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<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
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<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
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</tr>
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<td>FBOs</td>
<td>Faith Based Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGM</td>
<td>Female Genital Mutilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCs</td>
<td>Orphaned and Vulnerable Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPFAR</td>
<td>Presidential Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFAIDS</td>
<td>Southern African AIDS Information and Dissemination Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

Challenges associated with the care of orphans and vulnerable children are still evident in Sub-Saharan Africa. This is so even with the existence of non-profit organizations such as community based organizations (CBOs), non-government organizations (NGOs) and Faith Based Organizations. These organizations receive funding from international funding agencies in order to implement orphans and vulnerable children’s OVCs’ projects. The success of these projects and in particular those that are implemented by CBOs are however influenced by a multiplicity of factors key among them being the involvement of stakeholders. This study investigated the influence of stakeholder involvement on the performance of community based organizations (CBOs) implementing orphans and vulnerable children’s (OVC) projects in Samburu Central Sub County. The study investigated the influence of; community involvement, donor funding, government involvement and other service providers on the performance of CBOs implementing OVC projects in Samburu Central Sub County. The study was hinged on two theories; Resource Dependence theory and Stakeholders’ Theory. The study employed descriptive survey research design. The target population comprised 136 CBOs’ officials, 46 Heads of Institutions and 13 government children officers. Total population is 195 and the sample was composed of 93 officials from CBOs operating in the Sub County, 24 heads of Institutions and 13 government children officers who were selected to participate in the study. Stratified and random sampling was used to pick the respondents. Questionnaires were used to collect data from CBO’s officials and the heads of institutions while an interview guide was used to collect data from government’s children officers in the Sub County. Data was analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively using SPSS version 21.0. 100% of the respondents were of opinion that lack of community involvement on implementation of OVC project negatively influenced implementation of the projects. Local community involvement in formulation of the strategies in the strategic plans provides invaluable support during the implementation of the CBO’s OVC projects. It was found out that 82.3% of the respondents indicated that CBOs faced challenges in raising funds to implement OVC projects while 17.7 indicated otherwise. 48% relied on international donor funding, 26.6 from national government and 16.6 raised funds from members. Most OVCs’ projects are highly dependent on external donor funding. 100% of the respondents agreed that government support influences implementation of OVC projects. Government support is necessary to carry out necessary legal reforms and to enforce existing mandates concerning property rights. 86.1% agreed that the CBO worked in partnership with NGOs in the process of implementing OVC projects whereas 13.9% of the respondents were of the contrary opinion. This implies most of the CBO worked in partnership with NGOs In the process of implementing OVC projects which enhanced quality of services provided. The study recommends for strengthened partnerships with government departments such that they can be relied upon to assist OVC programs consistently when needed, expand efforts to mobilize communities and private businesses to support OVC interventions. Coordinated collaboration and networking of OVC programs by CBOs, government, FBOs and civil society Organizations to benchmark for quality child-care provision should be enhanced. Focus on building the economic base of the OVC households is paramount. Policy and legislative reforms are key to sustainable protection, provision of equal prioritization of social economic rights and access justice in Samburu Central sub-county.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Whilst children of this world are innocent, curious and hopeful they are also vulnerable and dependent, most of them living in squalid situations without access to basic needs such as; food, shelter and clothing and an education. Children can be exposed to a manifold of vulnerabilities including; HIV/AIDS and other illnesses, disability, poverty, limited access to services, physical, sexual and emotional abuse and neglect, child-headed households, violence and substance abuse within communities (Skinner and Davids, 2006).

In Europe, while some scholars discourage the upbringing of orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC) in institutions especially due to the uncertainty associated with funding and psychological risks, other scholars celebrate work done by these institutions such as community based organizations (CBOs). For instance, according to Browne, et al., (2006) OVCs under the care of institutions such as CBOs face the risk of psychological needs because they are detached from their extended family and abuse by workers in these institutions. This view is supported by international NGOs in Europe whose view is to support families to take care of their own vulnerable children especially those with disabilities than institutionalizing them (Save The Children, 2009). However, Tolfree, (2003b) and Tobis, (2000) did postulate that CBOs play a key role in taking care of vulnerable children in Europe.

In Asia some scholars don’t support OVCs’ care by CBOs. For instance, in a study in Nepal MacLean, (2005) did argue against the upbringing of OVCs in orphanages especially those run by CBOs. He argued that CBOs lacked the necessary governance structures, exhibited poor financial management practices which in turn meant they lacked professional employees who could fulfill the psychological needs of OVCs (MacLean 2005). However, Ali, et al., (2004) in a rejoinder from Pakistan posits that CBOs play a key role in the rehabilitation of street children and the granting of educational opportunities for these children.
In Eritrea and Benin, Menahem, et al., (2004) did a comparison study on the OVC situation and did conclude that OVCs were neglected because CBOs in these two countries could not afford taking care of them due to the high costs associated with taking care of OVCs with costs per child in Eritrea being $1,900 and in Benin about $1,300. This was due to limited access to sufficient donor funding because of political patronage and high costs of living in these two countries (Menahem et al., 2004).

In Ghana, Zaney, (2004) observed that the country had one of the highest numbers of OVCs in the Western Africa region second only to Nigeria and that non-profit such as CBOs though faced by challenges such as; effective governance structures and access to sufficient funding had a key role in taking care of the needs of OVCs in the country. Deters and Bajaj (2008) the success of OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs in Ghana was influenced by their ability to secure funding, their relationships with government agencies and the level of community participation in the projects.

In South Africa, King et al., (2009) posits that CBOs constitute 53% of the non-profit sector in the country. These CBOs provide education opportunities for OVCs in collaborations with local schools as therapeutic interventions. Such interventions have been reported to reduce cases of juvenile crimes resulting from peer pressure and contributed to the mentoring of these OVCs into responsible adulthood. Other CBOs in the country have also been reported to equip OVCs especially those that in early adulthood with life orientation skills (King et al., 2009).

Tiku, (2006) did observe that CBOs in Zimbabwe are faced with many bottlenecks such as political interference in their work on OVCs’ care. This he attributes to suspicion by government officials and politicians who view these organizations as vehicles of political competitions used by their rivals. However, Chitiyo, et al., (2008) in a study in Zimbabwe did postulate that CBOs in the country have provided education opportunities for OVCs a situation that has created psychological healing for the OVCs.

Ethiopia neglects most of its OVCs and the government does not offer support in form of social workers and bursaries to CBOs supporting OVCs (Chernet, 2001). This creates a little sense of responsibility and low self esteem since the children supported by these are not
equipped with skills to survive on after they leave care under the CBOs. This view was supported by Abebe and Aase (2009) who observed that Ethiopia lacked a well structured social network that would take care of the high number of OVCs in the country.

In Tanzania McAlpine et al., (2009) did posit that community based organizations’ initiatives to reduce cases of sexual abuse among street children were adversely influenced by limited funding. This they observed led to a continued increase in the number of street children and associated child rights abuses such as sexual abuse and child labor in Northern Tanzania.

In Uganda, Samson, (2010) did observe that CBOs faced numerous challenges such as political interference and insecurity during their implementation of projects targeting OVCs resulting from the war in the Northern part of the country. These challenges did negatively influence the successful implementation of CBOs’ projects targeting OVCs. Omwa and Titeca (2011) posits that albeit faced with challenges such as low community participation, insecurity and limited funding, interventions implemented by community based organizations (CBOs) for OVCs care were successful.

In Kenya, Ferguson and Heidemann, (2009) did posit that CBOs were working hand in hand with NGOs to provide care for OVCs. However, these interventions were faced by numerous challenges; lack of reliable support from the government, insufficient funding and resistance from street families. This was echoed by Odindo, (2009) who contended that despite the success of some of the projects implemented by CBOs, the performance of these organizations is still below par due to constrains related to; financial resources, poor managerial practices and lack of a professional human resource within the organizations.

In Samburu County, the Boma project which is implemented by a United States (U.S) based non-profit and in partnership with Kenyan CBOs has recorded a proven measurable and transformative track to alleviation of poverty and building resiliency (USAID, 2014). The project works with pastoralist communities/families and targets the women and the children in helping the women graduate from extreme poverty. This is done by giving the women tools that are required such as trainings and mentorship on entrepreneurship. The Boma project argues out that quite a remarkable number of women have been able to feed their
children, pay the school fees, buy school uniforms for their children, pay for medical bills and accumulate savings for long-term stability (USAID, 2014).

United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Assist Project, Kenya Country report for year 2014 performance period October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014 prepared by University of Research Co; LLC for review by USAID stated out that Presidents Emergency Plan for Aids Relief (PEPFAR) programs for OVC children are central to achieving an AIDS free generation not due to their response on socio-economic issues, collaboration with the national and community platforms that create enabling environment for the caregivers and the children to access other services including HIV prevention and treatment.

In Samburu the Assist project has supported the launching of Minimum Service Standards through children’s department, a guide for implementing quality services to OVC, mapping of the Volunteers children Officers (VCO) who help in delivery of children services under the leadership of children’s office and dissemination process and training of Child Status Index (CSI) (USAID 2014). It was identified that major gender related challenges within OVC programs were harmful practices that hinder girls from attaining basic education, female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM) unequal nutrition access and late/no birth registration which resulted to late school registration. Girls lacked regular access to sanitary pads which led to poor school attendance and retention. The report summarized that most of OVC work requires collaborative efforts and involvement of key services providers including the community and family members (USAID, 2014).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Globally, coping capabilities of community based organizations (CBOs) that care for OVCs are still wanting. This coupled with over-stretched financial resources, lack of or minimal tax waivers on donations and non-coordination of interventions between CBOs and other non-profits such as NGOs and FBOs placing OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs such as those in education and health at risk of failure. This also creates a scenario that leads to majority of CBOs failing to meet their mandate as exhibited by; children that still don’t have access to education, good medical services and are in danger of hunger and social evils such as child
sexual abuse and child labor. CBOs in Samburu Central Sub County are no exceptional with most facing bottlenecks such as; poor funding channels, low levels of community participation and lack of sufficient support from government agencies (USAID, 2014). These bottlenecks put most of these CBOs and projects they implement addressing OVCs issues on the verge of collapse. This is evidenced by the fact that out of the 17 CBOs operating in Samburu Central Sub County, only 5 are still performing with the remaining 12 exhibiting dismal performance relating to; the number of OVCs they are rescuing, a drop in the number of OVCs they are educating and reports that show lack of projects’ sustainability due to lack of enough and earmarked donor funding, lack of accountability of resources, low levels of community involvement as evidenced by very low numbers of community volunteers and donations from religious leaders and local politicians and little or no government support in terms of bursaries for OVCs under CBO care.

This study seeks therefore to investigate the influence of stakeholders involvement on the performance of community based organizations (CBOs) implementing OVC projects in Samburu Central Sub County, Samburu County. Specifically the study looked at the influence of; community involvement, donor involvement, governance involvement and other service providers.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to establish how stakeholder’s involvement influences performance of CBOs implementing orphaned and vulnerable children’s projects in Samburu Central Sub County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were;

1. To assess the influence of community involvement on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county.
2. To examine the influence of donor funding on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county.
3. To determine the extent to which government involvement influences the performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county.
4. To examine how involvement of other service providers influence the performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county.

1.5 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions;

1. How does society or community involvement influence the performance of CBOs supporting the vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county?
2. How does donor funding influence the performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county?
3. How does government involvement influence the performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county?
4. How does other service providers’ involvement influence the performance of CBOs supporting the vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county?

1.6 Significance of the study

It is hoped that the findings of this research will be beneficial to the NGOs, CBOs, FBOs and the relevant government ministries in understanding the influence of stakeholder involvement in implementing OVCs’ projects. The study will help the NGOs, CBOs, FBOs and the government on identifying the target beneficiaries and it will give some insight on the need to. It may be used to advice stakeholders on the scaling up of collaborations the project to benefit more people. The study will be used to assess the impact of financial skills training and choice of IGAs in improving or otherwise of community living standards. It will also be used by the beneficiaries in order to know how best they can use available resources in the creation of businesses and improve the quality of their lives. The study has availed information in some areas that has not been researched before. This will provoke other researchers to carry out more research on the influence of stakeholder involvement on OVCs’ projects.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to Samburu Central Sub-County of Samburu County. It only concentrate on OVCs’ projects initiated by CBOs within this region and therefore will not
study other projects like; agriculture and women empowerment. The study was limited to four key variables: community involvement, donor funding, government involvement and other service providers and how these influence implementation of OVCs’ projects by CBOs. OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs may also be influenced by other stakeholders not covered by the study.

1.8 Delimitation of the Study

The scope of the study was community based organizations (CBOs) in Samburu Central Sub-county. The respondents were CBOs’ officials, heads of institutions and government’s children officers from the children office in the Sub County. This study looked into how stakeholders; community, donors, government and other service providers influence the performance of CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

It was assumed that heads of institutions are aware of stakeholders’ influence on the performance of CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects and that government’s children officials were not be barred by their contractual agreement to freely talk on the topic of study. It was also assumed that the information provided by the respondents was fully truthful.

1.10 Definition of significant terms used in the study

**Community Based Organizations**  These are non-profit organizations that provide social services at a local level. CBOs depend heavily on donor funding and volunteers for labour for their operations.

**Community Involvement**  Working hand in hand with others like religious leaders, women groups, local political leadership and volunteers in the community to effectively implement OVCs’ projects.

**Donor Funding**  It refers to availability of financial resources and the conditions there in for access to implement successfully OVCs’ projects by CBOs.
Government Involvement  Initiatives by CBOs to closely work with government officials like government’s children officers to do a reliable OVCs’ needs index and also help in accessing government funding for OVCs’ projects.

Orphaned and Vulnerable Children  Children who have lost either one or both parents and are living in marginalized areas, child headed households or those living with frail grandparents in a squalid condition or in places where there at risk.

Other Service Providers  Refers to other institutions apart from CBOs that also offer community services aimed at alleviating the suffering of OVCs. These include NGOs, FBOs, and banks with corporate social responsibility arm and institutions that offer scholarships to OVCs.

Stakeholder Involvement  Collaborations with other institutions (donors, NGOs, FBOs and religious institutions) implementing OVCs’ projects.

1.11 Organization of the Study
This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One is the introduction covering; background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study which explains what the study intended to accomplish, research objectives and research question, significance of the study. The significance of the study justifies the reason for my study. This chapter also highlights delimitation and limitation of the study, and assumptions of the study.

Literature review is covered in chapter two of the study. This chapter also contains what previous researchers have found out in the area of study. This chapter covers how various independent variables: community involvement, donor funding, governance involvement and other service providers involvement factors influence performance of community based organizations implementing OVC’s projects from a global point of view narrowing down to the local level. It has also covered theoretical and conceptual frameworks.

Chapter Three is on Research methodology; research design, target population, sampling procedure which discusses in detail how the sample for this study was selected. It also covers methods of data collection, validity and reliability of data collection instruments. Chapter four covers data analysis, presentation and interpretation of findings, based on background
information and on four variables under study which include; community involvement, donor funding, governance involvement and other service providers’ involvement. Chapter five covers summary of findings, discussions of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. It also provided suggestions for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction to Literature Review

This chapter contains pertinent literature information that correlates and is consistent with the objectives of the study. The section is imperative as it ascertains the information that link the current study with past studies and what future studies will still need to explore so as to improve the body of knowledge in relation to the topic of study. The chapter also discusses relating theories and the conceptual framework of the study.

2.2 Influence of Community Involvement on Performance of CBO’s Supporting OVCs

In their study in the U.S Fontan, et al., (2009) report that it is the close working relationship between CBOs working in the OVCs sector and local political leaders more so county executives that expedites the successful implementation of OVCs’ projects. This view is supported by Bayne-Smith, et al., (2008) who in their study also observe that partnerships between CBOs and health centres in The U.S have provided much needed medical services to OVCs thereby helping these non-profit organizations to implement their projects.

Bhattacharya and Shah (2008) in a study in India report that, due to their inability to employ health workers, CBOs in Western India work closely with health centres in the region to offer medical services for the OVCs under their care. This helps reduce medical expenses for the CBOs and monies can be used in other CBOs programs like educating the OVCs (Bhattacharya & Shah 2008). This is echoed by Vashchenko, et al., (2010) in a different study in Ukraine who postulates that community non-profit organizations are not in a position to provide medical services and they therefore work in partnership with health centres to provide medical attention at lower charges for OVCs under their care. Such partnerships have proved to be successful as they provide an opportunity for the organizations to use funds that they could have spent on medical bills on other programs like clothing and education for the OVCs (Vashchenko et al., 2010). Riehman et al., (2012) in their study in Kenya reported that not all health centres more so those in rural areas had
prescription drugs needed by CBOs implementing OVCs projects especially those with the HIV/AIDS programs. Further, this they observed forced most CBOs to buy prescription drugs from commercial pharmacies (Riehman et al., 2012).

In some countries in Africa CBOs also enjoy a lot of community support. Morantz, and Heymann (2009) in their study in Botswana report that after donor funding dwindled for CBOs and they could not take in more vulnerable children, volunteers in a community provided a roof for HIV/AIDS OVCs in a residential area. Pedro (2002) in Burkina Faso also observed that community support for OVCs’ projects contributed to success of these projects. This is an outstanding example of a community reaching out to help vulnerable children in their community (Morantz and Heymann 2009). Further, Campbell, et al., (2008) in a study in South Africa reports of a similar situation where health volunteers from the community offer their services without pay for CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects. This has successfully witnessed the distribution of Antiretroviral drugs (ARVs) to these CBOs and immunization of OVCs living under the care of these CBOs (Campbell et al., 2008). Through their study in Ghana Gyapong, et al., (2011) also established it is those CBOs implementing OVCs projects and work in partnership with health centres that are better placed to expedite their OVCs’ projects. Community based OVCs’ projects in Mali receive little or no support from cash strapped health centres in Mali (Nzau-Muteta, et al., 2005). However, in Tanzania Makame, et al., (2002) reported that support from health centres towards OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs contributed to the success of these projects. These findings were however disputed by Magalla et al., (2002) who observed that it was only those CBOs that were located in urban areas that enjoyed support from health centres but those from rural areas had difficulties in accessing medical services for OVCs under their care.

Religious leaders have also supported OVCs projects implemented by CBOs. In a study in Tanzania, Nyangara et al., (2009) postulate that religious leaders from the Salvation Army were actively involved in helping implement OVCs projects and rallying the community to assist where possible. Lapse in government services in Zimbabwe is also reported to the support of CBOs OVCs’ projects by religious institutions (Salvation Army 2002). Most OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs in Ethiopia are supported by Evangelicals in the country (Gilgal Magazine 2010).
Nonetheless, non-profit organizations in Africa and more so CBOs lack support for their community projects from local political leaders. For instance, Ozor and Nwankwo (2008) in a study in Nigeria postulate that CBOs in Nigeria face stiff opposition from local political leaders as the leaders want development at the local district levels to be associated with them and not the CBOs. Most projects at the community level in Nigeria are at risk of failure because political leadership at the community level doesn’t support their implementation as a political survival strategy (Udensi et al., 2012). This is echoed in a different study in South by Muavha (2008) who observed that local political leaders don’t support OVCs’ initiatives by CBOs because this is thought to negatively affect their political influence. In a separate study Mansuri and Rao, (2004) point out the desire to assert political influence, means that most OVCs’ projects in South Africa don’t enjoy local political leadership support which places these projects in a danger of collapse.

McCurley, (2007) identified causes of the decline in volunteer participation in community work to be positively correlated to issues of; economic challenges, time constraints, social and family. This decline has had an adverse influence on the successful implementation of CBOs OVCs’ projects. For instance, in a study in Canada, Lasby, (2004) postulated most non-profits’ projects in the OVCs sector face challenges of a declining number of volunteers. This was echoed in a study in the U.S by Leonard, (2006) who observed that non-profits in the country faced the challenge of a reducing number of people willing to volunteer in their projects and more so those taking care of OVCs. This has had a negative influence on OVCs’ projects especially those implemented by CBOs (Michaels, 2007). Further, Dolnicar, and Randle (2007) did contend that the decision to volunteer in Australia and New Zealand was influenced by factors such as; the charity’s thematic area, location of charity and economic challenges. These factors did negatively influence the number of volunteers willing to work in local charities like CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects which derails these projects (Dolnicar and Randle 2007). Though CBOs in Ethiopia enjoy support from religious institutions, Schaeli, (2008) observes that CBOs face challenges in accessing volunteers from the local community. This affects the successful implementation of OVC’s projects because CBOs have limited financial resources that would enable them to employ qualified personnel that would deliver results (Schaeli 2008). Further, in a study in Zimbabwe Kaseke and Dhemba (2006) report that lack of volunteers to work in OVCs’ projects is a major challenge
for CBOs implementing such projects because these organizations have minimal funding to be in a position to employ a huge qualified human resource.

2.3 Influence of Donor Funding on Performance of CBO’s Supporting OVCs

Securing funding and sufficient funding to implement OVCs’ projects is one of the biggest challenges that CBOs face. According to Drucker, (2005) the overreliance on donor funding by non-profits such as CBOs places most projects implemented by these organizations in the vulnerability of collapse. Randl, (2008) earmarked funding places CBOs in a position of dilemma on what to implement and what not to. Weerawardena et al., (2009) advised that to overcome both the challenges of insufficient funding and earmarked funding; non-profits need to set up structures that would their sustainability. World over CBOs are faced with issues of financial uncertainty a situation that adversely affects their operations (Light, 2004). This is echoed by LeRoux, (2005) in a study in the U.S where he observed that CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects were facing challenges in raising funding and when they did the funding was earmarked. These CBOs are forced to re-adjust their OVCs’ project budgets which adversely influence the successful implementation of these projects (James, 2005). Similar findings are reported by Stowe and Barr (2005) who contend that projects implemented by CBOs in rural Ontario Canada were in the verge of collapse due to challenges associated to insufficient funding.

Jung, (2003) observes that CBOs in Korea find it challenging to implement OVCs’ projects because funds are not only minimal but are tied with conditions and donors remain sluggish. According to Andreas, (2005) non-profits in China face the challenge of raising funding for their programs. For instance, in a study on the comparison between CBOs in China and Europe, Yuwen, (2011) postulated that Chinese CBOs found it difficult to raise funds to implement projects as compared to their colleague institutions in Europe. This according to Yuwen (2011) is attributed to the philanthropic nature of Europeans as compared to that of the Chinese. According to a study by Dhakal (2007) limited funding is a major factor that negatively influences the success of CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects in Nepal. Most CBOs in Nepal are unable to successfully carry out their operations in OVCs sector because of limited financial resources and insufficient donations in kind (Dhakal 2007). Projects run by non-profits in Bangladesh were reported to fail due to challenges of accessing funding.
from international donors (Hossain 2008). Hossain (2008) further contends that most OVCs under the care of these non-profits are forced to drop out of school because of financial challenges experienced by CBOs resulting from underfunding.

In Pakistan, studies report that access to funding is a major bottleneck to the success of OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs (Anwar, et al., 2008). CBOs in China do also face funding challenges especially those taking care of HIV/AIDS orphans. This as postulated in a study by Zhao, et al., (2009) who contend that access to sufficient funding is a major hindrance for most CBOs operating orphanages for HIV/AIDS orphans and those taking care of other vulnerable children. Van Rooy (2000) observed that limited funding was a major bottleneck for CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects in Papua New Guinea. Most CBOs had OVCs drop out of school due to limited financial resources and providing a healthy balanced diet was also a major issue for those that ran orphanages (Van Rooy 2000). Limited access to funding and when available it was earmarked resulted to the closure of many orphanages operated by CBOs in Armenia (Andreeva 2010).

Foster, (2005) observed that limited financial resources were the major bottleneck for CBOs taking care of OVCs in Southern Africa. For instance, Chechetto-Salles and Geyer (2006) observed that OVCs projects implemented by CBOs in South Africa risk failure due to limited funding. Echoed by Birdsall and Kelly, (2007) in their study in South Africa on various issues facing CBOs implementing HIV/AIDS projects observed that CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects were faced with financial constraints. This was a huge bottleneck to the implementation of interventions targeting OVCs that were suffering from the consequences of HIV/AIDS (Birdsall and Kelly, 2007). Momoh, (2010) did postulate that CBOs in Nigeria were unable to assist OVCs achieve their educational goals and were also not in a position to meet other basic needs of the OVCs under their care due to challenges associated with earmarked funding. These findings were supported by, Kakietek et al., (2012) who contend that in Nigeria the biggest bottleneck to the success of OVCs’ projects under the umbrella of CBOs was lack of funds and or earmarked funding by donors. Limited funding has had adverse effects on the successful implementation of OVCs’ projects in most rural areas in Nigeria particularly on those that are implemented by CBOs (Unom and Monye 2010).
In a study in Southern African countries on the state of children under the care of CBOs, Dunn and Parry-Williams (2008) did postulate that availability of funding and when available it was earmarked was a major issue for most CBOs taking care of OVCs in Malawi and Lesotho. Most CBOs adopted project budget cuts which resulted to a negative influence on the success of OVCs projects. This is echoed by Zimmerman, (2005) who observed that most orphans living in orphanages operated by CBOs lacked some basic necessities due poor donor funding which negatively influenced care for orphans and under vulnerable children. Fitamo (2003) in his study also observed that CBOs in Ethiopia face the challenges of limited funding which affects their operations and has adverse influence on OVCs’ projects in the country. Access to funding is a serious issue also for CBOs in Zambia (Chishimba and Kaela 2006). This in turn incapacitates the OVC projects from achieving their objectives thus in a negative, less attractive light, (Chishimba and Kaela 2006). Nangula (2005) in a study postulated that funding was the biggest hindrance that CBOs in Namibia experienced to the successful implementation of their OVCs projects. In Bostawana, Lekorwe, (2007) did contend that most programs implemented by non-governmental organizations including CBOs taking care of OVCs were at risk of failure due to lack of funding from their traditional international donors. Similar findings were reported in Cameroon by Lotsmart, (2007) who observed that most CBOs’ projects targeting OVCs were at the verge of collapse due to insufficient funding and lack of donations in kind. These findings were in concurrence with those of Sarr, (2006) in a study in Senegal did assert that, non-governmental organizations and more so CBOs experienced funding challenges in implementing their programs. A study in Uganda by Roby and Shaw (2008) also reported that CBOs taking care of OVCs were faced by funding challenges which in most cases forced children to drop out of school.

In their study of an OVC project in Kenya, Thurman, et al., (2007) postulate that CBOs OVCs’ projects in the country are derailed by limited funding from the donor community and the conditions associated with funding. Budget cuts that in most cases have a negative influence are a characteristic of most OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs in the country (Thurman et al., 2007). These findings were supported through a study by Pfleiderer and Kantai, (2010) who asserted that lack of capacity among most CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects resulted to lack of access to funding a situation that had a negative influence on these
projects. Most of OVCs under the care of CBOs had to drop out of school while others had to change schools and others had limited access to medical help (Pfleiderer and Kantai, 2010).

2.4 Influence of government involvement on Performance of CBOs Supporting OVCs

According to Fontan et al., (2009), there exists a common goal between Community Based organizations (CBOs) and government; which is to improve the living conditions of members of the community. In their study in the U.S Fontan et al., (2009) observed that the government works closely with all CBOs and more those taking care of OVCs. It is such collaboration that facilitates the successful implementation of OVCs’ projects (Rich, et al., 2001). OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs can also be a success when the government offers support in terms of tax waivers on donations to these projects. A study in Korea by Mhin, (2003) agrees with this view by contending that government subsidies to CBOs have expedited the successful implementation of OVCs’ projects in the country. These findings are supported in a separate study which postulates that CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects also benefit from government funding and bursaries for the OVCs under their care (Cho, et al., 2010). Other scholars however disagree with these gains arguing that this practice results to government interference on the governance of these CBOs (Guo, 2007). Government support is in most cases attached to political influence (Hillman, 2005).

Prang, (2002) in a study also observed that CBOs in Cambodia received support from the Cambodian government an initiative that led to the successful implementation of OVCs’ projects. However, Dhakal, (2007) contends that CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects in Nepal don’t enjoy support from the Nepalese government in the form of tax waivers on donations and bursaries. This means that these CBOs have to rely on donor funding which is limited putting OVCs’ projects at a risk of failure (Dhakal 2007). A similar situation was reported in Papua New Guinea through a study by Cox (2005) who observed that lack of government support to local initiatives such as raising number of OVCs, did have an adverse influence on such initiatives started by CBOs. These findings were supported by similar findings by Regan (2005) who contended that CBOs in Papua New Guinea did not receive support from the government in form of tax waivers and bursaries which placed their OVCs projects in state of uncertainty. Bilson, and Cox (2005) observed that the government of Sri
Lanka does not support CBOs implementing OVC’s projects through bursaries and tax waivers and doesn’t also effectively supervise their operations which lead to abuse of child rights of children under the care of these CBOs. The Haitian government does not recognize efforts by non-profits in the country to not only prevent maternal mortality but also take care of OVCs (Anderson et al., 2007).

Feranil et al., (2010) in their study on OVCs projects in Botswana observe that, coupled with the high rates of HIV/AIDS rates and challenges such as manpower and finances facing CBOs and NGOs implementing OVCs’ projects, the government of Botswana funds some of the initiatives implemented by these organizations and also offers OVCs field mapping through its children officers. A similar situation is reported in Namibia by Yates, (2004) who reports that due the high number of OVCs resulting from HIV/AIDS, the Namibian government grants tax waivers to CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects and also offers bursaries for OVCs. Miller, et al., (2009) also observes that the government of Malawi was supporting both CBOs and families with OVCs through the social cash transfer program. This had a positive influence on both the educational and health outcomes of OVCs’ Miller et al., (2009).

However, the situation is quite the opposite in Zimbabwe as reported in a study by Gandure, (2009) who observes that CBOs in Zimbabwe have difficulty in accessing medical services for OVCs under their care since most hospitals are insufficiently funded by the government. Poor funding by the government of hospitals and health centres is a major challenge for CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects especially those leaning towards HIV/AIDS programs since they can not access needed medicine at affordable prices thereby affecting their financial positions (Powell, 2006). Further, according to Wyatt, et al., (2010) the number of children officers and other social workers employed to assist in OVCs’ needs analysis is inadequate. This puts CBOs in a precarious position to look for more funding from unwilling donors to carry out vulnerable children needs index (Wyatt et al., 2010). This is echoed in a different study by Alana et al., (2008) who observed that most OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs are facing the risk of failure because the government of Swaziland does not support them. Chishimba and Kaela (2006) in their study report that the Government of Zambia tends to shy away from the OVC sector and are also very critical, always looking at them with a
caustic eye which puts the CBOs’ projects at a precarious position. Similar findings were reported in a study by Abeba and Aase (2007) who asserts that the government of Ethiopia lacks a social structure that would work with non-profits in the identification of OVCs needs. This is entirely left in the hands of poorly funded and governed CBOs in the country resulting to adverse effects on OVCs’ projects.

2.5 Influence of other service providers’ involvement on Performance of CBOs

Supporting OVCs

A study by Guo and Acar (2005) observed that collaborations between NGOs and CBOs in Korea did lead to better results in OVCs’ projects than when these partnerships didn’t exist. The collaborations were in the areas of; OVCs need identification, donations in kind and education interventions (Guo and Acar 2005). In a study in Zimbabwe, SAFAIDS, (2004) reported that collaborations between FBOs and CBOs in areas such as; donations in kind and access to bursaries had a positive influence on the implementation process of OVCs’ projects in the country. In a study in three Southern African countries, Dlamini (2004) pointed out that FBOs worked in partnership with CBOs to provide health services for OVCs under the care of the CBOs. However, success rates of these partnerships were reported to be high in South Africa more than Botswana and Zimbabwe (Dlamini 2004). This was echoed by Morantz and Jody (2009) who argue that the failure of most OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs was lack of coordination between the CBOs, FBOs and NGOs. In his study, Ogonji, (2014) did contend FBOs in Kenya did work closely with CBOs to successfully identify and meet the needs of OVCs’ in the country.

McWilliams and Siegel (2010) defined Corporate Social responsibility (CSR) as initiatives by businesses mostly private companies that are meant to create a positive impact in the society they operate in. These can be in the area of education, environment and health McWilliams and Siegel (2010). According to Saalam, (2005) CSR programs can be successfully implemented to take care of OVCs through funding or donations in kind to organizations taking care of the OVCs. Kusku and Zarkada-Fraser (2004) in a study on the impact of CSR in the community did contend that banks and companies with a CSR program did support OVCs’ projects run by non-profits such as CBOs in Australia and Turkey. In most cases support was in the form of donations in kind but this was more evident in
Australia more than Turkey (Kusku and Zarkada-Fraser 2004). Brammer and Millington (2004) did postulate that there existed a positive relationship between CSR in the U.K and the success of community based projects especially those that attended to the issues of OVCs. In their study on CSR in seven Asian countries Chapple and Moon (2005) observed that Asian companies don’t exhibit strong CSR programs towards community initiatives for OVCs as compared to multi-national companies especially those from the U.S and part of Europe. This they observed was positively correlated to the successful implementation of OVCs’ projects addressing child labor (Chapple and Moon 2005).

Phillips, (2006) in his study postulated that CSR plays a key role in community projects in Africa. For instance, in a study in Ghana Atuguba and Dowuona-Hammond, (2006) postulated that; OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs were successful when they received support from CSR programs run by multi-national companies and banks operating in the area of their operations. This support included; provision of bursaries and donations in kind for OVS under the care of CBOs in the country (Atuguba and Dowuona-Hammond 2006). In a study in Zambia Chatterji, et al., (2009) observed that CSR programs run mostly by banks did support the education of OVCs supported by CBOs and these had a positive relationship in the OVCs’ attainment of educational goals. In an era of underfunding for non-profits’ community initiatives, Lindgreen, et al., (2010) did contend that CSR did play a vital role in supporting the success of CBOs’ OVCs projects in Malawi and Botswana. Donations in the form of food stuff and other donations in kind by private run businesses and banks did result to the success of OVC projects (Lindgreen et al., 2010).

Clark, et al., (2009) did contend that schools play a key role in ensuring that orphans and other vulnerable children like children with disabilities and those exposed to child labor receive an education. However, these was disputed by Kvalsvig, et al., (2007) by postulating that though the participation of OVCs in school has great positive impact on their physical and mental health, it has however been established that schools alone can not achieve this. They therefore advice that schools need to work closely with organizations providing care for OVCs organizations such as FBOs and CBOs in order to achieve inclusive education for OVCs (Kvalsvig et al., 2007). Kendall and O’Gara (2007) in their study in Zimbabwe, Kenya and Malawi did support this view by postulating that with dwindling donor funding to
traditional OVCs care givers such as CBOs, schools can play a key role in ensuring that these OVCs are in a stable psychological state and meet their educational goals. However, schools do need serious investment to be able to offer the care, protection and fulfill the socialization needs of vulnerable children (Kendall and O’Gara 2007). The need for investment was re-emphasized in a separate study by Ogina, (2010) who pointed out that schools do need investment to provide care and support for OVCs. Teachers go to the extent of using their own limited resources to meet OVCs’ needs in the area of food and counseling. These findings were however contested in a study in The U.S by Adelman and Taylor (2014) who contend that even with investment, schools should not be where OVC projects providing food and clothing are implemented, they advice this should be left to non-profits. If implemented in schools then the very purpose of providing education may not be met because schools’ attention will be diverted (Adelman and Taylor, 2014). However, in a quick rejoinder through a study in the U.K, Tucker, (2013) postulated that schools play a key role in handling issues facing OVCs and can work in partnership with non-profits to meet the care and protection that OVCs need.

Skovdal, et al.,(2014) in their study in Afghanistan did point out that schools if well equipped through support by non-profits can be important organizations in the realization of peace for OVCs in the country. Murray (2010) in his study did observe that CBOs in South Africa that worked in partnership with schools did realize positive educational outcomes for the OVCs under their care. Mnubi-Mchombu, et al., (2009) in their study in Namibia did report positive outcomes by CBOs that sought to work in partnership with local schools to provide opportunities to acquire an education for the OVCs under their care. Further, though marred by resource challenges Pufall, et al., (2014) did report that support provided by schools to children living with HIV/AIDS attending these schools had a positive relationship to their mental, psychological and educational outcomes. These findings were supported by Khanare, (2012) in a study in South Africa who observed that limited resources was the major bottleneck for rural schools supporting children living with HIV/AIDs. Sparling, et al., (2005) in their study in Romania did postulate an intervention by a local school through an educational program did improve the mental status of OVCs in an orphanage operated by a CBO. The academic performance of the OVCs under the care of the CBOs was reported to improve as a result of the existence of this intervention (Sparling et al., 2005).
2.6 Theoretical Framework

This study was pivoted on two theories; Resource Dependence Theory and Stakeholder Theory.

**Resource Dependence Theory (RDT)**

This theory was developed by Pfeffer and Salancik, (2003). In employing this theory to this study, the researcher looks at how the dependence on external resources by community based organizations affects the behavior of the CBOs. Further, the author argues that the CBOs under study are dependent on resources, these resources ultimately originate from the environment of the CBOs such as donors, the environment to a considerable extent contains other organizations, the resources one organization needs are thus often in the hand of other organizations, resources are a basis of power, legally independent organizations can therefore be dependent on each other (Pfeffer and Salancik, 2003).

In addition by adopting this theory, the researcher also argues that; in as much as organizations are inter-dependent, the theory of Resource Dependence needs a closer examination. Its’ very weakness lies in its very assertions of dependence. With changing trends of financial uncertainties, there is need to lean towards other theories of uncertainties. According to this theory, organization depends on resources for their survival; therefore, for any organization to achieve sustainability, resources are indispensable. For community based organizations to achieve sustainability, resources are important. The researcher therefore argues that these resources will not only come in the form of financial resources but for project sustainability, other resources of human for example volunteers and land should be considered. However, this dependency creates risks and uncertainty that is correlated to CBOs efficiency and effectiveness (Hillman, et al., 2009).

This theory addressed research question two which sought to empty the effects of access to funding in the performance of the CBOs OVCs’ projects, the theory will explain the important role that funding plays as part of the overall system that makes up CBOs and how earmarked funding influences their operations.

**Stakeholder Theory**

According to Freeman, et al., (2008) the stakeholder theory looks into how an organization influences both its internal and external environment. In adopting this theory to this study,
the researcher argues that it is important that CBO’s implementing OVCs projects understand how their operations are influenced by others and how they influence others. The leadership of these CBOs should lay emphasis on the relationships of the firm with its stakeholders, by finding ways to balance and assimilate the different relationships and objectives that a firm can have.

However, according to Freeman et al., (2008) an organization’s leadership should categorize its stakeholders as primary stakeholders and secondary stakeholders with greater priority granted to primary stakeholders. For CBOs primary stakeholders could include; community they operate in, financiers, employees and the OVCs they serve. CBOs’ management should prioritize their influence on these stakeholders and the influence of these stakeholders the CBOs’ objectives. Secondary stakeholders could include; government, media and other special interests groups.

This theory addressed research questions one, three and four which sought to unpack the effects of community involvement, government involvement and other service providers in the performance of the CBOs OVCs’ projects, the theory will explain the important role that these two groups plays as part of the overall system that makes up CBOs and how these influence their operations.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a model of presentation where a researcher represents the relationship between variables in the study and shows the relationship diagrammatically (Orodho, 2009).

Effective implementation of vulnerable children projects by CBOs is influenced by how these CBOs involve the following stakeholders: The community, donors, government and other service providers. The influences brought about by these stakeholders either by their involvement or lack thereof is the study’s independent variables and their correlation with the study’s dependent variable (Performance of CBOs implementing vulnerable children projects) is as illustrated in Figure 1.
2.8 Research Gap
The Dhakal, (2007) did not find out whether the absence of social workers provided by government influences the performance of CBOs implementing OVC projects. He does not also address the issue of government funding and how this influences service delivery. The Cho, et al., (2010) study doesn’t also address how government funding of CBOs results to political influence on the leadership of these CBOs. This research study seeks to fill this gap.
The Mhin, (2003) study in Korea only looks at State funding it does not look at international donor funding of CBOs and how this affects their service delivery. The Miller et al., (2009) study also looks at Government funding for CBOs but doesn’t look at dependency for funding from international donors. This study seeks to fill this research gap. The research also seeks to fill a research gap on whether the same findings by Mnubi-Mchombu, et al., (2009) in Namibia, Sparling et al., (2005) in Romani can be replicated in Samburu Central Sub-county.

Most of these studies have been done in far off countries and regions; through this study the researcher seeks to fill a research study gap on the influence of stakeholders involvement on the performance of CBOs implementing OVC projects in Samburu Central Sub-county.

2.9 Summary of Literature Review
Vashchenko, et al., (2010) health centres work together with CBOs to provide medical support for OVCs in Ukraine. Bhattacharya and Shah (2008) did report similar findings in a study in India. The successful provision of medical care for OVCs under the care of CBOs was reported in a study by Campbell et al., (2008) in South Africa. The dwindling number of volunteers was also reported to negatively influence the success of CBOs implementing OVC projects through studies in Canada by Lasby (2004) and Ethiopia by Schaeli (2008).

Dhakal, (2007) in his study in Nepal does contend that CBOs implementing OVC projects do not receive support from the Nepalese government. This he postulates leads to the poor performance of these CBOs and the failure of most OVC projects putting more children in the country at risk. This view is also supported by Bilson and Cox, (2005) who reports similar results in Sri Lanka.

The success of OVC projects in Korea implemented by CBOs has been attributed to collaborations between NGOs and CBOs as argued by Guo and Acar (2005). Ogonji (2014) has reported similar findings in Kenya.

This chapter has reviewed literature on how community involvement, donor involvement, government involvement and other service providers influence the performance of CBOs implementing OVCs projects. To this effect, the chapter also comes up with a theoretical framework and a conceptual framework.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter contains the research design to be used in the study, the target population, sampling procedure and methods of data collection, validity and reliability of the questionnaire which was used for data collection. It also contains the operationalization table of variables and objectives under study and methods of data analysis plus ethical considerations to be observed.

3.2 Research Design
According to Kothari, (2004) research design is the structure that directs the implementation of a research method, and the ensuing analysis of acquired data. It provides a framework for the generation of evidence that is suited both to a certain set of criteria and to the research question in which the investigator is interested. This study adopted a descriptive survey research design to investigate the influence of stakeholder’s involvement on performance of CBOs implementing vulnerable children’s projects in the study locale. Creswell, (2009) observed that a descriptive research design is used when data is collected to describe persons, organizations, settings or phenomena. Descriptive survey research design is ideal for this study because it facilitated the gathering of both qualitative and quantitative data on how study variables such as; Community Involvement, Donor Involvement, Government Involvement and The involvement of other services providers influences the performance of CBOs implementing vulnerable children’s projects in the study locale. Further, through this design the study was able to establish the link between study variables and study problem.

3.3 Target Population
According to the Social services office, Samburu Central Sub County has 17 CBOs that implement OVCs projects. This study concentrated on these CBOs because they are expected to have a wealth of information on the research topic from their experiences of working with the orphaned and vulnerable children (OVCs). The CBOs in the County have 136 officials in total. The study sought information regarding the research topic from the 31 academic institutions, 6 FBOs and 7 NGOs and the 2 banks present in the Sub County.
This is summarized in Table: 3.1 on target population

Table 3.1 Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBO’s Officials</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Institutions (FBOs, Banks, NGOs and Schools)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Children’s Officers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Social Services Office Samburu Central Sub-County and Samburu County Government (2016)*

3.4 Sample size and sampling Procedure

3.4.1 Sample Size

The sample size for the study was 130 drawn from a targeted population of 195. The sample size was computed using the formula: 
\[ n = \frac{Z^2 \cdot PQ}{\chi^2} \]

At 95% confidence level or probability of 0.05, sample size \( n \) can be calculated as:

Desired sample \( n = \frac{Z^2 \cdot PQ}{\chi^2} \)

Where \( Z = \) Critical value of \( Z \) at 0.05 which is equal to 1.96
P= Accessible proportion of the target population= 50%
Q= In accessible proportion of the target population=50%
The acceptance error estimate = \( \alpha \).

3.4.2 Sampling Procedure

At 95% confidence level or probability of 0.05, sample size \( n \) can be calculated as:

Desired sample \( n = \frac{Z^2 \cdot PQ}{\chi^2} \)

Where \( Z = \) Critical value of \( Z \) at 0.05 which is equal to 1.96
P= Accessible proportion of the target population= 50%
Q= In accessible proportion of the target population=50%
The acceptance error estimate = \( \alpha \).

Using the above formula, the maximum sample size \( (n_o) \) required from a large population of 10,000 or more units would be 384 units. The sample size can be adjusted with respect to target population as:
The adjusted sample size \( n_1 = \frac{n_o}{1+n_o/N} \). Where \( N \) is the size of the target population in the area of study

The adjusted sample size \( n_1 = 1 + \frac{384}{1+384/195} = 130 \)

A sampling frame is a list of population from which a sample was drawn. It’s a published list in which or a set of directions for identifying a population (Borg and Gall 2007).

The sample size is as shown in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2 Sampling Frame**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOs’ Officials</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Institutions</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Children’s Officers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the target population is grouped into three different categories, stratified random sampling was used. Stratified sampling ensured proper representation of the different stakeholders to enhance representation of variables related to them. Simple random sampling was then be used to select the final subjects proportionately from different strata.

### 3.5 Methods of Data Collection

The data for this study was collected through questionnaires and an interview guide. Johnson and Christensen (2004) define a questionnaire as a self-report data collection device that each research participant fills out as part of a research study. Questionnaires were used because they are free from the bias of the interviewee and respondents have adequate time to give well thought out answers. The questionnaires also provided relatively straight forward information to analyze (McNeill, 2005). Primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire. Structured questionnaires were used because they were easy to administer as each item is accompanied by choice answers and they were economical in terms of time and money. The questionnaire consists of both closed and open ended questions. Closed questions consist of a fixed set of questions to be answered by CBOs’ Officials and Head of Institutions in a specified sequence and with a pre-designated response options. Open ended questions were not restrictive to the respondents. Open ended questions provided respondents
with opportunities to reveal information in a naturalistic way. The questionnaires were divided in 5 sections. Section one requested the respondent to fill in his or her background information, whereas the remaining 4 sections consisted of variables which the researcher intends to research on. The sections were; Community Involvement, Donor Involvement, Government Involvement and The involvement of other services providers and performance of CBOs’ OVCs projects. Questionnaires were administered in person through the use of the drop and pick later method to the sampled respondents. A register of the questionnaires was maintained to facilitate tracking of the research collection instrument.

The other research instrument that was used in the study was unstructured interview guide. This gave the respondents freedom to fully express themselves without limitations and enable the researcher to gather supplementary information which otherwise would be difficult to get (Silverman, 2010). Personal interviews conducted with the help of the interview guide gave the researcher an opportunity to probe for more information and the respondent an opportunity to ask the researcher any questions regarding the research (King, 2004). The research prepared 13 interview guides for the government’s children officers.

3.5.1 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to determine whether the choice methodology, sampling, instruments and analysis were adequate and appropriate for the proposed research study (Welman et al. 2005). 1–10% of the main sample size as recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003) was used to conduct the pilot study. The pilot study was therefore conducted on 20 respondents from the target population.

3.5.2 Validity of Research Instruments

According to Neuman, (2005) validity is a means of assessing that the instrument in question gathers the data it attempts to gather. This study adopted content validity which is a measure of the degree to which data collected using the study’s instruments represents a specific domain or content of the concepts in this study. To ensure validity, the researcher requested expert opinion to comment on the representativeness and appropriateness of questions and give suggestions of corrections to be made to the structure of the research tools. The validity of the research instruments also be established by holding discussion and seeking counsel.
with the researcher’s supervisor and modification of the instrument was implemented after supervisor’s approval.

### 3.5.3 Instrument Reliability

A reliable instrument is one that gives consistent results. It is these consistent results gave the researcher confidence that the results actually represent what were measured (Babbie, 2010). Reliability was established by using more than one instrument to the group of individuals during the same time. Further, to check reliability of the research instruments and address any deficiencies in the research instruments, a pilot study was conducted using 1–10% of the main sample size as recommended by (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Therefore, this study’s pilot was conducted on 20 respondents from the target population. To enhance reliability of the instrument, the researcher employed split-half technique. This method was used to estimate internal consistency by dividing the scale into halves, and then correlating the scores on these two halves.

To calculate the reliability coefficient the researcher used the Spearman-Brown formula as suggested by (Mugenda & Mugenda 2003):

\[
r_{xx} = \frac{n \times r}{(n - 1) + 1} + \frac{2 \times 0.06}{(2 - 1)0.06 + 1}
\]

\[
r_n = 0.11
\]

Where: \( r \) = the original reliability

\( r_n \) = reliability of the test \( n \) items long

\( n \) = number of items in the instrument

A high correlation indicates that the two sets yield consistent information (Hayes, 2008) and 0.8 or higher will indicate good reliability (Mugenda, 2008). The research instruments used in this study have a reliability coefficient of 0.78 which indicates they are reliable.

### 3.6 Data Analysis

Data analysis is a procedure that involves creating order, structure and meaning to the mass of information collected by a researcher (Tabachnik and Fidell, 2007). To ensure that data is entered correctly, scores are high or low and how many in each category, the researcher constructed frequency and percent distribution using SPSS version 21.0. SPSS was used
because it helps to spot data entry errors or unusual data points and has full set of statistical tests. The researcher also analyzed the data to be collected to get statistical measures such as correlations among different variables, mean and standard deviations for easy interpretation of the study. The analysis helped the researcher to make valid inference on the topic of study.

The data from interview guide and open ended questions were analyzed through content analysis by presenting data in themes as per the research objectives. Frequencies and percentages were used to summarize information.

To establish the importance of each of the study’s four variables with respect to CBOs performance, the researcher also applied a multivariate regression model. This is a flexible method of data analysis that is suitable in situations when quantitative variables (the dependent) are to be examined in correlation to any other factors. Relationships may be non-linear, independent variables may be quantitative or qualitative and one can examine the effects of a single variable or multiple variables with or without the effects of other variables taken into account, (Cohen, West and Aiken, 2003).

The regression model is presented as:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \varepsilon \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = Performance of Community Based Organizations Implementing Orphaned and Vulnerable Children Projects
- \( \beta_0 \) = Constant Term
- \( \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \) and \( \beta_4 \) = Beta coefficients
- \( X_1 \) = Community Involvement
- \( X_2 \) = Donor Involvement
- \( X_3 \) = Government Involvement
- \( X_4 \) = Other Service Providers

### 3.7 Ethical Considerations

Consent was sought from the participants to indicate the willingness to participate; the researcher also ensured anonymity when it comes to answering the study questionnaire. The researcher ensured that the information was used for research purposes only. To conduct this
study, the researcher also sought a permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation.

3.8 Operational definition of variables

Denscombe, (2007) define the operational definition of variable as the Actual method, tool, or technique which indicates how the concept were measured. The variables are defined as shown on Table 3.3
### Table 3.3 Operationalization of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To assess the influence of community involvement on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county. | **Independent Variable** Community Involvement | OVCs’ receiving medical help from Health Centres  
Religious leaders donations Support  
Local Political support  
Volunteers working in OVCs’ Projects | Number of CBOs’ officials reporting that their OVCs’ projects are receiving support from health centres and are well implemented when in partnership with these health centres is fully involved.  
Number of CBOs’ officials reporting that their OVCs’ projects are receiving support from religious leadership and are more sustainable when they receive this kind of support.  
Number of CBOs’ officials reporting that their OVCs’ projects are receiving support from local political leadership and are more sustainable when they receive this kind of support.  
Number of CBOs’ officials reporting that failure to involve volunteers in their OVCs’ projects makes these projects less sustainable. | Nominal  
Nominal  
Nominal  
Nominal | Descriptive Statistics  
Descriptive Statistics  
Descriptive Statistics  
Descriptive Statistics |
| To examine the influence of donor funding on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county. | **Independent Variable** Donor Involvement | Availability of donors  
Earmarked Funding  
Availability of donations in kind | Capacity of CBOs to establish contacts with donors for purposes of raising funds for OVC projects.  
Main source of funding  
Existence of Earmarked funding for CBOs’ OVC projects.  
Conditional Funding for OVC projects.  
Number of CBOs’ Officials reporting that their OVC projects receive donations in kind. | Interval  
Interval  
Interval  | Descriptive and Inferential Statistics  
Descriptive and Inferential Statistics  
Descriptive Statistics |
| To determine the extent to which government involvement influences the performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county. | Independent Variable  
Government Involvement | Tax Waivers  
Bursaries  
Funding | Number of CBOs’ Officials/ Government’s children officers reporting that OVC projects receive tax waivers donations in kind.  
Number of CBOs’ Officials/ Government’s children officers reporting that OVCs receive bursaries.  
CBOs’ Officials/ government’s children officers reporting that they have difficulty in accessing government funding for OVCs projects | Nominal  
Descriptive and Inferential Statistics |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Independent Variable  
Other service Providers | Support through CSR donations  
Partnerships with FBOs  
Partnerships with NGOs  
OVCs’ support by Academic Institutions  
OVCs’ support by Academic Institutions | Number of CBOs’/Banks officials/ government’s children officers reporting that CSR influences the implementation of OVCs’ projects makes these projects less sustainable.  
Number of CBOs’/FBOs’ officials reporting that they work in partnership with FBOs and this influences the implementation of OVCs’ projects makes these projects less sustainable.  
Number of CBOs’/NGOs officials reporting that they work in partnership with NGOs/CBOs and this influences the implementation of OVCs’ projects makes these projects less sustainable.  
CBOs’ officials/ school heads reporting that they work in partnership with local schools/CBOs and this influences the implementation of OVCs’ projects makes these projects more sustainable increasing number of OVC attending school.  
Government officials reporting that they assist CBOs in working with schools and health centres. | Nominal  
Interval  
Descriptive and Inferential Statistics |
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the interpretation and presentation of the findings obtained from the field. The chapter presents the background information of the respondents, findings of the analysis based on the objectives of the study. Descriptive and inferential statistics have been used to discuss the findings of the study.

4.1.1 Response Rate

Table 4.1 shows the response rate as per every targeted group. The study targeted a sample size of 130 respondents from which 112 filled in and returned the questionnaires making a response rate of 86.2%.

Table 4.1: Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Targeted a sample size</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOs’ Officials</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of Institutions</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Children’s Officers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.1, response rate was satisfactory to make conclusions for the study as it acted as a representative. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a response rate of 50% is adequate for analysis and reporting; a rate of 60% is good and a response rate of 70% and over is excellent. Based on the assertion, the response rate was excellent.

4.2 Response from CBO’s Officials

4.2.1 Personal Information

4.2.1.1 Age Distribution

Various age groups hold different opinions relating to various subjects. In this understanding, engaging respondents of various age groups deemed fundamental in quest to establish how stakeholder’s involvement influences performance of CBOs implementing orphaned and
vulnerable children’s projects in Samburu Central Sub County. Table 4.2 shows the distribution of respondents in terms of their own age category. From the research findings,

**Table 4.2: Age category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 Years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Years and above</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.2, study noted that most of the respondents (34.2%) were aged between 40-49 years, 34.2% of the respondents were aged between 40-49 years, and 20.3% of the respondents were aged between 20-29 years whereas 20.3% of the respondents were aged between 50 years and above. This implies that majority responses were fairly distributed in terms of their gender category.

**4.2.1.2 Distribution of the Respondents In Terms Of Gender Category**

Responder was requested to indicate their gender category. This was done in view of establishing the level of fairness in terms of gender engagement. Table 4.3 shows the distribution of respondents in terms of their gender.

**Table 4.3: Gender distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.3, the study revealed that majority of the respondents as shown by 43.0% was males whereas 57.0% of the respondents were females. This implies both genders were fairly engaged in this research and therefore the findings of this research did not suffer from gender biasness.
4.2.1.3 Level of education

The level of education determines ones’ perception, understanding and uptake of deferent issues. In this line of understand respondents were requested to indicated their highest level of understanding. Table 4.4 show results on the respondent’s highest level of education achieved.

Table 4.4 Level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters and Above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.4, the study revealed that most of the respondents as shown by 36.7% held bachelor’s degree, 27.8% of the respondents indicated masters and above 25.3% of the respondents indicated diploma whereas 10.1% of the respondents indicated certificate, this implies that majority of respondents were well educated which implies that they were in a position to comprehend the research question and attend to them with easy.

4.2.1.4 Periods of service

The research sought to establish the period which the respondents had worked for as an official. Table 4.5 shows the period which the respondent had served as a CBO official.

Table 4.5: Periods of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods of service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>below 2 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 7 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 7 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.5, majority of the respondents as shown by 35.4% indicated to have served as a CBO official for a period of 3 to 4 years or 4 to 7 years, 10.1% of the respondents indicated to
have served as a CBO official for a not more than 2 years, 10.1 whereas 19.0% of the respondents indicated to have served as a CBO official for more than 7 years. These shows that majority of the respondents served as a CBO official for a considerable period of time which implies that they were in a position to give credible information relating to this study.

4.2.1.5 Training on community based organizations’ management

The study sought to establish whether the CBO officials had received training on community based organizations’ management. Table 4.6 shows results on CBO officials who had had received training on the management of community based organizations.

Table 4.6: Training on community based organizations’ management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.6, all the respondents as shown by 100% indicated received training on community based organizations’ management.

4.2.2 Influence of community involvement on CBOs implementing OVC projects

This subsection investigates on the effect of community partnership with CBOs in implementation of OVC projects

4.2.2.1 Community involvement in CBO’s OVC projects

The study sought to establish whether lack of community involvement negatively influenced the successful implementation of CBO’s OVC projects Table 4.7 show the effect of community involvement on successful implementation of CBO’s

Table 4.7: Effect of community involvement on implementation of CBO’s OVC projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.7, all the respondents (100%) were of the opinion that lack of community involvement negatively influenced the successful implementation of CBO’s OVC projects. This implies that lack of community involvement negatively influenced the successful implementation
of CBO’s OVC projects. CBOs officials further reported that local community involvement in formulation of the strategies in the strategic plans provides invaluable support during the implementation of the CBO’s OVC projects activities.

4.2.2.2 Provision of medical help from health centres

The study sought to establish whether OVCs’ under the care of the CBO received medical help from health centres. Table 4.8 shows the results on whether OVCs’ under the care of the CBO received medical help from health centres.

Table 4.8: provision of medical help from health centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.8, the respondents as shown i.e. 77.2% indicated that OVCs’ under the care of the CBO received medical help from health centres whereas 22.8% indicated otherwise. This implies that OVCs’ under the care of the CBO received medical help from health centres. The CBO officials further reported that partnering with medical health centres accelerated treatment access for adults with children to reduce the number of orphans, improved pediatric mortality and social well-being. It also provided Psychological counseling and mentoring for OVC to improve their psychological well-being. Health centres provided Educational support for orphan girls to reduce risk of HIV acquisition and increase educational attainment and that the Program promoted the strength of families and offered family-centered integrated economic, health and social support that resulted in improved health and education outcomes for orphans.

4.2.2.3 Donations for OVC Projects

The study sought to establish whether CBO received donations from religious leaders for its OVC projects. The results are shows in table 4.9
Table 4.9: Donations for OVC Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.9, the study indicated that all the CBO officials (100%) agreed that the CBO received donations from religious leaders for its OVC projects. This implies that the CBO partially relied on donations from religious leaders for its OVC projects.

4.2.2.4 Local political leadership supports the CBO’s OVCs projects

The study sought to establish which level of political leadership supports their CBO’s OVC projects. Table 4.10 shows some of the local political leadership groups support the CBO’s OVCs projects through donations or good will

Table 4.10: Local political leadership that support the CBO’s OVCs projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Political Leadership</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Governor’s Office</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Member of Parliament</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of County Assembly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Elders</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.10, the research findings as shown revealed that among the local political leadership groups that supported the CBO’S OVCs projects through donations or good will included the local Member of Parliament as shown by 31.6%, the governor’s office as shown by 27.8%, village elders as shown by 24.1% and member of county assembly as shown by 16.5%. The study also noted that Local political interference in the identification and provision of care to the community and insecurity in the program areas negatively this influenced the implementation of CBO’s OVC projects.

4.2.2.5 Community volunteers working in its OVCs projects

The study sought to establish whether there were community volunteers currently working with CBO in its OVCs projects. Results are shown in Table 4.11
Table 4.11: Community volunteers working in its OVCs projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.11, the results shown i.e. 87.3% indicated that there community volunteers currently working with CBO in its OVCs projects whereas 12.7% indicated otherwise. This implies that most of the CBO have community volunteers working in its OVCs projects the study also noted that Grassroots mobilization contributes to community ownership, builds advocacy and raises awareness of OVC, all of which contribute to the sustainability of programs and continued care and support of OVC. Funding and programming for OVC must reflect this fact and include support for caregivers so that children may be raised by their community versus being institutionalized in an orphanage where often there is a far lower care-taker to child ratio and where children simply do not fare as well.

Table 4.12: statements relating to stakeholder involvement in implementation of CBOs’ OVCs projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donations from religious leaders for CBOs’ OVCs projects do influence the</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of OVC projects success.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The failure by CBOs to receive medical help from health centres for OVCs</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under their care influence OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement of volunteers in OVCs’ projects implementation by CBOs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leads to the success of these projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The failure by local political leadership to support CBOs’ OVCs influences</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.11 show the extent to which respondents agreed with the above statements relating to local stakeholder involvement by CBO’s in the implementation of OVCs projects. From the research findings majority of the respondents agreed that; The involvement of volunteers in OVCs’ projects implementation by CBOs leads to the success of these projects as shown by a mean of 4.42, donations from religious leaders for CBOs’ OVCs projects influence the implementation of OVC projects success as shown by a mean of 3.95, the failure by CBOs to receive medical help from health centres for OVCs under their care influence OVC projects as shown by a mean of 3.84 and that the failure by local political leadership to support CBOs’ OVCs influences the implementation of OVC projects as shown by a mean of 3.89.

Increased community participation is fundamental to successful local CBOs’ service delivery and advocacy. Community-based programming, such as neighborhood care points, church volunteer networks and comprehensive support given to needy families, better addresses the needs of each individual population and provides more effective care and support for its vulnerable children.

### 4.3.3 Influence of Donor Involvement on CBOs Implementing OVC Projects

This subsection investigates on the effect of donor partnership with CBOs in implementation of OVC projects

#### 4.3.3.1 Challenges in raising money for OVCs projects

The study sought to establish whether the CBO faced challenges in raising money to implement projects targeting OVCs. Results are shown in Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.13, majority of the respondents as shown by (82.3%) indicated that the CBO faced challenges in raising money to implement projects targeting OVCs whereas 17.7% indicated otherwise. This implies that most of the CBO faced challenges in raising money to implement projects targeting OVCs. The CBO officials further reported that most organizations are highly dependent on external donor funding and that the number of OVC in need of support is too high compared to available resources.

**4.3.3.2 Main Source of Funding For OVCs’ Projects**

Table 4.14 shows some the main source of funding for OVCs’ projects implemented by the CBO

**Table 4.14: Main Source of Funding For Ovcs’ Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funding</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Donors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Government</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Government</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member’s Contribution</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.3.3.2, the study revealed that most of the CBO as shown by 48.1% relied on International Donors as their main source of funding for OVCs’ projects implemented 26.6% of the respondents indicated national government as their main source of funding, 16.5% of the respondents indicated county government as their main source of funding whereas 8.9% of the respondents indicated member’s contribution as their main source of funding. This implies that most of the OVCs’ projects were commonly financed international donors, national government county government and member’s contribution.

**4.3.3.3 Donor conditions**

The study sought to establish whether the grants receive by CBO’s for implementation of OVC projects were attached with conditions. Results are shown in Table 4.15
From Table 4.3.3.3, the study revealed that all of the respondents as shown by 100.0% indicated that the CBO faced challenges in raising money to implement projects targeting OVCs. This implies that most of the CBO faced challenges in raising money to implement projects targeting OVCs. The study also noted that donor funding conditions often focus on new capital investments to the exclusion of supporting operation and maintenance budgets which have adverse effects on projects timelines

### 4.3.3.4 Donations from the well wishers
The study sought to establish whether the CBO receive any donations from the well wishers, Results are shown in Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.3.3.4, the study revealed that all the respondents shown by 100%, agreed that the CBO received donations in both monitory and in commodity form and both were used in implementing projects targeting OVCs.

### 4.3.3.5 How lack of funding influence the implementation of OVCs projects
The study also established that Limited resources, most organizations are highly dependent on external donor funding and that the number of OVC in need of support is too high compared to available resources.
### Table 4.17: Statements Relating to Implementation of Ovcs Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most CBOs face access to funds challenges that influences the successful implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked funding influence the implementation of OVC by CBOs.</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of donations in kind does influence the implementation of OVC projects by CBOs.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of donor funding of CBOs’ OVC projects does not influence the implementation of these projects.</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table shows the extent to which respondents agreed with the above statements relating to implementation of OVCs projects. From the research findings majority of the respondents agreed that; Earmarked funding influence the implementation of OVC by CBOs as shown by a mean of 4.22, most CBOs face access to funds challenges that influences the successful implementation of OVC projects as shown by a mean of 4.17, lack of donor funding of CBOs’ OVC projects influence the implementation of these projects as shown by a mean of 4.10 and that lack of donations in kind does influence the implementation of OVC projects by CBOs as shown by a mean of 3.85

#### 4.4.4 Influence of Government Involvement on CBOs Implementing OVC Projects

This subsection investigates the role of government in implementing OVC projects

#### 4.4.4.1 Effect of Government support of CBO’s on implementation of OVC projects

The study sought to establish whether government support to CBO’s influenced the implementation of OVC projects. Results are shown in Table 4.18
Table 4.18: Effect of government support on implementation of OVC projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.18, all of the respondents as shown by 100.0% agree that government support of CBO’s influences the implementation of OVC projects. The study also noted the Applying an integrated government approach and intervention can acts as an effective means in supporting the implementation of OVC projects, and that the partnership also ensured that legislation, policy, and programs are in place to protect the most vulnerable children.

4.4.4.2 Tax Waivers from Government

The study sought to establish whether the CBO received tax waivers from government on donations made to it. Results are shown in Table 4.19

Table 4.4: Tax waivers from government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.19, all the respondents as shown by 100% agreed that CBO received tax waivers from government on donations made to it. The study noted that exemption from tax by the governments helped CBO to draw more Donors which increased the level of funding.

4.4.4.3 Bursaries from the Government

The study sought to establish whether the CBO received bursaries from government. Results on whether the CBO received bursaries from government are shown in Table 4.20
Table 4.20: Bursaries from government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.20, all the CBO officials as shown by 100% agreed that the CBO received bursaries from government. The study also notes that provision of bursaries to orphans in OVC enabled the CBO accomplish one of its missions which aimed at providing quality education to all vulnerable children.

4.4.4.4 Funding From Government

The study sought to establish whether the CBO received funding from government. Results on whether the CBO received funding from government are shown in Table 4.21

Table 4.21: Funding from government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.21, majority of the respondents as shown by 92.4% agreed that the CBO received funding from government whereas 7.6% of the respondents were of the contrary opinion. This implies most the CBO received funding from government.

4.4.4.4 Level Government involvement in the implementation of OVCs projects

Table 4.22 shows the extent to which respondents agreed with the above statements relating to government involvement in the implementation of OVCs projects.
Table 4.22: Government involvement in the implementation of OVCs projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOs receive tax waivers from government and this influences the</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs received bursaries from government and this influenced</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government funds CBOs and this influences the implementation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs implementation of OVC projects is supervised by government and this</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence the implementation of these projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the research findings majority of the respondents agreed that; The government funds CBOs and this influences the implementation of OVC projects as shown by a mean of 4.15, CBOs implementation of OVC projects is supervised by government and this influence the implementation of these projects as shown by a mean of 4.06. CBOs receive tax waivers from government and this influences the implementation of OVC projects as shown by a mean of 3.99 and the CBOs received bursaries from government and this influenced the implementation of OVC projects as shown by a mean of 3.86.
This study also revealed that the government needs to improve on policy and legal reforms. Many orphans suffer due to a lack of inheritance rights or a lack of enforcement of said inheritance rights thus Government support is necessary to carry out necessary legal reforms and to enforce existing mandates concerning property rights, birth registration and equitable access to education.

4.5.5 Role of other Service Providers on Implementation on OVC Projects

This subsection investigates on the effect of Service Providers partnership with CBOs in implementation of OVC projects.

4.5.5.1 Role of other Service Providers on Implementation on OVC Projects

The research sought to establish support through CSR donations influences CBO’s implementation of OVC projects. Results on effect of Service Providers on CBO’s implementation of OVC projects are shown in Table 4.23

Table 4.5: Role of Service Providers on Implementation on OVC Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.23, all the respondents as shown by 100% agreed that support through other Service Providers influences CBO’s implementation of OVC projects whereas % of the respondents was of the contrary opinion. This implies support through CSR donations influences CBO’s implementation of OVC projects and assist the organizations to develop program approaches and timely interventions.

4.5.5.2 Partnership between the CBO and FBOs

The research sought to establish whether the CBO working partnership with FBOs

In the process of implementing OVC projects. Results on are shown in Table 4.24
Table 4.6: Partnership between the CBO and FBOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.24, majority of the respondents as shown by 75.9% agreed that the CBO worked in partnership with FBOs in the process of implementing OVC projects whereas 24.1% of the respondents were of the contrary opinion. This implies most of the CBO worked in partnership with FBOs in the process of implementing OVC projects, and this enhanced the monitoring of OVC projects thereby enhancing accountability and sticking to the objectives.

4.5.5.3 Partnership between the CBO and NGOs

The research sought to establish whether the CBO working partnership with NGOs in the process of implementing OVC projects. Results on are shown in Table 4.25

Table 4.7: Partnership between the CBO and NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.25, majority of the respondents as shown by 86.1% agreed that the CBO worked in partnership with NGOs in the process of implementing OVC projects whereas 13.9% of the respondents were of the contrary opinion. This implies most of the CBO worked in partnership with NGOs in the process of implementing OVC projects. The study also noted that partnership between NGOs and CBOs is characterized by complementarities, mutual benefits, exchange, contribution, and sharing of power by both. The partnership is also based on recognition of the weaknesses, strengths and value of each plainer which give place to a balanced partnership, CBOs implement the project and are institutionally independent from the NGOs, and that the
NGOs develop some strategies of control to ensure that the CBOs acted in accordance of what the contract advocates.

4.5.5.4 Partnership between the CBO and Local Schools

The research sought to establish whether the CBO working partnership with local schools in the process of implementing OVC projects. Results on are shown in Table 4.26

Table 4.8: partnership with local schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.26, majority of the respondents as shown by 84.8% agreed that the CBO worked in partnership with local schools In the process of implementing OVC projects whereas 15.2% of the respondents were of the contrary opinion. This implies most of the CBO worked in partnership with local schools In the process of implementing OVC projects. The study also noted that partnership between local schools helped to provide support to orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC) through school-based programs delivered or facilitated by schools. i.e. large percentage of these children receive bursary support, including fee exemption, and/or social support (excluding bursary support/fee exemption) in the form of: a) Material support for education (e.g. uniforms, school books, etc.); b) Food assistance (e.g. school feeding or take home rations); and c) Other forms of economic support.

4.5.5.5 Level service provider involvement in the implementation of OVCs projects

The respondents were also requested to indicate their level of agreement with statements relating to the level of involvement of other service providers in the implementation of CBOs’ OVCs projects in the study locale.

Table 4.27 shows the extent to which respondents agreed with the above statements relating to service providers involvement in the implementation of OVCs projects.
Table 4.9: Service provider’s involvement in the implementation of OVCs projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR support donations have no influence the implementation of OVC projects by CBOs.</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBOs do not work with CBOs and this doesn’t influence the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs work in partnership with CBOs and this influences the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools cannot work in partnership with CBOs and this doesn’t influence the implementation of these projects.</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.27, the study revealed that FBOs do not work with CBOs and this doesn’t influence the implementation of OVC projects as shown by a mean of 4.18, NGOs work in partnership with CBOs and this influences the implementation of OVC projects as shown by a mean of 4.13, CSR support donations have no influence the implementation of OVC projects as shown by a mean of 4.03, and that Schools cannot work in partnership with CBOs and this doesn’t influence the implementation of these projects as shown by a mean of 3.96.

The study further noted that business people involvement can lead better management and accountability, due in part to the fact that the private business functions as a contractor business people involvement can heighten implementation of OVC projects due to greater flexibility in terms of purchase of facilities and that realizing the role of business people can improve chances.
of OVC projects success due to greater efficiency of project operations which can lead to enhanced performance.

4.6.6 Regression analysis

In this study, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to test the influence among predictor variables. The research used statistical package for social sciences (SPSS V 22.0) to code, enter and compute the measurements of the multiple regressions.

4.6.6.1 Model summary

The model summary is presented in the Table 4.28.

Table 4.10: Model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.0790</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>.32561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R squared is coefficient of determination which tells us the variation in the dependent variable due to changes in the independent variable. From the findings in the above table the value of adjusted R squared was 0.746 an indication that there was variation of 73.6 percent on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county due to changes in Community involvement, donor funding, government involvement and involvement of other service providers at 95 percent confidence interval. This shows that 74.6 percent changes in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county could be accounted to Community involvement, donor funding, government involvement and involvement of other service providers. R is the correlation coefficient which shows the relationship between the study variables, from the findings shown in the table above is notable that there exists strong positive relationship between the study variables as shown by 0.899.

4.6.6.2 Analysis of variance

The study further tested the significance of the model by use of ANOVA technique. The findings are tabulated in Table 4.29

Table 4.11: Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.724</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>3.814</td>
<td>.001b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>12.091</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.815</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical value = 1.997

From the ANOVA statics, the study established the regression model had a significance level of 0.3% which is an indication that the data was ideal for making a conclusion on the population parameters as the value of significance (p-value) was less than 5%. The calculated value was greater than the critical value (3.184 > 1.997) an indication that Community involvement, donor funding, government involvement and involvement of other service providers all the affects the performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county. The significance value was less than 0.05 indicating that the model was significant.

4.6.6.3 Coefficients

In addition, the study used the coefficient table to determine the study model. The findings are presented in the Table 4.30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.30: Coefficientsa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement Of Other Service Providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data in Table 4.30 the established regression equation was

\[ Y = 1.508 + 0.481X_1 + 0.347X_2 + 0.416X_3 + 0.267X_4 \]

From the above regression equation it was revealed that holding community involvement, donor funding, government involvement and involvement of other service providers to a constant zero, the performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county would be at 1.508, a unit increase in community involvement would lead to an increase in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county by a
factors of 0.481, a unit increase in donor funding would lead to increase in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county by factors of 0.347, a unit increase in government involvement lead to increase an in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county by a factor of 0.416, and a unit increase in involvement of other service providers would lead to an increase in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county by a factors of 0.267 and . All the variables were significant as their significant value was less than (p<0.05).
CHAPTER FIVE SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
From the analysis and data collected, the following discussions, conclusion and recommendations were made. The responses were based on the objectives of the study.

5.2. Summary of the Findings
The study sought to how stakeholder’s involvement influences performance of CBOs implementing orphaned and vulnerable children’s projects in Samburu Central Sub County. Specifically, the researcher had intended to find out how community involvement, donor funding, government involvement, and involvement of other service providers influence the performance of CBOs implementing orphaned and vulnerable children’s projects. The findings of the study are summarized in the following subsequent sub sections.

5.2.1 Community Involvement
The study established that increased community participation is fundamental to successful provision of service delivery by the CBOs. Community-based programming, such as neighborhood care points, church volunteer networks, and comprehensive support given to needy families, better addresses the needs of each individual population and provides more effective care and support for its vulnerable children. Mobilization contributes to community ownership, builds advocacy, and raises awareness of OVC, all of which contribute to the sustainability of programs and continued care and support of OVC.

5.2.2 Donor Funding
The research established that most organizations are highly dependent on external donor funding and that the number of OVC in need of support is too high compared to available resources. Donor funding conditions often focus on new capital investments at the exclusion of supporting operation and maintenance budgets, which have adverse effects on project timelines and that limited funding is a major factor that negatively influences the success of CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects.
5.2.3 Government Involvement

The study noted that the government needs to improve on policy and legal reforms. Many orphans suffer due to a lack of inheritance rights or a lack of enforcement of said inheritance rights thus government support is necessary to carry out necessary legal reforms and to enforce existing mandates concerning property rights, birth registration and equitable access to education, OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs are facing the risk of failure because the government of does not support them.

5.2.4 Service Providers

The findings on role of service providers show that, support through CSR donations influences CBO’s implementation of OVC projects and assisted the organizations to develop program approaches and timely interventions. The partnership between NGOs and CBOs is characterized by complementarities, mutual benefits, exchange, contribution, and sharing of power by both. The partnership is also based on recognition of the weaknesses, strengths and value of each plainer which give place to a balanced partnership. Schools work in partnership with CBOs and this influences the implementation of these projects. FBOs in Kenya did work closely with CBOs to successfully identify and meet the needs of OVCs’ in the country.

5.3 Discussion
5.3.1 Community Involvement

The first objective of the study aimed to assess the influence of community involvement on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county; results obtained from the regression results predict that a unit increase in community involvement would lead to an increase in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county

The study also noted that lack of community involvement negatively influenced the successful implementation of CBO’s OVC projects. CBOs officials further reported that local community involvement in formulation of the strategies in the strategic plans provides invaluable support
during the implementation of the CBO’s OVC projects activities, OVCs’ under the care of the CBO received medical help from health centres, the CBO officials further reported that partnering with medical health centres accelerated treatment access for adults with children to reduce the number of orphans, improved pediatric mortality and social well-being, it also provided Psychological counseling and mentoring for OVC to improve their psychological well-being, health centres provided Educational support for orphan girls to reduce risk of HIV acquisition and increase educational attainment and that the Program promoted the strength of families and offered family-centered integrated economic, health and social support that resulted in improved health and education outcomes for orphans. The findings are in line with the research by Nzau-Muteta, et al., (2005) that Community-based programming, such as neighborhood care points, church volunteer networks and comprehensive support given to needy families, better addresses the needs of each individual population and provides more effective care and support for its vulnerable children.

The research also established that CBO received donations from religious leaders for its OVC projects. Local political interference in the identification and provision of care to the community and insecurity in the program areas negatively this influenced the implementation of CBO’s OVC projects t most of the CBO have community volunteers working in its OVCs projects the study also noted that Grassroots mobilization contributes to community ownership, builds advocacy and raises awareness of OVC, all of which contribute to the sustainability of programmes and continued care and support of OVC. the findings are in support of the research by Randl, (2008) that Funding and programming for OVC must reflect the fact and include support for caregivers so that children may be raised by their community versus being institutionalized in an orphanage where often there is a far lower care-taker to child ratio and where children simply do not fare as well.

The research further noted that involvement of volunteers in OVCs’ projects implementation by CBOs leads to the success of these projects, donations from religious leaders for CBOs’ OVCs projects influence the implementation of OVC projects success, the failure by CBOs to receive medical help from health centres for OVCs under their care influence OVC projects and that the failure by local political leadership to support CBOs’ OVCs influences the implementation of
OVC projects. The findings are in line with the research by Light, (2004) that increased community participation is fundamental to successful local CBOs’ service delivery and advocacy.

5.3.2 Donor Funding

The second objective of the study aimed to assess the influence of donor funding on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county, results obtained from the regression results predict that a unit increase in donor funding would lead to increase in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county. The study further noted that most of the CBO faced challenges in raising money to implement projects targeting OVCs, most organizations were highly dependent on external donor funding, number of OVC in need of support is too high compared to available resources. OVCs’ projects were commonly financed international donors, national government county government and member’s contribution, donor funding conditions often focus on new capital investments to the exclusion of supporting operation and maintenance budgets which have adverse effects on projects timelines, CBO received any donations in both monetary and in commodity form and both were used in implementing projects targeting OVCs. The findings are in line with the research by Dhakal (2007) limited funding is a major factor that negatively influences the success of CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects

The study also established that most organizations are highly dependent on external donor funding earmarked funding influence the implementation of OVC by CBOs, most CBOs face access to funds challenges that influences the successful implementation of OVC projects, lack of donor funding of CBOs’ OVC projects influence the implementation of these projects and that lack of donations in kind influences the implementation of OVC projects by CBO. The findings are in line with the research by Jung, (2003) observes that CBOs in Korea find it challenging to implement OVCs’ projects because funds are not only minimal but are tied with conditions and donors remain sluggish.
5.3.3 Government Involvement

The third objective of the study aimed to assess the influence of Government involvement on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county, results obtained from the regression results predict that a unit increase in government involvement lead to increase an in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county.

The study noted that the level of government support of CBO’s influences the implementation of OVC projects, applying an integrated government approach and intervention can acts as an effective means in supporting the implementation of OVC projects, and that the partnership also ensured that legislation, policy, and programs are in place to protect the most vulnerable children, exemption from tax by the governments helped CBO to draw more donors which increased the level of funding, provision of bursaries to orphans in OVC enabled the CBO accomplish one of its missions which aimed at providing quality education to all vulnerable children, CBO received funding from government. The findings are in line with the Alana et al., (2008) who observed that most OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs are facing the risk of failure because the government of does not support them.

This study also revealed that the government needs to improve on policy and legal reforms. Many orphans suffer due to a lack of inheritance rights or a lack of enforcement of said inheritance rights thus government support is necessary to carry out necessary legal reforms and to enforce existing mandates concerning property rights, birth registration and equitable access to education. The findings are in line with the Mhin, (2003) agrees with this view by contending that government subsidies to CBOs have expedited the successful implementation of OVCs’ projects in the country.

This research also revealed that CBOs implementation of OVC projects is supervised by government and this influence the implementation of these projects. CBOs receive tax waivers from government and this influences the implementation of OVC projects and that CBOs received bursaries from government and this influenced the implementation of OVC projects.
The findings are in line with the Fontan et al., (2009) observed that the government should work closely with all CBOs and more those taking care of OVCs.

5.3.4 Other Service Providers

The fourth objective of the study aimed at assessing other service providers’ influence on performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county; results obtained from the regression results predict that a unit increase in involvement of other service providers would lead to an increase in performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county.

The findings show that support through CSR donations influences CBO’s implementation of OVC projects and assisted the organizations to develop program approaches and timely interventions, most of the CBO worked in partnership with FBOs In the process of implementing OVC projects, and this enhanced the monitoring of OVC projects thereby enhancing accountability and sticking to the objectives, most of the CBO worked in partnership with NGOs In the process of implementing OVC projects. The study also noted that partnership between NGOs and CBOs is characterized by complementarities, mutual benefits, exchange, contribution, and sharing of power by both. the partnership is also based on recognition of the weaknesses, strengths and value of each plainer which give place to a balanced partnership. CBOs implement the project and are institutionally independent from the NGOs, and that the NGOs develop some strategies of control to ensure that the CBOs acted in accordance of what the contract advocates. The findings are in support of the research by Saalam, (2005) CSR programs can be successfully implemented to take care of OVCs through funding or donations in kind to organizations taking care of the OVCs

The research also established that CBO worked in partnership with local schools In the process of implementing OVC projects, partnership between local schools helped to provide support to orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC) through school-based programmes delivered or facilitated by schools. i.e. large percentage of these children receive bursary support, including fee exemption, and/or social support (excluding bursary support/fee exemption) in the form of:) material support for education (e.g. uniforms, school books, etc.); food assistance (e.g. school
feeding or take home rations); and other forms of economic support. The findings are in support of the research by Saalam, Murray (2010) observe that CBOs that worked in partnership with schools did realize positive educational outcomes for the OVCs under their care.

The findings show that FBOs worked with CBOs and this influenced the implementation of OVC projects, NGOs work in partnership with CBOs and this influences the implementation of OVC projects, CSR support donations have influence the implementation of OVC projects by CBOs, and that Schools work in partnership with CBOs and this influences the implementation of these projects. The study further noted that business people involvement can lead better management and accountability, due in part to the fact that the private business functions as a contractor business people involvement can heighten implementation of OVC projects due to greater flexibility in terms of purchase of facilities and that realizing the role of business people can improve chances of OVC projects success due to greater efficiency of project operations which can lead to enhanced performance. The findings are contrary to Ogonji, (2014) did contend FBOs in Kenya did work closely with CBOs to successfully identify and meet the needs of OVCs’ in the country.

5.3 Conclusions
It is concluded that increased community participation is fundamental to successful local CBOs’ service delivery and advocacy, local community involvement in formulation of the strategies in the strategic plans provides invaluable support during the implementation of the CBO’s OVC projects. Community-based programming, such as neighborhood care points, church volunteer networks and comprehensive support given to needy families, better addresses the needs of each individual population and provides more effective care and support for its vulnerable children.

The research confluents that most OVCs’ projects are highly dependent on external donor funding and that the number of OVC in need of support is too high compared to available resources, donor funding conditions often focus on new capital investments to the exclusion of supporting operation and maintenance budgets which have adverse effects on projects timelines and that limited funding is a major factor that negatively influences the success of CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects
The research concludes that government support is necessary to carry out necessary legal reforms and to enforce existing mandates concerning property rights, birth registration and equitable access to education, OVCs’ projects implemented by CBOs are facing the risk of failure because the government of does not support them.

The research concludes that involvement of other service providers influence the performance of CBOs supporting vulnerable children in Samburu Central sub-county, the partnership between CBOs and service providers is characterized by complementarities, mutual benefits, exchange, contribution, and sharing of power by both.

### 5.4 Recommendations

Based on the study findings, it is recommended that

1. Strengthen partnerships with line government departments such that they can be relied upon to assist OVC programs consistently when needed.
2. Advocacy on formulation of OVC strategic plan at the county level by the policy makers. Policy and legislative reforms are key to sustainable protection and justice.
3. Coordinated Partnerships, collaboration and networking of OVC programs, government, faith based organizations and civil society to benchmark for quality child-care provision.
4. Engage national and international stakeholders to support program-relevant research. USAID, for example, has Basic Program Evaluation (BPE) and Public Health Evaluation (PHE) mechanisms to support research as well as programming.
5. At the program level, it will be helpful for the Department of Children services within the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development and partners to incorporate a National Scale-up Plan for OVC in the OVC National Plan of Action; with clear annual coverage targets matched with expected resources.
6. Hold national meetings on an annual basis where OVC programmatic good practices and challenges can be tabled. Participation in these meetings should include government, Organizations providing services to OVC and the donors.
7. School-based programs targeting orphans and vulnerable children need to be improved and/or scaled up.
8. Focus on building the economic base of the OVC households for sustainability purposes.
9. Public readiness of need for child protection is positive, hence there is need for enhanced community awareness on OVC rights.


5.5 **Recommendations for Further Research**

1. A similar study should be conducted on service effectiveness of strategic CBOs partnerships on success of CBO projects implementation.
2. Community based approaches to sustainable integrated OVC care and support.
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APPENDIX I: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

Cecilia K Imathiu
P.O BOX - 60200,
Meru- Kenya.

Dear Sir /Madam,

RE: Letter To The respondents

I am currently a student at The University of Nairobi pursuing a Master of Arts degree in Project Planning and Management to meet the requirements of the programme I am undertaking a study on **THE INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVEMENT ON PERFORMANCE OF CBOs IMPLEMENTING ORPHANED AND VULNERABLE CHILDREN’S PROJECTS. IN SAMBURU CENTRAL SUB-COUNTY, SAMBURU COUNTY, KENYA.**

Kindly provide data which I require for this study through the provided study instruments.

The data you provide will be used for research purpose only and your identity will be held confidential.

Thank you.

Yours Faithfully,

Cecilia K Imathiu

L50/71027/2014
APPENDIX II: CBO'S OFFICIALS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is to collect data for purely academic purposes. You are kindly requested to answer the questions as sincerely as possible. The information you will give will only be used for research purposes and your identity will be treated with confidentiality. Fill the questionnaire by putting a tick √ in the appropriate box or by writing your response in the provided spaces.

PART A: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Please indicate your age?
   - 20-29 ( )
   - 30-39 ( )
   - 40-49 ( )
   - 50 and above

2. Indicate your Gender.
   - Male ( )
   - Female ( )

3. What is your level of education?
   - Certificate ( )
   - Diploma ( )
   - Degree ( )
   - Masters and Above
   - Any other please specify ________________________________

   ________________________________________________________

4. How long have you worked as an official for your CBO? Please write down in the space provided?
   ________________________________________________________

5. Have you received any training on community based organizations’ management?
   - Yes ( )
   - No ( )

PART B: INFLUENCE OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ON CBOs IMPLEMENTING OVC PROJECTS

6. Does lack of community involvement negatively influence the successful implementation of your CBO’s OVC projects?
   - Yes ( )
   - No ( )
   - Explain your answer.
   ________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________
7. Do OVCs’ under the care of your CBO receive medical help from health centres and how does this influence the implementation of your CBO’s OVC projects?

Yes ( )  No ( )

Explain your answer.

8. Does your CBO receive any kind of donations from religious leaders for its OVC projects?

Yes ( )  No ( )

Explain your answer.

9. How does this influence the implementation of your CBO’s OVC projects? Please answer in the space provided.

10. Which group of local political leadership supports your CBO’s OVCs projects through donations or good will? Please Tick all that apply.

   The Governor’s Office ( )
   Our Member of Parliament (M.P) ( )
   Member of County Assembly (M.C.A) ( )
   Village Elders ( )

11. How does this influence the implementation of your CBO’s OVC projects? Please answer in the space provided.


12. Does your CBO currently have community volunteers working in its OVCs projects and what is the influence of this on these projects?
Yes ( ) No ( )
Explain your answer.

13. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donations from religious leaders for CBOs’ OVCs projects do influence the implementation of OVC projects success.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The failure by CBOs to receive medical help from health centres for OVCs under their care influence OVC projects.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement of volunteers in OVCs’ projects implementation by CBOs leads to the success of these projects.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The failure by local political leadership to support CBOs’ OVCs influence the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART C: INFLUENCE OF DONOR INVOLVEMENT ON CBOs IMPLEMENTING OVC PROJECTS

14. Does your CBO have difficulty in raising money to implement projects targeting OVCs?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
   Explain your answer.

15. What is the main source of funding for OVCs’ projects implemented by your CBO? Please tick one.
   - International Donors ( )
   - National Government ( )
   - County Government ( )
   - Member’s Contribution ( )

16. Are the grants you receive to run your CBO’s OVC projects attached with conditions?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
   Explain your answer.

17. Do you receive any donations in kind and what is the influence of these on the implementation of OVC projects run by your CBO?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
   Explain your answer.
18. In what ways does lack of funding influence the implementation of projects targeting OVCs and the running of your CBO?

19. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most CBOs face access to funds challenges that influences the successful implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earmarked funding influence the implementation of OVC by CBOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of donations in kind does influence the implementation of OVC projects by CBOs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of donor funding of CBOs’ OVC projects influence the implementation of these projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART D: INFLUENCE OF GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT ON CBOs IMPLEMENTING OVC PROJECTS

20. Would you say that government support of CBO’s influences the implementation of OVC projects?
   Yes ( )    No ( )
   Explain your answer.

21. Does your CBO receive tax waivers from government on donations made to it and what is the influence of these on projects targeting OVCs?
   Yes ( )    No ( )
   Explain your answer.

22. Does your CBO receive bursaries from government and what is the influence of these on projects targeting OVCs?
   Yes ( )    No ( )
   Explain your answer.

23. Does your CBO receive funding from government and what is the influence of these on projects targeting OVCs?
   Yes ( )    No ( )
   Explain your answer.
24. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBOs receive tax waivers from government and this influences the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs do not receive bursaries from government and this influences the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government funds CBOs and this influences the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs implementation of OVC projects is supervised by government and influence the implementation of these projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. In which areas would you like support from the government for the successful implementation of your CBOs projects targeting OVCs?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PART E: THE INFLUENCE OF OTHER SERVICE PROVIDERS ON CBOs IMPLEMENTING OVC PROJECTS

26. Would you say that support through CSR donations influences CBO’s implementation of OVC projects?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
   Explain your answer.

27. Does your CBO work in partnership with FBOs and what is the influence of these on projects targeting OVCs?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
   Explain your answer.

28. Does your CBO work in partnership with NGOs and what is the influence of these on projects targeting OVCs?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
   Explain your answer.

29. Does your CBO work in partnership with NGOs and what is the influence of these on projects targeting OVCs?
   Yes ( )   No ( )
   Explain your answer.
30. Does your CBO work in partnership with local schools and what is the influence of these on projects targeting OVCs?
Yes ( ) No ( )
Explain your answer.

_________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________________________

31. What is your take on schools working as organizations that help implement OVCs’ projects in partnership with CBOs?
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________________________________

32. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR support donations have influence the implementation of OVC projects by CBOs.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBOs do not work with CBOs and this influence the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs work in partnership with CBOs and this influences the implementation of OVC projects.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools work in partnership with CBOs and this influence the implementation of these projects.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX IV: HEADS OF INSTITUTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is to collect data for purely academic purposes. You are kindly requested to answer the questions as sincerely as possible. The information you will give will only be used for research purposes and your identity will be treated with confidentiality.

Fill the questionnaire by putting a tick √ in the appropriate box or by writing your response in the provided spaces.

PART A: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Please indicate your age?
   20-29 ( )  30-39 ( )  40-49 ( )  50 and above

2. Indicate your Gender.
   Male ( )  Female ( )

3. What is your level of education?
   Certificate ( )  Diploma ( )  Degree ( )  Masters and Above
   Any other please specify

4. How long have you worked as a leader in this institution? Please write down in the space provided?

PART B: THE INFLUENCE OF OTHER SERVICE PROVIDERS ON CBOs IMPLEMENTING OVC PROJECTS

5. Does have a CSR program in your bank that donates to CBOs taking care of OVCs?
   Yes ( )  No ( )
   Explain your answer.

6. In what ways would you say CSR donations influence CBOs’ implementation of OVC projects?
7. In what areas does your FBO partner with CBOs implementing OVCs projects and how does this partnership influence the implementation of these projects?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8. Does your NGO work in partnership with CBOs implementing OVCs projects and how does this partnership influence the implementation of these projects?
Yes ( ) No ( )
Explain your answer. _____________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

9. Would say schools have an important role in the success of OVCs projects implemented by CBOs?
Yes ( ) No ( )
Explain your answer. _____________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. In what ways does your school partner with CBOs implementing OVCs projects and how does this partnership influence the implementation of these projects?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX V: GOVERNMENTS’ CHILDREN OFFICERS INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Kindly tell me about yourself

2. What would you say is the situation of OVCs in Samburu Central Sub County?

3. Does your office assist CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects to access donor funding and what is the influence of this on these projects?

4. Does your office assist CBOs to access government bursaries for OVCs under their care and what is the influence of this on the lives of OVCs in Samburu Central Sub County?

5. Does your office assist CBOs to access government waivers for OVCs’ projects and what is the influence of this on these projects in Samburu Central Sub County?

6. Do you assist CBOs implementing OVCs’ projects in seeking for in kind donations and what is the influence of this on these projects?

7. How do you assist CBOs to effectively involve the community they are working in and what is the influence of this on OVC projects?

8. Would you say that CSR does positively influence the implementation of OVC projects by CBOs operating in Samburu Central Sub County?

9. How do you assist CBOs to receive help from health centres/ local schools to successfully implement their OVC projects?

10. In which areas would you suggest to CBOs’ management in Samburu Central Sub County to collaborate with FBOs and NGOs in their projects implementation?