and the level of household income has a great influence on ACC and S Food Security Project implementation. The study revealed that timely provision of funding has a great influence on ACC and S Food Security Project implementation. The Study showed that Monitoring and Evaluation has a great influence on project implementation and that beneficiaries should be involved in all stages of Monitoring and Evaluation. The study recommends that farmers training should be organized within their communities so that women can be able to access the trainings. The study also recommends for more involvement of the youths in farming activities.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

According to USAID (2003), the term food security encompasses three basic elements. They include food availability, access and utilization. As Webb and Rogers (2003) wrote, food availability is necessary but insufficient to ensure food access and food access is necessary but insufficient to ensure adequate food utilization. In order to produce food security, all three elements must also act complementarily.

Achieving food security in its totality continues to be a challenge not only for the developing nations, but also for the developed world (Mwaniki, 2003). The difference lies in the magnitude of the problem in terms of its severity and proportion of the population affected. In Central Europe for example, food and nutrition, insecurity and poverty are very widespread and are hampering the region's development process (FAO, 2005). In developed nations the problem is alleviated by providing targeted food security interventions, including food aid in the form of direct food relief, food stamps, or indirectly through subsidized food production. These efforts have significantly reduced food insecurity in these regions. Similar approaches are employed in developing countries but with less success. He goes on to explain that the discrepancy in the results may be due to insufficient resource base, shorter duration of intervention, or different systems most of which are inherently heterogeneous among other factors.

The rising problem of hunger prompted the world leaders to cooperate through the Rome Declaration and Millennium Declaration (Food and Agriculture Organization 1996, Von Braun et. all, 2004). The Millennium Declaration Goals set during Millennium Summit included eight goals. Each goal is linked towards reducing hunger and food poverty in the world by 2015. Despite the increased attention to reducing hunger since the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals, the World still faces large problems of widespread hunger and malnutrition. On the world level, the number of hungry has declined, but remains unacceptably high. FAO (2010) estimates that a total number of 925 million people are undernourished in 2010 compared to 1023 million in 2009, out of this developing countries account for 98 percent of the world’s undernourished people. The goals of World Food
Summit (WFS) were also consistent with MDGs aiming to reduce by half the proportions of people living on less than a dollar a day and people who suffer from hunger (FAO, 1996). With only a few months a stronger commitment and more rapid progress is needed to be made in order to achieve the targets by the country leaders. Otherwise the goal of halving hunger and poverty by 2015 will not be achieved.

According to (IFPRI, 2002), Food security; a situation in which all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active healthy life is affected by a complexity of factors. These include unstable social and political environments that preclude sustainable economic growth, war and civil strife, macroeconomic imbalances in trade, natural resource constraints, poor human resource base, gender inequality, inadequate education, poor health, and natural disasters, such as floods and locust infestation, and the absence of good governance. All these factors contribute to either insufficient national food availability or insufficient access to food by households and individuals.

InterAcademy (2002) attributes the root cause of food insecurity in developing countries as the inability of people to gain access to food due to poverty. While the rest of the world has made significant progress towards poverty alleviation, Africa, in particular Sub-Saharan Africa continues to lag behind. In Sub Saharan Africa alone, over 218 million people live under extreme poverty and hunger (MOA 2011). Projections show that there will be an increase in this tendency unless preventive measures are taken (Oxfam, 2002). Many factors have contributed to this tendency including the high prevalence of HIV/AIDS; civil war, strife and poor governance; frequent drought and famine; and agricultural dependency on the climate and environment. Over seventy percent of the food insecure population in Africa lives in the rural areas (Mwaniki, 2004). He proposed seven strategies for achieving food security in Africa. They include nutritional interventions, facilitating market access, capacity building, Gender sensitive development, building on coping strategies, creating off- farm opportunities and good governance.

Anderson (1990) reported that there were three important elements of food insecurity at the community level, first the quantity and quality of available food, secondly, physical accessibility of the food; that is the transportation systems, and thirdly the affordability of food price compared to the level of disposable income.
Recently, the global rises in prices and droughts have had drastic effect on household food security in Kenya. In April, 2008, about 3.5 million people in the country were reported to be in need of emergency food aid (USAID, 2009). A concerning problem of food insecurity in Kenya is concentrated in the rural areas and ASAL areas in particular. The food crisis in the target area of Maai Mahiu could be attributed to some basic factors such as economic and political factors along with weather changes. In 2009, the then President of Kenya, His excellency Mwai Kibaki, declared food security as national disaster resulting from the food shortage caused by the prolonged drought in Kenya (Kenya News Agency, 2009). As a result of the drought, ACC&S began a six month Food Aid program, funded through the Canadian Food grains Bank. Through 2009, the situation did not improve due to another season of failed rains and the ACC&S continued the Food Aid distribution for an additional six months to the targeted 1500 households.

The main contributing factor to the need for Food Aid was the prolonged drought in Kenya. Other contributing factors include the post-election violence that marred the country immediately after the last presidential elections, along with rising food and fuel prices. The rise in fuel prices leads to a rise in the price for farm inputs such as fertilizer and seeds resulting in less land being cultivated for crops because the farmers cannot afford the inputs. Conditions in Maai Mahiu have improved though this could change because of the expected impacts of La Nina, which threatens to further disrupt rainfall patterns. (FEWSNET, November 2, 2010)

Beyond the drought conditions in Kenya, food insecurity in Maai Mahiu has been hampered by declining crop yields which has devastating effects on household food reserves. This problem is attributable to a number of factors (ACC&S Survey, April 2009- Feb 2010). These factors include lack of training in Agriculture for the local farmers, lack of quality seeds during planting, high soil infertility due to lack of resources to buy fertilizer, soil erosion and land overuse without adding back nutrients and lack of farm tools. The ACC & S food aid Project was converted into ACC & S Food Security Project in April 2011. The project started will last for four years. It was funded for a total of Ksh. 23,812,480. The various components of the project and their budgetary allocations are shown in table 1.1.
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Table 1.1 Components of the ACC & S Food Security Project at Maai Mahiu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>1,542,000</td>
<td>1,779,750</td>
<td>2,029,500</td>
<td>1,124,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>756,000</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree nursery establishment</td>
<td>64,800</td>
<td>68,040</td>
<td>71,280</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and Exposure visits</td>
<td>928,500</td>
<td>1,279,425</td>
<td>1,659,350</td>
<td>487,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport costs</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>302,400</td>
<td>316,800</td>
<td>347,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>1,494,000</td>
<td>1,568,700</td>
<td>1,643,400</td>
<td>2,093,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>302,000</td>
<td>317,100</td>
<td>332,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration costs</td>
<td>284,000</td>
<td>235,200</td>
<td>246,400</td>
<td>451,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,443,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,306,615</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,288,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,773,835</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The long-term objective of the project was to achieve locally sustainable food security that is culturally and environmentally appropriate for 1200 farmers in three communities within Maai Mahiu Division. The medium term outcomes were to ensure that 1200 farmers were trained on conservation agriculture, livestock husbandry, and food storage; have appropriate farming tools to implement; have access to certified drought resistance seeds and are trained on traditional drought resistant crops. Despite, the above intervention, the residents of Maai Mahiu are not food secure. From, the foregoing there was need to investigate the factors influencing the implementation of the African Christian Church and Schools Food Security Project at Maai Mahiu Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya.

Several factors have been cited by various studies as influencing the implementation of projects. Saara (2005) cited socio-economic factor such as educational qualification, income level and occupation of the beneficiaries as key to project implementation. She argued that giving education to young mothers in United Kingdom had resulted in their participation in community projects resulting to self-confidence and self-esteem. Reuben (2005), Michelle (2006) and Macharia et al (2007) also found out the education level of house-holds heads was an important factor influencing what development projects the household undertook (Ndegwa 2009). The acknowledgement of the link between women’s empowerment and improved household food security recognizes Kenyan women as the gatekeepers to national
development and increased nutrition for its children. Improving women’s education is probably the most important policy instrument Kenya can use to increase agricultural productivity, reduce poverty, and promote better health. According to Quisumbing and Pandolfelli (2008), one year of primary education provided to all Kenyan women farmers would boost farm yields by 24%. The lack of education is believed to be the basic cause of poor agricultural development and food insecurity in developing countries.

Suzzane (2004) have cited capacity building as a factor influencing food security. Capacity can be seen as the ability to productively use one’s asset base to protect and enhance one’s food security. According to her, capacity building is a process by which actors increase their abilities to use their assets and enlarge their asset base, or at least maintain it. This applies at the community level as well, where the asset base includes the pool of public goods and where managers are the community leaders. The local level capacities that protect and enhance food security, as well as control risks and decrease households’ vulnerability, are divided into two broad types: analytical and managerial capacities and general capacities.

Analytical and managerial capacities are capacities that enable populations and their leaders to discuss and reflect together on their concern about food security, to assess the food security situation, establish a food security action plan, target, monitor and evaluate food security activities, design ways to mitigate risks and decrease vulnerability, advocate for food security and make other decisions that affect food security at different levels in the community. These capacities broaden the communities’ understanding and sharing of a food security framework and allow them to focus on food security in the midst of various options for action planning. Leaders in particular need to develop such capacities to promote the complementary aspects and synergy between activities affecting food availability, access and utilization in their community, monitor and manage the risks community members face and to reduce their vulnerability, promote the accumulation of buffers that can mitigate shocks, and implement and target special programs that help families quickly recover after a crisis.

Analytical and managerial capacities also apply to the organizational and household levels (IFRC 2000). At the household level, examples could be the management and distribution of new resources or assets within the household in a manner that increases the food security of all members, or securing buffers that protect the household’s asset base when it is facing shocks. These capacities can also contribute to increased bargaining power of the more vulnerable individuals within the household, such as women with young children and elders.
General capacities are those needed to produce food and otherwise increase its availability, produce income, control food prices and promote food access and those adequately utilize foods (in terms of consumption and/or in terms of physiological of nutrients).

Capacity building in community food security projects has some implications for project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. It affects the nature of beneficiaries, the time at which beneficiaries should be involved in the project, the choice of project activities, the sequence of their implementation and the techniques used in the process. Although food security projects have always included capacity building activities, there is not enough monitoring, evaluation, and documentation of these activities to generate lessons learned and best practices (Suzanne, 2004). This calls for the need for a systematic study to be carried out to establish the influence of capacity building on successful implementation of food security projects.

Monitoring and evaluation in food security projects primary purpose is to allow project teams to run projects effectively, ensuring they have the desired results for beneficiaries (ACF, 2011). Monitoring is a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds (Mbeche, 2009). Evaluation is the coordinated process of data collection about the activities, systems, processes and outcomes of projects and or programmes, for use by specific people (internally and externally) to reduce uncertainties, improve effectiveness and make short, mid and long term decisions with regards to which programmes are doing (ACF, 2011). The aim of Monitoring and Evaluation is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability (Europe Aid, 2012).

There are several parameters for measuring Monitoring & Evaluation. For example the ten steps to a results based monitoring and evaluation (World Bank, 2004), Participatory Monitoring, Evaluation, Reflection and Learning for Community-based Adaptation (CARE_PMERL, 2012), Results-oriented Monitoring (Europe Aid, 2012), little has been documented on how these guidelines have been followed during project implementation. The guidelines from donors do not indicate how the projects implementing agencies will be audited to ascertain compliance to the guidelines (Kimweli, 2003). It is against this background, the proposed study will seek to determine the influence of monitoring and
evaluation practices on the successful implementation of African Christian Church and Schools Food security project.

1.2 Statement to the problem

Food insecurity is a pressing global challenge and remains an elusive goal in many parts of the world despite the concerted efforts of governments, non-governmental and international agencies over the past years. An estimated 925 million people around the world were undernourished in the year 2010 (FAO, 2011). All nations signatory to the Millennium Declaration of the year 2000, have a goal of reducing hunger and extreme poverty by halve by the year 2015 in fulfillment of the MDG goal number one. Over the years, several interventions for reducing poverty and enhancing food security have been designed and initiated in Kenya being a signatory to the Declaration. Some of the strategies includes: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture (SRA), Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and employment creation (ERS), National Accelerated Agricultural Input Access Programme (NAAIAP) among others. Food security means access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life.

In Maai Mahiu Division of Nakuru County, Kenya, several projects all geared towards promoting food security have been established. Some of the projects include African Christian Church & School Food Security Project, Kenya Agricultural Productivity and Agribusiness Project (KAPAP), Kenya Agricultural Productivity and sustainable Land Management (KAPSLM), Njaa Marufuku Kenya (NMK) and Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) among others (Njoroge, 2012). Most of these projects are completed but the residents of Maai Mahiu Division are still food insecure. Many of these agencies were working individually based on their own capacity and definition of food insecurity scope and visible long term strategies to deal with food insecurity are not apparent. This may simply reflect insufficient attention being given to the implementation of programmes. This implies that there could be issues not addressed during the implementation of these projects. This concurs with Madhu (2006)’s definition that a project will be termed successful once it meets customer expectations, quality, budget and time lines and also with Lewis (2005)’s definition that; a successful project is the one that delivers what it is supposed to, gets results, and meets stakeholder expectations. Several studies have been conducted on food security by Fan et.al (2011), Fan and Lorch (2012) and Wodon and Zaman (2008), the studies focused on food
programs as technology investment, system approach and production systems as avenues to attain food security but did not concentrate on the factors influencing such food security projects.

An evaluation of International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) projects on food security by TANGO International specifically in India and Bangladesh concluded that, in order to achieve projects’ objectives, it is essential that projects retain the ability to adapt to changes in the programming context. Overly rigid programme structures leave too little room for community input; flexibility is therefore particularly important to projects based on household food security. According to (Locker and Gordon, 2009) effective program implementation requires a number of factors and considerations to be adhered to. These include, firstly, having a clear project plan in place. The African Christian Church and Schools Food Security Project has been in operation since 2011. It aims at providing locally sustainable food security that is culturally and environmentally appropriate for 1200 farmers in three communities within Maai Mahiu Division. Despite its existence for the last four years since its inception in 2011, the residents of the division are still food insecure (African Christian Church and Schools Survey, 2014). There is need to establish the factors behind this phenomena. The proposed study proposes socio-economic factors, capacity building, funding and Monitoring and Evaluation as some of them.

Suzzane (2004) cited that although food security projects have always included capacity building activities, there is not enough monitoring, evaluation, and documentation of these activities to generate lessons learned and best practices. The guidelines from donors do not indicate how the projects implementing agencies will be audited to ascertain compliance to the guidelines (Kimweli, 2003). Finally, no project can be implemented without proper funding. There is no documented study on the factors influencing the successful implementation of the African Christian Church and Schools food security project in Maai Mahiu. Thus the proposed study seeks to fill the above gaps by seeking to find out how socio-economic, capacity building, funding, monitoring & Evaluation influence the successful implementation of African Christian Church & Schools Food Security Project in Maai Mahiu ward, Nakuru County.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors influencing implementation of African Christian Church & Schools Food Security Project in Maai Mahiu Ward, Nakuru County, Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The study was guided by the following objectives:-

1. To establish the influence of personal attribute of the project beneficiaries on the implementation of African Christian Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward
2. To determine the extent to which capacity building of the project beneficiaries influence implementation of African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward
3. To determine the influence of funding of project beneficiaries on the implementation of African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward
4. To investigate the influence of the monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward

1.5 Research Questions

The study intended to answer the following questions:-

1. How does the personal attribute of the project beneficiaries influence implementation of the African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward?
2. To what extent does the capacity building of the project beneficiaries influence implementation of the African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward?
3. To what extent does funding on project beneficiaries influence implementation of the African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward?
4. To what extent does monitoring and evaluation influence implementation of the African Christian Church and Schools Food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward?

1.6. Significance of the study

The study findings and recommendations was hoped to help government and non-governmental organizations implement policies that can revitalize community-based projects
and private sector participations on food security initiatives. The study findings was hoped to provide information to the ACC and S Development personnel at different levels in order to aid them identify the strengths and weaknesses on the project implementation and hence corrective measures where need be. Empirical findings and recommendations in the subject were hoped to offer practical importance for the stakeholders of the project. Related project within the county and even beyond may also make use of the same. The study findings were also to be useful to the residents of Maai-Mahiu Ward. They may be informed on the factors that hindered the implementation of the ACC and S food security project. The donors were to also benefit from the study. They were to be informed on the factors hindering implementation of food security projects and perhaps design new implementation strategies.

1.7 Delimitations of the study

The study was delimited to residents of the four sub-locations of Maai Mahiu Ward where the African Christian Church and Schools project was operational. They include Kijabe, Longonot, Munyu and Satellite. The area was selected because of its extreme climatic condition. In addition, the area of study has remained food insecure despite the past efforts of both government and donor agencies. The findings were more likely to reflect the situation in the area and hence may not be generalized to other areas.

1.8 Limitations of the study

The study was likely to be constrained by a number of factors. One of the limiting factors of the study was the language barrier where some the respondents who are semi-illiterate or illiterate may be handicapped in filling in the written questionnaire. To mitigate this constrain, a trained research assistant, conversant in the local language of the area was used.

Uncooperative respondents were also likely to be encountered due to suspicion on the real motive of the study. The purpose of the study was to be explained to them with the aid of community group facilitators, community leaders and the community volunteers.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The study was to make the following basic assumptions; it was assumed that African Christian Church and Schools Food Security project was still to be in operation by the time the study was to be conducted. It was also assumed that the record of the African Christian
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Church and Schools Food Security Project beneficiaries had been updated and it was proper to use it to draw a representative sample.

1.10 Definition of Significant Terms

Capacity Building: In this study, this concept was taken as a social factor that is aimed at strengthening the skills, competencies and ability of the people so that they can be actively involved in the activities of food security projects. It included issues of types of training, frequency and relevance of these trainings and networking with others.

Community: A Community meant a number of villages who are close enough together and with common interests.

Food security: Food Security meant beneficiaries were able to produce enough food to meet their household food needs throughout the year.

Funding: refers to the act of providing resources, usually in form of money (financing).

Household: this meant individuals who comprise a family unit and who live together under the same roof.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Systematic collection and analysis of information at regular intervals about ongoing project in order to compare the actual project impacts against the set objectives to facilitate decision making.

Project implementation: This was construed to mean involvement in carrying out of the actual activities within the project towards realizing the project objectives of improving food security status within the division.

Program beneficiaries: These referred to the primary stakeholders who benefit from a project

Personal attribute: personal attribute are the attributes that constitute the African Christian Church and Schools Food Security Project beneficiaries occupation, income levels and education levels.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter attempts to review past studies in the area of implementation of projects of sustainable food security. It also highlighted the gaps existing in the area and how the proposed study will be designed in the literature. The independent variable of the study was to focus on and their contribution to implementation of projects for sustainable food security which is the study’s dependent variable. A conceptual framework was to be used to demonstrate the relationship between variables.

2.2 Overview of the ACC and S food security project

ACC & S Food Security project was started as an exit strategy from food relief project to food security project. It was a four year project targeting three communities mainly Kigecha, Muniu and Longonot community of Maai Mahiu Ward of Nakuru County. It was started in 2011 and hopes to wind up in 2015. ACC&S Food Security Project aims to address the problem of food security through increasing productivity at farm level for 1200 resource poor farmers who owns less than 2 acres of land. Each of the 1200 resource poor farmer was to be funded with 4kg of Open pollinated variety of maize seeds, 2kg of pigeon peas, 2kg of Dolichos Lab Lab and 50 pieces of sweet potato vines. The same households were to be funded with hand held farming implements to help them prepare their land on time in order to plant at the onset of rains.

Maai Mahiu Ward in particular has been under several projects all geared towards promoting food security in the Division. Some of the projects include African Christian Church & School Food Security Project, Kenya Agricultural Productivity and Agri-business Project (KAPAP), Kenya Agricultural Productivity and sustainable Land Management (KAPSLM), Njaa Marufuku Kenya (NMK) and Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) among others.

The April 2009- Feb 2010 ACC & S survey also revealed there are factors that contributed to food insecurity in the division. They included post-harvest problems. Many farmers in Maai Mahiu do not know how to properly store the harvest to last until the next harvest is due. A majority of farmers confessed that they sell all their harvest as they have no proper storage and all their harvest will be infested by weevils if they do not sell. This means many
households are unable to feed themselves whenever there is a crop failure in even one season. Ellis (2000) showed that the extent of post-harvest losses in Kenya is wide and varies, and has an average of about 10-15% (weight loss). Major causes of post-harvest losses in Kenya include unexpected natural circumstances such as heavy rains, poor harvest management and insects. These factors affect the amount of household on-farm foods and therefore affect household food security. For example, Maai Mahiu in 2006 had a bountiful harvest but due to lack of post-harvest management skills, they sold all the harvest and had no food during the droughts of 2007, 2008, and 2009.

2.3 The concept of Food security

There are three basic elements of food security that can be used to adequately understand this concept. They include Food availability, access and utilization (USAID, 2013). As Webb and Rogers (2003) wrote, food availability is necessary but insufficient to ensure food access and food access is necessary but insufficient to ensure adequate food utilization. In order to produce food security, all three elements must also act complementarily. This implies that interventions that aim at strengthening any element must ensure that results will complement or enhance the situation of the other elements of the framework and especially that they will not negatively affect any of them. For example, if food production or increases in income are achieved at the expense of proper childcare, then the child’s food utilization and health may become even more at risk, putting the child’s own food security in jeopardy. Ensuring complementarities between the basic elements may require the broadening of an intervention to include activities addressing the other elements. For example, when food production is diversified and increased, it is important that families also learn how to utilize the new products and those markets can supply the necessary inputs for production, as well as absorb production surpluses. Ensuring the complementarities between the three pillars also brings about their synergistic effects. Better fed people can produce a better work output and increase their capacities to manage their food security.

The general capacities are usually directly associated with each food security pillar separately. They refer to those capacities needed to (1) produce food and otherwise increase its availability; (2) produce income, control food prices and promote food access; and (3) adequately utilize foods (in terms of consumption and/or in terms of physiological utilization of nutrients). In many cases, these capacities materialize through capacity building activities promoting improved practices and behavioral changes at the individual and household levels.
Most capacity building activities in this group are instrumental to the success of specific sectoral project activities. For example, activities improving technical skills and transferring appropriate knowledge about improved farming practices contribute to the success of project activities in the agricultural sector, which aim to increase food availability. General capacities are focused on assuring that the conditions necessary for achieving adequate food availability, adequate food access and adequate food utilization are met. Managerial and analytical capacities are required to achieve the complementarities and synergy between these three pillars. In addition, managerial and analytical capacities are required to assess and manage risks so they do not block community food security.

2.4 Influence of Personal Attribute on Implementation of food security projects

Education qualification as brought to the light by Saara (2005) is key to project implementation. She argues that giving education to young mothers in United Kingdom had resulted in their participation in community projects resulting to self-confidence and self-esteem. Reuben (2005) as well thought that education levels of households in Niger Delta in Nigeria were quite low, especially among the youth and women who were engaged in agricultural farming. In his time of study in the Niger area, only two projects offered educational services. He recommends raise of levels of education of both gender and across age in order to achieve projects objectives since illiteracy is a factor that hinders development as concluded by many researchers.

A study carried out in Senegal by Michelle (2006) reported that non-formal education had a key role in promoting community participation in implementation of community projects, although the utilization of non-formal education had been largely neglected. The same study found that those with non-formal education were more likely to than those without education at all to belong to community organization, hold leadership position with the local institution, attend local organizational meetings at least occasionally, speak out in meetings and get together with others to raise an issue. Macharia et al (2007), in his study conducted in Kiambu, Kirinyaga and Maragwa districts established that the education level of households heads was an important factor influencing what development projects people would initiate collectively, which new farming technologies would be adopted and what farming enterprises to undertake. Education has a tremendous influence on the food security status. Implementation of food security projects is associated with the level of education of the project beneficiaries. Illiteracy level in the rural area of Vihiga district leads to poor
implementation of the agricultural programmes by the donors and also by the government (Mwaura, 2009). Kidane (2006) indicates that educational attainment by the household heads could lead to awareness of the possible advantages of modernizing agriculture by means of technological input, read and understand documentation, read instructions on the fertilizer packs, and diversification of household income which in turn would enhance household food supply. Njoki (2009) in her research project notes that implementation of community based projects for food security has been entirely culturally assigned to women as an informal contribution which in most cases goes unaccounted for. Women have been neglected in policies, programmes and services that are designed to improve food security (Lado, 1992). Studies also reveal that women have less access to resources such as land, extension services and credit that would facilitate their productivity towards sustainable food security.

Lack of finances contributes to people’s powerlessness. Frances (2009) argues that the poor and marginalized feels stigmatized and rarely join with others in community projects. Lack of capital has been identified in many studies as a major constraint in expansion of projects. In Central Kenya, Macharia (2010) found out that lack of affordable credit was a major impediment to intensified use of modern farming methods and technology. In Uganda, Rutaisire et al (2010) found that lack of capital was one of the major factors hindering project implementers from achieving their intended objectives. Most of the active participants of community projects were community members of stable incomes and were able to generate incomes for expansion of the projects. Occupation of different members of the community will affect their income and the availability of labour for agricultural activities. The type of occupation will also determine available time that can be invested in agriculture activities. However, this will depend on the farmer’s priorities as some farmers may prefer to invest their time and money in non-agricultural activities. Rutaisire concluded that daily income of the community members significantly associated with implementation of projects hence their sustainability.

Ismail Hassan (2010) in his research study on improving project implementation in agriculture sector in South Africa delimited his variables to resistance to change, financial sources, capacity development and competition from other off-farm activities. There have not been adequate studies on implementation of projects for sustainable food security in Maai Mahiu Division and therefore a knowledge gap on the extent to which social economic factors would influence project implementation exists, thus the need for the study.
2.5 Influence of Capacity Building on Implementation of Food Security Projects

Capacity is often defined in terms of ability and performance. For example, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) defines capacity as “the ability to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably” (UNDP 1997). In the context of local food security, a community needs the ability to perform many functions, starting with ensuring that food is available and accessible for all in a sustainable manner and that people can and do utilize foods adequately. Additional critical functions relate to reducing vulnerabilities and increasing resiliency for the entire community (Webb and Rogers 2003, FFP 2003).

One’s capacity to perform in any domain rests on one’s asset base and the ability to use it productively. This capacity can be applied at the individual and organizational levels, as well as the community level. Commonly, assets are categorized as managerial, physical or environmental, human or technical, financial or economic and social (Green and Haines 2002; Mathie and Cunningham 2003, Lowe and Schilderman 2001). For example, to produce more food, people rely on physical assets such as productive land and water. They use their agricultural knowledge and farming skills, which are technical assets. Women selling cakes rely on their savings or their access to micro-credit, which are their financial assets, to procure raw materials for their income generating activities. They draw on the community’s physical assets as they use roads and markets to sell their products. Local farmers associations providing agricultural extension services draw on their technical assets to deliver sound agricultural messages, while they use their community’s social assets when they use local branches of farmer associations in outreach to benefit individual farmers. Thus, the “ability to productively use one’s asset base to perform a function” can adequately summarize the working definition of capacity. This applies equally to individuals, households, organizations and communities.

Capacity building is not only a stand-alone training interventions but rather a strategically coordinated set of activities aimed at improving the abilities of skills of individuals for a better performance. A study conducted by Webbs Rogers (2003), shows that in order to produce more and more nutritious food the beneficiaries have to use agricultural knowledge and farming skills which are technical assets. According to Kistern (1998), capacity development and skills training are determinants of successful agricultural developments. For a project to realize its objectives, the guidelines of the project cycle must be vigorously implemented. The cycle should however further incorporate participative process, social
integration, capacity development and economic diversity. Kistern insists that human
capacity development and skills training are important determinants of successful agriculture
development. Neglect to human development would often feature to failures, and various
studies illustrate the value of human capacity development in enabling efficient resource use
and productive farming (Mac Calla, 1999). A study by Shalmali (2006) on the programme’s
implementation reveals that lack of knowledge and skills have prevented people from taking
full advantage of recent government agricultural programmes.

According to Suzzane (2004), to address the “big picture” of food security at the community
level, it is necessary to have a good understanding of the determinants underlying
households’ capacity to use, protect and enhance their asset base, secure their livelihoods,
maintain their safety nets and participate in their community’s affairs.

As such, it is important to understand the social structure and dynamics of decision making in
the community that affect the community’s asset base, its provision of services, and the ways
people access those services. This, in turn, can inform the selection of capacities that projects
can build in communities to enable them to better address their food security issues. This
understanding is crucial for determining the most appropriate level of targeting for specific
capacity building activities in the community. Suzzane (2004) has further observed that
broadening the scope of food security project activities to include a focus on community
capacity building has at least five implications for project implementation. First, it determines
the nature of beneficiaries. Addressing food security at the community level includes all
members in the community. Some levels within the community might need more capacity
building than others. Community leadership has not been the conventional target of food
security interventions because they are not seen as vulnerable, yet it plays an important role
in the long term management of community development, presenting a high potential for
benefit from food security project’s capacity building efforts. Again, working with leaders
provides a good opportunity for projects to build democratic values and communities and
leaders to increase their experience of good governance at the local level.

The second implication for project implementation on capacity building is that, it affects the
time at which to involve the various stakeholders in the project. Involving project participants
from the beginning and at all stages of project implementation presents greater opportunities
for beneficiaries to learn how to assess their own capacities and needs, plan actions, conduct
activities and participate in processes that affect their food security. This in turn can lead to
development of greater process ownership on their part and present opportunities to develop skills for participation in future development. Again capacity building activity will have an implication on the choice of project activities. Although the development of a program may require that at least some of the activities be pre-determined, the more opportunities beneficiaries have to influence the choice of project activities, the higher the project’s potential to be responsive to community members’ specific needs and to engender participation. Furthermore, for sustainability of many project activities, it becomes necessary to expand their scope vertically or horizontally (Kistern 1998).

For example, training in the use of new farming techniques and in the use of new inputs (seeds, fertilizer, weed control chemicals, tools, etc.) can be instrumental to the achievement of an increase in yield over the life of the activity. However, if the community particularly the market, is not able to sustain long-term availability and accessibility of these inputs, or if social policies do not promote vulnerable households’ access to land, then poor farmers will not be able to use their new capacities after the project pulls out. These vertical and horizontal expansions of activities may call for capacity building activities and targets of their own.

Fourth, the best sequence for activity implementation may be determined by focusing on community capacity building. For projects building local capacities to assess their community’s food security situation, establish food security actions plans and conduct food security activities, it is logical to implement such activities in that sequence. Specific project activities in various sectors can then emerge from the community food security action plans, and be more naturally linked to one another in a local food security framework. Finally, the techniques used for enhancing capacities and implementing project activities greatly influence the efficiency of the project, its potential for durability and its impact on local democracy. Instead of narrowly focusing on the identification of food security problems, their causes and solutions, food security projects can focus more broadly on identifying people’s assets, abilities and food security goals and work toward increasing people’s capacities to attain these goals. Through this process, populations will confidently develop ways to handle the constraints and other issues that hinder or threaten the realization of their food security goals. The final product has a higher potential for protecting and enhancing people’s livelihoods and food security over time, this will increase sustainability.
Whereas the concept of capacity translates assets and abilities into performance, the concept of capacity building is associated with transformation processes and increments in capacities or performance. Increasing capacities can imply broadening the asset base, but this is insufficient for enhancing performance. The act of increasing capacities encompasses the enhancement of abilities to use assets productively. Building capacities would seem a useless effort if they were not sustainable. A major challenge facing food security projects is ensuring their capacity building activities are not only instrumental to the success of a specific project component, but that the new capacities will be put to use and contribute to the sustainability of food security in communities over the long-term. Food security projects can build capacities by developing people’s abilities to use and maintain their infrastructure, use their new tools, actually put in practice their new knowledge, and conduct income-generating activities in an autonomous fashion with high potential for sustainability.

2.6 Influence of Funding of Project Beneficiaries on the Implementation of ACC and S Food Security Project

Funding is the act of providing resources usually in form of money (financing). The funding can be given either directly to the project beneficiaries or indirectly through provision of farm inputs. Project funding is crucial as no project gets started until a thorough analysis is done on how much funding is required to complete the project and what the return on investment will be and also the sources of the funding. In most cases by the time a project is approved there must be funding in place to begin the work. Managing funds, as well as other project attributes that contribute to cost, is a significant challenge faced by project implementers. The challenge is to understand the timing of project costs and using the tools available at the right times and for the right reasons. There are various tools available to project implementers that can be used to effectively manage project costs while successfully accomplishing all project tasks and deliverables at the right time. According to USAID report (2003), overall long term causality of high levels of households’ food insecurity and poverty has not been adequately addressed, because of poor planning, implementation or both and insufficient resources.

There are many ways to fund sustainable projects. Funds can be allocated for either short-term or long-term purposes. Some projects receive all of the required funding up front and others receive funds incrementally based on project phases of the accomplishment of milestones. Funding has always been the limiting factor to most project success.
Agricultural inputs, primarily seed, fertilizer and agrochemicals, have an enormous potential to leverage the efforts of hard-working farmers. Used appropriately, they can mean the difference between a good harvest and starvation (Negeri and Adisu, 2001). Experience has shown in countries, such as Kenya, Zimbabwe and Malawi that small scale, resource poor farmers can double or triple the productivity of maize by using quality hybrid seeds, improved management practices, use of modern farming technologies and provision of credit (Negeri, 2001; Friis-Hansen, 1994). This can be achieved if the farmers have funds to access the agriculture inputs they require and the funds are available at the right time.

2.7 Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on the Implementation of Food Security Projects

Monitoring and evaluation in food security projects primary purpose is to allow project teams to run projects effectively, ensuring they have the desired results for beneficiaries (ACF, 2011). Monitoring is a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds (Mbeche, 2009). According to UNDP (1997) “Monitoring enables management to identify and assess potential problems and success of a program or project. It provides the basis of corrective actions, both substantive and operation to improve the program or project design, manner of implementation and quality of results. In addition it enables the reinforcement of initial positive results.” In fact it is a major aspect that cannot be overlooked because it determines the sustainability of any venture or project. According to Standish Group Project Chaos Report (2005), one of the reasons for project failure is lack of project monitoring and control. Monitoring and evaluation of development activities provides programme and project managers, including Government officials and civil society with better means for learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocating resources, and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholders.

Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. The aim of Monitoring and Evaluation is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability (Europe Aid, 2012). Within any
programme or project there is a strong focus on results - this helps explain the growing interest in monitoring and evaluation. The success and sustainability of any project or program largely depend on constant feedbacks about project on going activities (Mark, Henry, and Julnes, 2000). There are several parameters for measuring M & E. For example the ten steps to a results based monitoring and evaluation (World Bank, 2004), Participatory Monitoring, Evaluation, Reflection and Learning for Community-based Adaptation (CARE_PMERL, 2012), Results-oriented Monitoring (Europe Aid, 2012), little has been documented on how these guidelines have been followed during project implementation.

Middle and large scale business projects train their project managers and staff on critical aspects of project implementation, physical milestones, financial targets, quality of inputs, quality of production processes and sustainability (Wickham, 2008). Unfortunately, in food security projects, the beneficiaries are usually not taken through monitoring and evaluation training due to financial constraints and project management incompetency to establish a baseline against which to measure progress. Therefore, when beneficiaries, Project managers and team members working in a project acquire competence in monitoring and evaluation skills, they are able to detect deviations from project plan in time and make necessary correction (Mulwa, 2007), this will ensure food security projects sustainability even after the initial funding has been stopped. Experience has shown that the extent to which the project staff and management are drawn into the decision machinery pertaining to the evaluation of the projects, the same extent will they value and use the evaluation results. In this case, evaluation should be seen as management tool to help stakeholders improve on what they do (Mulwa, 2007). The guidelines from donors do not indicate how the projects implementing agencies will be audited to ascertain compliance to the guidelines (Kimweli, 2003). It is against this background, the proposed study will seek to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on the successful implementation of ACC & S Food security project.
2.8 Theoretical Framework

This study will be grounded on the Theory of participation. Participation is not a new concept (Buchy, Ross et al. 2000). It represents a move from the global, aspatial, top-down strategies that dominated early development initiatives to more locally sensitive methodologies (Storey 1999). There are differing opinions as to the origins of participation theory. Midgley et al (1986) suggested that the historical antecedents of community participation include: the legacy of western ideology, the influence of community development and the contribution of social work and community radicalism.

The roots of citizen participation can be traced to ancient Greece and Colonial New England. Before the 1960s, governmental processes and procedures were designed to facilitate "external" participation. Citizen participation was institutionalized in the mid -1960s with President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs (Murdock, 2005). According to Price and Mylius (1991), Participation means the involvement of intended beneficiaries in the planning, design, implementation and subsequent maintenance of the development intervention. They further observe local ownership of a project or program as a key to generating motivation for sustainable agricultural activities. Participation represents a move from the global, a spatial, top-down strategies that initially dominated most development initiatives to more locally sensitive methodologies (Storey, 1999).

Chamala (1995) stated that community participation has been the hallmark of many successful development projects around the world.

According to Holcombe (1995), acknowledgement of the importance of participation grew out of the recognition that the worlds’ poor have actually suffered as a result of development, and that everyone needs to be involved in development decisions, implementation and benefits. According to Lane (1995) the only way to ensure that individuals have the power to attack the root causes of underdevelopment is to enable them to influence all decisions, at all levels, which affect their lives. White (1981) identified a number of beneficial reasons for community participation, he argues that with participation, more will be accomplished, and services can be provided more cheaply. Participation has an intrinsic value for participants; is a catalyst for further development; encourages a sense of responsibility; guarantees that a felt need is involved; ensures things are done the right way; uses valuable indigenous knowledge; frees people from dependence on others’ skills; and makes people more conscious of the causes of their poverty and what they can do about it.
Bamberger (1988) identified the following weaknesses of community participation: Negotiations with beneficiaries may delay Project start-up, Participatory approaches increase the number of managerial and administrative staff required and organized communities may exert pressure to raise the level or widen the range of services beyond those originally planned, leading to an increase in project costs. This study adopted this theory because it helped explain concept of community participation and how it influences sustainability of Projects.

The philosophical assumption for this study is that, is not only enough to identify communities vision of development, but it is important to get their views of their plans to achieve their dreams or vision. This is because people will change only if they participate in the decision about the change. The general principles of participatory approach include among others the following; Encouraging communities to take responsibilities, Promote participation for all, Reconcile different interests, Listen to the community, examine the situation/problem from different points of view and then adapt to local situations.

2.9 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework involves forming ideas about relationships between variables in the study and showing the relationship graphically (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The conceptual framework provides a structural description of the relationship between the variables forming the concepts of the study on the implementation of food security projects. The independent variables are grouped together on the left side but not in any order of importance. The dependent variable is placed on the right hand connected with an arrow as a sign of direct relationship. The study identified four independent variables; they include personal attribute of the beneficiaries, the Capacity building, funding and Monitoring and Evaluation systems. The implementation was singled as the dependent variable. This study was guided by the following conceptual framework as shown in figure 2.1.
Figure 2.1 Conceptual Framework
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter contains the research methodology used in the study. Specifically, it focused on the research design, target population, sample and sampling techniques, methods of data collection, validity and reliability of research instruments, data collection procedures, methods of data analysis, ethical consideration and methodology matrix.

3.2 Research Design
The research study used descriptive survey design which is under quantitative approach. According to Kothari (2004), descriptive research design is that study concerned with describing the characteristics of a particular individual, or of a group. The design was deemed suitable since it help to describe the state of affairs as they are, without manipulation of variables (Kothari, 2004). The descriptive survey design helps answer the questions like who, what, where and how on describing the phenomenon on study. This design was considered to be appropriate for the study because it enabled data collection from a large population of Maai-Mahiu in order to answer the research questions.

3.3 Target population
Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) defines population as a complete set of individuals, cases or objects with some common observable characteristics. The target population is a complete set of individuals that have common characteristics to which the researcher is studying. The researcher targeted small scale farmers who had been participating in African Christian Church and Schools Food Security Project within Maai Mahiu ward.

According to African Christian Church and Schools Project Report (2014), 1200 farmers had been reached by the African Christian Church and Schools Food Security Project for the last three years. The 1200 farmers who are project participant represented the target population.
Table 3.1. Distribution of the target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of farmers benefiting in the ACC and S Food Security program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nakuru</td>
<td>Maai Mahiu</td>
<td>Longonot</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satellite</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kijabe</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Munyu</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total  | 1200       |

3.4 Sample and Sampling procedure

Kumar (2005) defines sampling as the process of selecting a sample from the target population so that it forms the basis of predicting the prevalence of the phenomena under study. Sample is a finite part of a statistical population whose properties are to gain information about the whole (Webster, 1985).

The determination of the sample size was guided by the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) (Appendix III). According to the table, for a target population of 1200 farmers, an optimum sample size of 291 farmers is appropriate.

The study used stratified sampling technique to select the number of farmers from each location. The four locations of Longonot, Satellite, Kijabe and Munyu formed the strata. Systematic sampling was used to select the number of farmers to participate in the study. Proportional sampling was used to determine the appropriate representation. Proportional sampling requires that the researcher be able to identify the percentage of the population each stratum contains. The researcher then samples the population proportionally, based on these percentages (Dempsey & Dempsey, 2000). This was determined using the following formula:

\[
\text{No of Households in each stratum} = \frac{\text{No. of Households in stratum}}{\text{Total No. of Households}} \times \text{sample size (291)}
\]
Table 3.2 Sampling Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of farmers benefiting from the ACC and S Food Security Project</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longonot</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400/1200*291 = 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>360/1200 * 291 = 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kijabe</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260/1200 * 291 = 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munyu</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180/1200 * 291 = 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1200</strong></td>
<td><strong>291</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systematic sampling was used to select the participating farmers. A List of the benefiting farmers in each location was written down and every 4th farmer was picked. For example all the 400 farmers in Longonot Location were written down and every 4th farmer picked to comprise a sample of 97. This was done for the rest of the locations.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

Data collection was done using a questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into five sections. Section I collected data on demographic characteristics. Section II was on personal attribute; section III on Capacity building; section IV on funding and Section V on Monitoring & Evaluation. The closed ended questions were used to gain specific information while the open ended questions enabled the researcher to capture the respondent’s personal views which would otherwise be limited by the closed ended questions. According to Khan (2008) a questionnaire guide allows a researcher to collect data from respondents with low literacy levels; collect information that cannot be directly observed, obtain historical information and gain control over the line of questioning. Thus a questionnaire was distributed to all the 291 respondents to obtain the required information. Data collection was carried out for a period of two weeks.
3.5.1 Piloting of the instruments

Orodho (2004) describes pilot testing as a smaller version of a larger study that is conducted to prepare for the study or to field test the survey to provide a rationale for the design. It involves pre-testing of the instruments to determine their validity and reliability. The designed questionnaire was piloted with 29 farmers within the Maai Mahiu Ward. These 29 farmers were excluded in the main study. The sample comprised 10% of the sample size of 291. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) argue that, 10% of the study sample is enough for piloting a study. The pilot study helped the researcher to familiarize with data collection process.

3.5.2 Validity of the research instrument

Validity is the degree to which an instrument measures what is supposed to measure (Kothari, 2004). Creswell (2003) notes that validity is about whether one can draw meaningful and useful inferences from scores on the instrument. It is therefore about the usefulness of the data and not the instrument. To ascertain the content validity of the instruments, 3 experts opinion were sought from, colleagues and the supervisor in the Department of Extra Mural Studies, University of Nairobi, Thika Centre.

3.5.3 Reliability of the research instrument

According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) reliability refers to a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. The reliability of the instruments was estimated through a repeated measurement which involved the split half method. The questionnaire items responded by the respondents of the pilot testing group were assigned arbitrary scores. The scores obtained were keyed into the SPSS software and through Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, a correlation coefficient of 0.711 was obtained indicating that the instrument had an internal consistency. According to Mbwesa (2006), if the correlation coefficient of the instruments falls above +0.6, the instrument is taken reliable and therefore suitable for data collection.

3.6 Data collection procedures

This procedure started after being given an approval letter by the University to go to the field. A permit to conduct the study was also acquired from the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology. The researcher collected the data accompanied by the ACC and S field officer in charge of each village. Data was collected from the 291 farmers for a period of two weeks. Four research assistants aided in data collection after training for two days. Each research
assistant paid a visit to the homestead beforehand and requested when he/she can administer the questionnaire at the convenience of the person who had participated in the project in that household. He/she then returned at the appointed time and administers the questionnaire. The assistants had worked with the community hence were known and this helped to reduce suspicion and cater for the communication barriers.

3.7 Data Analysis Techniques

The raw data obtained from the study was systematically organized and converted to numerical codes representing measurements of variables. The data was analyzed with the help of electronic spreadsheet SPSS Program Version 21.0 while qualitative data was analyzed thematically. The analyzed data was presented in frequency distribution tables. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies and percentages was used to analyze the demographic characteristic, personal attribute, capacity building, funding and monitoring & Evaluation.

3.8 Ethical Issues

A letter of introduction was obtained from Resident Lecturer at Thika Extra Mural Centre. The letter aided in processing of a research permit at National Council of Science, Technology and Innovation. After that authority to collect data was sought from the County Commissioner office, Naivasha District. More authority was sought from the Assistant Chiefs of the four locations of Maai Mahiu Ward. The principle of voluntary participation was strictly adhered to. The respondents were not coerced into participating in the research. Each respondent was explained the purpose of the study and requested to fill a consent form. They were assured of confidentiality and that the information obtained from them will be used for the purposes of study only.
## 3.9 Operational Definition of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Type of Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurement scale</th>
<th>Measuring instrument</th>
<th>Data collection techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful implementation of the ACC and S project</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Percentage of projected completed</td>
<td>Level of project completed</td>
<td>-ordinal</td>
<td>- Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish the influence of personal attribute on implementation of the ACC and S project</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>soci-economic factors: income levels, level of education, occupation, gender, marital status, household size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine the influence of capacity building on implementation of the African Christian Church and Schools Food security project</td>
<td>Independent (capacity building)</td>
<td>length of training, types of trainings, frequency of trainings</td>
<td>Duration of training in days, Frequency of training, Number of visits to successful projects</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine influence of funding on the implementation of African Christian Church and Schools food security project</td>
<td>Independent (funding)</td>
<td>amount of funding</td>
<td>amount in Ksh funded</td>
<td>-ratio</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the influence of Monitoring and</td>
<td>Independent (Monitoring)</td>
<td>Monitoring and</td>
<td>Number of times a</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Frequencies
- Percentages
- Mean
| Monitoring and Evaluation on the implementation of African Christian Church and Schools food security project | & Evaluation | evaluation records | - Presence of Monitoring and Evaluation team | - Frequent feedback | project Monitoring and Evaluation is carried out. | - Availability and evidence of use of monitoring tools in the projects | - Number of times feedback is given | Nominal | Ratio | - Mean |
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CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATIONS, INTERPRETATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the study findings which have been discoursed under key themes and in line with the study’s objectives. It also focuses on analysis, presentation of information as well as discussions and interpretation of data on the factor influencing the implementation of African Christian Church and schools food security project; a case of Maai Mahiu Ward, Nakuru County. The information obtained was on the demographic characteristic of the project beneficiaries that covered gender, age, marital status, type of family as well as size of the family; personal attributes, capacity building, funding and monitoring and evaluation of the project beneficiaries and the influence they had on implementation of African Christian Church and Schools.

4.2 Response Rate

Response rate refers to the percentage of the number of people who responded to the research instruments divided by the total number respondents in the sample. The study had a target population of 291 respondents in collecting data with respect to factors influencing the implementation of African Christian Church and Schools Maai Mahiu food security projects for sustainable food security in Maai Mahiu, Nakuru County, Kenya. The study sample size of 291 was not realized as only 271 questionnaires were returned hence a response rate of 93.1%. According to (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003) a response rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and over is very good. The study therefore recorded an outstanding rate of response. The questionnaires were administered with the help of 5 research assistants. Their responses were recorded as illustrated in table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
<th>No. Responded</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Demographic characteristics of respondents

This section describes the characteristics of the respondents used in the study. Demographic characteristics include features such as gender, age and marital status, type of family as well as the size of the family. The demographic characteristics were studied in order to give an understanding of the respondents and their setting which was viewed as necessary to the analysis of the data obtained.

4.3.1 Gender of the Respondent

The research sought to establish the gender of the respondents. The results obtained are as tabulated in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Distribution of respondent by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results obtained, 63.8% were females while 36.2% were males. From the results analysis, it was an indication that female genders were more involved in the project implementation of the ACC and S Maa Mahiu Food Security Project compared to male gender. Rural women are rarely considered as clients for agricultural research and development programs or users of improved technology (FAO, 1997). Programs for development activities often do not take into consideration the time women spend on household chores (Otsyina and Rosenberg, 1999). Despite the fact that women produce 80-90 percent of food grown for domestic consumption, most agricultural extension services are directed at programs for men (Truitt, 1999). Policy makers give too little attention to women and the roles they play in rural society in spite of their importance in agricultural production (Fergison and Sallia, 1992). As a result, women’s role in achieving food security through food crop production and selection has often been bypassed. By discounting the contributions of women, many development policies and programs designed to alleviate impoverishment actually often make the problem even worse.

Although Boserup (1970) documented the high rate of female participation in the agricultural process, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, neither the strategies for the development of agriculture nor specific programs targeted towards the betterment of the situation of rural
women in this region seem to have taken women into consideration. Gender distribution has been found to have great influence on implementation of development and food based projects. It can be concluded that involvement of more women in food security projects helps in the implementation of food security projects.

4.3.2 Characteristics of respondents by Age

The research sought to establish the age of the respondents by indicating the age category in the questionnaire. The age was important in this study since in many rural areas in Kenya, age has a correlation with literacy levels and also productivity. The obtained results were as shown in table 4.3

**Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents by age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study results, 57.6% of the respondents are aged 51 years and above. These finding imply that majority of food security project implementers (57.6%) are over 51 years, an age group that is considered not as productive compared to the 9.2% (31-40 years) middle age group which is considered most productive. The results imply that there is a large group of old men and women playing the role of project implementation in the sub County.

The significance of age on farm output has been examined extensively by Rongoor et al. (1998) where it is revealed that the influence of age on farm productivity is very diverse. Some studies have found that age has a positive effect on productivity (Kalirajan and Shand 1985, Stefanou and Sexena 1988). Also, a study by Adubi (1992) reveals that age, in correlation with farming experience, has a significant influence on the decision-making process of farmers with respect to risk aversion, adoption of improved agricultural technologies, and other production-related decisions. Age has been found to determine how active and productive the head of the household would be. Age has also been found to affect
the rate of household adoption of innovations, which in turn, affects household productivity and livelihood improvement strategies (Dercon and Krishnan 1996).

Further investigation was carried out on the extent of respondents’ involvement in the project implementation in relation to the age of the respondents and the results were presented in Table 4.4

4.4: Involvement in the Project Implementation by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Involvement</th>
<th>31-40 years</th>
<th>41 – 50 years</th>
<th>51 years and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largely</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowly</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of count</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated in Table 4.4, out of the 66.4 % of the respondents who were largely involved in the program implementation, 42.4 % were above 51 years, 21.8 % were in the age group of 41-50 years while only 2.2% were in their age of 31 -40 years. This indicates that a large number of ACC and S project implementers are concentrated in the age above 51 years.

Age distribution was therefore found to have influence on the implementation of food-based Projects, since most of the community members in their productive age are not involved in the project implementation process.

The study results concede with research findings by Mwanyumba (2010) conducted in Taita district, Wundanyi location. It was found that most of the farm workers (66%) were women aged between 35 and 60 years, closely followed by women of advanced age group. Some old men over 60 years also assisted in the farming equally. The dependence of farm families on farming as the predominant occupation may have a positive effect on agricultural production. This can be associated with asset ownership and getting of support from their children. The higher the age of the head, the more stable the economy of the farm household.

Older people have also relatively richer experiences of the social and physical environments. Moreover, older heads are expected to have better access to land than the younger heads.
(Degefa, 2001). It would be concluded that age influences the implementation of food security projects.

4.3.3 Marital Status of the Respondent

Marital status is a demographic characteristic that is likely to have influence on implementation food security projects. In order to establish its influence on the project implementation, the study respondents were asked to state the marital status they belonged to and the findings were analyzed and presented in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5: Distribution of Respondents Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above analysis, 203 (74.9%) of the respondents were married, 58 (21.4%) were Widowed while 10 (3.7%) were single. The findings showed that a large number of the project implementers were married, followed by the widowed and finally by single families. The study found it important to examine the extent to which respondents in each marital status were involved in the implementation of the project in order to ascertain the influence it had in implementing the ACC and S Food Security project. The results arrived at are shown in Table 4.6

**Table 4.6: Involvement in Project Implementation by Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of involvement</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>single</td>
<td>married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely involved</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately involved</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowly involved</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings indicate that among the respondents who were married, 61.6% of them were largely involved in the project activities, 9.2% were moderately involved while only 4.1% were lowly involved. From the widowed families, 12.5% were largely involved, but only 1.8% was lowly involved. Very few single families were in the project implementation with 2.6% moderately involved and 1.1% involved to a greater extent.

Extent of involvement in project implementation with respect to marital status of the respondents confirmed that, community members in stable and complete families are more involved in implementing community food-based projects compared to single and widowed families. Married families are prominent in the society and with many members to provide for and therefore the need to embrace project activities for food security within the households.

4.3.4 Family Status of the Respondents

The study respondents were asked to state the status of their families whether it is female headed, male headed or child headed and the results of their responses were as shown in table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female headed</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male headed</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study findings majority of the respondents were from male headed as represented by 204 (76.4%), 64 (23.6%) were from female headed and none of the respondent was from a child headed family. The study indicated that a large number of the project implementers were from male-headed families followed by female-headed families. Most of the family assets like land, income are controlled by men and this may influence individual’s involvement in project implementation

Studies done by Degafa, (2000), Ramarkrisha (2002), and Kidane (2005) as quoted in Murei (2011), independently conducted in different parts of rural Ethiopia, came out with common conclusions that livelihood of female-headed households were disadvantaged when compared with their male counterparts. This is due to the fact that researches justify female
households have limited access to livelihood assets like land, education, labour force and credit services which can be extended in implementing community projects.

4.3.5 Family Size of the Respondent

The study respondents were asked to state the size of their families. The size of the families of the respondents is within demographic characteristics and is bound to influence implementation of projects and especially related to food security. Their responses were analyzed and presented in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 Distribution of Respondents by Family Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table 4.8 indicates that majority of the respondents 242 (89.3%) who were implementing the African Christian Church and Schools Food Security project had families of less than 6 members. The family size is bound to influence the implementations of food related projects. It could influence the availability of labour to implement food security projects activities.

4.4 Personal Attributes and Project Implementation

4.4.1: Respondents Education Qualifications and Project Implementation

The study looked into the educational background of the respondents as a factor influencing their ability to embrace new farming technology to increase productivity thus ensuring food security. In order to answer the study question on influence of respondents’ education level on project implementation, the study respondents were asked to indicate their highest level of education and the findings were analyzed and presented in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: Education Qualification of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never attended any school</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary level</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study findings, 167 (61.6%) respondents indicated primary education as their highest education level, 50 (18.5%) had secondary education, 1 (0.3%) had college education, none of the respondents had university education while 53 (19.6%) had not attended any form of school.

For further analysis, extent of respondents’ involvement in project implementation with respect to their education qualification was cross tabulated and results were presented in Table 4.10
Table 4.10: Involvement in Project Implementation by Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education qualification</th>
<th>Largely involved</th>
<th>Moderately involved</th>
<th>Lowly involved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not attended any school</td>
<td>Count: 33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total: 12.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary level</td>
<td>Count: 97</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total: 35.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level</td>
<td>Count: 22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total: 8.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College level</td>
<td>Count: 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total: 0</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total: 152</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total: 56.1%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis on the extent of involvement of the respondents with primary education in implementation of the project activities with respect to their education qualification indicated 97 (35.8%) were largely involved in the project activities, 43 (15.9%) were moderately involved and none was lowly involved in the project implementation. Out of the 50 (18.4%) respondents with secondary education qualification, 22 (8.1%) were largely involved, 26 (9.6%) were moderately involved while only 2 (0.74%) was noted to be involved to a low extent. The respondent with college qualification was moderately involved in the project implementation. The respondents who had not attended any formal school were noted to be involved in project implementation. 33 (12.2%) of the 53 respondents who had not attended any form of school confessed of being largely involved in the implementation of the project activities while 20 (7.4%) were moderately involved.
From the study findings, it can be interpreted that education is essential to the implementation of the project. However, the level of education of the project implementers does not directly influence implementation of food-based projects as long as they apply the correct farming methods and attend farming seminars and workshops.

Reuben (2005) noted that education levels of households in Niger Delta in Nigeria were quite low, especially among the youth and women who were engaged in agricultural farming but with constant field demonstration, the government supported food interventions were successfully implemented. The study agrees with Macharia (2007) who studied educational characteristics of dairy farmers in Central and the Rift Valley provinces and concluded that those mostly involved in dairy farming were lowly educated.

Mubichi (2009) while studying factors influencing sustainability of foreign aid projects in Imenti North found out that, where community members had primary education, the donor funded projects were about 58 times more likely to succeed compared to where the community had no education and therefore the study findings agree with most of the findings of the past researchers of implementation of food based projects.

### 4.4.2 Respondent Main Source of Income

The level of income of the project implementers is a factor bound to influence implementation of community projects. In order to answer the research questions of this study, the respondents were asked to specify their main sources of incomes, either from external sources or if they were wholly dependent on products of the ACC and S food security project activities. Table 4.11 presents the analysis of the study findings on the beneficiaries’ main source of income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC and S activities</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study findings, 192 (70.8%) of the 271 respondents had their main source of income from the benefits accrued from ACC and S food security funded activities. Only 79
(29.2%) had their main income from external sources. The study finding agrees with Doss (2011) that 79% of women in least developed countries who are economically active report that agriculture is their primary economic activity.

4.4.3 Average Monthly Income of the Respondents from ACC and S activities

The size of the implementer’s income dictates the amount extended towards implementing the project. The study therefore sought to investigate the average monthly income of the study respondents from ACC and S Food Security Project activities in order to assess its influence on the project implementation. Table 4.12 present the analysis of the study findings on the average monthly income from ACC and S Food Security Project activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 1000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 5000</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 – 10000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000 and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>192</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study findings 158 (82.3%) of the project beneficiaries are earning between Ksh 1001 and 5000 per month from ACC and S project activities. 34 (17.7%) are earning less than Ksh 1000 per month from the ACC and S project activities.
4.4.4: Average income per month from external sources other than ACC and S activities

The respondents were asked to indicate approximates of their monthly incomes from external sources other than from ACC and S project activities. The results obtained are in Table 4.13

Table 4.13: Average income per month from external sources other than ACC&S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No external income</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1000</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 5000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 – 10000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings revealed that 67.9% of the respondent had an external source of income with only 32.1% with no external source of income. However 44.7% of all those who had an external source of income had an income of below Ksh 1000 with only 23.2% getting between 1001 and 5000.

For further analysis the study cross tabulated the respondents’ average monthly income responses on extent to which income levels helped in the implementation of the ACC and S Food Security project activities. The obtained results are presented in the table 4.14
Table 4:14 Extent of Help of Income Levels in the Implementation of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income levels</th>
<th>Extent of help in the implementation</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Small Extent</th>
<th>No Extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No external income</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1000</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001 – 5000</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 – 10000</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10001</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td><strong>76%</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 shows that 121 (44.6%) of the respondents had a monthly income of below 1000 and among them, 88(32.5%) felt that income levels helped in the project implementation to a great extent, 31 (11.4%) to a small extent and only 2(0.74%) felt that income levels does not help in the implementation of the project activities. From the study findings, 63 (23.3%) of the respondents had a monthly income of between 1000 – 5000 and among them 55(20.3%) felt that income levels helped to a great extent in the implementation of the project activities and only 8(3.0%) felt that income levels helped to a small extent.

It can be interpreted that most of the community members felt that extra income will help to a great extent in the implementation of project.

4.5 Capacity Building on ACC and S Project Implementation

Among the variables investigated in this study is the capacity building of the project beneficiaries. This is because achievement of projects and food interventions is tied on the capacity of the direct project implementers. In order to answer the study question on influence of capacity building on project implementation, the study sought for information on
the training offered to the respondents, frequency of training, relevance and usefulness of training to the project implementation.

4.5.1 Training of the Project Beneficiaries
Implementation of the ACC and S Maai Mahiu Food Security Project involved execution of agricultural training activities and therefore the study sought to establish influence of training in the project implementation. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they were trained or not prior to project implementation process. The findings were analyzed and presented in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15: Capacity Building of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.15 showed that all the project respondents had their capacity developed prior to the project implementation. The study findings indicated that a larger number of respondents underwent through training for skills to be applied in conducting the project activities. Capacity building involves training for technical skills for practical application. The government of Kenya recognizes that educating and training its citizens is fundamental to the success of the vision 2030 strategy (Ministry of Planning, National Development and Vision 2030, 2007). Any agricultural development plan should start with training of the target participants on relevant topics during the project implementation. Farmers should have a great contact with various sources of relevant information which confirms the importance of knowledge in order to improve farming efficiency.

4.5.2 Frequency of Training of Beneficiaries
The number of training sessions that the project implementers are exposed to determines the magnitude of skills and knowledge imparted which in turn would influence project implementation. In attempt to answer the study question, the study respondents were asked to state the number of times they had been trained and the results were analysed as shown in Table 4.16
Table 4.16 Frequency of training offered to Project Beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Trainings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 shows that 171 (63.1%) of the respondents had been trained for more than ten times, while 41 (15.1%) had been trained between six to ten times and only 59 (21.8%) had been trained between one to five times. The study findings therefore indicate that all the respondents had attended trainings and there was no project implementer who had not attended training. From the same table it is clear that majority of the project implementers had attended trainings regularly. The data would be interpreted to mean that the project participants placed a high value on the training they were getting and therefore important in the implementation of the project.

4.5.3 Relevance of Training on Project Implementation.

Capacity building involves strengthening of performance and capabilities of the project implementers through skills training for specific project activities. To answer the research question, the respondents were asked to indicate whether training offered to them was of any relevance to the project implementation. The responses were analyzed and presented in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17: Relevance of Training on Project implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Relevance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 indicates that 257 (94.8%) of the respondents confirmed relevance of capacity building offered to them for the implementation of the project activities. A small number represented by 14 (5.2%) of the project beneficiaries, among them those who never attended
all the trainings indicated that training offered was not relevant to the activities they were undertaking.

Skills and technology attained through training will have relevance if directly applied in the actual implementation of project activities. It can be concluded that the type and frequency of training will have an influence in the implementation of a project. The study findings ascertain the findings of a study conducted by Njuguna (2011) on implementation of fish projects in Embakasi constituency. The study had established that regardless of low education qualification of the program implementers, the skills and knowledge gained during technical training enabled implementers to have more exposure and thus get actively involved in implementation of community projects.

4.5.4 Usefulness of the Training in Project Implementation

To answer the research question, the respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which training offered to them was useful to the project implementation. The responses were analyzed and presented in Table 4.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately useful</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 indicates that 243 (89.7%) of the respondent confirmed that the training that was being offered to them was very useful in the implementation of this project.

A small number represented by 28 (10.3%) of the project beneficiaries, among them those who never underwent all the trainings offered felt the training was moderately useful to the implementation of the project activities they were undertaking.

According to Kistern (1998), capacity development and skills training are determinants of successful agricultural developments. For a project to realize its objectives, the guidelines of the project cycle must be vigorously implemented. The cycle should however further incorporate participative process, social integration, capacity development and economic
diversity. Kistern insists that human capacity development and skills training are important
determinants of successful agriculture development. Skills and technology attained through training will have relevance if directly applied in the actual implementation activities and therefore, untrained respondents may not realize its relevance in the project implementation until they are fully trained and apply the same in the implementation activities.

This finding also anchors around a study by (Muok, Kimondo, & Atshushi, 2001) in Uganda that found out that the more a farmer has been trained effectively and continuously the more successful the farmer becomes. Training thus improves the managerial ability by helping the farmer to emulate and execute farm plans and also acquire information on how to improve marketing of their products. Hence a sound training background reinforces natural talent and provides a basis for decision making.

4.6 Funding of ACC and S Food Security Project Implementers

To answer the research questions the respondent were asked to state what kind of funding they have received from the ACC and S Maai Mahiu Food Security Project. The study findings are highlighted in table 4.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Funding</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified seeds</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Farm Structures</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study findings, different funding were given to the project beneficiaries although majority of the respondents 218 (80.4%), were supported with certified seeds. The study findings revealed that only 8 (3%) were supported directly with finances while 45(16.6%) were supported with construction of farm structures.

Funding is the act of providing resources usually in form of money (financing). The funding can be given either directly to the project beneficiaries or indirectly through provision of farm inputs. Agricultural inputs, primarily seed, fertilizer and agrochemicals, have an enormous potential to leverage the efforts of hard-working farmers. Used appropriately, they can mean the difference between a good harvest and starvation (Negeri and Adisu, 2001).
For more information on implementation of the ACC and S Maai Mahiu Food Security Project, the researcher sought to establish the extent to which the funding was adequate to the specific project activities they were executing and the findings were analyzed and presented in Table 4.20.

**Table 4.20: Extent of adequacy of the funding to the implementation of project activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of adequacy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequate</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study findings, 93 (34.3%) felt that the funding were adequate among them those who had an extra source of income while 178 (65.7%) felt that the funding were not adequate. From the study analysis, it can be interpreted that extra income from external source is important for the implementation of food security projects. The extra income helps the farmer to support that which they have been supported with. For those supported with seeds they mentioned that the extra income helped to purchase things like fertilizer and chemicals used to control the pests that were attacking the crops while in the field.

The study also sought to determine whether the funding had been distributed on time or not. Timely planting using fertilizer allows the germinating seeds to benefit from the nitrogen flux effect which occurs with the first rains. The germinating seeds will also benefit from the warm soil temperature and good aeration thereby escaping pests and diseases which minimize agricultural yield. When subsidies are distributed early, farmers will plant early and harvest promptly thus allowing land preparation for the next cropping season. Prompt harvesting also allows the farmers to store their produce on time thus reducing post-harvest losses.

In order to determine how the time of distribution of funding influenced the implementation of food security project in Maai Mahiu Ward, the study sought to find out whether the funding were distributed on time or not. The study findings are illustrated in table 4.21.
Table 4.21: On-time distribution of funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not timely</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.21, the study showed that 254 (93.7%) received their funding on timely base with only 17(6.3) responding to not timely funding. It is thus evident from the study that majority of the farmers did receive the funding, mainly finance, certified seeds and construction of farm structures on time.

The study further sought to determine the extent to which funding influenced the implementation of the ACC and S Maai Mahiu food Security Project. Managing funds, as well as other project attributes that contribute to cost, is a significant challenge faced by project implementers. The challenge is to understand the timing of project costs and using the tools available at the right times and for the right reasons. There are various tools available to project implementers that can be used to effectively manage project costs while successfully accomplishing all project tasks and deliverables at the right time. According to USAID report (2003), overall long term causality of high levels of households’ food insecurity and poverty has not been adequately addressed, because of poor planning, implementation or both and insufficient resources. The study findings are illustrated in table 4.22

Table 4.22: Extent of funding in influencing the implementation of the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of influence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very greatly</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study findings, 183 (67.5%) confirmed that the funding they received helped very greatly in the implementation of the project. The other 88 (32.5%) confirmed that the funding helped greatly in the implementation of the project. Although majority had felt that the funding was not sufficient they still confirmed that funding is a factor that influences the implementation of projects.
4.7 Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on Implementation of ACC and S Maai Mahiu Food Security Project

Monitoring and evaluation is the systematic collection and analyzing of information at regular intervals about ongoing project(s) in order to compare their actual impact against the set objectives to facilitate decision making. Monitoring and evaluation in food security projects primary purpose is to allow project teams to run projects effectively, ensuring they have the desired results for beneficiaries (ACF, 2011). According to Standish Group Project Chaos Report (2005), one of the reasons for project failure is lack of project monitoring and control. In an attempt to answer the study question on the influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on the implementation of the project, the study respondent were asked to state whether any form of monitoring and evaluation had been carried out.

The study sought to find out whether there was any form of monitoring and evaluation done to the ACC and S food security project. Guidelines by ACF, (2011) encouraged active stakeholder participation in project formulation, implementation and M&E activities to ensure relevant programming and accountability. Feedback gives the positive aspect of the project as well as shortcomings. It helps in decision making on what line to pursue and what corrective aspects to take. Eventually if corrective measures are taken, sustainability of the project is enhanced.

4.7.1. Monitoring and Evaluation Tools

The study found that 193(71.2%) of the project beneficiaries were involved in monitoring and evaluation data collection process. They are several tools applied in Monitoring and Evaluation of a project. 162(59.8%) had participated in questionnaire, 137(50.6%) had participated in Focus Group Discussions while 98(36.2%) had participated in observation. These are preferred because they are not time consuming and any beneficiary can participate and make contributions using these tools. In addition, they do not require high degree of literacy. Direct observation and group discussion on the project progress help in evaluating the project. Corrective measures can be done immediately the deviations from the target are noted leading to sustainability of the group.

The study found out that the beneficiaries participated in M and E data collection. This was proper according to guidelines by CARE which provided that the stakeholders were to be
involved from the design of the PMERL framework through to data collection, analysis and feedback (CARE_PMERL, 2012).

4.7.2. Sharing of the Finding of the Monitoring and Evaluation

According to ACF, (2011), the communities in which a project was implemented should have a sizeable say in shaping and undertaking Monitoring and Evaluation activities, as well as in decision-making around Monitoring and Evaluation findings. A Participatory monitoring and evaluation framework in food security projects was to assess the degree of relevance and success of a project through satisfaction feedback from beneficiaries and other stakeholders on whether needs were being addressed (ACF, 2011). As such the research sought to establish the extent to which sharing the findings of the M and E had on the implementation of the ACC and S food security project. The responses were analyzed and presented in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23: Influence of sharing M and E findings on the Implementation of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of influence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very greatly</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study findings sharing the M and E findings had a great influence on the implementation of the project. 125(46.1%) agreed that sharing of the M and E feedback with the beneficiaries had a very great influence on the implementation of the project, 62(22.9%) said sharing influenced greatly and 84(31.0%) said to a large extent.

The study agrees with a study done by Miseda (2014) on Influence of Community Participation on Sustainability of selected Njaa Marufuku Kenya Food Security Projects in Kisumu County Kenya which established that participants in the community should participate in information gathering and should also participate in utilizing of the information gathered.

This study findings are in line with a study by Kimweli (2013) on The Role of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices to the Success of Donor Funded Food Security Intervention Projects in Kibwezi District which established that Participatory monitoring and evaluation in food security projects contributes to the success of food security projects though it should be
complemented with good project management skills. IFAD (2007) also emphasizes that a PM&E process contributes to the construction of information feedback systems that strengthen learning and build organizations that value critical reflection, and learn from success and failure alike and therefore the respondents were in order to claim that participation in monitoring and evaluation through information sharing and utilization to a high extent led to good project implementation.

4.8 Sustainability of the ACC and S Project Activities

One of the ACC and S Maai Mahiu Food Security Project objectives was to ensure sustainable food security in the area of study and therefore the study sought to establish whether the activities undertaken by the respondents were sustainable. Their responses were analysed and recoded as shown in the table 4.24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of sustainability</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very sustainable</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study findings indicated that most of the activities within the project were very sustainable as stated by 218 (80.4%) of the study respondents. None of the respondents confessed that the ACC and S Maai Mahiu Food Security Project activities under their care had not been sustained. It can therefore be interpreted that success of food project implementation can be facilitated by developing capacities of the implementers and also timely provision of funding to the project beneficiaries.
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CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.2 Introduction
This chapter presents the study’s summary of findings, conclusion and recommendations in line with the research questions. The summary of the analysis of each research indicator is featured and from this study analysis, associated recommendations for improvement of project implementation and suggestions for further research were made.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
This section presents a summary of the research findings as grouped according to the objectives of the study namely; demographic characteristics, Personal attribute of the project beneficiaries, capacity building of the project beneficiaries, Funding of the project beneficiaries and Monitoring and Evaluation of the project beneficiaries.

5.2.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Project Beneficiaries
The study established that 173 (63.8%) of the project implementers were female against 98 (36.2%) male gender.

The study established that majority of the project implementers represented by 57.6% were above 51 years. Only 9.2% were between 31 years to 40 years while 33.2 were between 41 years to 50 years. The study established that out of the 66.4% of those who were largely involved 42.4% were above 51 years old a clear indication that farmers above 51years were more involved in ACC and S Project activities.

Study respondents were also from different marital status, 74.9% married, 21.4% widowed while 3.7% were from single families. A large number of the respondents who were largely involved in project implementation were from married families. The study also established that majority of the respondents were coming from male headed families represented by 76.4% and most of the households represented by 89.3% had families of between 1-5 persons per household.

5.2.2. Personal Attributes of the Project Beneficiaries
As far as education was concerned most of the project beneficiaries represented by 61.6% had primary education as their highest level, 18.5% had obtained secondary education while only 0.3% of the respondents had attained post secondary education. It was also noted that 19.6% of project implementers interviewed had not attended any school for formal education.
Majority of the respondents who were involved in project implementation to a large extent had primary education as their highest level of education.

The study established that majority of the respondents represented by 70.8% depended on ACC and S food security activities as their main source of income. The study respondent confirmed that 82.3% earned an average of between 1001 and 5000 per month from the food security activities. The study findings revealed that 67.9% of the respondent had an external source of income with only 32.1% with no external source of income. However 44.7% of all those who had an external source of income had an income of below Ksh 1000 with only 23.2% getting between 1001 and 5000.

5.2.3 Capacity Building of the Project Beneficiaries
As far as the capacity building of the project beneficiaries prior to the onset of the project implementation was concerned, it was established that all the project implementers represented by 100% had been trained on skills and technology necessary for the project activities. Further to this, 94.8% of the respondents confirmed that the type of training offered to them was of great relevance and 89.7% confirmed that the training was very useful to the project implementation.

5.2.4 Funding of the beneficiaries on Project Activities
The research study revealed that 65.7% indicated that the funding was not adequate. However 93.7% indicated that they received the funding on timely base. 67.5% confirmed that funding helped very greatly in the implementation of the project.

5.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation of the ACC and S Food Security Project
As far as monitoring and evaluation is concerned, the study revealed that 71.2% of the respondent had participated in monitoring and evaluation data collection process. Only 28.8% had not participated in data collection process during monitoring and evaluation process. The study also revealed that the respondents were not only involved in data collection but they also participated during sharing of the Monitoring and Evaluation findings. 46.1% of the respondent agreed that sharing of the findings with the participants influenced in a very great way in the implementation of the project. 22.9% said sharing of the monitoring and evaluation findings had a great influence in the implementation while 31.0
5.3 Conclusions of the study
The study focused on factors influencing the implementation of ACC and S food security project, a case of Maai Mahiu ward, Nakuru County. From the study findings, demographic characteristics of the project beneficiaries including gender, age distribution, marital status and family status of the project implementers have a role to play in the implementation of community projects, both for development and for food security. The study findings on age indicate that age influences implementation of food security projects. At the age above 40 years most of the participants have stable families and have resorted to farming as a means of providing for their families.

The study therefore concludes that demographic characteristics and especially age is an outstanding factor that plays a large role in food insecurity in household levels and to the society at large. Age has a significant influence on the decision making process of farmers with respect to adoption of improved agricultural technologies and other production related decisions. Traditionally, women were expected to provide food for the family and also take care of the family members, therefore there is need to direct agriculture extension services to women.

In an attempt to answer the study question on the influence of personal attributes on the implementation of the project, it was established that basic education is a prerequisite to implementation of any project since it enhances uptake of new skills and technology necessary for project implementation. However education level is not a determinant in the implementation as long as the farmers exercise good farming practices and attends farming seminars and workshops to enhance their farming techniques and hence improve productivity.

In most cases, majority of the rural occupants with low levels of education are left to shoulder the burden of food provision since most of the high educated society members migrate to the urban areas in search of white colour jobs. For effective implementation of food-based programs, the research findings reflect a need for at least basic education to enhance access of information and also skills necessary in projects implementation processes.
It can therefore be concluded that any community member of any education level as long as their capacity performance is enhanced through training can effectively and efficiently contribute in project implementation. However, education should be availed to all citizens since it increases self confidence and self esteem in individuals. From the past researchers, education has a key role of promoting community participation; it increases levels of literacy and thus access to information, skills and technology required for project implementation.

Most of the study respondents had no other source of income and they largely depended on ACC and S food security project as their main sources of incomes. From the study findings, the study respondents revealed that income levels helped to a great extent in the implementation of the project. Level of income of project beneficiaries was therefore concluded as a factor influencing implementation of food security project. Therefore food security project should aim at increasing the income levels of the target households empowering them to reduce dependency for sustainable food security. In Uganda, Rutaisire (2010) established that lack of reliable capital was among major factors hindering program implementers from achieving their intended objectives.

In order to answer the study questions on influence of capacity building, the study investigated the variable of capacity building of the project beneficiaries prior to the onset of the project implementation. Despite the low education qualifications of the project implementers, the study observed that the type of training offered to the project implementers, had a positive influence to the implementation of ACC and S food security project. It is therefore concluded that capacity building is key to implementation of projects as long as the appropriate training is duly offered and frequent farm follow up done. The trainings need to be organized in venues where all gender can access regardless of age and education level.

The study respondent indicate that the funding was not enough but they agreed that timely provision of whatever kind of funding is key to the implementation of food security project. However for sustainable food security to be achieved participants should be empowered to generate the funding on their own and from the project activities they are undertaking to reduce dependency. The researcher recommends that the participants be given the seed capital necessary and on timely base as community members strive to achieve self-reliance,
self-help, self-growth based on the felt needs of the community as the main pillar of development and be more committed to self-help projects than relying on external support.

On the influence of monitoring and evaluation on implementation of food security project, it can be concluded that close monitoring and evaluation of the food security projects is very important. The beneficiaries should be empowered to establish management committee whose members should keep monitoring the progress of their projects and also evaluate their performance over time. It can be concluded that it is very necessary for the community members to participate in the project by gathering information and utilise the information gathered by frequently reporting the project progress during meetings and also use baseline data to compare the project performance. Findings similar to these were reported by Wabwoba & Wakhungu(2013) whose study recommends that for Kenyan communities to enjoy food security through community projects, the project members should be involved in project design, implementation, resource contribution, monitoring and evaluation, to ensure ownership and hence sustainability.

5.4 Recommendations of the study

From the findings of this study the following recommendations are made:

1. Food security projects should aim at involving both male and female gender and encouraging the youthful age group to be actively involved for they have the energy and basic education hence able to learn new farming technologies easily and also ready to adapt to new technologies.

2. Training for farmers should be organized within their communities for accessibility by all project participants. When trainings are organized far from the community they deny women a chance to attend due other household chores under their care. The training should further be followed up by extension service provider in the farm to ensure the activities are implemented as intended.

3. Community members should be involved right from the planning stage of the project so that they clearly understand their role and their contribution into the project. Even where the project is to support the farmers with funding it should only be done once the capacity of the farmers have been built and the funding should be done on timely basis.
4. Community (beneficiaries) should be trained to build up their capacity to participate productively in Monitoring and Evaluation right from data collection and analysis to sharing in the findings of the Monitoring and Evaluation.

5.5 Suggestion for further reading
The study recommends other studies on how policies in place affect success of food security projects in the ward.
Another study could be carried out to include other factors that influence implementation of food security projects like demographic characteristics and socio-economic factors. Future studies should apply different research instruments like focus group discussions to involve respondents in discussions in order to generate detailed information which would help improve projects implementation process.
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APPENDICES:

Appendix I: Letter of Transmittal

Patrick Maina Kimani  
P.O. BOX 1365,  
Thika

Dear Sir/Madam,


I am a Master of Arts student at the University of Nairobi-Thika Extra-Mural Centre, Reg. No. L50/70666/2011. I am undertaking a study that seeks to examine the factors that influence the implementation of the ACC and S food security project at Maai Mahiu Ward, Nakuru County as a partial fulfillment for the requirement for an award of Masters in Arts degree in Project Planning and Management.

You have been randomly selected to provide information on implementation of the ACC and S food security project through the issued questionnaire. This is a request for your participation in responding to the attached questionnaire. Your truthful response will help facilitate this study. Please be assured that any personal information given will be treated with utmost confidentiality and will be purposely used for this study.

Thank you for your participation.

Yours Faithfully,

Patrick Maina Kimani
Appendix II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FARMERS UNDERTAKING ACC and S FOOD PROJECTS ACTIVITIES

The Questionnaire seeks to gather information from the ACC and S Food Security Project beneficiaries, study variables. The identity of all the respondents will be held in strict confidence. Do not include your name in the questionnaire. Participation of the survey will be voluntary and all the information given will be used only for the research purpose. Kindly spare your time to provide answers based on your experience in the implementation of ACC and S Food Security project. In case of any clarification or need for translation, please feel free to ask.

SECTION (A) DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Instructions: TICK (√) appropriately.

1. Gender
   Male [ ]
   Female [ ]

2. Age bracket in years
   21 – 30 years and below [ ]
   31 -40 [ ]
   41 -50 [ ]
   51 and above [ ]

3. Marital Status:
   Single [ ]
   Married [ ]
   Widowed [ ]

4 Type of the family
   Female headed [ ]
   Male headed [ ]
   Child-headed [ ]

5. Size of the family members
   1- 5 [ ]
   6- 10 [ ]
   11 and above [ ]
Section B: Personal attributes

6. What is the highest level of your education?
   - Have never attended any school [ ]
   - Primary level [ ]
   - College level [ ]
   - Secondary level [ ]
   - University level [ ]

7. What is the main source of your income?
   - Benefits from ACC and S projects activities [ ]
   - Others. [ ]
   - specify ………………………

8. Estimate your income per month from ACC and S Food Security project activities (Ksh)
   - Below 1000 [ ]
   - 1001-5000 [ ]
   - 5001-10000 [ ]
   - 10001 and above [ ]

9. Estimate your income per month from other external sources other than from ACC and S project?
   - Below 1000 [ ]
   - 1001-5000 [ ]
   - 5001-10000 [ ]
   - Above 10001 [ ]

10. To what extent do you think income levels have helped in the implementation of ACC and S food security project?
    - Great extent [ ]
    - Small extent [ ]
    - No extent [ ]
SECTION C: CAPACITY BUILDING OF THE PROJECT BENEFICIARIES

11. (a) Have you ever been trained on implementation of the ACC and S Food Security project activities you are undertaking?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

(b) If yes, how many times have you been trained?
   1-5 [ ]
   6-10 [ ]
   10 and above [ ]

12. In your own opinion, do you think the training offered is of relevance towards implementation of ACC and S Food Security project?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

13. To what extent has the training been useful to the implementation of the ACC and S Food Security project?
   Very useful [ ]
   Moderately useful [ ]
   Not at all useful [ ]

Section D: Funding of the ACC and S Food security project

14. Which of the type of funding have you received from the ACC and S food security project?
   Finances [ ]
   Certified seeds [ ]
   Farm implements [ ]
   Tree seedlings [ ]
   Construction of farm structures [ ]
   Other (specify)………………………………………………..
15. To what extent has the above funding been adequate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of funding</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Not Adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm implements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified seeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree seedlings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of farm structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. To what extent has the funding of the ACC and S project been timely?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of funding</th>
<th>Timely</th>
<th>Not timely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm implements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified of seeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree seedlings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of farm structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. To what extent has funding influenced implementation of the ACC and S food security project?

- Very greatly [    ]
- Greatly [    ]
- To a large extent [    ]
- To a small extent [    ]
- Not at all [    ]
Section E: Monitoring and Evaluation of the ACC and S food Security project

18. During the implementation of ACC and S project activities have you participated in any form of Monitoring and Evaluation Activity?
   - Yes
   - No

19. If yes, what tools was used?
   - Questionnaire
   - Focus group Discussion
   - Observation

20. To what extent has sharing of the Monitoring and Evaluation findings influenced the implementation of the ACC and S food security project?
   - Very greatly
   - Greatly
   - To a large extent
   - To a small extent
   - Not at all

21. In your opinion, to what extent does Monitoring and Evaluation influence the implementation of the ACC and S food security project?
   - Very greatly
   - Greatly
   - To a large extent
   - To a small extent
   - Not at all

Section F: Implementation of the ACC & S food security project

22. To what extent have the ACC & S projects being implemented in Maai- Mahiu Ward been sustainable?
   - Very sustainable
   - Sustainable
   - Not sustainable
23. If not sustainable, what do you think would have contributed to their failure?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

24. What do you think should be addressed to ensure sustainable food security in Maai Mahiu?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
Appendix IV: Krejcie & Morgan (1970) for determining the sample size of a population

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