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The study aimed to analyze factors influencing the performance of horticulture projects in Bahati Constituency, Nakuru County, Kenya. The lenders' decision to fund a given project must be based on a good understanding of variables that may pose as threats or turn into opportunities to them. It is on this basis that this study sought to make an empirical examination into managerial skills, community participation, and projects’ monitoring and evaluation as some of the critical factors that affect the successful implementation of the projects funded through project financing. An in-depth analysis of aspects pertaining these factors will be carried out. A brief review of projects outside Kenya such as Algatech in Israel and Bell Pepper Production Project in Botswana proofs that complete execution of a project funded through project financing is a possibility. This study therefore employed the theory of organizational effectiveness and examined the view of various scholars on this theory over time. This study limited itself to horticultural projects in Nakuru County, Bahati constituency. The survey used descriptive survey study in which a sample of 50 project managers were administered with questionnaires. The data collected was summarized using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) and analysis was done using the same package to produce frequency and correlations that was used to produce the findings. The means and the standard deviation of influence of management skills of managers on the performance of the projects were also calculated. In this context, skills requirements, roles assignment, additional trainings, targets, and decision making had means of 4.0682, 3.8295, 3.3864, 3.7614, and 3.9318 respectively. Since all these means were within the bracket range of 3.5 and 4.5, it indicated that the respondents tended on average to agree in relations all these metrics for financial performance. On the other hand, the standard deviation of skills requirements, roles assignment, additional trainings, targets, and decision making had means were 0.73961, 0.83352, 0.79411, 0.85761, and 0.79936 respectively. This indicated that the responses were moderately distributed. The means and the standard deviations of community participation were undertaken. The effective communication, decision making, collaboration and support had means of 4.1136, 3.5000, 4.1591 and 3.8182 respectively. This implied that on average the respondents tended to agree in relations to all the community participation since they had a mean between 3.5 and 4.5. On the other hand, effective communication, decision making, collaboration and support had standard deviations of 0.65094, 0.99424, 0.72534, and 1.11979 respectively. This indicated that the responses for all the metrics were moderately distributed except for the local community actively support the project which had a standard deviation of 1.11979 indicating lack of consensus. The study found positive and statistically significant relationship between management skills and horticultural performance. There was also a significant statistical relationship between community participation and horticultural performance in Bahati constituency. Finally, the study found a statistically significant relationship between monitoring and evaluation, and horticulture performance. The study recommends that greater emphasis should be placed on management skills as a means of influencing performance of the horticulture projects in Bahati Constituency.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

The past twenty years has seen a flood of development projects in virtually all the sectors of the economy. What give lease of life to these projects is the funds that facilitate all the aspects of the project. Consequently, this has led to an in-depth research into all that entails project financing as one of the means of funding a project (M. Mwangi, 2015).

Project financing can be described as the raising of finance on a non-recourse basis for the purpose of developing a large capital-intensive infrastructure project, where the borrower is a special purpose vehicle and repayment of the financing by the borrower will be dependent on the internally generated cash flows of the project (Niaga, 2012). Recourse financing gives lenders full recourse to the assets or cash flow of the shareholders for repayment of the loan in the case of default by the special purpose vehicle (SPV). If the project or SPV fails to provide the lenders with the repayments required, the lenders will then have recourse to the assets and revenue of the shareholders, with no limitation (Southon & Gorbachev, 2003).

Project financing, by contrast is ‘limited’ or ‘non-recourse’ to the shareholders. In this case of non-recourse financing, the project company is generally a limited liability special purpose project vehicle, and so the lenders recourse will be limited primarily or entirely to the project assets (including completion and performance guarantees and
bonds) in the case of default of the project company (Jimba, 2015). Therefore, one of the primary advantages of project financing is that it provides for off-balance-sheet financing of the shareholders or the government contracting authority, and shifts some of the project risk to the lenders in exchange for which the lenders obtain a higher margin than for normal corporate lending (Mochiemo, 2014). The success of any project funded through project financing hence needs an in-depth review of all the critical factors to Horticulture project performance. Financial resources, liquid funding available to the project team as well as monetary equivalent resources such technical equipment and prototype testing, but not human resources assigned to the project, help in the easy execution of a project (Mutinda, 2013).

This research study focused on the horticulture project. Horticulture is the branch of agriculture that deals with the art, science, technology and business of growing plants. It includes the cultivation of medicinal plants, fruits, vegetables, nuts, seeds, herbs, sprouts, mushrooms, algae and non-food crops such as grass and ornamental trees and plants (Adams, 2008). The project was based in Bahati constituency in Nakuru County.

1.2 Statement of the problem

This study seeks to establish the factors that are critical for successful Horticulture project performance. This research propose that these critical factors can be identified and analyzed in a strategic management approach. Failure to do so will result in substantial financial losses to both project sponsor and lender and even project failure.
The lenders decision to fund a given project must be based on a good understanding of variables that may pose as threats or turn into opportunities to them. Therefore, this study is of relevance to practitioners as it will systematically highlight the elements that affect Horticulture project performance for the benefit of executives of medium-to-large size business ventures who are considering funding projects. It is of relevance to researchers too as it can form the basis of their further research into the Horticulture project performance field. A case study based on the financing of facilities to enable horticulture farming in Nakuru County is chosen to examine these critical factors. This case will show that the inadequate analysis of the suggested critical factors and lack of a thorough project planning results in delay in project start up and difficulties in negotiating the Horticulture project performance.

1.3 Purpose of the study

This research seeks to have an empirical examination into the factors that brings about the effect that may be termed as strength or threat to horticulture project performance.

1.4 Research Objectives

This research was based on the following three objectives:

i) To examine the extent to which management skills influences horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency.

ii) To establish the influence of community participation on horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency.
iii) The extent to which monitoring and evaluation influences horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency.

1.5 Research questions

This research was guided by the following three research questions:

i) To what extend does the management skills influence horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency?

ii) To what extend does community participation influence horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency?

iii) To what extend does monitoring and evaluation influence horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency?

1.6 Significance of the study

Effective and efficient implementation of projects would result in to more developments, better income being generated; however a few studies have reported the challenges that are associated with successful Horticulture project performance. The findings contained in this study may therefore be important in forming the effective design implementation and continuous improvement of Horticulture project performance. In Corporate financing, the sponsoring company typically procures capital by demonstrating to lenders that it has sufficient assets on its balance sheets, to use as collateral in the case of default. Unlike corporate financing, project financing relies upon the revenues generated by the project to pay back to the lenders. This fact calls for a comprehensive examination into
the relevant factors that are vital in the implementation of a successful Horticulture project performance and also helps to evade unnecessary contractual disputes among relevant parties.

1.7 Limitations of the study

The greatest challenge of this study was arrogance of the respondents pose, as some were suspicious of the intention and some even perceived agriculture with backwardness, so the researcher had to explicitly explain to the sample frame the research purpose being for data collections and improvements of future projects. The questionnaire given out were not brought back 100%, hence the researcher made a thorough follow up to get maximum respondents, the final challenge was that some respondents from the target community having low literacy levels, hence not able to keep much records, to minimize the effect of wrong records or lack of it, the sturdy team dug deep, inform of interview to get all the needed information.

1.8 Delimitation of the study

The evaluations of these factors were based on a horticulture project funded by means of project financing. The horticulture project is based in Bahati constituency in Nakuru County. The Nakuru County Bahati area is an administrative division with the general population of 143,714 based on 2009 census. The study had a target population of 100.
1.9 Assumptions of the study

The main assumption is that the researcher will get 100% response from all the respondents. The project being funded through project financing will be a success so as to enable accurate evaluation of these factors to Horticulture project performance.

It is also the researcher’s assumption that the respondents will respond to all the questions truthfully, especially because the questions touch on their daily activities, yet this could be otherwise.

1.10 Definition of significant terms

Analysis: Detailed examination of the elements or structure of something typically as a basis for discussion or interpretation.

Project financing: Is a term generally referred to the arrangement of debt, equity, and credit enhancement to finance a particular facility, in which lender looks primarily to the project cash flows and assets for the loan repayment and collateral. There is no or limited recourse to the sponsor during the life of the project loan.

Financing: The act of providing money for a project. Can be funds or capital provided by investors or lenders.

Factors: Are constituents or elements that bring about certain effects or results. It can also be a variable under study.
**Horticulture:** Is the art and science of producing, improving, marketing and using fruits, flowers and ornamental plants.

**Project:** Is a unique, transient endeavor undertaken to achieve planned objectives which could be defined in terms of output, outcomes or benefits. A project is usually deemed to be a success if it achieves the objectives according to their acceptance criteria, within an agreed timescale and budget.

**Non-Recourse:** Is where the project company generally a limited liability special purpose project vehicle and so the lenders recourse will be limited primarily or entirely to the project assets.

**Risk:** Is the probability that an actual return on an investment will be lower than he expected return.

**Appraisal:** Refers to the act of judging or estimating the value, condition, or importance of something or someone.

**Special purpose vehicle (SPV) project:** Refers to company with no previous business or record and the sole activity of the project company is to carry out the given project.

**Community participation:** Is a process whereby social groups are supported to crystallize their needs and are assisted to translate them into action. This leads to commitment and a community driven initiative which leads to a common goal.
Management skills: Is the art of understanding, developing and deploying people and their skills. Well implemented skills management should identify the skills that job roles require.

1.11 Organization of the study

In this study, chapter one has the introduction section which has background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, significance of the study, de-limitation of the study, limitation of the study, assumption of the study and study summary as sub-sections. Chapter two will deal with literature review on the study topic showing what the previous researchers have found out in the area under study. Chapter three will show the research methodology with the following subsections: introduction, research design, target population, sampling procedure, and methods of data collection, validity and reliability, operational definition of variables, methods of data analysis and a summary of the chapter. Chapter four examines the research results and analysis while chapter five gives the summary of the results.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is the review of literature related to integrated management planning of projects under Horticulture project performance and the indicators of management effectiveness of integrated management approaches. The purpose of this chapter will be to identify the knowledge gap that the study seeks to fill. The chapter is discussed under sub-headings of: management skills in Horticulture project performance; community participation in Horticulture project performance and monitoring and evaluation under Horticulture project performance. The later sections of the chapter provide the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that inform the study.

2.2 Management skills and Horticulture project performance

Management skills are the practice of understanding, developing and deploying people and their skills. Well implemented skills management should identify the skills that job roles require, the skills of individual employees and any gap between the two (Okwach, 2015). In an increasingly competitive world, projects are as successful as their managers. Managers have to learn more about themselves and how to manage others and the project they are working on. They are to make sure they are prepared for the challenges ahead. Having robust skills in multiple areas opens up a whole new world of possibilities for success. They adapt more easily, deal with shortcomings, collaborate more successfully and become far more valuable to the project (Mungai, 2014). In a nutshell the ability to
manage people is the foundation project success. To get a clear picture of this the researcher shall explore the management skills aspects up and close.

2.3 Management and leadership skills

It involves setting priorities, delegating, motivating and developing people and coaching them to become top performers. It is basically getting the people working on a given project what they need to get their bits of the project done, whether this is equipment, skills, cash or just the space to get on with it (Mamburi, 2014). The manager should be able to organize tasks in the right order to hit the right outcome at the right time, this is project scheduling. Resource allocation is closely linked to scheduling, here the manager has to find the right people, and then negotiate with them to ensure they are available at the right time to work on the project (Kitoto, 2012). Delegation involves the manager giving tasks to individuals to complete, along with possibly coaching them or organizing training if they do not already have the skills. There are also the technical aspects of updating the schedule, calculating whether someone is over-loaded and balancing the work appropriately so that it all gets done without burning anyone out (Siganda, 2012). All these takes place with exemplary leadership skills, not least so that everyone on the project knows what it is they have to do and why. A manager with good leadership skills does the following: Encourage employees to take ownership of their jobs and to strive for personal excellence, be knowledgeable, and share resources and referrals, make sure job responsibilities are clear and useful, discuss skills that are essential to be useful in the job,
provide opportunities for increased responsibility and carrier advancement and give honest recognition for work achievements (Gathiru, 2014).

2.4 Communication Skills

According to American Managers Association effective communication skills involves putting your point across, creating a compelling presentation to support your goals and get buy-in for your ideas inspire others to achieve better results and demonstrate emotional intelligence. Great project managers are objective, trustworthy, focused and confident. They lead by example, foster an energetic environment and are experts at managing the expectations of key stakeholders (Ochelle, 2012). Here is a deeper look at these characteristics and more plus the role communication plays in project manager’s success:

Objectivity and fairness: complex projects pose risks to team dynamics for example when individual stakeholders or department objectives clash. Managers with effective communication skills are inclusive in their communication and seek to constructively overcome these differences. They actively listen to more than one side without bias and work with key stakeholders to prioritize ideas and find solutions that best support the overall strategic goals.

Focus and stability: in order for the manager to effectively manage the project, it is imperative to focus on key aspects of a project and remain calm under pressure. Not all
projects go as planned. In fact most do not. It is during these moments that the project teams look to their manager to be rational and practice sound judgment.

2.5 Finance skills

As Muchai (2012) vividly describes, a project costs money, even if it is your time spent on it. Increasingly, project managers have to track their own expenses and budget often without formal templates or support from the finance department. This also includes forecasting, especially if the project will last long enough to push some of the budget into the next financial year. As a minimum the manager has to work out how to spend what he has been allocated and whether it is enough to deliver what the project sponsor is expecting. The project manager’s financial stake in a project is controlling costs to adhere to the proposed or baseline budget. The three core processes of cost management are cost estimation, cost budgeting and cost control. Of the many technical and financial skills needed for budgeting, the relentless monitoring of the project’s performance to see where actual costs have varied from estimated costs will generate the true savings (Munyao, 2013). Without proper monitoring small overruns can quickly balloon into serious budget problems.

2.6 Critical thinking

American Management Association describes critical thinking as the art of approaching problem solving logically, research options, avoid biases and focus on meaningful data to draw the right conclusion even under pressure. Projects today face a multitude of challenges, including growing complexity brought on by globalization, technology, rapid
change and diversity (Mwangi, 2015). By incorporating agile critical thinking, project managers can deal effectively with these challenges. Critical thinking forces the manager to look at a situation and weigh all possible solutions before coming up with a final answer. Even though the process may take long its benefits are immense for example it brings new ideas, fosters teamwork, and promotes options just to mention a few. (Root, 2015)

2.7 Community participation and Horticulture project performance

Despite some authors contesting that participation makes no difference, the importance of community participation is well established in the literature. Chamala (1995) identified efficiency benefits from participation, stating that ‘involving stakeholders and empowering community participants in projects at all levels, from local to national, provide a more effective path for solving sustainable resource management issues’. Participation enhances project effectiveness through community ownership of development efforts and aids decision-making (Kelly and Van Vlaenderen 1995; Kolavalli and Kerr 2002). Price and Mylius (1991) also identified local ownership of a project as a key to generating motivation for ecologically sustainable activities. The authors also identify the role of community participation in disseminating information amongst a community, particularly local knowledge that leads to better facilitation of action (Price and Mylius, 1991; Stiglitz, 2002). Kelly (2001) identified that participation results in learning, and learning is often a prerequisite for changing behavior and practices.
Gow and Vansant (1983) identified four affirmations that summarize the importance of community participation in a project: People organize best around problems they consider most important, local people tend to make better economic decisions and judgments in the context of the own environment and circumstances, voluntary provision of labor, time, money and materials to a project is a necessary condition for breaking patterns of dependency and passivity, the local control over the amount, quality and benefits of development activities helps make the process self-sustaining (Botchwa, 2001) page

White (1981) identified a number of beneficial reasons for community participation: with participation, more will be accomplished, and services can be provided more cheaply. Participation: has an intrinsic value for participants; is a catalyst for further development; encourages a sense of responsibility; guarantees that a felt need is involved; ensures things are done the right way; uses valuable indigenous knowledge; frees people from dependence on others’ skills; and makes people conscious of causes of their poverty and what they can do about it.

Curry (1993) identifies that ‘policies that are sensitive to local circumstances will not only be more effective in taking the uniqueness of local social structure, economy, environmental and culture into account, but also, through the involvement of the local community, will be more likely to be successful in their implementation of policies for
their locality are much more likely to be enthusiastic about their implementation’ (Curry, 1993, Storey 1999). Golooba-Mutebi (2004) found that participation has a role in enhancing civic consciousness and political maturity that makes those in office accountable.

Local community participation ranges from inclusion in the planning and development stage of the project to the ownership and operation of the business. In addition, members of the local community could sit on the advisory boards, and could participate directly in the management of a project (Pinnock, 2000). The local community tends to evaluate the level of success of the project according to the level of involvement. Passive involvement includes manual jobs and hand-outs, moving across a continuum towards a more successful and active involvement, which represents level resulting in equal partnership, planning and participation (Pinnock, 2000). Participatory development has the propensity of achieving project sustainability and increased utilization rate of the project by members of the community and sustained ownership. National development cannot be achieved without partnership and active participation of other key stakeholders at the community level. Community members are important partners in national development and therefore participation, ownership and sustainability of the project has the multiplier effect of enhancing the overall development of the local community and contributing to the country’s national development and economic growth. As Kenya implements the democratic decentralization of people’s participation in development and decision-making process as reflected in the spirit of the new constitution, the research becomes
even more significant because people will own and sustain the entire chain of
development (IJCRR, 2010).

2.8 Monitoring and Evaluation in Horticulture project performance

According to Richmond (2008) monitoring is the systematic and routine collection of
information from projects and programs for four main purposes: to learn from
experiences to improve practices and activities in the future, to have internal and external
accountability of the resources used and the results obtained, to take informed decisions
on the future of the project and to promote empowerment of beneficiaries of the project.
Monitoring is a periodically recurring task beginning in the planning stage of a project.
Monitoring allows results, processes and experiences to be documented and used as a
basis to steer decision-making and learning processes. Monitoring is checking progress
against plans. The data acquired through monitoring is used for evaluation.

Evaluation is assessing as systematically and objectively as possible, a completed project
or program (or a phase of an ongoing project that has been completed). Evaluations
appraise data and information that inform strategic decisions, thus improving the project
in the future. Richmond (2008) continues to say evaluation should help draw conclusions
about five main aspects of the intervention: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact
and sustainability. Information gathered in relation to these aspects during the monitoring
process provides the basis for the evaluative analysis.
Monitoring and Evaluation, (M&E), is an embedded concept and constitutive part of every project design. It is not an imposed control instrument by the lender or an optional accessory of any project. M&E is ideally understood as dialogue on development and its progress between all stakeholders. In general monitoring is integral to evaluation. During an evaluation, information from previous monitoring processes is used to understand the way in which the project developed and stimulated change. Monitoring focuses on the following aspects of an intervention:

On quantity and quality of the implemented activities (outputs: what do we do? How do we manage our activities?)
On processes inherent to a project (outcomes: what were the effects changes that occurred as a result of your intervention?).
On processes external to an intervention (impact: which broader, long-term effects were triggered by the implemented activities in combination with other environmental factors?)

The evaluation process is an analysis or interpretation of the collected data which delves deeper into the relationships between the results of the project, the effects produced by the project and the overall impact of the project. (Hormuzi and Dube, 1999). On the other hand, John Wiley & Sons, (1999) asserts that too much or the wrong type of M&E may constrain the team’s creativity, impede their progress and injure their ultimate performance. He suggests for a formal and interactive M&E mechanism to be available for the project managers in monitoring and evaluating the project and the relationship between these mechanisms and project performance. Formal output and process controls are examined which consists of the setting and monitoring of outcomes, such as goals
schedule and budgets, and of processes and procedures, respectively. He further explores how the effectiveness of these mechanisms may be contingent upon the degree of innovativeness in the project and the degree to which the project is part of a broad product program. In addition, the use of formal rewards for achieving team performance as opposed to rewards for individual achievement is investigated. Lastly, interactive M&E are examined which consists of project managers interacting directly with project members in the development strategy and operational goals and procedures prior to the start of the project, and project managers intervening in project decision-making.

Bonner (2005) collected information on 95 projects across a variety of industries. The findings suggest that while projects teams need some level of strategic direction concerning the objectives to be accomplished and the procedures to be followed, project managers can exert too much control. In particular, the findings showed a negative association between the use of project manager-imposed process controls and project performance. The findings also indicated that the degree to which project managers intervened in project-level decisions during the project was negatively related to project performance. In particular, early team member and project manager in the setting of operational controls, such as goals and procedures for monitoring and evaluating the project, was positively associated with project performance. This study also provides insight into our understanding of upper-management support in a given project. The study suggests that upper-managers can over control with the wrong type of controls and suggests effective ways of implementing participative and interactive control mechanism.
2.9 Sample of projects under Horticulture project performance

Israel Alga technologies or Algatech, is a research-based project that cultivates and grows algae. The biotechnology project has developed a way to mass produce microalgae in Israel’s hot Negev desert. Its premiere product is astaxanthin, a powerful and natural antioxidant for human consumption. GreenSoil Ventures is one of the venture capital firm in Israel focused solely on Israel agricultural technologies. This is the main lender of The Algatech project.

Bell pepper production in Botswana has specialized in bell paper production one of the agricultural commodities for exporting into U.S and European Union. To guarantee constant supply and quality, small and medium-size growers use passively ventilated protective structures (i.e. greenhouse and high tunnels) to control the growing environment to reduce pests, and to improve fruit quality and yields. Jean-Robert Estime Group is the main lender of this project. “It is difficult to comprehend the magnitude of the changes that have affected Botswana’s wildlife and range land resources over the past twenty five years. The contrast either side of this time period could not be greater, with resource use over large areas of range land undergoing a shift from wildlife and hunting and gathering to extensive livestock production. Drastic reductions in the populations of some key wildlife species have resulted, coincident with increasing restrictions upon the distribution and movement patterns of almost all large herbivores.” (Perkins J.S. and Ringrose S.M., 1996). Rising mercury, growing populations and loss of land mean a higher demand for food quality and quantity in the future. The economists along with the
world-renowned researchers and investors have to find ways to feed the future. This has led to the high rise of project financed horticulture projects around the world to safeguard the future generation.

2.10 Theoretical Framework

This study was guided by the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework Model. This framework was based on five basic indicators to measure different aspects of the project performance. An indicator is a variable that measures a particular aspect of the project. The monitoring and evaluation team uses indicators for: Monitoring the project to show project activities are being carried out as planned, and evaluating the projects to show that the project activity has caused a change in the overall project.

Monitoring focuses primarily on the first three categories of indicators, while evaluation focuses largely on the last two categories.
Figure 1: Monitoring and Evaluation Framework Model.

Input indicators include indicators that measure the human and financial resources, physical facilities, equipment and supplies that enable implementation of the project. For example, data on an input indicator can tell whether supplies are coming in on time.

Process indicators reflect whether a project is being carried out as planned and how well project activities are being carried out. Such indicators could, for example focus on training staff, for instance they give the project manager an explanation of why one project activity requires more cash than the other. Process indicators are usually reported in form of a number. Output indicators report on the results of program efforts (input and processes/activities) at the project level. They will inform us about the direct products or deliverables of the project and are usually reported as numbers.
Outcome indicators measure the projects level of success in improving service accessibility, utilization or quality. These types of indicators are usually reported as percentages or rates. Data for outcome indicators often come from surveys or surveillance systems. These data sources typically provide data on both numerators and denominators needed to calculate the necessary percentages to measure outcome indicators.

Impact indicators measure the long-term cumulative effects of the project over time on the larger social system. Such impacts are increasingly becoming difficult to attribute to a single project.

A project should select at least one indicator for each significant aspect of the project including each significant input, output or overarching project objectives. The selected indicators should link to the projects framework. Also the project should consider the resources needed to collect and analyze data for each indicator.
2.11 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework was informed by the monitoring and evaluation framework and shows the linkage between input-process-output.

![Conceptual Framework Diagram]

**Independent variables**

- **Management Skills**
  - Management and leadership skills
  - Communication skills

- **Community Participation**
  - Co-operation with project management
  - Self-directed actions

- **Monitoring and Evaluation**
  - Accountability
  - Making informed decisions
  - Learn from experiences and improve future practices

**Moderating variable**

- Government policy

**Dependent variable**

- Horticulture project performance
  - access to project financing
  - performance of horticultural projects

Figure 2: Conceptual Framework of the study

The conceptual framework above shows the linkage between the independent and the dependent variables of the study. The independent variables are factors which are likely to impact on the performance (dependent variables) of the project. Although there may be
various factors that affect projects performance, the factors considered in the conceptual framework were management skills factors, community participation factors and monitoring and evaluation factors.

2.12 Knowledge Gap

A large percent of projects initiated through Horticulture project performance fail. To improve on the success quotient of these projects management skills as a critical factor that affects projects under Horticulture project performance has to be taken a notch higher than what has been done before. The work-force which is the integral part of project implementation is to be given focus. The individual objectives have to be achieved apart from pushing for the accomplishment of the projects’ objectives and goals. The human resource has to be put in an enabling environment to achieve the projects’ goals and objectives. This is what the project proposal strives to bridge in the course of project implementation.

2.13 Summary of Literature Review

This chapter reviewed various literatures on the critical factors to project under project financing with particular reference to factors that result in better project performance. Management skills are paramount for the success of a project. The top management of the project ought to be well equipped with aspects that will enable them catch up with the dynamics of a project. With respect to community participation and project performance the literature will suggest that interactions with the local community will be essential to the success of projects. Establishing a bidirectional communication line between the
project and the locals facilitates goodwill for the project. Lastly, monitoring and 
evaluation of the project ensures the projects’ mandate is fully accomplished.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the research design and methodology that was used in the research. This chapter provides the rationale that was used by the researcher in choosing the design. The target population, sample size and sampling procedures, instrumentation and their validity and reliability, data collection procedures and data analysis are the sub-sections.

3.2 Research design
The research design that was used is the descriptive survey design which includes both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The descriptive survey was ideal for the study as the researcher was interested in describing the factors that influence the performance of horticulture projects in Bahati. It is used to describe the characteristics of the variables. The study only described the state of the affairs without interference of the variables in the study as they existed. The research design is applicable since it is a research technique in which information is gathered from a sample of people using questionnaire and used when the target population is small (Kothari, CR 1990).

3.3 Target Population
A target population was the population to which the researcher wanted to generalize the results of the study (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The study population target was 50
members comprising of horticultural projects funded through project financing in Bahati Constituency Nakuru County. This was because there were only 50 such horticultural projects using project financing. A horticultural comprises of three component (Brunner, 2007), irrigation development program, farmer support system and project co-ordination.

3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

The census sampling method was used for the purposes of sampling. This was because there were a relatively very low number of the project managers within the horticulture projects. The census sampling is ideal where all the population members are being used for the sample.

3.5 Research Instruments

This study used questionnaire and interview schedule for data collection. A combined closed and open ended questionnaire was used for collecting primary data from key respondents. Closed ended questionnaires were used to avoid much ambiguity in terms of responses and are also a bit easier to administer (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The questionnaire was consistent with the quantitative data analysis methods that was used. The questionnaires were administered to the project managers.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts; a question on background information and another section with questions measuring the independent variables in our case managerial skills, M&E and community participation using a three point rating scale.
Additional data was obtained from interviews with the Sub-county Projects Administrator. The interview was guided by an open ended interview schedule.

3.6 Validity of the research instruments

The validity is the degree to which the results obtained from the analysis of the data actually represents the phenomenon under study (Mugenda, 2003). Content validity will be used for this study and it is concerned with the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content of the measuring instrument, such as the items or questions it contained. The content validity was tested using the lecturers of the university well versed with the concept of horticulture financing.

3.7 Reliability of the Research instruments

To strengthen the reliability of the tool, the study used internal consistency techniques. This involved correlating a score in one item with scores obtained from other items in the instrument. The Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha was computed on the items to establish their correlation. The cronbach alpha coefficient of a threshold of above 0.7 were considered.

\[ KR_{20} = \frac{(K)(S_2 - \sum 2)}{(S_2)(K - 1)} \]

Where

KR\(_{20}\) = reliability of coefficient of internal consistency

K = Number of items to measure the concept
\[ S^2 = \text{variance of the scores} \]

\[ S^2 = \text{variance of individual items} \]

This technique despite using the split half techniques of internal consistency estimation principle will be selected over the split half techniques because it results in a conservation estimate of the reliability useful in avoiding erroneous conclusions, (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The technique will also be appropriate when the items in the tool measure different substantive areas within a single construct (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

### 3.8 Data Collection Procedures

This study collected both primary and secondary data. Data was collected from the project managers through a questionnaire self-administered by the researcher. This method of data collection allows the researcher to seek clarifications mitigate against a low response rate, reduce misunderstanding and ensure that the literacy level of the respondents does not compromise quality of responses. Additional information was sourced from document review. The documents review included Projects Status Report and other documents generated by the projects and funding ventures.

### 3.9 Data Analysis Techniques

The research generated enumerative data such as community size hence use nominal, ordinal and interval scales of measurement. The researcher assigned codes to the responses for ease of analysis. After collection of the data the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 was used for data entry and data analysis. Descriptive
statistics was used to summarize the data and to describe the sample as well as the variables under study. To study the relationship between the variables, the coefficient of the correlation as developed by Karl Person was calculated using the same statistical package. Each independent variable was correlated against the dependent variable. The results were then analyzed. On the other hand, the multiple linear regressions was calculated using the independent variables against the dependent variables and the results analyzed.

3.10 Ethical Considerations

Ethics in research describes the acceptable behavior during the process undertaking research (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). The ethical issues that the study will face include the misuse of the collected data for purposes other than the one stated, and the data privacy concerns. The ethical consideration were taken care of through the use of the consent statement in which the respondents were informed on the academic purpose of the study, the right to leave the study at any stage without financial penalties and the anonymity of the respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Measurement scale</th>
<th>Tools for Data collection</th>
<th>Tools for data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance of the project</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>-Increased goodwill from community</td>
<td>-Number of locals supporting the project</td>
<td>-Ordinal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Percentage Correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Economic benefits</td>
<td>-Revenue levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Project still running</td>
<td>-Revenue levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management skills</td>
<td>independent</td>
<td>-Management and leadership skills</td>
<td>-Wellbeing of the project</td>
<td>-Ordinal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Percentage Correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Critical thinking</td>
<td>-Kind of decisions made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Communication skills</td>
<td>Level of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation</td>
<td>independent</td>
<td>-Decision making</td>
<td>-Level of community cooperation with project</td>
<td>-Ordinal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Percentage Correlations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Cooperation with project management</td>
<td>community involvement in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Self-directed action</td>
<td>Level of community cooperation with project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of community self-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Monitoring and evaluation | independent | -Accountability  
--Making informed decisions  
-Learn from experience and improve future actions | -Level of accountability by the project management  
-Level of the project management making informed decisions  
-Level of the management improving on future actions | -Ordinal | Questionnaire | Percentage Frequency Correlations | driven action in the project |
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the research findings related factors influencing the performance of horticulture projects in Bahati Constituency of Nakuru County. The findings are presented according to the following thematic areas; Respondents general information, influence of management skills on the performance of horticulture projects, influence of community participation on the performance of horticulture projects, influence of monitoring and evaluation on the performance on horticulture projects.

4.2 Response Rate
A total of 50 questionnaires were distributed and out of which 47 were duly filled and returned. This gives a response rate of 94% which according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) is a good rate for analysis and reporting.

4.3 Background Information
The study sought the background characteristics of the respondents with a view to understand the general demographic features. The respondents were asked to choose their highest level of education, age bracket that they currently are in and the number of year the project has been in operation.
Table 4.1 shows that there were more male respondents 55.3% compared to 44.7% female respondents. This could indicate that there are still low levels of employment of females in horticulture projects in Bahati constituency, Nakuru County. The findings represent the views of the two gender groups about the performance of horticulture projects. This was necessary for the study to get a balanced picture of the respondents’ views.

Table 4.0.1. Gender Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Show that the majority of respondents 36.2% were in the age bracket of 40-49 years, 31.9% were in the age bracket of 30-39 years, 23.4 were in the age bracket of 50-59 years and 8.5% were in the age of 20-29 years of age. The study further sought to know age bracket the respondents fall in as project managers. The age bracket is correlated with the experience level of the project managers. This is because the relatively older project managers have worked for a longer time in project management and hence their experience level. The experience level of the project managers is critical in giving credibility of the responses.

Table 4.0.2. Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39yrs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49yrs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study sought to know the duration of the project as illustrated in Table 4.3.

Table 4.0.3. Duration of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in operation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over two years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that majority of the projects 70.3% have been in operation for over two years, 21.2% less than two years in operation and 8.5% of the projects have been in operation for less than a year. The duration of the project is critical in understanding the resources required and the complexities of the horticultural project being undertaken.

Table 4.4 Duration of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration in operation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over two years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study further sought to know what crops are grown under the project.

Table 4.5 shows that the major crops 51.0% grown under the horticulture projects are vegetables followed by Herbs 34.0% and other crops 15.0%. The different crops being grown would often require different project management skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crops</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics were undertaken using frequency distributions, means and standard deviations. The dependent and independent variables used the Likert scale type of questions using five descriptors that Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Uncertain (U), Agree (A) and Strongly Agree (SA) which were inputted as 1,2,3,4 and 5 on SPSS. The means falling between one and one point five was interested as the respondents on average tending to strongly disagreeing. The means falling between one point five and two point five were interpreted that on average the respondents tended to disagree. On the other hand, the means falling between two point five and three point five that on average the respondents tended to be uncertain. The means falling between three point five and four point five implied that on average the respondents tended to agree with the metric. Finally, the respondents with means greater than four point five indicated that on average the respondents tended to strongly agree with the metric. On the other hand, the standard
deviation measures the dispersion of the responses from the mean with an interpretation assigned as follows. Standard deviation of less than 0.5 implied high consensus amongst the respondents. Standard deviation of between 0.5 and 1 indicated moderately distributed responses. Finally, the standard deviation of greater than 1 indicated the lack of consensus on given metric.

**4.4 Influence of management skills in Horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency**

**Table 4.0.4: Frequency Distribution of Management Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>U (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce have the skills required for the work</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce is assigned roles that suit their qualification</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce receives additional training useful for the project</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce assigns targets</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce is involved in decision making</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out the influence of management skills of managers on the performance of the projects based on the following dimensions; skills requirements, roles assignment, additional trainings, targets, and decision making. The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to the listed questions using a
The five Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. The frequency distribution results for Project workforce have the skills required for the work were 30.7% (SA), 45.5% (A), 23.9% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The frequencies for Project workforce is assigned roles that suit their qualification were 27.3% (SA), 28.4% (A), 44.3% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The results for Project workforce receive additional training useful for the project were 11.4% (SA), 23.9% (A), 56.8% (U), 8.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The frequencies for Project workforce assigns targets were 19.3% (SA), 45.5% (A), 27.3% (U), 8.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). Finally, the results for Project workforce is involved in decision making were 28.4% (SA), 36.4% (A), 35.2% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD).

Table 4.0.5: Means and Standard Deviation of Management Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce have the skills required for the work</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.0682</td>
<td>.73961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce is assigned roles that suit their qualification</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.8295</td>
<td>.83352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce receives additional training useful for the</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.3864</td>
<td>.79411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce assigns targets</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.7614</td>
<td>.85761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project workforce is involved in decision making</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.9318</td>
<td>.79936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid N (list wise)</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means and the standard deviation of influence of management skills of managers on the performance of the projects were also calculated. In this context, skills requirements, roles assignment, additional trainings, targets, and decision making had means of 4.0682,
3.8295, 3.3864, 3.7614, and 3.9318 respectively. Since all these means were within the bracket range of 3.5 and 4.5, it indicated that the respondents tended on average to agree in relations all these metrics for financial performance. On the other hand, the standard deviation of skills requirements, roles assignment, additional trainings, targets, and decision making had means were 0.73961, 0.83352, 0.79411, 0.85761, and 0.79936 respectively. This indicated that the responses were moderately distributed.

4.5 Influence of community participation on Horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency

Table 4.0.6: Frequency Distribution of community participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>U (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is effective communication with the community</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community is involved in decision making that involve them</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project staff regularly collaborate with the local community</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community actively support the project</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study sought to find out the influence of community participation on the performance of the projects based on the following dimensions; effective communication, decision making, collaboration and support. The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to the listed questions using a five Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. The frequency distributions for effective communication were 27.3% (SA), 56.8% (A), 15.9% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD).

In relations to the decision making, the results were 19.3% (SA), 28.4% (A), 35.2% (U), 17.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The results for the project staff regularly collaborate with the local community were 35.2% (SA), 45.5% (A), 19.3% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). On the other hand, the results for the local community actively support the project were 0.0% (SA), 15.9% (A), 40.9% (U), 23.9% (D), and 19.3% (SD). Finally, the results for there is effective communication with the community were 38.6% (SA), 20.5% (A), 25.0% (U), 15.9% (D), and 0.0% (SD).

Table 4.0.7: Means and Standard Deviation of community participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is effective communication with the community</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community is involved in decision making that involve them</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project staff regularly collaborate with the local community</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.1591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The local community actively support the project  

Valid N (list wise) 47

The means and the standard deviations of community participation were undertaken. The effective communication, decision making, collaboration and support had means of 4.1136, 3.5000, 4.1591 and 3.8182 respectively. This implied that on average the respondents tended to agree in relations to all the community participation since they had a mean between 3.5 and 4.5. On the other hand, effective communication, decision making, collaboration and support had standard deviations of 0.65094, 0.99424, 0.72534, and 1.11979 respectively. This indicated that the responses for all the metrics were moderately distributed except for the local community actively support the project which had a standard deviation of 1.11979 indicating lack of consensus.

4.6 Influence of monitoring and evaluation influences Horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency

Table 4.0.8: Frequency Distribution of monitoring and evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>U (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An analysis and strategy for addressing the project’s threats and pressures</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a detailed work-plan that identifies specific targets for achieving management targets</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project activities are guided by the</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of research and monitoring is routinely incorporated into planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and strategy...</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed work plan...</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project activities...</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out the influence of monitoring and evaluation on the performance of the projects based on the following dimensions; analysis and strategy for addressing the project’s threats and pressures, detailed work plan that identifies specific targets for achieving management targets, projects guided by the work-plans developed, and results of research and monitoring is routinely incorporated into planning. The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to the listed questions using a five Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. The results were as follows; analysis and strategy for addressing the project’s threats and pressure had 19.3%, 40.9%, 23.9%, 15.9%, and 0.0% of the respondents indicating strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. In relations to the detailed work plan that identifies specific targets for achieving management targets, 15.9%, 31.8%, 27.3%, 17.0%, and 8.0% of the respondents indicating strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. In relations to the project activities being guided by the work-plans developed the results were 28.4%, 38.6%, 15.9%, 17.0%, and 0.0% of the respondents indicating strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. On the other hand, results of research and monitoring is routinely incorporated into
planning were 39.8%, 27.3%, 15.9%, 17.0%, and 0.0% strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree respectively.

Table 4.0.9: Means and Standard Deviations of monitoring and evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.6364</td>
<td>.97299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.5068</td>
<td>1.16814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.7841</td>
<td>1.04440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.8977</td>
<td>1.11458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means and standard deviations of monitoring and evaluation were examined. The analysis and strategy for addressing the project’s threats and pressures, detailed work plan that identifies specific targets for achieving management targets, projects guided by the work-plans developed, and results of research and monitoring is routinely incorporated into planning had means of 3.6364, 3.5068, 3.7841, and 3.8977 respectively. This indicates that on average the respondent’s tended to agree with the given metrics. On the other hand, analysis and strategy for addressing the project’s threats and pressures, detailed work plan that identifies specific targets for achieving management targets, projects guided by the work-plans developed, and results of research and monitoring is routinely incorporated into planning had standard deviations of .97299,
1.16814, 1.04440, and 1.11458 respectively. This shows that there was lack of consensus in relations to the three metrics that had standard deviations of greater than 1.0.

### 4.7 Horticulture Performance

#### Table 4.0.10: Frequency Distribution of Horticulture Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>U (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The horticulture farms in Bahati are able to financially empower the local community</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The horticulture farms in Bahati are able to provide constant supply of horticultural products</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The horticulture farms in Bahati are able to produce quality products</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The horticulture farms in Bahati are able to produce competitively priced products</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study sought to find out horticulture performance in Bahati based on the following dimensions; financial empowerment of the local community, provision of constant supply of horticulture products, production of quality products, and production of competitively priced products. The results for financial empowerment of the local community were 44.3% (SA), 23.9% (A), 31.8% (U), 0.0% (D) and 0.0% (SD). The results for provision of constant supply of horticulture products were 15.9% (SA), 48.9% (A), 35.2% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The results for production of quality products were 15.9%
(SA), 31.8% (A), 36.4% (U), 15.9% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The results for production of competitively priced products were 15.9% (SA), 31.8% (A), 17.0% (U), 27.3% (D), and 8.0% (SD).

Table 4.0.11: Means and Standard Deviations of Horticulture Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The horticulture farms in Bahati are able to financially empower the local community</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.1364</td>
<td>.8685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The horticulture farms in Bahati are able to provide constant supply of horticultural products</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.8068</td>
<td>.6924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The horticulture farms in Bahati are able to produce quality products</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.5045</td>
<td>.9465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The horticulture farms in Bahati are able to produce competitively priced products</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.1250</td>
<td>.7703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (list wise)

The means and standard deviations of horticulture performance were calculated. The financial empowerment of the local community, provision of constant supply of horticulture products, production of quality products, and production of competitively priced products had means of 4.1364, 3.8068, 3.5045, and 4.1250 respectively. On the other hand, the financial empowerment of the local community, provision of constant supply of horticulture products, production of quality products, and production of competitively priced products had standard deviations of 0.86851, 0.69245, 0.94659, and 0.7703 respectively.
The inferential statistics were undertaken using the linear correlation to measure the strength of each individual variable on the dependent variable.

Influence of management skills in horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency:
The examination of whether management skills had statistically significant influence on horticultural produce in Bahati constituency was done using the linear correlation tests. The relationship was found to be positive and moderately significant since \( r=0.497, \ p<0.05 \).

Table 4.0.12: Linear Correlation Between management skills and Horticulture Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Skills</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Influence of community participation on Horticultural Performance in Bahati constituency:

The examination of whether community participation statistically significant influence on the horticultural performance in Bahati constituency was done using linear correlation tests.
### Table 4.13: Linear Correlation Between Community Participations and Horticultural Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Participation</th>
<th>Horticultural Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.436**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The relationship was found to be positive and had a moderate significance correlation since $r=0.436$, $p<0.05$.

This shows that the community participation had a positive impact on horticulture performance in Bahati constituency.

Influence of monitoring and evaluation influences Horticulture project performance in Bahati constituency:

The examination of whether monitoring and evaluation statistically significant influence on the horticultural performance in Bahati constituency was done using linear correlation tests. The relationship was found to be positive and statistically significant since $r=0.549$, $p<0.05$.

### Table 4.0.13: Linear Correlation Between Monitoring & Evaluation and Horticultural Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horticultural Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Table 4.0.14: 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>.622</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.30949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), management skills, Community Participation, and monitoring & Evaluation.

The F-ratio in the ANOVA table tests whether the overall regression model is a good fit for the data. The table shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable, F (3, 44) = 13.072, p < .005 indicating that the regression model is a good fit for the data.

Table 4.0.15: ANOVA

<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>1 Regression</td>
<td>5.008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>13.072</td>
<td>.000a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7.950</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.958</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), management skills, Community Participation, and monitoring & Evaluation.

b. Dependent Variable:
The contribution of the individual independent variable on the variance in the horticultural performance is achieved through the use of the regression model.

**Horticultural Performance** = 0.304 + 0.421 (management skills) + 0.134 (community participation) + 0.320 (Monitoring & Evaluation)

The horticultural performance in Bahati constituency in the absence of management skills, Community Participation, and monitoring & Evaluation would stand at 30.4% as indicated through a coefficient of 0.304. The beta coefficient of management skills of 0.421 indicates that 100% increase in management skills with the other independent variables held constant leads to a 42.1% increase in horticultural performance. The beta coefficient of the community participation of 0.134 indicates that 100% increase in community participation leads to 13.4% increase in horticultural performance at Bahati constituency. The beta coefficient of account payables that 0.320 indicates that 100% in monitoring and participation leads to 32.0% increase in horticultural performance in Bahati constituency.

**Table 4.17: Horticultural Performance**

Coefficients of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management Skills</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>3.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Participation</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>3.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>1.662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Horticultural Performance
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

5.2 Summary of Findings

This section gives the summary of each research objective; Management Skills Influences Horticulture project performance In Bahati Constituency; The study sought to find out the influence of management skills of managers on the performance of the projects based on the following dimensions; skills requirements, roles assignment, additional trainings, targets, and decision making. The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to the listed questions using a five likert scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. The frequency distribution results for Project workforce have the skills required for the work were 30.7% (SA), 45.5% (A), 23.9% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The frequencies for Project workforce is assigned roles that suit their qualification were 27.3% (SA), 28.4% (A), 44.3% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The results for Project workforce receive additional training useful for the project were 11.4% (SA), 23.9% (A), 56.8% (U), 8.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The frequencies for Project workforce assigns targets were 19.3% (SA), 45.5% (A), 27.3% (U), 8.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). Finally, the results for Project workforce is involved in decision making were 28.4% (SA), 36.4% (A), 35.2% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD).
The means and the standard deviation of influence of management skills of managers on the performance of the projects were also calculated. In this context, skills requirements, roles assignment, additional trainings, targets, and decision making had means of 4.0682, 3.8295, 3.3864, 3.7614, and 3.9318 respectively. Since all these means were within the bracket range of 3.5 and 4.5, it indicated that the respondents tended on average to agree in relations all these metrics for financial performance. On the other hand, the standard deviation of skills requirements, roles assignment, additional trainings, targets, and decision making had means were 0.73961, 0.83352, 0.79411, 0.85761, and 0.79936 respectively. This indicated that the responses were moderately distributed.

Community Participation on Horticulture project performance In Bahati Constituency;

The study sought to find out the influence of community participation on the performance of the projects based on the following dimensions; effective communication, decision making, collaboration and support. The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to the listed questions using a five Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree. The frequency distributions for effective communication were 27.3% (SA), 56.8% (A), 15.9% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). In relation to the decision making, the results were 19.3% (SA), 28.4% (A), 35.2% (U), 17.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). The results for the project staff regularly collaborate with the local community were 35.2% (SA), 45.5% (A), 19.3% (U), 0.0% (D), and 0.0% (SD). On the other hand, the results for the local community actively
support the project were 0.0% (SA), 15.9% (A), 40.9% (U), 23.9% (D), and 19.3% (SD).

Finally, the results for there is effective communication with the community were 38.6% (SA), 20.5% (A), 25.0% (U), 15.9% (D), and 0.0% (SD).

The means and the standard deviations of community participation were undertaken. The effective communication, decision making, collaboration and support had means of 4.1136, 3.5000, 4.1591 and 3.8182 respectively. This implied that on average the respondents tended to agree in relations to all the community participation since they had a mean between 3.5 and 4.5. On the other hand, effective communication, decision making, collaboration and support had standard deviations of 0.65094, 0.99424, 0.72534, and 1.11979 respectively. This indicated that the responses for all the metrics were moderately distributed except for the local community actively support the project which had a standard deviation of 1.11979 indicating lack of consensus.

Monitoring and Evaluation Influences Horticulture project performance In Bahati Constituency; The study sought to find out the influence of monitoring and evaluation on the performance of the projects based on the following dimensions; analysis and strategy for addressing the project’s threats and pressures, detailed work plan that identifies specific targets for achieving management targets, projects guided by the work-plans developed, and results of research and monitoring is routinely incorporated into planning. The respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed to the listed questions using a five likert scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and
strongly disagree. The results were as follows; analysis and strategy for addressing the project’s threats and pressure had 19.3%, 40.9%, 23.9%, 15.9%, and 0.0% of the respondents indicating strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. In relations to the detailed work plan that identifies specific targets for achieving management targets, 15.9%, 31.8%, 27.3%, 17.0%, and 8.0% of the respondents indicating strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. In relations to the project activities being guided by the work-plans developed the results were 28.4%, 38.6%, 15.9%, 17.0%, and 0.0% of the respondents indicating strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. On the other hand, results of research and monitoring is routinely incorporated into planning were 39.8%, 27.3%, 15.9%, 17.0%, and 0.0% strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree respectively.

5.3 Discussion of the Study

The study evaluated the various variables that the researcher picked out to check their relationship with regard to factors influencing the performance of horticulture projects in Kenya which were management skills, community participation and monitoring and evaluation.

The multiple linear regressions was used to make conclusion of this study as it explained the cumulative effects of management skills, Community Participation, and Monitoring & Evaluation. The relationship was a strong positive correlation was indicated through the multiple linear regression correlation coefficient of 0.622. The three independent
variables only accounted for 38.6% of the variance in horticulture performance giving an indication that there are other factors not in the scope of this study that accounted for 61.4% of the variance in horticulture performance.

5.4 Conclusions of the Study

The study found positive and statistically significant relationship between management skills and horticultural performance. The management is key in the performance of any organization including the horticulture projects. This is because the management is responsible for the day to day control of resources and workflow of the organization. There was also a significant statistical relationship between community participation and horticultural performance in Bahati constituency. Community participation is critical in the horticulture projects in the context that they provide the human resources especially for labour intensive tasks. The study concluded that the management skills were key to successful performance of the horticultural projects, furthermore it was note that there was effective communication across and among all the project managers. The study inferred that the management was critical in implementation and performance of the horticultural projects in Bahati constituency.

Finally, the study found a statistically significant relationship between monitoring and evaluation, and horticulture performance.
5.5 Recommendations of the Study

The study made a number of recommendations in regards to the research findings. It is recommended that the community should be actively involved and consulted in the entire process of project implementation in order to ensure that the implementation is successful. The study recommends that greater emphasis should be placed on management skills as a means of influencing performance of the horticulture projects in Bahati Constituency.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Studies

The study recommends for further examination of the role of the foreign currency exchange fluctuations on horticulture projects, challenges affecting implementation of successful horticultural projects, the role of project financing in horticultural projects and the influence of donor in implementation of performance of horticultural
REFERENCES


APPENDIX I:

Questionnaire No…….

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESEARCH PROJECT

I am a post graduate student at the University of Nairobi Nakuru campus. As a requirement in fulfillment of a Master’s Degree in Project Planning and Management, I am carrying out a study on horticultural projects funded through project financing with a special focus in Bahati constituency.

Your organization has been chosen as you are well positioned to provide relevant information that will enable study achieve its objectives. I intend to research on the above mentioned study by reviewing data from secondary sources.

The information availed will be used only for academic purposes and will be treated with strict confidence. Where possible, a copy of the research report will be availed to you upon request.

Your assistance and cooperation will be highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Ascar Adoyo Juma
APPENDIX II:

Please indicate your answer in the questions by placing a tick (✓) where necessary in the spaces provided in each of these statements regarding factors influencing the performance of horticulture projects in Kenya; a case of Bahati Constituency, Nakuru County.

Background information

1) What crops are grown under the project:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Vegetables (tomatoes, kales, cabbages, onions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Herbs (chives, basil and rosemary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) For how long the project has the project been in operation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) What is your highest level of Education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Post Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Masters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Bachelors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Higher Diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Indicate your age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 20-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Female ( )

c. 40-49 ( )
d. 50-59 ( )
e. 60 – above ( )

6) What is the number of your work force?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than six months</th>
<th>( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than three years</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than five years</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than seven years</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than seven years</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) What are the main activities of the project?

____________________

____________________

Section B.

Indicate your degree of agreement with the statement. The level 5 as strongly agree, 4 as agree somewhat, 3 is undecided (not sure), 2 disagree somewhat and 1 is strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Project workforce have the skills required for the work</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Project workforce is assigned roles that suit their qualification</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Project workforce receives additional training useful for the project</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Project workforce assigns targets</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Project workforce is involved in decision making</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C.

Indicate your degree of agreement with the statement. The level 5 as strongly agree, 4 as agree somewhat, 3 is undecided (not sure), 2 disagree somewhat and 1 is strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. There is effective communication with the community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The community is involved in decision making that involve them</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The project staff regularly collaborate with the local community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The local community actively support the project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section D.

Indicate your degree of agreement with the statement. The level 5 as strongly agree, 4 as agree somewhat, 3 is undecided (not sure), 2 disagree somewhat and 1 is strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. An analysis and strategy for addressing the project’s threats and pressures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. There is a detailed work-plan that identifies specific targets for achieving management targets</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Project activities are guided by the work-plans developed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The results of research and monitoring is routinely incorporated into planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Internal audit at the branch level affects Revenue Collection</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND EXTERNAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF CONTINUING AND DISTANCE EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTRA-MURAL STUDIES

Tel 051 - 2210863
P. O Box 1120, Nakuru
18th May 2016

Our Ref: UoN/CEES/NKUEMC/1/12

To whom it may concern:

RE: ASCAR ADOYO JUMA – L.50/61947/2013

The above named is a student of the University of Nairobi at Nakuru Extra-Mural Centre
Pursuing a Masters degree in Project Planning and Management.

Part of the course requirement is that students must undertake a research project during
their course of study. She has now been released to undertake the same and has identified
your institution for the purpose of data collection on “Factors Influencing the
Performance of Horticulture Projects: A Case of Bahari Constituency, Nakuru County,
Kenya.”

The information obtained will strictly be used for the purpose of the study.

I am for that reason writing to request that you please assist her.

[Signature]
Resident Lecturer
Nakuru Extra-Mural Centre
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NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Ref: NACOSTI/P/16/15994/11374

Ascar Adoyo Juma
University of Nairobi
P.O. Box 30197-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Following your application for authority to carry out research on “Factors influencing the performance of Horticulture Projects. A Case of Bahati Constituency, Nakuru County, Kenya.” I am pleased to inform you that you have been authorized to undertake research in Nakuru County for the period ending 13th June, 2017.

You are advised to report to the County Commissioner and the County Director of Education, Nakuru County before embarking on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit two hard copies and on soft copy in pdf of the research report/thesis to our office.

DR. STEPHEN K. KIBIRU, PhD.
FOR: DIRECTOR-GENERAL/CEO

Copy to:

The County Commissioner
Nakuru County.

The County Director of Education
Nakuru County.