

**INFLUENCE OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION ON SUSTAINABILITY OF DONOR
FUNDED PROJECTS: CASE OF KENYA COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
KILIFI COUNTY, KENYA**

BY

KIRIGHA ESTHER ROZINAH

**A RESEARCH PROJECT REPORT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF A MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN
PROJECT PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF EXTRA MURAL
STUDIES.**

2016

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this research project report is my original work and has not been presented for a degree at any other university.

Signature: Date.....

KIRIGHA ESTHER ROZINAH

REG NO: L50/76893/2014

This research project report has been submitted for examination with my approval as the University Supervisor

Signature: Date.....

DR. MOSES OTIENO

LECTURER, DEPARTMENT OF EXTRA MURAL STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research project to my late parents Mr and Mrs Kirigha for the good foundation in my life, rest in peace.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank the Almighty God for this opportunity He has given me this far and for the grace and strength to complete this research. Special thanks to my husband Eric and my children Bob and Valine for their moral support.

I acknowledge my supervisor Dr Otieno for being patient with me and guiding me through all the stages in making this research a success. It was my pleasure working with you. My lecturers Mr. Kisimbii, Mr. Nyambati, Mr. Maluki and Mr. Mwanyota thank you very much for laying a good foundation in Project Planning and Management course.

I also acknowledge the Kenya Coastal Development Project fraternity for the scholarship opportunity God bless you abundantly.

Finally I express my gratitude to my colleagues Vicky, Dora and Cornel thank you for being part of this journey. God bless you all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Purpose of Study	5
1.4 Research Objectives.....	6
1.5 Research Questions.....	6
1.6 Research Hypotheses	6
1.7 Significance of Study.....	7
1.8 Assumptions of the Study	8
1.9 Definition of Significant Terms.....	8
1.10 Limitations of the Study	9
1.11 Delimitations of the Study.....	9
1.12 Organization of the Study	9

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW	11
2.1 Introduction.....	11
2.2 Concept of Community Participation and Project Sustainability	11
2.3 Stages of Community Participation	11
2.4 Forms of Community Participation	12
2.5 Project Selection and Project Sustainability	12
2.6 Project Planning & Design and Project Sustainability	13
2.7 Project Execution and Project Sustainability	14
2.8 Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Sustainability.....	15
2.9 Theoretical Framework.....	17
2.10 Conceptual Framework.....	20
2.11 Research Gap.....	21
2.12 Literature Review Summary	20

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY	21
3.1 Introduction.....	21
3.2 Research Design	21
3.3 Target Population.....	21
3.4 Sampling Size and Sampling Procedure.....	21
3.5 Data Collection Instruments.....	24
3.6 Validity of Research Instruments	23
3.7 Reliability of Research Instruments.....	23

3.8 Data Collection Procedures.....	25
3.9 Ethical Considerations	24
3.10 Data Presentation and Analysis Techniques	24
3.11 Operationalization of Study Variables.....	24
CHAPTER FOUR	
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATIONS AND INTERPRETATION	26
4.1 Introduction.....	26
4.2 Questionnaire Return Rate.....	26
4.3 Key Informant Response Rate	26
4.4 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	27
4.5 Involvement of Locals in Project Selection and Project Sustainability of Donor funded projects in Kilifi County	29
4.6 Community Involvement in Project Planning & Design and Project Sustainability of Donor funded projects in Kilifi County	32
4.7 Community Involvement in Project Execution and Project Sustainability of Donor funded projects in Kilifi County	36
4.8 Community involvement in Project Monitoring & Evaluation Project Sustainability of Donor funded projects in Kilifi County	40
CHAPTER FIVE	
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	42
5.1 Introduction.....	42
5.2 Summary of Findings.....	42
5.3 Discussion of Results.....	47
5.4 Conclusion	50

5.5 Recommendations.....	50
5.6 Suggestions for Further Studies	51
REFERENCES.....	52
APPENDICES.....	55
APPENDIX A: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	55
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM	56
APPENDIX C: BENEFICIARIES QUESTIONNAIRE	57

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1: Sampling Procedure and Sampling size	23
Table 3.2: Operationalization of Study Variables.....	26
Table 4.2: Questionnaire Return Rate.....	27
Table 4.3: Key Informant Response Rate	28
Table 4.4: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	29
Table 4.5: Awareness Creation in Project Selection.....	31
Table 4.6: Awareness Creation and Clear Goals & Objectives.....	31
Table 4.7: Awareness Creation and Project Acceptability.....	32
Table 4.8: Awareness Creation and Project Ownership.....	32
Table 4.9: Testing Research Hypothesis.....	33
Table 4.10: Community Involvement in Planning and Sustainability.....	34
Table 4.11: Project Planning and use of local knowledge.....	34
Table 4.12: Project Planning and Resource Identification.....	35
Table 4.13: Project Planning and Communication Plan.....	35
Table 4.14: Testing Research Hypothesis.....	36
Table 4.15: Community Involvement in Project Execution.....	37
Table 4.16: Project Execution and Better Decision Making.....	37
Table 4.17: Project Execution and Overcoming of Challenges.....	38
Table 4.18: Project Execution and Innovation.....	38
Table 4.19: Testing research Hypothesis.....	39
Table 4.20: Involvement of Locals in Project Monitoring & Evaluation.....	40
Table 4.21: Project Monitoring & Evaluation and Locals Involvement.....	40
Table 4.22: Project Monitoring & Evaluation and Monitoring Frequency.....	41

Table 4.23: Project Monitoring & Evaluation and Feedback Mechanism.....	41
Table 4.24: Testing Research Hypothesis.....	42

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1: Ladder of Citizen Empowerment.....	18
Figure 2: Ladder of Participation.....	19
Figure 3: Conceptual Framework.....	20

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CDA	: Coast Development Authority
DFRD	: District Focus for Rural Development
GB	: Grameen Bank
HMP	: Hazina ya Maendeleo Pwani
KCDP	: Kenya Coastal Development Project
KMFRI	: Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute
KFS	: Kenya Forest Services
M&E	: Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	: Memorandum of Understanding
NEMA	: National Environmental Management Authority
NGO	: Non-Governmental Organization
OPP	: Orangi Pilot Project
WTL	: Where Talent Lives

ABSTRACT

Sustainability has been a major challenge for most donor funded projects in least developed countries Kenya included as most projects usually collapse after the donor withdrawal or projects closure. Several NGOs and government agencies have implemented projects which do not last to benefit the targeted beneficiaries long after the donor exits. Generally these projects lack sustainability aspect which is contributed by several factors including lack of community participation in projects, political instability and corruption among others. Kilifi County has several donor funded projects by World Vision, AMREF, Red Cross International among others implementing projects in different sectors like agriculture and livestock, health, education and many others but most of them cease to benefit the target beneficiaries after the closure of projects. According to the literature review, approaches applied by most NGOs and government agencies have failed to ensure that project continue to benefit the targeted beneficiaries after the exit of the donor. These approaches lack the active involvement of the local community right from the project formulation stage to the project monitoring and evaluation stage after the project closure. Therefore, the study was aimed at investigating the influence of community participation on sustainability of KCDP, a donor funded project case of 'Where Talent Lives' Youth group in Kilifi County. The study objectives were how community involvement during the projects life cycle affects sustainability of donor funded projects during selection of projects, during project planning & design, execution of project and during project monitoring & evaluation. The total target population for the study was 770 out of which a sample size of 170 was selected. Out of the 770 beneficiaries, 750 were households while 20 were WTL Youth group members who benefitted from the donor funded project. A simple random sampling method was used to select 150 households; while census method was applied to select the 20 WTL youth group members. Key informant persons were 2 KCDP Kilifi County Liaison officers who were also interviewed to give additional information. A total of one hundred and seventy (170 no.) questionnaires were administered out of which 151 questionnaires were returned. The data collected was presented in form of cross tabulations, frequencies, percentages and tables and Chi square method was used to analyze the data and test the hypothesis. According to the findings, involvement of locals during project planning and designing and project monitoring and evaluation significantly affects sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County. However involvement of locals during project selection and during execution has no effect on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County. Therefore community participation plays a key role during project life cycle by influencing sustainability of that project. However other factors should also be considered like level of education, political instability and economic level among others which might have an effect on sustainability of projects. It is therefore recommended during project selection phase proper training is carried out for awareness creation. It is also recommended that the education standards of the locals to be raised by encouraging enrollment to tertiary level of education.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of Study

Bamberger & Cheema (1990) suggested that participation by the community in any development initiative contributes significantly to sustained development. Projects cannot stand on their own therefore the need for community involvement for any project to be successful. Studies have shown that locals must be actively engaged in the process in a development project from formulation right through maintenance. Anderson & McFarlane, (2010) argued that a strategy that allows for doing things with the locals instead of doing things for them will allow the locals to participate in the project. Anderson & McFarlane, (2010) are of the argument that when locals are not actively engaged, there is no psychological commitment hence reduces the importance of participative development. A number of factors influence how the locals will participate in any development initiative including the economic level of the community whereby the lower the socio-economic status of the community the more they participate in the donor funded project for their own personal benefits hence high level of project ownership Boyes & Melvin, 2010). Chambers, (1992) suggested that participation by community is a process which involves negotiating and making decisions at different stages with relevant stakeholders which influences the sharing, allocation, policy making and access to resources.

World Bank, (2004) explained participation as involving stakeholders that play a key role in a project in influencing control on development resources, initiatives and decisions. The idea of participation by the community commenced from about 40 years ago from parts of Asia and Africa. The administrators during colonial eras used development initiatives approach as a means of raising the standards of living of the locals and capacity building people about local administration McCommon, (1993). However, the policy did not achieve its objectives mainly because the approach used by the leaders was not democratic. Generally, community participation means the involvement of the target beneficiaries of a project in all the stages of project life cycle i.e. from the selection of project, planning and designing, implementation and monitoring and evaluation.

Globally the Orangi Pilot Project and the Grameen Bank (GB) in South Asia was a good example (Uphoff, 1997). Through effective participation by the locals, OPP was very successful and it led to the government along with international agencies replicating its model for urban development in other parts of the country. GB's significant performance resulted to it being copied in other countries of world including US, UK, Australia, China, India and other developed & developing countries.

In Africa, South Africa's community involvement strategy was used as the accepted way of leadership and governance. This meant that the systems used by mayors in charge had to report on how the public views and involvement of community based organizations were put into consideration in the running of the affairs of the municipality. It is to be noted that participation by the locals in development interventions were just mere politics since locals just endorsed development plans. This means that the locals are manipulated by the administrators.

Community participation in the context of development is the active engagement of the target beneficiaries whereby they have a right to give directions on execution of development interventions rather than share the project outcomes. During this process people especially the disadvantaged influence on decisions concerning development and not just involved in sharing benefits of an intervention. Capacity building the local poor gives them control over their lives and increases their ability to mobilize sufficient resources for sustainable development. This also ensures that targets set are realized through community empowerment. Public participation in the management and planning of developmental initiatives is crucial in ensuring lasting impacts Thwala, (2001).

According Kerote, (2007), participation is important from the identification phase to the maintenance stage of projects because without evaluation it is difficult for the project to take corrective measures to ensure that the set targets are met as planned during the formulation stage. Community involvement will ensure project acceptability and increase likelihood of beneficiaries participating in the project and is also an essential condition for sustainability of projects. DFRD as a development strategy was initiated in Kenya in 1983, a strategy that sought to involve locals in the running of programs at the lowest level through the District Development

Committees. The aim of the government was to actively involve the locals in setting priorities and finding solutions depending on the available resources. However, the strategy turned out to be ineffective as the exercise did not represent genuine commitment by the government in giving the grassroots' people a chance for self-determination Makokha, (1985).

In order to achieve sustainability in projects, there was need to have better approaches covering governance, foundations, advocacy, fundraising, management and leadership among others. The focus should be on capacity building at both national and regional level to ensure workforce with appropriate skills that promote participatory and sustainable project development while at the same time empowering stakeholders to be more analytical about their situations, resources and develop appropriate interventions strategies to address the problems faced Mutimba, (2013).

The Kenya Coastal Development Project (KCDP), a multi-sectoral development program which was funded by the Global Environment Facility and World Bank and is under by the Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute (KMFRI). The objective of the initiative was to enhance revenue generation and improve management effectiveness of resources at the Kenyan coast. The program targeted coast terrestrial, marine environment and promote institutional reforms in order to improve productivity, incomes and livelihood of the local poor.

KCDP implementation is through partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (State Department of Fisheries, KMFRI), Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (Kenya Forest Research Institute, Kenya Wildlife Service), Ministry of Environment, Water and Mineral Resources (CDA, NEMA), and the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development (State Department of Physical Planning) in collaboration with various NGOs, Community Based Organizations and the private sector.

The Hazina ya Maendeleo ya Pwani (HMP) is a sub-component under KCDP aimed at improved conservation of the available resources found naturally and provide community services for improved living standards of the people in coastal areas. HMP is aimed at giving grants to locals to fund environmental projects up to 90% to women and youth groups. The project supports

community projects in the Coast region covering Taita Taveta, Lamu, Kilifi, Mombasa, Tana River and Kwale Counties.

Several groups from the region have benefitted from HMP and one of them is Where Talent Lives Youth Group which is located in Mnarani ward, Kilifi North constituency, Kilifi County. The group has 20 members out of which 10 are females and the rest are males. The goal of the group is to increase youth participation in governance, advocacy and reconciliation in their area of operation and even beyond. The group mobilizes and educates young people to advocate for better access to comprehensive health services and nurture talents to take advantage of the available opportunities in Kilifi County and the country at large.

The group is involved in integrating injective drug users, teenage mothers and orphans in the society to ensure effective and sustainable waste management in Kilifi County. In addition, they work towards conserving the environment by collecting garbage, recycling, establishing composite manure from organic waste and planting trees and flowers. It is through these efforts that the group received Kshs. 1,693,350/= as grant from HMP to undertake the environmental conservation activities. The fund was used as seed capital to start waste management project whereby the group engaged drug users and teenage mothers in garbage collection. Over 750 households are currently benefiting from the services of proper waste management by the group. Using the funds obtained from waste management, the group started a revolving fund whereby there are beneficiaries who have benefitted directly from small scale loans. The group has expanded its activities from Mnarani ward to cover the Kilifi Township ward within 3 years!

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The concept of sustainability of projects whether donor or government funded is posing a serious challenge not only in Kenya but also in many least developed countries. Most projects implemented at huge costs often tend to experience sustainability difficulties especially after project closure whereby the donor exits but the project is expected to continue to benefit the targeted beneficiaries. Development partners such as World Bank, USAID and other bilateral aid organizations have been expressing concerns on sustainability of projects UNDP, (2012). According to Mutimba (2013), in Kenya the scenario has not been different and most projects

funded by either the government or development partners remain as white elephants once the funding and technical support is withdrawn. Report by World Bank, (2012) showed that projects funded by donors failed to meet the expectations of the donors and the beneficiary communities and have not produced the desired results. This means that most funds are wasted on donor funded projects which is a serious challenge considering the fact that resources are scarce and have to be utilized sparingly. Ababa, (2013) noted with a lot of concern that in 2005 the country received US\$ 770M and this figure has been escalating since 2002 supporting different development sectors for instance health, infrastructure, agriculture, environmental conservation among others.

Poor communities have continued to witness a decline in living standards, increased levels of poverty and deterioration in infrastructure regardless of many efforts by government and development partners implementing projects in the area (Kilifi District Development Plan KDDP, 2005-2012). Most donor funded projects in Kilifi County and Kenya at large do not last to benefit the targeted beneficiaries after the donor has exited. For instance, according to KDDP, the donor funded food security project in Ganze which was initiated since 1999 is available in papers and not a reality on the ground. This indicates failure by institutions to sustain aid driven services beyond the involvement of international donor agencies. Other projects include Farmer Field Schools' project and Njaa Marufuku Kenya Groups, National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Program, NALEP among others ceased to be active after the donors withdrew funding in Kilifi County. Therefore sustainability is posing a serious challenge to projects generally in Kilifi County hence the need for research in order to come up with recommendations that will ensure that projects are sustainable and they benefit the targeted beneficiaries beyond project closure.

1.3 Purpose of Study

The study was to explore how the participation of community in project selection, planning and designing of projects, execution and monitoring & evaluation of projects will affect sustainability of projects funded by donors specifically KCDP in the County Kilifi.

1.4 Objectives of the Research

The research followed the following objectives;

1. To determine the effect of community involvement in project selection of donor funded projects on sustainability of KCDP in Kilifi County.
2. To explore locals participation influence in project planning and design on sustainability of KCDP in Kilifi County.
3. To assess influence of participation of community on project execution on sustainability of KCDP in Kilifi County.
4. To examine the influence of involvement of locals in project monitoring & evaluation on sustainability of KCDP in Kilifi County.

1.5 Research Questions

The study attempted to answer;

1. To what extent does involvement of locals in selection of projects influence continuity of donor funded projects in KCDP?
2. Does community participation in project planning and design of project have an effect on continuity of donor funded projects in KCDP?
3. How does community involvement in execution of intervention affect the continued use of donor funded projects in KCDP?
4. What is the influence of participation of community in project monitoring & evaluation on continuity of donor funded projects in KCDP?

1.6 Research Study Hypotheses

The research tested the outlined hypotheses;

Hypothesis 1

H1: Participation of community in project selection significantly influences continuity of donor funded projects in KCDP.

Hypothesis 2

H1: Participation of community in project planning and design significantly influences continuity of KCDP

Hypothesis 3

H1: Participation of community in project execution significantly affects continuity projects in KCDP.

Hypothesis 4

H1: Participation of community in project monitoring and evaluation significantly affects continuity donor funded projects in KCDP.

1.7 Significance of the Research Study

This research is significant to the following groups of people;

Government: to come up with policies that will ensure proper utilization of donor funds in Kenya. The government will be able to play an oversight role and monitor the activities of these NGOs and ensure that they are carrying out their roles according to the laws and ensure sustainability.

NGOs: These non -government actors will be able to come up with proper strategies that will involve the locals at each stage of project development i.e. project selection, planning and designing, execution and monitoring and evaluation that will enhance project sustainability even after the exit of the donors.

Community: through the study, the beneficiaries know the role that they are expected to play in the process of implementing donor funded projects to ensure sustainability as they will be enlightened on what is expected of them.

Project sponsors/financiers: the study was aimed to investigating factors affecting sustainability of donor funded projects. Therefore through the recommendations of the study, the project financiers can come up with better strategies of planning for projects by coming up with approaches that involve the community at all stages of project formulation and implementation.

Academicians/researchers: to further delve into the donor funded projects issue and research further for instance research on other factors influencing sustainability of projects apart from community participation as donor funds play a critical role in the county and the country at large.

1.8 Study Assumptions

It was assumed that the respondents were honest in their responses and the sample size chosen was adequate to draw valid conclusion to enable the study to be reliable.

1.9 Definition of Significant Terms

Community participation: is a process that involves specific groups which have similar needs and not necessarily living in a defined geographical location, pursuing identification of their problems affecting them and coming up with strategies to solve these problems or needs.

Donor: refers to a person, organization or government that donates something voluntarily.

Project management: is the art of applying tools, skills, knowledge and techniques to an intervention in order to meet the targeted objectives within cost, scope, quality and schedule requirements.

Project: A project is an undertaking that normally takes limited time, financial and technical performance goals in order to benefit targeted beneficiaries.

Project selection: means determining whether the project is worth-while or not based on the information from project needs assessment.

Project planning and design: is the process of establishing a model that provides supporting details to the project definition in terms of resources, cost, time scope and quality plan.

Project execution: a phase of project life cycle whereby the activities are implemented in order to develop a product, service or process or generally the deliverables.

Project monitoring and evaluation: involves collection of data to provide management and stakeholders with information on ongoing development progress and achievement of objectives and use of allocated resources in order to take corrective action when necessary to control execution of project.

Sustainability: the ability of project/program to operate on its own without outside support or intervention which is often used as a measure of projects long term effectiveness or impact.

1.10 Limitations of the Study

Time limitations: a lot of time was spent trying to explain to the respondents in the language they are familiar with which was done by the research assistants.

Unwillingness by some respondents to fill the questionnaire for fear of their confidentiality however the respondents were asked not to write their names in the questionnaires and they therefore felt comfortable to fill the questionnaires.

Unavailability of key informants due to their busy schedule was also another limitation as they were not easily available for the interview.

1.11 Delimitations of the Study

The study was restricted to sustainability perspective of donor funded projects in Kilifi County specifically 'Where Talent Lives' Youth project under Kenya Coastal Development Project. Since the study was undertaken in Kilifi County, the results might not be generalized to other neighboring counties in the country. The study was also seeking to find influence of community participation by looking at the project life cycle i.e. project selection, planning and design, execution and monitoring and evaluation and how it affects sustainability of donor funded projects.

1.12 Organization of the Study

Chapter One highlighted the background information on community participation and sustainability of donor funded projects in general. The chapter explained the forms of community participation that have generally been practiced globally and locally. It also described the study objectives, questions to undertake research, limitations of study, definition of significant terms, delimitations and study assumptions.

Chapter Two is the literature review of the research topic which described what other authors have done on community participation specifically under project selection, planning and designing of projects, execution and maintenance of projects. It also explained the different forms of participation. The conceptual framework showing the variables and the indicators are also included in this chapter.

Chapter Three described the methodology of study in terms of research design, sampling procedure, sampling size, targeted population, instruments used to collect data, data collection procedures, data validity & reliability techniques used to analyze data, ethical considerations and finally operationalization of study variables. The methodology used was descriptive research which involves collecting data from respondents in their natural environment.

Chapter Four contained the data analysis, presentations and interpretation of community participation in selection of projects, planning and designing, implementation and monitoring and evaluation and how it affects sustainability of donor funded projects.

Chapter Five described summary of results, discussions and recommendations made by the researcher and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter outlined what authors have done concerning community participation and sustainability which describes the concept of community participation and forms of community participation. It also explains the theoretical framework relationship how independent variable (community participation) i.e. selection of project, planning and designing, execution and monitoring and evaluation of projects affects the dependent variable i.e. project sustainability. The conceptual framework shows diagrammatically the indicators of independent variable are related to the dependent variable and the intervening variables.

2.2 Concept of Community Participation and Project Sustainability

Participation of community is not about sharing of benefits accrued from the project instead it is the involvement of the vulnerable groups to have play key role in decisions that affect development. Paul, (1987) proposed five community participation objectives as increasing project effectiveness and efficiency, project cost sharing, building beneficiary capacity and empowerment. All these objectives lead to project sustainability.

The ability of a development initiative to continue to benefit the locals by government taking over the programs after the donor fizzles financial support is referred to as sustainability Joaquin, (1998) and Lyson, Stephens & Smuts (2001). Community participation is evidenced by 2 global projects the Orangi Pilot Project and the Grameen Bank in South Asia Uphoff, (1997).

2.3 Phases of Community Participation

In order to ensure that there are development initiatives that are sustainable, the locals have to participate in all stages of project development and implementation. This reduces cases where locals are marginalized as they are assumed to lack knowledge on how a project should be handled. Therefore guidelines must be set that will ensure active participation by the locals for the process to be effective. Ofori, (2008) in his study came out with five stages of local

participation as initial, planning & design, execution and monitoring. Relevant stakeholders should add value to each stage so that the project will achieve the targets set successfully.

2.4 Forms of Community Participation

Mikkelsen (2005) identified three main forms of local involvement in projects as coerced induced and spontaneous participation. These forms of involvement engage the communities at different extents therefore determining whether a project will be sustainable or nor sustainable. These forms of participation are described as follows;

2.4.1 Induced participation

This is where decisions are made for the beneficiaries but people are consulted or involved as though their views are of relevance. This is as the initial development strategy of DFRD whereby important decisions were made from ‘above’ and locals were only involved during implementation stages. However, this contributed to failure of this strategy in terms of ensuring sustainability of projects. The technocrats after designing plans, they handed them over to stakeholders without any opportunity for their input in the plan preparation process.

2.4.2 Coerced Participation

This form of participation forces beneficiary groups to participate in decision making process and implementation of such decisions whereby there is normally a sanction for non-participation. People who are compelled into decision making and implementation in most cases do not feel part of decision making and implementation process hence there is lack of ownership and sustainability of such projects.

2.4.3 Spontaneous Participation

It arises as a result of common interest which may or may not be threatened. In this form of community involvement, locals share ideas, think critically about views hence there is clear understanding by the community this makes such decisions sustainable. Locals feel part of the project therefore their ownership and sustainability.

2.5 Project Selection and Project Sustainability

Project selection involves identification of needs which is a crucial phase in development of project at the grassroots level. Development initiatives commences with identification of a

problem to be addressed by the locals. After the community selects what intervention to undertake in order to solve the problem faced, discussions are held for further analysis. These brainstorming sessions elicit a sense of commitment as the locals own the project. It is during these group discussions that resources are also identified and allocated depending on availability. According to Mulwa, (2008), the goal, objectives, and how the development initiative will be executed is clearly set out the community. Therefore for any development to be successful there must be involvement by stakeholders and beneficiaries who must be able to understand their needs, be able to prioritize and rank the needs according to the severity of the needs they must be able to understand how the problems affect them including their causes and effects. Communities must also be involved in assessing the options available to them given their resource base. According to Kinyanjui & Misaro (2013) study in Nyandarua revealed that community participation in project selection is encouraging meaning that more locals are being actively engaged selection of projects. However, Kinyanjui & Misaro caution that there is need to sensitize households to actively engage in project selection to ensure continuity of projects.

Mwangi & Ravallion (2005) agreed that any development initiative for the community commences with problem identification. The first phase of project cycle which is project selection requires effective awareness creation of local communities especially on scope and benefits of the project. It should be open and not restricted to opinion leaders but the process should involve all the parties involved including stakeholders and the locals. This involvement can be in terms of meetings held at the local level, capacity building workshops for creating awareness and getting the opinion of the locals about what kind of project(s) will suit the locals or that which is preferred by the community. Feasibility study reports should also be shared to the locals by disseminating the information during meetings and barazas so that the locals will know what the project is all about, the outputs and impacts expected even before project implementation.

2.6 Project Planning & Design and Project Sustainability

Community participation improves project planning and design through increase project acceptability, use of local knowledge, promote local resource mobilization, produce more

equitable distribution of benefits and help ensure project sustainability. Chikati, (2009), asserts that during this phase of the project cycle, locals express their perspective on different issues concerning what is to be done in order to achieve the targets set by reaching at an agreement. He argues that by communicating people become more committed to decisions made hence there is control of the whole process. Targeted beneficiaries must be involved in the coordination process by making decisions concerning budget, resource allocation and procurement Mulwa, (2008).

Local knowledge and skills are key aspects that must be incorporated in a development initiative for it to be successful. This indigenous knowledge can be obtained through active involvement of the community at every phase of development process Andrew, (2010).

2.7 Project Execution and Project Sustainability

According to Sheikh (2010) locals have not been involved much in active planning and execution of projects. His study revealed that economically disabled people are rarely included in execution committees. Most of these committees are managed by those that have influence because of their financial status and their positions in the society. Community development process is where locals are actively and genuinely involved whereby the locals make decisions on issues that concern their lives, formulate policies and come up with actions that will bring changes into their lives which finally result to self-reliance to the beneficiaries Breuer, (1999).

Community participation is where beneficiaries help in continuity of projects in the community Umesi, (2005). The community will identify with projects they initiated and may even want their completion with personal interest. The government's role is to rise the living standards of people and corporate organization similarly involved in community development without knowing the needs and preferences of the community, the aim of such project is often not realized Gozie, (2007). Genuine involvement of MOU and people's participation are indispensable in order to make the intended beneficiaries self- reliant in meeting of basic needs and the making of the process of their project development self- sustainable Ohwahwa, (2009).

2.8 Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Sustainability

Effective participatory and regular monitoring of community initiatives can improve transparency, participatory, lessons learnt, efficiency and development impacts. Evaluation and continuous check on progress is a vital tool of management in any development project Khan, (2003). It is important for any project aimed at addressing development issues to have an effective monitoring and evaluation to ensure sustainable service delivery project benefits. A good monitoring and evaluation system must involve the beneficiaries and stakeholders whereby they are allowed to freely express their opinion without fear.

In management of projects, monitoring can be used to improve the way governments and private organizations achieve results and ensure sustainability. It is important that governments set up structures that will support use of efficient monitoring and evaluation systems that will lead organizations meeting their goals without duplicating efforts. IFAD, (2002). The donors, project managers and staff must actively participate in implementation of monitoring and evaluation system for its effectiveness and sustainability.

According to UNDP (2009), evaluation & monitoring in any institution helps the organization to take corrective measure in the process of implementing a project. It ensures that proper mechanisms are set up that are geared towards meeting the objectives. Resources will also be utilized as budgeted for if there is a proper monitoring system in place. According to the World bank (2002) internal evaluation units, community based projects in the African region have performed better than the region project as a whole, yet only one in five of the community-based development projects are likely to be sustainable.

2.9 Theoretical Framework

The sub chapter critically analyzed theories supporting community involvement and participation in implementation of community projects. The theories were continuum of involvement, ladder of participation and citizen empowerment ladder.

2.9.1 Ladder of Participation

The theory was by Arnstein (1969) whose work recognized that there are different levels of participation. These are manipulation of citizens, consultation and genuine participation. The

limitation of this work is that it was not realistic as every step had broad categories. Practically levels of participation reflect a complicated continuum than just simple series of steps. Increased control may not always be desired by the community and increased control without the necessary support may result in failure.

2.9.2 Citizen Empowerment Ladder

Participation is viewed as the empowerment of communities. This perspective that the citizen is a consumer led to the theory by Burns et al (1994) who modified Arnstein's ladder to ladder of citizen power where choice was seen as a means of access to power. This model encourages people to be responsible and be active in public service decision-making. Citizen empowerment ladder is more elaborate than Arnstein's ladder with a more qualitative breakdown the different levels.

CITIZEN CONTROL
12.Independent control
11.Entrusted control
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION
10.Delegated control
9.Partnership
8.Limited decision-making
7.Advisory boards
6.Genuine Consultation
5.Quality information
CITIZEN NON-PARTICIPATION
4.Customer care
3.Poor information
2.Cynical consultation
1.Civic hype

Figure 1: Citizen Empowerment Ladder (Burns et al, 1994)

2.9.3 Continuum of Involvement

Wilcox identified five interconnected levels of local involvement as information, consultation, and decision making, working together and supporting initiatives. Wilcox’s work has arisen from the UK regeneration context and reflects a philosophical progression on participation. Different levels of participation are acceptable in differing context and settings, this progression recognizes that power is not always transferred in apparently participative processes, but that the processes still have value. As opposed to the common interpretation of Arnstein, that bring the thought that it is only acceptable to be striving towards citizen control.

Information
Consultation
Decision making

Working together
Supporting Initiatives

Figure 2: Participation Ladder (Wilcox, 1999)

The study was therefore based on the ladder of citizen empowerment and ladder of participation as they are complimentary to each other and they involve engagement of locals more actively.

2.10 Conceptual Framework

Independent variable

Project Selection
- Clear goals and objectives
-Project acceptability
-Project ownership

Project Planning and Design
-Involvement of locals in identification and allocation of resources/budgeting
-Use of local knowledge
-Communication plan

Project Execution
-Locals involved in execution/employed
-Better decision making
-Overcoming of challenges
-Innovation

Project Monitoring and Evaluation
-Locals involved in monitoring and evaluation of project
-Monitoring done frequently
-Complaints and feedback mechanism

Dependent variable

Sustainability of donor funded projects
-Growth and up scaling of projects
-Maintenance of projects
-Extended project life span

Moderating variable

Socio cultural factors
-Religion
-Ethnicity
-Age
-Political factors

Figure 3: Conceptual Framework of Community Participation factors that Influence Sustainability of Donor Funded Projects

2.11 Research Gap

Most authors whose literature has been reviewed shows that sustainability of donor funded projects is affected by other factors apart from the involvement of community during all project cycles. Community participation is very significant in terms of ensuring that donor funded projects are sustainable. It should be applied in all stages of project cycle i.e. Initiation and selection, planning and design, execution and monitoring & evaluation. However, it should be noted with a lot of concern that for community participation to be effective, the community members need to be empowered so that during all these stages they are able to make informed decisions and that they are involved fully. There is no research that has been done so far on how involvement of community in project phases is influencing sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County.

2.12 Literature Summary

The chapter has reviewed what other scholars have done in the field of community participation and sustainability of donor funded projects under the aspects of selection, planning and design, execution and monitoring & evaluation. Generally the authors acknowledge that community participation at all stages of project development enhances sustainability of both donor funded and government funded projects. The involvement of the locals must be active as opposed to passive involvement whereby locals are involved in decision making and in sharing of benefits and opportunities. The study was based on the theory of citizen empowerment and the ladder of participation. The two theories are complimentary to each other and they both argue that citizen must actively be involved in every step of decision making process. When locals are given priority to make their own decision, they can identify their own problems and solutions. This enhances ownership in project implementation. The conceptual framework illustrated the independent variables indicators i.e. Selection of project, planning and designing, execution and project monitoring and evaluation and how they are related to the dependent variable which is sustainability of donor funded projects.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The methodology described the target population, the design of research, sampling procedure and sampling size, instruments used to collect data and procedure used, data analysis technique and presentation, ethical considerations, validity and reliability of the research.

3.2 Research Design

Refers to the method and procedures which were applied to collect data. Descriptive research design was adopted to collect data from the respondents which is a scientific method of data collection involving observing and describing the behavior of the subject without influencing it Shuttleworth, (2008). Data was therefore collected from the respondents using questionnaires in their natural environment. According to Kothari (2004) the design provides a deep understanding of the circumstances under study and its instruments are helpful in getting in-depth first hand experiences; and that it has ability to allow collection of large amounts of data quickly and at minimal cost.

3.3 Target Population

Target population consists of entire items to which the study result is intended to be generalized. It is the total number of units from which information can be gathered where the study result will be generalized Parahoo, (1997). In this study the target population was 772 out of which 20 were the WTL Youth group members who received the grant from KCDP and 2 KCDP Liaison officers and 750 households who benefitted from the project.

3.4 Sampling Size and Sampling Procedure

A sample is part of the population that has been procedurally selected to represent the population once the sample has been scientifically taken and the result can be generalized to the entire population. Burns & Groove, (2001) defined sampling as the process of choosing units which to conduct research. Mugenda & Mugenda, (2003) recommended a sample size of 10-30% is for descriptive research design. Therefore in this study 20% of the beneficiaries of 750 households

was used which translated to 150 households as sample size for community. The study targeted the WTL (20) and the beneficiaries 150 totaling 170 as the total sample size. Two (2) key informants who are KCDP officials in Kilifi County were also interviewed for more information. Random sampling was used to select the 150 beneficiaries. Role, (2010) indicates that this method involves random selection of groups that exist therefore everybody has a chance of being selected to participate in research. To obtain the participants from the population, the names of the possible participants were numbered and the researcher wrote these numbers in small pieces of paper folded them and placed them in a container. The researcher then made a simple random sampling by randomly handpicking the papers and those whose names coincided with the numbers picked were included in the study.

Table 3.1 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

Population category	Target population	Sample size	Sampling procedure
Community	750	150	Random sampling
WTL group	20	20	Census method
KCDP officials	2	2	Census method
Total	772	172	

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

These refer to the tools used for data collection from the respondents on the topic under study. The researcher in this case used questionnaires to collect the data whereby research assistants were trained on how interview the respondents and collect the data. The questionnaire had 5 sections; A-E. Section A contained general questions to collect general demographic data like

gender, age and education level. Section B contained questions related to project selection, section C; project planning and design, section D; project execution and section E: project monitoring and evaluation. Questionnaire administration was used to conduct interviews and the major advantage of questionnaire include less costly and easy to administer to the respondents. Primary data was collected by administering questionnaires to the respondents.

3.6 Validity of Research Instruments

Validity refers to ability of the scores to measure what is intended by the researcher. The scores have to be statistically sound for the research to be valid. According to Mugenda & Mugenda, (2003) the scores should measure what is intended. According to Orodho (2004), a pilot test is a carrying out a pre-test before the larger study to test for the rationale of the design. The researcher pilot tested the questionnaire using a similar KCDP project in Kisauni sub county Mombasa County. The project benefitted approximately 100 households. A sample of 10% is enough to undertake pilot study. Therefore the researcher selected a sample of 10 for pilot testing. To ensure content validity questionnaires were scrutinized by the supervisor. Through the pilot testing, the researcher also ensured that the research instruments were valid.

3.7 Reliability of Research Instruments

According to Koul (2005) reliability is the ability of test to for consistency and yield same results when repeated measurements are taken of the same individual under same conditions. The reliability of the research questionnaires for this study was determined using split half technique. The questionnaire was split into two, administered on participants and the results correlated mathematically to determine the level of consistency of these results through use of spearman correlation. A coefficient of 0.9876 was obtained which is closer to 1 meaning that the study was reliable.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures

The research considered the ethical considerations by informing the respondents that the data collected was purely for academic purposes. Therefore the respondents signed the consent form before any data was collected. Permission was also sought from the KCDP Kilifi office to collect data from WTL Youth Group in Kilifi County.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

Respondent's anonymity, confidentiality and privacy observed during data collection. Permission was sought from the local leadership specifically KCDP office in Kilifi County Liaison office and the local administration before data collection was done. A cover letter accompanied the questionnaire and interview guide for the key informants. Respondents were guaranteed of the confidentiality of data collected and researcher requested for honesty in answering questions. Respondents' permission was sought first before administering the questionnaires.

3.10 Data Presentation and Analysis Techniques

According to Polit & Hungler (1997) data analysis refers to the process of organizing, providing structure and elicits meaning to the collected data. Data was checked for accuracy and completeness by the researcher by ensuring that the questionnaires were completely filled before the questionnaires were collected from the respondents. Percentages and tables were used to summarize and organize the data. To examine whether a relationship exists between two variables, they were statistically tested using Chi-square method to analyze the data and to test the research hypothesis.

3.11 Operationalization of Study Variables

The table explained the objectives, the type of indicator, data source, measurement of scale and tools of analysis as shown below.

Table 3.2 Operationalization of Study Variables

Objective	Indicator	Data source	Measurement of scale	Tool of Analysis
Extent of locals involvement in selection of projects on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness created during project selection • Clear goals and objectives • Project acceptability • Project ownership 	Questionnaire /interview	Ordinal/nominal	Percentages, frequencies, Chi square correlation
Effects of locals participation in planning and design on continuity of donor funded projects in Kilifi County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of locals in project planning and designing • Use of local knowledge • Resource identification and allocation • Existence of communication plan 	Questionnaire/ interview	Ordinal/nominal	Percentages, frequencies, Chi square correlation
Effect of community involvement in execution on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locals involved in execution • Better decision making • Overcoming of challenges • Encourage innovation 	Questionnaire/ interview	Ordinal/nominal	Percentages, frequencies, Chi square correlation
Extent of locals participation in monitoring and evaluation on continuity of donor funded projects in Kilifi County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locals involved in M & E • Frequent monitoring done • Feedback mechanism in place 	Questionnaire/ interview	Ordinal/nominal	Percentages, frequencies, Chi square correlation

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATIONS & INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

The chapter described analyses, presentation and interpretation of data collected from Kenya Coastal Development Project in Kilifi County. The information obtained included general demographic characteristics and involvement of locals during project selection, planning and designing, execution and during project monitoring and evaluation.

4.2 Questionnaire Return Rate

The study used a sample size of 170 respondents out of which 151 questionnaires were returned as summarized in the table below;

Table 4.2: Questionnaire Response rate

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Returned	151	88.82
Not returned	19	11.18
Total	170	100.00

According to the data obtained 88.8% of the questionnaires were returned for analysis. This rate is acceptable according to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003). Most of the respondents were beneficiaries of the KCDP grant that was given for environmental conservation activities while the 2 key informant person who are in charge of the project in Kilifi county gave additional information about the project. Only 11.18% failed to return the questionnaire.

4.3 Key Informant Response Rate

A total of 2 key informant persons were interviewed and their opinion collected on community participation and sustainability of donor funded projects as shown in the table below.

Table 4.3: Key Informant Rate of Response

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Returned	2	100
Not returned	0	0
Total	2	100.00

4.4 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

This include general information about the respondents specifically gender, age and level of education.

Table 4.4: Demographic Characteristics of respondents

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	59	39.07
Female	92	60.93
Total	151	100
Age (Years)		
Below 25	4	2.65
25-34	76	50.33
35-44	62	41.06
Above 45	9	5.96
Total	151	100.00
Level of Education		
No school	6	3.97
Primary school	18	11.92
Secondary school	80	52.97
Tertiary	47	31.13
Total	151	100

4.4.1 Gender

According to the data collected the majority of the beneficiaries are female at 60.93% which means that most donor funded projects are mean to benefit women for empowerment. Most donor funded projects are focusing on youths, women and vulnerable groups. Male proportion stood at 39.07%.

4.4.2 Age

From the analysis, majority are of the age 25-34 years are 50.33% followed closely by age group 35-44 years at 41.06% many of whom are the youths. Those below 25 years were at 2.65% while the oldest above 45 years were 5.96%. This means that it will ensure sustainability as more youths are involved rather than those who are above 45 years.

4.4.3 Level of education

Majority of the beneficiaries have reached secondary education 52.97% followed by those with tertiary education at 31.13%. This means that most of the beneficiaries have some education which increases chances of the project to be sustainable in the long run. However those without education 3.97% while those who reached primary school stood at 11.92%.

4.5 Involvement of Locals in Project Selection and Project Sustainability of Donor funded projects in Kilifi County

The first objective was to determine whether involvement of locals in project selection significantly affects sustainability of KCDP project in Kilifi County. Awareness creation was identified as a key factor during project selection. Respondents gave an opinion on whether involvement of locals on selection of projects had any influence on goals and objectives, project ownership and project acceptability as indicators of project selection as summarized in the tables below.

Table 4.5: Awareness Creation during Project Selection

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	147	97.35
No	4	2.65
Total	151	100.00

According to table 4.5, 97.35% agreed that the local community is involved during selection of the project while only 2.65% opposed. The beneficiaries overwhelmingly agreed that they were involved in selection of projects since the project idea came from the community. Therefore there was almost no objection on involvement of locals in selection of projects to be implemented by the community. This was further confirmed by the key informants who agreed that locals were involved in project selection.

Table 4.6: Awareness Creation and Clear Goals & Objective

		Clear goals					
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Awareness created during project selection	Yes	0	0	1	25	121	147
	No	0	0	0	2	2	4
Total			0	1	27	123	151

Key:

SD -Strongly Disagree; D – Disagree; N-Neutral; A-Agree; SA-Strongly Agree

According to table 4.6, 0.66% of the respondents were neutral, 17.88% of the respondents agreed while 81.46% strongly agreed that awareness creation enhances creation of clear goals and objectives during project selection.

Table 4.7: Awareness creation and acceptability of project

		Acceptability					
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Awareness created during project selection	Yes	0	0	1	11	135	147
	No	0	0	3	1	0	4
Total		0	0	4	12	135	151

From table 4.7, 2.65% were neutral, 7.95% agreed while 89.40% strongly agreed that creation of awareness during project selection encouraged acceptability of the project by the locals.

Table 4.8: Awareness creation and Project Ownership

		Ownership					
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Awareness created during project selection	Yes	0	0	1	10	136	147
	No	0	0	0	4	0	4
Total		0	0	1	14	136	151

From table 4.8, 0.66% of the respondents were neutral, 9.27% agreed and 90.07% strongly agreed that awareness creation during selection of projects enhanced project ownership by the community.

Hypothesis testing

H1: Involvement of locals during project selection significantly affects sustainability of KCDP project in Kilifi County.

Table 4.9: Chi square results on the relationship between awareness creation and project sustainability

Indicator	Chi square value	Table value	D.f	Decision
Clear goals & objectives	0.499	9.488	4	Reject H1
Acceptability	5.203	9.488	4	Reject H1
Ownership	5.466	9.488	4	Reject H1

According to table 4.9, the computed Chi square values at 4 degrees of freedom for clear goals and objectives of 0.499, is less than the table value of 9.488, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted meaning that awareness creation during project selection does not affect creation of clear goals and objectives which in turn does not influence sustainability of donor funded projects. The calculated Chi square value for project acceptability at 4 degrees of freedom is 5.203 which is less than the table value of 9.488. This means that the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore awareness creation during project selection does not influence acceptability of projects hence sustainability. Project ownership Chi square value of 5.466 is less than the table values of 9.488 therefore the creating of awareness during project selection does not influence ownership of project by community hence does not affect project sustainability in Kilifi County.

4.6 Community Involvement in Project Planning & Design and Project Sustainability of Donor funded projects in Kilifi County

The second study objective sought to establish whether involvement of locals during project planning and design significantly affects sustainability of KCDP project in Kilifi County. The

indicators identified include use of local knowledge, involvement during resource identification and allocation and existence of a communication plan.

Table 4.10: Community Involvement in Setting goals and objectives of projects

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	136	90.07
No	15	9.93
Total	151	100.00

Out of the 151 respondents 136 were of the opinion that locals are involved in setting project goals and objectives which makes 90.07% while 15 (9.93%) are of contrary opinion that the locals are not involved in setting goals and objectives of projects.

Table 4.11: Involvement of locals in Project Planning and Design and use of Local Knowledge

	Knowledge						Total
	SD	D	N	A	SA		
Locals involved in planning & designing	Yes	0	0	3	123	10	136
	No	0	0	0	3	12	15
	Total	0	0	3	126	22	151

From table 4.11, 83.44% agree that the involvement of locals in project planning and designing encourage the use of local knowledge while 14.57% strongly agree however 1.99% is unsure

whether involving locals in project planning and designing encourages use of indigenous knowledge.

Table 4.12: Involvement of locals in Project Planning and Resource identification and allocation

		Resource					
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Locals involved in planning & designing	Yes	0	0	10	123	3	136
	No	0	0	10	4	1	15
Total			0	20	127	4	151

According to the data from table 4.12, majority of respondents 84.12% agree that involvement of locals during planning and designing affects resource identification and allocation. Only 2.65% strongly agree and 13.25% are undecided whether involvement of locals affects resource identification and allocation.

Table 4.13: Involvement of locals in Project Planning and Communication Plan in place

		Communication					
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Locals involved in planning & designing	Yes	0	0	3	123	10	136
	No	0	0	0	3	12	15
Total			0	3	126	22	151

Majority of the respondents 88.08% agreed that there is a communication plan in place while 9.27% are not sure whether there is a communication plan in place. However the least 2.65% strongly agree that there is a communication plan in place.

Hypothesis testing

H1: Involvement of locals in project planning and designing significantly affects sustainability of KCDP project in Kilifi County.

Table 4.14: Chi square results on the relationship between involvement of locals in project planning and design and project sustainability

Indicator	Chi square value	Table value	D.f	Decision
Use local knowledge	57.302	9.488	4	Accept H1
Resource identification & allocation	43.433	9.488	4	Accept H1
Communication plan	109.570	9.488	4	Accept H1

From table 4.14, the computed Chi square values for use of local knowledge were 57.302 a value which was greater than the table value of 9.488. This means that the use of local knowledge during project planning has influence on sustainability of donor funded projects. Resource identification and allocation indicator had a chi square value of 43.433 compared to table value of 9.488, meaning that involvement of locals in resource identification and allocation during project planning and designing had influence on project sustainability. Formulation of a communication plan as an indicator of involvement of locals in project planning chi square value was 109.570 compared to the table value of 9.488 indicated that involvement of locals in formulation of a communication plan had influence on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County.

4.7 Community Involvement in Project Execution and Project Sustainability of Donor funded projects in Kilifi County

The third study objective sought to establish whether involvement of locals during project execution significantly affects sustainability of KCDP project in Kilifi County. The indicators identified include better decision making, overcoming of challenges and encourages innovation during project implementation.

Table 4.15: Community involvement in Project Execution

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	150	99.34
No	1	0.66
Total	151	100.00

Almost all the respondents agreed that the locals have been involved in the project implementation. Out of the 151 only one had a contrary opinion but 99.34% thinks the locals are fully involved.

Table 4.16: Involvement of locals in Project Implementation and better decision making

		Better decision					Total
		SD	D	N	A	SA	
Locals involved in execution	Yes	0	0	1	1	148	150
	No	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total			0	1	1	149	151

From table 4.16, 98.67% strongly agree to the fact that when locals are involved in implementation of the project, they are likely to make better decisions than when they are not involved. Those that are undecided and those agreeing are at 0.66%. Therefore majority of the respondents strongly agree that involvement of locals in implementation encourage respondents to make better decisions.

Table 4.17: Involvement of locals in Project Execution and Overcoming of Challenges in Projects

	Challenges						Total
	SD	D	N	A	SA		
Locals involved in project execution	Yes	0	0	0	2	148	150
	No	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total		0	0	2	149	151	

From the table 4.17, 98.68% strongly agree that when locals are involved, it is easier to overcome challenges that might be faced during project execution while 1.33% agrees to this statement.

Table 4.18: Involvement of locals in Project Execution and Innovation

	Innovation						Total
	SD	D	N	A	SA		
Locals involved in project execution	Yes	0	0	1	138	11	150
	No	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total		0	1	138	12	151	

From table 4.18, 91.39% of respondents agree involvement of locals during execution encourages the spirit of innovation. This is attributed to the fact that the locals will try to find alternative ways of implementing projects in case of any challenges. Only 0.66% of the respondents are undecided while 7.95% strongly agree.

Hypothesis testing

H1: Involvement of locals in project execution significantly affects sustainability of KCDP project in Kilifi County.

Table 4.19: Chi square results on the relationship between involvement of locals in project execution and project sustainability

Indicator	Chi square value	Table value	D.f	Decision
Better decision making	1.0266	9.488	4	Reject HI
Overcoming challenges	0.0135	9.488	4	Reject HI
Innovation	11.661	9.488	4	Accept HI

From the analyzed data, the computed Chi square values for better decision making indicator was 1.0266 a value which was less than the table value of 9.488. This means that involving the locals during execution stage does not encourage better decision making hence no influence on sustainability of donor funded projects. Overcoming of challenges during project execution indicator had a chi square value of 0.0135 compared to table value of 9.488, meaning that involvement of locals during project implementation had no influence on the way the locals overcome challenges faced consequently had no influence on project sustainability. Enhancement of innovation indicator chi square value was 11.661 compared to the table value of 9.488 indicated that involvement of locals during execution had an influence on innovation thus had influence on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County.

4.8 Community involvement in Project Monitoring & Evaluation Project Sustainability of Donor funded projects in Kilifi County

The fourth study objective sought to establish whether involvement of locals during project monitoring and evaluation significantly affects sustainability of KCDP project in Kilifi County. The indicators identified include the monitoring and evaluation is participatory, the monitoring is done frequently and there is a feedback mechanism to address complaints.

Table 4.20: Involvement of locals in project monitoring and evaluation

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	102	67.55
No	49	32.45
Total	151	100.00

Majority of the community are of the opinion that the locals are involved during project monitoring and evaluation at 67.55% while 32.45% think that the locals are not involved in monitoring the project.

Table 4.21 Involvement of locals in Monitoring and Participatory M & E

		Participatory					
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Locals involved in monitoring & evaluation	Yes	0	0	0	2	100	102
	No	0	40	8	1	0	49
	Total		40	8	3	100	151

From Table 4.21, 66.23% strongly agree, 26.49% disagree that the monitoring and evaluation undertaken is participatory while 5.30% are undecided and only 1.99% agree. Therefore the

respondents feel that the kind of monitoring and evaluation being undertaken is not participatory. Locals are not involved during monitoring and evaluation.

Table 4.22: Involvement of locals in Monitoring & Evaluation and frequency of monitoring

		Frequency					
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Locals involved in monitoring & evaluation	Yes	0	0	0	1	101	102
	No	0	0	48	1	0	49
Total		0	0	48	2	101	151

According to Table 4.22, 67.55 % strongly agree that monitoring is done frequently while 31.79% are undecided. Only 0.66% agrees that monitoring is done frequently.

Table 4.23: Involvement of Locals in Project Monitoring & Evaluation and feedback mechanism in place

		Feedback plan					
		SD	D	N	A	SA	Total
Locals involved in monitoring & evaluation	Yes	0	0	20	22	60	102
	No	0	0	41	8	0	49
Total		0	0	61	30	60	151

From table 4.23, 40.40% are not sure whether there is a communication plan in place followed closely at 39.74% who are strongly agree that there is a feedback plan. 19.87% agree that there is a feedback plan.

Hypothesis testing

H1: Involvement of locals in project monitoring & evaluation significantly affects sustainability of KCDP project in Kilifi County.

Table 4.24: Chi square results on the relationship between involvement of locals in project monitoring & evaluation and project sustainability

Indicator	Chi square value	Table value	D.f	Decision
Participatory M&E	147.959	9.488	4	Accept H1
Frequent Monitoring	142.0138	9.488	4	Accept H1
Feedback plan	62.911	9.488	4	Accept H1

According to table 4.24, participatory M & E indicator had a Chi square value of 147.959 a value which was far much greater than table value of the 9.488. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Therefore participatory M & E had influence on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County. Frequent monitoring indicator chi square value was 142.1038 which were greater than the table value of 9.488. This means that frequent monitoring had influence on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County. Feedback plan indicator had a value of 62.911 which was greater than 9.488. Therefore existence of a feedback plan had significant influence on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The chapter explained the study summary of findings, discussions, conclusions and suggestions and recommendations for improvement and further studies. The researcher sought to investigate the influence of community participation on sustainability of donor funded project case of WTL youth group in Kilifi County. The factors considered were community participation during the project life cycle; project selection, project planning and designing, project execution and project monitoring and evaluation.

5.2 Summary of Findings

The total questionnaires given out was 170 copies out of which 151 were returned translating to 88.8% questionnaire return rate. According to the data collected the majority of the beneficiaries are females at 60.93% which means that most donor funded projects are meant to benefit women for empowerment. Most donor funded projects are focusing on youths, women and vulnerable groups in order to ensure sustainable development. Male proportion stood at 39.07% which is a representation.

From the analysis, majority of the beneficiaries are of the age 25-34 years are 50.33% followed closely by age group 35-44 years at 41.06% meaning that most of them are the youths. Those below 25 years were at 2.65% while the eldest above 45 years were 5.96%. This means that the project is assured of sustainability as more youths are involved rather than those who are above 45 years.

Most respondents have reached secondary education level represented by 52.97% followed by those who have attained tertiary education at 31.13%. This means that most of the beneficiaries have some knowledge which increases chances of the project to be sustainable in the long run. However those without education are 3.97% while those who reached primary school stood at 11.92%. This means that the beneficiaries have some knowledge to enable them sustain the project as illiteracy levels are very low at 3.97%.

5.2.1 Influence of Community Participation during Project Selection on Sustainability of donor funded projects

According to the findings, there is no relationship between involvement of locals in project selection and the sustainability of the donor funded project in Kilifi County. Results showed that 97.35% agreed that the local community is involved during selection of the project while only 2.65% had a contrary opinion. The respondents overwhelmingly agreed that they were involved in selection of projects since the project idea came from the community itself. Therefore there was almost no objection on involvement of locals in selection of projects to be implemented by the community.

Concerning formulation of clear goals and objectives due to awareness creation at project selection stage, 0.66% of the respondents were undecided, 17.88% of the respondents agreed while 81.46% strongly agreed that awareness creation enhances creation of clear goals and objectives during project selection. It is assumed that during mobilization and sensitization, the communities are given details on what the project entails such that even as the project commences, the community are aware of what is expected of them and what to expect from a project. According the chi square results showed that the involvement of locals during project selection does not influence creation of clear goals and objectives hence had no influence of sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County.

Acceptability of the project by community due to awareness creation indicator, 89.40% strongly agreed with this statement 7.95% agreed while only 2.65% were undecided. When communities understand what the project entails right from the initial stages, they create a positive perspective so that accepting the project becomes very easy rather than when the community is involved at later stages. The chi square results showed that involvement of locals in project selection had no influence on acceptability therefore did not influence sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County.

Project ownership is enhanced when proper awareness creation is done during project selection. From the findings, 90.07% strongly agree that awareness creation encourages project ownership.

This is attributed by the fact that since the community understands what the project entails and the project is already accepted then it means that the community takes up the ownership of the project and they can easily associate with it. Only 0.66% of the respondents were neutral and 9.27% just agreed. Chi square results showed that involvement of locals in project selection did not affect project ownership consequently had no influence on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County.

5.2.2 Influence of Community Participation during Project planning and Designing on Sustainability of donor funded projects

Project purpose and objectives setting are some of the activities that have to be done during project planning and designing. Out of the 151 respondents, 90.066% are of the opinion that the locals are involved in setting project purpose and objectives. This is a good indication when the locals set their own objectives to be achieved in the project. This is based on their needs to be fulfilled. However 9.934% think that the locals are not involved in setting goals and objectives during project planning and design.

Involvement of locals during project planning and designing enhances use of local knowledge according to 83.44% of the respondents who agreed and 14.57% strongly agreed to the statement. The community has rich background knowledge about the project area, culture and general information which can add a lot of value towards making the project successful. Sometimes the government and non governmental agencies should consider incorporating the local knowledge during the planning stages of the project. However 1.99% is unsure whether involving locals in project planning and designing encourages use of indigenous knowledge. This indicator had an influence on sustainability of donor funded projects according to the chi square results obtained from the study.

Majority of respondents 84.12% agree and 2.65% strongly agree that involvement of locals during planning and designing influences resource identification and allocation. During project planning resources are identified and allocated according to the needs as suggested by the locals.

It is at this stage that sources of financing are identified to finance the project. Priority activities are ranked depending on needs and available resources. However 13.25% are undecided whether involvement of locals has any effect on resource identification and allocation. Results showed that involvement of locals in identification and allocation of resources played a key role in ensuring that the project will be sustainable.

Majority of the respondents 88.08% agree and 2.65% strongly agree that there is a communication plan in place while 9.27% are unsure. This communication plan will show how responses and comments about the project from the sponsors to beneficiaries and vice versa will flow. It also explains frequency of submitting reports whether monthly quarterly, biannually or annually depending on the agreement. According to the chi square results the existence of a communication plan ensured that the donor funded project will be sustainable in Kilifi County.

5.2.3 Influence of Community Participation during Project Execution on Sustainability of donor funded projects

According to the findings, almost all the respondents agreed that the locals have been involved in the project implementation. Out of the 151 only one had a contrary opinion but 99.34% thinks the locals are fully involved. Most respondents are involved as they are the beneficiaries of the project.

The findings show that 98.67% strongly agreed and 0.66% agreed to the fact that when locals are involved in implementation of the project, the community is likely to make better decisions than when they are not involved. This is true since when the locals are involved in implementation, it creates a sense of responsibility such that members are able to make better decisions concerning the project. Locals will also be objective hence make decisions based on facts about the project. Therefore majority of the respondents strongly agreed that involvement of locals in implementation encourage respondents to make better decisions. However this indicator had no effect on sustainability of the project.

From the findings, 98.68% strongly agreed that when locals are involved, it is easier to overcome challenges that might be faced during project execution while 1.33% agreed to this statement. Locals' involvement in project execution is important in terms of ensuring that any challenges faced will be overcome. Since locals are on the ground implementing, in case of any challenges faced, locals can find their own way to by passing the challenge and move on with project implementation. This is because the locals are aware what the project entails and what it is meant to achieve. This therefore prompts the locals to think outside the box and come up with solutions to achieve the goals set. However overcoming of challenges during project execution had no influence on sustainability of donor funded projects.

Most at 91.39% respondents agreed and 7.95% strongly agreed that involvement of locals during execution encouraged the spirit of innovation. This is attributed to the fact that the locals will try to find alternative ways of implementing projects in case of any challenges. Only 0.66% of the respondents are unsure. The study findings showed that innovation in project implementation had a significant relationship with sustainability of donor funded projects.

5.2.4 Influence of Community Participation during Project Monitoring and Evaluation on Sustainability of donor funded projects

Majority of the community are of the opinion that the locals are involved during project monitoring and evaluation at 67.55% while 32.45% think that the locals are not involved in monitoring the project. Training the community on monitoring is necessary so that during the exercise the community knows what to expect as the beneficiaries of the project.

The monitoring and evaluation exercise should be participatory and from the findings 66.23% strongly agreed, 1.99% agreed, 5.30% were undecided while 26.49% disagreed that the monitoring and evaluation undertaken is participatory. This therefore shows that though majority of community members strongly agree that the monitoring and evaluation is participatory, 26.49% of the community feels that the kind of monitoring and evaluation being undertaken is not participatory. This is something that needs to be given attention and ensure that locals are involved in monitoring and evaluation exercise. Participatory M & E during monitoring and

evaluation exercise significantly influences sustainability of donor funded project in Kilifi County according to the research findings.

Frequency of undertaking the monitoring and evaluation exercise has an effect on sustainability of the donor funded projects. According to the results 67.55 % strongly agreed and 0.66% agreed that monitoring is done frequently while 31.79% are not sure whether the monitoring exercise is done frequently to monitor the project progress. Monitoring should apparently be done often such that corrective measures will be taken in case the project progress is wanting. It will be difficult for project implementers to achieve the target set if monitoring is not done frequently as monitoring and evaluation ensures efficiency and effectiveness of projects.

Monitoring and evaluation feedback plan is important so that the communication can reach the parties involved in the project like sponsors, beneficiaries and implementers including stakeholders. Majority of the community at 40.40% are not sure whether there is a feedback plan in place followed closely at 39.74% who strongly agreed and 19.87% who agreed that there is a feedback plan. This is an indicator that the community is not aware what this plan is all about therefore the need for training. A feedback plan enables the different parties in project implementation to take corrective measures where need be in order to be on track and achieve the objectives within the budget limit. The existence a feedback plan for project monitoring and evaluation had a significant influence on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County.

5.3 Discussion of Results

According to the researcher's first objective was to investigate influence of involvement of locals in project selection on sustainability of donor funded project in Kilifi County. Results showed that majority agreed that locals are involved in project selection this is as noted by Kinyanjui & Misaro (2013) study in Nyandarua that revealed that community participation in project selection is encouraging which means more locals are being involved in project selection. Awareness creation at project selection stage is very paramount because it is at this stage that the communities are informed what the project entails, benefits, and the role that the beneficiaries and the stakeholders are supposed to play. The community is also able to set the objectives, goals and how the intended development will be carried out Mulwa, (2008). Hence, for any

development to succeed there must be participation by stakeholders and beneficiaries who must be able to understand their needs, be able to prioritize and rank the needs according to the severity of the needs they must be able to understand how the problems affect them including their causes and effects. Participation plays a crucial role from the identification stage to the final stage of evaluation and adjustments of the plan as well as immediate stages taking decisions about the setting of targets, then application of resources and management of operation Kerote, (2007). Community participation enhances successful implementation of the project but it does not influence sustainability of that project as found out in the study.

The second objective was to investigate influence of community participation in project planning and design on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County. The study results revealed that in terms of project planning, involvement of locals during this phase encourages use of local knowledge, resource identification and allocation and enables putting up of a communication place. This is as emphasized by Andrew, (2010) who argued that there is need for participatory model of development in which local people are not just involved in identification, formulation, implementation and evaluation of projects, but where their knowledge and skills are the building blocks for development initiatives. Thus participation is viewed as an active process in which the participants take initiative and actions that are stimulated by their own thinking and deliberation and over which they can exert effective control. For effective development to be realized the community which is the major beneficiary of the project must be involved by use of project implementation committees to coordinate project planning and other aspects such as budgeting, resource identification, procurement and allocation Mulwa, (2008). During the planning stage, the problem is discussed further by focusing on budget, resource mobilization, expected completion date, designing and costing activities, implementation plan and schedule and wrap up evaluation plan. Though project plan and design are technical, inputs from the local community members could be very useful. Peoples' participation is regarded as a right and therefore the community has the right to participate in decision making which directly affects their living conditions. Involvement of locals in project planning and design significantly influences sustainability of donor funded project in Kilifi County.

The third objective was to investigate influence of community participation in project execution on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County. Project execution is the stage when the actual activities are undertaken as the initial stages are all planning phases. The involvement of the locals encourages better decision making and overcoming of challenges faced during implementation. Community participation during project execution does not influence sustainability of these projects as found out from the study. The involvement of intended beneficiaries can help in successful completion of projects in the community but not sustainability. The community will identify with projects they initiated and may even want their completion with vested interest. It is the aim of the government to improve the quality of people's lives in the community but governments and corporate organization similarly involved in community development without knowing the needs and preferences of the community, the aim of such project is often not realized Gozie, (2007). However involvement of locals encourages innovation and hence has an influence on sustainability of donor funded projects.

The fourth objective was to examine the influence of community participation in project monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County. The research found out that involvement of locals during monitoring and evaluation is very critical in any donor funded project as it significantly affects sustainability of that project. However it was noted with a lot of concern that the locals lack the skills needed for effective monitoring and evaluation exercise. There is need for trainings on how the monitoring and evaluation is supposed to be done so that the locals know what the exercise entails. The study showed that the locals lack awareness what the exercise is all about the reason that most of them disagreed and some even unsure whether the monitoring exercise is participatory. There were no feedback plans for the locals so that they are able to take corrective measures as required. Monitoring and evaluation is a vital tool of management in any development project and it starts right from planning stage of the project cycle Khan, (2003). It is important for any project aimed at addressing development issues to have an effective monitoring and evaluation to ensure efficient delivery of services with intended outcome and sustainability of the program/project benefits and policy implementation leading to the envisioned change. A good monitoring and evaluation

system must involve the beneficiaries and stakeholders whereby they are allowed to freely express their opinion without fear.

5.4 Conclusion

From the findings of the study, it is evident that community participation during project planning and designing and during project monitoring and evaluation play a very crucial role in ensuring project sustainability of donor funded projects. During project planning and designing, the locals come up with goals and objectives that are to be achieved by the project hence solving the needs of the community. When clear goals are set by the locals, it is easier to achieve the goals set as the communities know the vision of the project. Project monitoring and evaluation is not participatory meaning that locals are not involved in the exercise. It is important that training during project planning and during monitoring is done so that locals fully participate during these phases. Capacity building empowers the locals to be able to make more informed decision that will ensure successful implementation and sustainability of the project.

Donors also play a crucial role to determine whether a project will be sustainable or not. This is because donors in most cases come with their own terms and conditions of implementing the project without necessarily considering the needs of the locals. Therefore locals will conform to what the donor wants only to benefit from the monetary gains during the project period but after the donor exits the project becomes unsustainable. Therefore donors should consider the needs of the locals and these needs differ from one community to the other before a project commences.

5.5 Recommendations

From the study, during project selection, awareness creation through proper mobilization and sensitization at the initial stages of project development plays an important role in ensuring successful project implementation. It is at this stage that the locals ask questions and get details about the project so that during implementation the project progresses smoothly. Research shows that the more locals are aware of the project the lesser the problems faced.

Trainings at different levels of project life cycle to encourage sustainability of projects are also important so that the target population will be empowered to continue to benefit from a project

even after the exit of the donor. The trainings will enable the community to plan the project at the initial stages and in the actual project implementation. This capacity building should be done at the national and regional level so that locals are imparted with skills to promote participation and sustainable development. Locals also become more analytical about situations and are therefore able to come up with appropriate measures to address the challenges.

Education levels in Kilifi County needs to be upgraded so that locals can go up to tertiary levels of education instead of stopping at secondary and even primary level. Majority leave at primary and secondary levels but this trend can be changed by encouraging the locals to pursue further education and improve levels of education in the County.

5.6 Suggestions for Further Studies

Further studies can be done in the following areas;

Influence of level of education on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County

Influence of economic levels on sustainability of donor funded projects in Kilifi County

REFERENCES

- Ababa, C, T. (2013). *Factors influencing sustainability of rural community based water projects in Mtito Andei, Kibwezi Sub County*. University of Nairobi.
- Anderson, E., & McFarlane, J. (2010). *Community as partner: Theory and practice in nursing (6th Ed)*. New York: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Andrew, O. (2010). *Understanding the dynamics of communities is a key to sustainable development*. Onitsha: Nigerian Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Arnstein, Sherry R (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4), 216-224
- Bamberger, M., & Cheema, S. (1990). *Case studies of Program Sustainability: Implications for policy and operations from Asian experience*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Boyes, W. & Melvin, M. (2010). *Micro-economics*. (8th Ed). Ohio: Cengage Learning.
- Breuer, D. (1999). *Community participation in Local Health and Sustainable Development: A Working document on Approaches and Techniques European Sustainable Development and Health series*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Brohman, J. (1996). Universalism, Eurocentricism and Ideological Bias in Developmental Studies: *From Modernization to Neo-liberalism*, 16(1), 90-103.
- Burns, D. & John, P. (1994). *The Politics of Decentralization*. London: Macmillan
- Burns, N., & Grove, S. (2001). *The Practice of nursing research: Conduct, critique and utilization*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: W.B. Saunders.
- Chikati, J. (2009). *Participatory project identification and planning publication: A regional partnership for resource development publication*. Nairobi: Signal Press Ltd.
- Corgan and Sharpe. (1986). *Unpacking participation models, meaning and practice*.
- Cornwell, L. (2000). *Education and development: Introduction to development studies*. South Africa: Oxford University Press.
- Gozie, I. (2007). *Imperative of a mutually beneficial relationship between the community and donor agency in community project development in Nigeria*. Lagos: Unwin Publishers Ltd.
- Joaguin, L. (1998). *Development Sustainability through Community Participation: Mixed Results from the Philippine Health sector*. Brook Field, Aldershot.
- Kerote, O. (2007). *The Role of the Local Community in Management of CDF in Sabatia Constituency in Vihiga. A Research Project*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Kilifi District Development Plan 2002-2012, (2003)

- Kinyanjui, K.D. & Misaro, J. (2013). Socio-economic status and participatory development in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(1), 183-193
- Kothari, C. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Age International. New Age International (P) Ltd.
- Lyson, M., Smut, C & Stephens, A. (2001). Participation, empowerment and Sustainability. *Urban studies*, 38(8).
- Makokha, J. (1985). *The District Focus: Conceptual and management problems*. Nairobi: African Press Research Bureau.
- McCommon, C. (1993). Community management of rural water supply and sanitation services: *Water and Sanitation for Health (WASH) Technical Report*. Washington DC: United States Agency for International Aid (USAID).
- Mikkelsen, B. (2005). *Methods for development work and research: A new guide for Practitioners*. New Delhi.
- Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, G. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Mulwa, F. (2007). *Participatory monitoring and evaluation of community based project: Monitoring qualitative impact assessment and people friendly evaluation methods*.
- Mulwa, F. (2008). *Participatory monitoring and evaluation of community projects*. Nairobi.
- Mutimba, M. (2013). *Determinants of sustainability of donor funded projects: The case of selected projects in Ganze Constituency in Kilifi County, Kenya*. University of Nairobi.
- Mwangi, K. (2005). Efficiency and Efficacy of Kenya's Constituency Development Fund: Theory and Evidence. *Working Paper, 4*.
- Nyerere, J.K. (1990). *The Challenges to the South: The Report of the South Commission*. Great Britain: Biddles Ltd.
- Orodho, A. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Techniques of writing proposal and reports in education and Science*. Nairobi: Reater Printers Nairobi Pearson Education.
- Ohwahwa, F. (2009). *The Place of MOU and Implementation Committees in Community Project Execution in Nigeria*. Shomolu: Bumico Publishers.
- Parahoo, K. (1997). *Nursing research: Principles, process and issues*. London: Macmillan.
- Polit, D. & Hungler, B. (1997). *Essentials of Nursing Research: Methods, Appraisal and Utilization*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Ravallion, M. (2005). *Evaluation anti-poverty programs development research group. World Bank and Handbook of Development Economics*. Schultz, P., & Straus. J. (Ed.). Amsterdam, North Holland
- Spiegel, B.C. (1968). *Citizen participation in urban development*. Washington D.C:

- Institute for Applied Behavioral Science Sussex
- Swinepoel, H & De Beer, F. (2000). *Community Capacity Building*. Johannesburg: International Thomson Publishing South Africa Ltd.
- Thunde, D. (1993). *Towards a transformation development organization: Possible Challenges and Future*. Lilongwe (Unpublished).
- Thwala, W. (2001). *Critical evaluation of large-scale development projects and Programs in South Africa 1980-1994*. University of the Witwatersrand.
- Umesi, V. C. (2005). *The Importance of MOU and Implementation Committees in Facilitating Community Project Development: The Experience of Egi Peoples forum*. Enugu: Forth Dimension Books.
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, (2009). *People matter: Civic Engagement in public governance*. Washington DC: United Nations Publications
- United Nations Development Program. (2012). *Results-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation: A Handbook for Program Managers*
- Wilcox D. (1999). *A to Z of Participation*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- World Bank, (2004). *World Development Report: Making Services Work for Poor People*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. (2002). *Community Driven Development: Challenges and Opportunities For Kenya*. Washington D.C: World Bank
- World Bank. 2012. *Guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluation for Biodiversity Project*

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Kirigha Esther Rozinah

P.O. Box 1322-80100

MOMBASA

Email address:estherkirigha@yahoo.com

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUEST TO COLLECT DATA

I am a student at the University of Nairobi undertaking a post graduate degree in Masters of Arts in Project Planning and Management. I am required to undertake a research as part of the requirement for the course.

This is to kindly request for permission to undertake my research taking Where Talent Lives Youth Group in Mnarani Ward as my case study. The information collected from the questionnaires is for academic purpose. All the information gathered will be treated with a lot of confidentiality.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Kirigha Esther Rozinah

M.A. Project Planning & Management Student,

University of Nairobi Malindi Centre.

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

Influence of Community Participation on Sustainability of Donor Funded Projects in Kilifi County: Case of KCDP Project in Kilifi County

Name of Researcher: Kirigha Esther Rozinah

Masters Student at University of Nairobi, School of Continuous and Distance Education

Department: Extra Mural Studies, Malindi Centre

Contacts: 1322-80100 Mombasa

Phone: 0720987585; Email: estherkirigha@yahoo.com

You are kindly requested to take part in this research study. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is important that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Kindly ask the researcher if there is anything that is not clear or any more information.

The purpose of this study is purely for academic purposes and will be treated with the utmost confidentiality. The risks of study are minimal. The questions in the survey are not intended to upset you. Just in case you feel compromised, feel free to terminate it.

There will be no direct benefit to you for your participation in this study. However, I hope that the information that will be obtained from this study may help inform the project implementers like government agencies and NGOs in implementing donor funded projects in Kilifi County in future.

Respondent's declaration:

By signing this form, I confirm that I have understood the information and I have had an opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw any time, without giving any reason and without cost. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

Signature..... Date.....

APPENDIX C: BENEFICIARIES QUESTIONNAIRE

Topic: Influence of Community Participation on Sustainability of Donor Funded Projects: Case of KCDP Project in Kilifi County, Kenya

Respondent no.....

Part A: GENERAL DATA

1. Gender; Male Female
2. Age; below 25 years 25-34 years 35-44 years above 45 years
3. What is your level of education? No school Primary school
Secondary school Tertiary

Part B: Project Selection

4. Awareness creation was done during project selection

Yes

No

5. Give an opinion to the following ways in which community involvement in project selection may affect project sustainability. (Please tick as appropriate between a scale of 1-5, where 1 means strongly agree, 2 means agree, 3 means neutral, 4 means disagree and 5 means strongly disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
Clear understanding of goal and objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Acceptance of project by community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ownership of project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part C: Project Planning and Designing

6. Are the community members involved in setting the purpose and objectives of the project?

Yes

No

7. Give opinion to the following ways in which community involvement in project planning and design may affect project sustainability. (Please tick as appropriate between a scale of 1-5, where 1 means strongly agree, 2 means agree, 3 means neutral, 4 means disagree and 5 means strongly disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
Encourages use of local knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resource identification and allocation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication plan put in place	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part D: Project Execution

8. Are the locals involved in execution of the project?

Yes

No

9. Give an opinion to the following ways in which community involvement in project execution may affect project sustainability. (Please tick as appropriate between a scale of 1-5, where 1 means strongly agree, 2 means agree, 3 means neutral, 4 means disagree and 5 means strongly disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
Better decision making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Challenges can easily be solved by the locals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Encourages innovation by the locals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part E: Project Monitoring and Evaluation

10. Is the project monitored to ensure attainment of objectives?

Yes

No

11. Give an opinion to the following ways in which community involvement in project monitoring and evaluation may affect project sustainability. (Please tick as appropriate)

between a scale of 1-5, where 1 means strongly agree, 2 means agree, 3 means neutral, 4 means disagree and 5 means strongly disagree).

	1	2	3	4	5
Participatory M& E	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Project progress is monitored frequently	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Feedback mechanisms are put in place	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. What can be done to improve sustainability of this project?

.....

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX D: KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

(KILIFI COUNTY LIAISON OFFICER)

1. How long have you been a liaison officer for the KCDP?

.....

2. What procedure do you follow to select which project to fund?

.....

.....

.....

.....

3. What are the benefits of involvement of community members in;

i. Project Selection?

.....

.....

.....

ii. Project Planning and Designing?

.....

.....

.....

iii. Project Execution?

.....

.....

.....

iv. Project Monitoring & Evaluation?

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

4. Apart from the above factors, what other factors do you think affect sustainability of projects?

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

5. Do you think community participation is the **key** to project sustainability?

Yes.....No.....

State your reasons

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

6. In your opinion, what can be done to make donor funded projects more sustainable?

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

THANK YOU