

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND IMPLEMENTATION OF
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PROJECTS: A CASE OF KAMUNGI
CONSERVANCY, MAKUENI COUNTY KENYA**

PETER MOPHAT OJIAMBO

**A Research Project Report Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements of the Award of the Degree of Master of Arts in Project
Planning and Management of the University of Nairobi**

2022

DECLARATION

This research project report is my original work and has not been submitted for any academic award in any other Institution.

Signature: 

Date: 1st October 2022

Peter Mophat Ojiambo

L50/38672/2020

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

Signature: 

Date: **05.10.2022**

Dr. Moses Machuki Maturi Otieno

Lecturer

Department of Business Administration

Faculty of Business and Management Science

University of Nairobi

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research project report to my loving parents, Mr. Maxtone Ojiambo and Mrs. Lydia Nambiro, for supporting me throughout my academic life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I sincerely thank my employer, Tsavo Trust Limited, for giving me a full scholarship to study this degree. Happy and much appreciative of the guidance offered by my University Supervisor, Dr. Moses Machuki Maturi Otieno, who assisted throughout the research project.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ACRONYMS

CBNRM – Community Based Natural Resources Management

CBOs – Community Based Organizations

HWC – Human – Wildlife Conflict

IUCN - International Union for Conservation of Nature

KCPE – Kenya Certificate of Primary Education

KCSE – Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education

KWCA – Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association

KWS – Kenya Wildlife Service

M&E – Monitoring and Evaluation

NACOSTI – National Commission for Science, Technology, and Innovation

NGOs – Non-governmental Organizations

ToC – Theory of change

TOC – Theory of Constraints

UNEP - United Nations Environment Programme

UoN – University of Nairobi

WCPA – World Commission on Protected Areas

WMAs – Wildlife Management Areas

WWF - World-Wide Fund for Nature

ZSL – Zoological Society of London

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	3
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ACRONYMS	4
LIST OF TABLES	8
LIST OF FIGURES	9
ABSTRACT	10
CHAPTER ONE	11
INTRODUCTION	11
1.1 Background to the study	11
1.2 Statement of the problem	14
1.3 Purpose of the study	16
1.4 Objectives of the study	16
1.5 Research questions	16
1.6 Hypotheses	17
1.7 Significance of the study	17
1.8 Delimitation of the study	17
1.9 Limitations of the study	18
1.10 Assumption of the study	18
1.11 Definition of significant terms	18
1.12 Organization of the study	20
CHAPTER TWO	21
LITERATURE REVIEW	21
2.1 Introduction	21
2.2 Implementation of wildlife conservation projects	21
2.3 Project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects	23
2.4 Community capacity building and implementation of wildlife conservation projects ..	24
2.5 Communication and implementation of wildlife conservation projects	25
2.6 Project monitoring and evaluation and implementation of wildlife conservation projects	25
2.7 Theoretical Framework	26
2.7.2 Theory of change	27
2.7.3 Stakeholders Theory	28

2.8 Conceptual Framework	28
2.9 Summary of the Literature Reviewed and Research Gaps.....	30
CHAPTER THREE	43
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	43
3.1 Introduction	43
3.2 Research Design.....	43
3.3 Target Population	43
3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	44
3.5 Research Instruments	45
3.5.1 Piloting the Instruments.....	46
3.5.2 Validity of the Instruments	46
3.5.3 Reliability of the Instruments	47
3.6 Data Collection Procedures	47
3.7 Data Analysis Technique	48
3.8 Ethical Consideration	48
3.9 Operationalization of variables	49
CHAPTER FOUR.....	52
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION, AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	52
4.1 Introduction	52
4.2 Response Rate	52
4.3 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents.....	52
4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents.....	53
4.3.2 Age of the Respondents.....	53
4.3.3 Level of Education of the Respondents	54
4.3.4 Duration that Respondents have been members of Kamungi Conservancy.....	54
4.3.5 Duration of Respondents Involvement in Kamungi Conservancy Projects	55
4.4 Project Management Practices and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	56
4.4.1 Project Planning and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects.....	56
4.4.2 Community Capacity Building and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	59
4.4.3 Communication and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	62
4.4.4 Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	64

4.4.5 Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	67
4.4.6 Regression Analysis	69
CHAPTER FIVE	72
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	72
5.1 Summary of Findings	72
5.1.1 Project Planning and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects.....	72
5.1.2 Community Capacity Building and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	72
5.2.3 Communication and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	72
5.2.4 Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	73
5.3 Conclusion of the Study	73
5.4 Recommendations of the Study.....	75
5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies	75
REFERENCES	76
APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE	80
APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW GUIDE	85
APPENDIX III: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE	86
APPENDIX IV: INTRODUCTION LETTER	87
APPENDIX V: RESEARCH LICENSE	88
APPENDIX VI: KAMUNGI APPROVAL LETTER.....	89
APPENDIX XII: MAP	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Literature reviewed, and research gaps identified	30
Table 3.1: The study target population	44
Table 3.2: The study sample size	45
Table 3.3: Cronbach Alpha	47
Table 3.4: Operationalization of variables	49
Table 4.1: Questionnaire Response Rate	52
Table 4.2: Gender of the Respondents	53
Table 4.3: Age of the Respondents	53
Table 4.4: Levels of Education of the Respondents	54
Table 4.5: Duration that Respondents have been members of Kamungi Conservancy.....	55
Table 4.6: Duration of Respondents Involvement in Kamungi Conservancy Projects	55
Table 4.7: Descriptive statistics for Project Planning Influence	56
Table 4.8: Spearman's Correlation Coefficient test Project Planning and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	57
Table 4.9: Descriptive Statistics for Community Capacity Building Influence	59
Table 4.10: Spearman's Correlation Coefficient Test Community Capacity Building and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	60
Table 4.11: Descriptive Statistics for Communication Influence	62
Table 4.12: Spearman's Correlation Coefficient test Communication and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	63
Table 4.13: Descriptive Statistics for Project Monitoring and Evaluation Influence	64
Table 4.14: Spearman's Correlation Coefficient test Project monitoring and evaluation and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	65
Table 4.15: Descriptive Statistics for Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects	67
Table 4.16: Model summary of regression analysis	69
Table 4.17: ANOVA	70
Table 4.18: Regression coefficients	70

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework.....	29
---------------------------------------	----

ABSTRACT

Globally, the management and conservation of wildlife resources outside government protected areas is a major challenge. 70 percent of the environmental Non-Governmental Organizations projects fail to be completed on time, within budget, and fail to meet set objectives.

This study investigated project management practices and implementation of wildlife conservation projects: a case of Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya. The study measured project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project monitoring and evaluation to determine their influence on execution of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

The study adopted Concurrent Triangulation Research Design. A sample of 108 respondents was selected from a target population of 164. Data was collected by use of questionnaires administered to 90 Kamungi Conservancy members who were randomly sampled using simple random method. Focus Group Discussion guide was administered to 10 Kamungi Conservancy leaders. Interview guides were administered to 5 key informants comprising Project Manager, Project Officer, KWS official, Makueni County Government official, and National Government official. SPSS was used for data analysis.

Findings showed that project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project monitoring and evaluation were present in wildlife conservation projects with composite means of 3.66, 3.49, 3.49 and 3.53 respectively. Implementation of wildlife conservation projects had a composite mean of 3.98. Four hypotheses were tested using Spearman's Correlation Coefficient. The null hypotheses were rejected. All the practices were found to have a significant and positive influence on implementation of wildlife conservation projects. The study established that 23.3%, 14.1%, 6.9%, and 4.1% of variations in execution of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy was because of Project planning, Project monitoring and evaluation, communication, and community capacity building respectively.

The study recommends active involvement of project beneficiaries, partners, and stakeholders in project planning, incorporation of community capacity building aspects in the project plans, a clear communication structure and a framework to record and address community concerns, grievances, and feedback. Finally, effective and efficient project monitoring and evaluation system that promote active involvement of project beneficiaries in M&E.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Globally, majority of wildlife are found outside the government protected areas on either private or local communities' lands. According to a report by the UNEP, IUCN, and WCPA, less than 20% of key biodiversity areas worldwide have been put under protected areas (Belmonte & Bieberstein, 2016). The conventional approach to wildlife conservation by creating more protected areas has not been very effective (Muchapondwa & Stage, 2015 and P, 2018). The limitation with government protected areas approach has been exclusion or limited involvement of local community members in management of the wildlife and the approach is highly expensive. Furthermore, with more wildlife being found on either local communities or private lands and with most of the protected areas lacking physical barriers to deter wildlife from roaming in community areas, communities' participation in conservation of wildlife is inevitable.

Muchapondwa and Stage (2015) further argues that the traditional state-managed protected areas model has become increasingly problematic as the human population has increased, converting wildlife migratory corridors and dispersal areas into land uses that are incompatible with wildlife conservation such as human settlement, urbanization, agriculture, and development of big infrastructural projects. This has resulted in high Human - Wildlife Conflict, loss of biodiversity, habitat degradation, and loss of livelihood which has negatively impacted both wildlife and the local communities. To promote coexistence between wildlife and local communities neighbouring protected areas, wildlife conservation projects are being implemented globally. The overall goal of wildlife conservation projects is to create a win-win solution by creating more space for wildlife and at the same time provide incentives and tangible benefits to local communities.

Wildlife conservation practices in Africa have shifted from state-managed protected areas to a participatory approach involving more actors executing wildlife conservation projects (Muchapondwa & Stage, 2015). Community-based conservancies are the most common approach (Banerjee & Aiyadurai, 2020, Muchapondwa & Stage, 2015 and P, 2018). Involvement of the community in wildlife conservation projects adjacent to protected areas has been identified as a success factor. The shift in wildlife conservation practices in Africa has resulted in a shift in foreign donors and foreign NGOs support from partnering with government agencies to working with non-state actors or even directly executing projects themselves (Muchapondwa & Stage, 2015).

In most of the Southern African countries, land and natural resources are owned by state governments, and individuals or community members only have restricted access rights to them. This has resulted in community members being unwilling to expend effort to conserve natural resources they see as belonging to the government (P, 2018). Weak community institutions in Southern Africa have limited capacity to make resource use, management, and conservation rules, resulting in limited success in wildlife conservation projects (P, 2018). P (2018) observes poor governance in Botswana, Namibia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, where leaders and elected committees of community-based wildlife conservation projects serve their interests at the expense of local community members. Issues such as biased selection of community projects, misuse of project funds, limited participation, and decision-making by local communities in conservation, and a lack of transparency are common.

In Tanzania, community-based wildlife conservation occurs through establishment of Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs). Villages create WMAs for wildlife conservation with a goal of obtaining a percentage of revenue from tourism. Currently the country has nineteen WMAs and nineteen more planned. However, efficiency, equity, communication, benefit sharing mechanism, time consuming obtaining community buy in, inclusion in WMAs, transparency

and accountability, and high cost of establishing and running WMAs are some of the implementation challenges (Kimario et al., 2020, Lee & Bond, 2018 and Kiwango et al., 2015). Kimario *et al.*, (2020) further established that effective planning and monitoring had a positive impact in many WMAs.

P. Mogomotsi, L. Stone, G. Mogomotsi, *et al.* (2020) alludes that despite the benefits of wildlife conservation projects, Human-Wildlife Conflict may result in negative attitudes and perceptions towards wildlife and nullify all the benefits. Negative attitudes and perceptions towards wildlife often promote retaliatory killings of wild animals, unsustainable extraction of wildlife resources, low community participation, and lack of community ownership of wildlife conservation projects.

65 percent of Kenya's wildlife is found on communally or privately owned lands adjacent to the protected areas (KWCA, 2021). This implies that only 35 percent of wildlife is found within state-managed protected areas. According to Kenya's Vision 2030, the Conservancy model is highly valued and the country targets to achieve 20% of its land mass under conservancy management by 2030. According to KWCA (2017), the following are some of the key challenges confronting conservancies in Kenya: i) communities and landowners lack a voice in important decision-making processes; ii) establishing a conservancy is costly and time-consuming; iii) local politics, inequitable benefit-sharing, poor local governance, and the exclusion of women and youth threaten the productivity and impact of conservancies; iv) misconceptions about conservancies; and v) limited management capacity.

Kamungi Conservancy is an example of wildlife conservation projects being implemented in Kenya. It is a community conservancy located on the northern boundary of Tsavo West National Park, Makueni County, Southern Kenya. The Conservancy comprises of 140 community members. Majority of the wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy have been implemented by Tsavo Trust which is a local non-profit organization and a few

through the partnership between Tsavo Trust and Zoological Society of London. The wildlife conservation projects implemented are Human-Wildlife Conflict mitigation projects, permaculture projects, conservation education projects, livelihood improvement projects, community scouts, among others. A Social Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas conducted in 2021 in Kamungi Conservancy identified Human-Wildlife Conflict, governance issues, information barrier, low community participation as some of the issues facing the Conservancy. These issues might pose implementation challenges.

For a country like Kenya, failure to implement wildlife conservation projects properly leads to far-reaching consequences on ecological wellbeing, economic development, and livelihood sustainability. Bosibori & Otieno (2021) observes that modern project management practices tools emerged in the mid-1950s and have been accepted worldwide as their application ensures smooth implementation of projects. Resources are always limited, and better project management has become increasingly important for organizations. The literature reviewed shows that when project management practices are used correctly, they promote project success. Additionally, each organization should customize the project management tools and techniques to fit its specific needs and requirements (Tereso et al., 2019).

Despite challenges experienced during implementation of wildlife conservation projects, available evidence suggests that implementation challenges in this type of project or related projects may be influenced by the way project management practices are undertaken.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Worldwide there is a shift in wildlife conservation approaches from the conventional American Park model to community conservation model. In Kenya, Community Conservancies are the widely used community-based wildlife conservation model. Kenya's megafauna declined by 68 percent on average over the last four decades, with most of the decline occurring outside of gazetted Protected Areas (the Republic of Kenya, 2017). According to Kenya's Vision 2030,

the Conservancy model is highly valued and the country targets to achieve 20% of its land mass under conservancy management by 2030.

In Kenya, there have growth in community-based wildlife conservation with more community conservancies being established. However, effective implementation of wildlife conservation projects within community conservancies remains a major challenge with a larger percentage of the projects failing to be completed within budget, within planned time and failing to meet the set objectives. Ochieng (2018) alludes that implementation of environmental NGOs projects is a major challenge, with 70 percent of the projects failing to be completed on time, within budget, and failing to meet set objectives. Furthermore, organizations in developing nations have a much more failure rate in project implementation compared to those in developed countries.

Bosibori & Otieno (2021) investigated the Influence of Project Management Practices on The Implementation of Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations' Projects: A case of WWF – Kenya in Kwale County. The study focused broadly on environmental projects and only used a questionnaire. Mwangunya (2016) investigated factors influencing implementation of wildlife conservation projects focusing on WWF-Kenya. The study focused on political, social-cultural, legal, and economic factors. King'ori (2019) investigated the influence of community involvement on wildlife conservation projects performance, focusing on Loisaba Community Trust in Laikipia County, Kenya. The study investigated involvement of community in identification of project, project design, implementation of project, and project monitoring and evaluation.

Therefore, this study investigated project management practices and execution of wildlife conservation projects, a case of Kamungi Conservancy. Project management practices investigated are project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project monitoring and evaluation.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to look into project management practices and implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

1.4 Objectives of the study

This study aimed to achieve four objectives:

- i. To determine the influence of project planning on the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.
- ii. To assess the influence of community capacity building on the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.
- iii. To determine how communication influences the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.
- iv. To assess how project monitoring and evaluation influences the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

1.5 Research questions

This study was guided by four questions;

- i. How does project planning influences implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya?
- ii. How does community capacity building influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya?
- iii. How does communication influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya?
- iv. How does project M&E influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya?

1.6 Hypotheses

This study tested four hypotheses;

- i. Project planning does not significantly influence wildlife conservation projects implemented by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.
- ii. Community capacity building does not significantly influence wildlife conservation projects implemented by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.
- iii. Communication does not significantly influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.
- iv. Project monitoring and evaluation does not significantly influence wildlife conservation projects implemented by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

1.7 Significance of the study

This study may contribute towards project management body of knowledge, specifically on implementation of wildlife conservation projects. This will promote successful implementation of wildlife conservation projects outside government protected areas. This study's findings may inform the development of policies in community-based wildlife conservation by National governments, County Governments, and Non-state actors. This study may contribute to further research by suggesting areas for additional research on the topic of project management practices and implementation of wildlife conservation projects.

1.8 Delimitation of the study

This study investigated project management practices and implementation of wildlife conservation projects by the Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya. The study thus delimited itself to Kamungi Conservancy because it's located on the northern boundary of Tsavo West National Park which is a critical and significant government protected area

in Kenya. Additionally, despite the Conservancy facing challenges which might affect the implementation of wildlife conservation projects, no research has ever been conducted to investigate project management practices and implementation of the wildlife conservation projects.

This study was anchored on concurrent triangulation design. This is a design that gives equal importance to quantitative and qualitative approaches. The researcher established the relationship between project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project monitoring & evaluation and the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by the Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

1.9 Limitations of the study

Language barrier. Most Kamungi Conservancy members are only literate in local Kamba language. Three research assistants were hired from local community within Kamungi Conservancy. The research assistants assisted in administering the questionnaires and translating during Focus Group Discussion. This enabled the study objectives to be met.

1.10 Assumption of the study

The researcher assumed that the sample of study represents the population and is not biased. The researcher also assumed that the respondents gave response to all questions in the research instruments as honestly as possible. The researcher assumes that the research instruments sufficiently addressed the research problem.

1.11 Definition of significant terms

Project management practices: Processes and methods used to achieve set project objectives within stipulated standards.

Implementation: It refers to the entire process of converting broad project goals or objectives into visible outcomes.

Wildlife conservation projects: Active participation of local community in wildlife conservation efforts. These projects are implemented on private or community-owned land adjacent to state-managed protected areas and thus have wildlife. The main objectives of wildlife conservation projects are to promote coexistence between local communities and wildlife and improve local communities' livelihoods through incentives and benefits from wildlife conservation.

Project planning: Expound all the project activities and the final product. Additionally, it highlights how the activities will be executed. It involves setting goals, organizing the work, allocating responsibilities to individuals, the outline of time and costs, and providing the basis for monitoring and control.

Community capacity building: The process of enhancing the skills, intuition, expertise, practices, and resources needed by local community members to enable them to participate in genuine and constructive execution of wildlife conservation projects.

Communication: Exchange of project-related information from partners to Kamungi Conservancy members and vice versa.

Project Monitoring & Evaluation: Project monitoring is the continuous review and management of project activities that involves checking progress against plans. Project evaluation is systematically and impartially assessing a project, either a completed project or a completed phase. M&E is an ongoing process integrated within other project management phases.

Kamungi Conservancy: Community wildlife conservation approach bringing together local community members with the main goal being wildlife conservation and tangible benefits and incentives from wildlife conservation.

1.12 Organization of the study

The study is made up of five chapters. In the first chapter, the context of the study is introduced while defining the research problem being investigated. Chapter two reviews related literature with an objective to show how the study relates to earlier research. Chapter three discusses the research methodology for achieving the objectives. Data analysis, presentation, interpretation, and discussion of findings are described in the fourth chapter. Finally, summary of findings, conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further research are discussed in chapter five.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter shows what has been done on the topic of interest. It is organized based on themes and variables under the study: project management practices and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. It further provides a theoretical framework which describes theories that underpins the study, conceptual framework highlights a researcher's understanding on how the variables interacts, and summary of reviewed literature/gaps identified and how the study is addressing them.

2.2 Implementation of wildlife conservation projects

According to Chirenje et al (2013), increased poaching and declining wildlife habitat resulted in unanimous agreement among wildlife conservation stakeholders that state-managed protected areas were ineffective. This was because local community members neighbouring protected areas were excluded from the management and conservation of wildlife resources despite carrying the burden such as Human-Wildlife Conflict due to proximity. Worldwide, there has been a push for feasible and sustainable wildlife conservation. The strategy of involving communities in execution of wildlife conservation outside of state-managed formal protected areas has been established as a success factor. The projects are aimed to create a win-win solution between wildlife and local communities that live in harmony with wildlife.

Through the implementation of wildlife conservation projects outside of government-protected areas, foreign state agencies, international organizations, NGOs, private companies, CBOs, individual donors, and conservancies have significantly contributed to the conservation of wildlife habitats and species. This is pegged on the fact that local community members living near protected areas are constantly in contact with wildlife and to a large extent impact them (Ipara et al., n.d.). In Zimbabwe, a study conducted on communities neighbouring Hwange

National Park showed that due to limited participation in decision making and limited benefits, local communities had negative perceptions towards community-based wildlife conservation programme. (Shereni & Saarinen, 2021). This coupled with elite capture of resources and wildlife tourist revenue has led to the programme not to meet its objectives.

Chevallier & Harvey (2017) investigated viability of CBNRM policy in Botswana which was adopted in 1997. Implementation of the policy has had challenges such as limited capacity of CBOs, limited decision-making responsibilities of CBOs, and equitable distribution of revenue from wildlife resources. To improve the CBNRM policy, the study suggest improved communication, change of some aspects of the policy, and capacity building of CBOs. In Kenya, wildlife management is majorly regarded as a responsibility of the Kenya Wildlife Service (Ndege, 2017). Institutionalized efforts to involve local communities in wildlife conservation began in 1991 when KWS created the Community Wildlife Service Department with the main goal of ensuring communities are involved in wildlife conservation on community or private land to ensure a win-win situation between wildlife and local community members that coexist with wildlife (Ipara *et al.*, n.d.).

Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, 2013 has inclusive principles and structure that integrate communities and landowners in wildlife conservation, recognize wildlife conservation as a land use, realize the need for sustainable use and benefits from wildlife and promote public participation in conservation. In Kenya, with recognition that wildlife require more space than government protected areas and that majority of wildlife are found outside protected areas on community and private lands, there have been an emergence of conservancies. KWCA is an umbrella body for wildlife conservancies in Kenya. There are over 160 registered conservancies with 11% of Kenya's landmass under conservancy model. The conservancies have been successful in involvement of local communities in wildlife conservation. However, conservancies have faced issues such as limited management capacity,

communities lack voice in important decision making, establishing a conservancy is costly and time consuming, among others.

2.3 Project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects

Project planning involves setting goals, organizing the work, allocating responsibilities to individuals, the outline of time and costs, and providing the basis for monitoring and control. Chirenje *et al* (2013) assert that bottom-up policy and development framework are sustainable. Despite community participation being a success factor in the implementation of wildlife conservation projects, literature shows that developing nations, particularly those in Africa, have either had limited participation or no participation at all in decision making.

Participatory project planning is a two-way process of dialogue, negotiation, and decision-making between local communities where wildlife conservation projects will be implemented and the implementing organizations. The purpose of participatory planning is to draft a course of action with activities to be undertaken by the local communities and supported by the implementing organizations and other stakeholders. Avedi *et al.* (2020) studied how the Project Planning Strategy Influences Energy Access Projects Implementation focusing on Counties in Kenya which are underserved. The results showed implementation of projects aimed at access to energy was significantly influenced by project planning in Kenya's underserved counties.

Awuor and Daniel (2020) studied impact of project resource planning on elephant conservation performance in Kenya's Tsavo National Park. Using random sampling, 83 People were chosen from the target population of 176. Resource planning was found to influences performance of conservation project. Bosibori & Otieno (2021) investigated project management practices and environmental NGOs Projects implementation focusing on WWF – Kenya in Kwale County. Participation of stakeholders had the highest influence with a significant positive change of 77%. Project Team Competence was ranked second with 72%, Monitoring and Evaluation was ranked third with 63%, and Project Planning Process was ranked fourth with 47%.

Nyabera (2015) investigated involvement of stakeholders' and execution focusing on Compassion International projects in Mwingi Sub-County, Kenya. The findings showed stakeholders involvement in initiation of project had greatest influence, followed by project planning, project implementation, and finally project M&E.

2.4 Community capacity building and implementation of wildlife conservation projects

Ndonye et al. (2021) investigated project beneficiaries capacity building and community-based conservation projects performance. Findings revealed community-based conservation projects performance is significantly increased by enhancing the capacity of project beneficiaries. Roba and Kikwatha (2021) investigated how women participation influence sustainability of Jaldesa Community Conservancy in Marsabit County, Kenya. Findings showed participation of women in execution of conservation projects had significant and positive influence on their sustainability and long-term existence. The study recommended more capacity building for women and an increase in women's participation in decision making.

Mwangunya (2016) investigated factors influencing wildlife conservation project implementation focusing on WWF – Kenya in Nairobi, Kenya. Implementation of wildlife conservation projects was significantly influenced by political, social-cultural, legal, and economic factors. The study recommended the government conduct awareness on how communities can participate in the implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Maiyo (2015) investigated factors influencing execution of public construction projects in Ainamoi Sub-County, Kericho County. Project Management Committee training, funding, information access, and stakeholder involvement had significant positive influence on construction projects implementation. The study recommended formulation of policies that promote training of various project actors.

2.5 Communication and implementation of wildlife conservation projects

Odhiambo (2020) investigated communication as a driver of project performance with a focus on Kenya commercial banks. All Project Managers from 43 banks were involved. It was shown that communication is critical in ensuring that all stakeholders involved in a project are on the same page. And improved communication necessitates optimal communication. Mang'eni (2019) investigated the impact of organizational factors on contractors' performance focusing on public building projects. Findings showed performance of contractors in public building projects was influenced by communication systems, procurement procedures, staff competence, financial services, and effective client communication.

Sharon (2019) investigated project meetings and implementation performance of classroom projects sponsored by constituencies development fund in Aldai Constituency Financial Year 2017/2018. The findings showed that kick off meetings, project status meetings, special project meetings, and project management review meetings influences performance of constituency development fund sponsored classroom projects.

2.6 Project monitoring and evaluation and implementation of wildlife conservation projects

Karanja and Yusuf (2018) asserts that increasing pressure to better project outcomes has improved adoption of project M&E. Literature shows effectiveness of M&E depends on stakeholders' participation in the preparation of the tool, the actual M&E, sharing of results, and informed decision making due to the findings. Cheruiyot *et al.* (2021) investigated influence of participatory evaluation on Mau Forest conservation Programme. Effective and efficient execution of the programme was found to be influenced by the involvement of stakeholders in evaluating forest conservation activities. Stakeholders' participation has been established as a success factor in project implementation. Stakeholders are either impacted by

the project or they have interest in the project and thus involving them in all project phases including evaluation is crucial.

Ndege (2017) investigated the factors that influence wildlife conservation projects performance focusing on a Lion Project within Meru National Park in Kenya. The findings showed that involvement of community, social-cultural factors, monitoring & evaluation, competence of project management team impacted Lion Rover Project performance respectively.

King'ori (2019) investigated community involvement and wildlife conservation projects performance focusing on Loisaba Community Trust in Kenya. Wildlife conservation projects performance were significantly and positively influenced by involving community in identification of project, design of project, implementation of project, and project M&E.

Rumenya & Kisimbi (2020) investigated Monitoring and Evaluation Systems and NGOs projects performance focusing on education projects in Mombasa County, Kenya. M&E organizational structures, M&E plan, and M&E human resource capacity had a constructive and notable correlation with education projects performance in NGOs. However, M&E work plan had a weak constructive correlation.

Ocharo *et al.* (2020) investigated the influence of Monitoring And Evaluation Frameworks on Agricultural projects performance in public sector in Galana Kilifi County, Kenya. Findings showed a relationship between M&E frameworks and agricultural projects performance.

Wanjiru *et al.* (2020) studied monitoring and evaluation and livelihood ventures performance focusing on youths' conservation projects within Nairobi County in Kenya. Findings showed a constructive correlation between solid waste management projects performance and monitoring and evaluation practices.

2.7 Theoretical Framework

The following are the three theories that underpin this research:

2.7.1 Theory of Constraints

Eliyahu Goldratt invented this theory in 1984. TOC was introduced to managers through Eliyahu's book "The Goal." According to the theory of constraints, several barriers prevent management and the manufacturing system from accomplishing more of their goals. Goldratt (1990) aimed at pointing out constraints or barriers that limit achievement of goals and addressing them to lessen vulnerability. The theory of constraints helps Managers to identify the weakest link by looking at processes, organizations, individual team members, and any other impediment to the project's successful completion. After identifying the limiting factors, Managers then work on mitigation or making them less harmful to boost overall project performance.

TOC has been used in many areas of project planning and management to adequately respond to problems that arise during the project management life cycle. It is applied during project planning to develop plans and project monitoring and evaluation to follow project plan and ensure project objectives are met. This helps to make sure the project is completed on planned time, within budgeted resources, with high quality, and with sustainability, aspects incorporated.

2.7.2 Theory of change

It is a hypothesis about how a project intends to achieve its goals. A change theory assists in identifying viable alternatives to adequately solve the root cause of issues that impede progress and guides on viable approaches to be considered. Furthermore, it aids in identifying assumptions and risks to monitor them throughout the process. ToC is a roadmap on how to get from project activities to project impacts. Effective and efficient implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy requires a multistakeholder approach consisting of local community members, Kenya Wildlife Service, National Government,

Makueni County Government, Tsavo Trust, and Zoological Society of London among others.

Theory of change provides a learning framework as well as growing collaboration.

By ensuring that wildlife conservation projects are effectively and efficiently implemented, more wildlife will benefit from conservation initiatives, and communities can benefit from wildlife resources. This will help build more equal partnerships between the communities, Kenya Wildlife Service, and conservation organizations.

2.7.3 Stakeholders Theory

R. Edward Freeman invented the theory in 1984. It postulates, as an ethical consideration, an organization should create value for all its stakeholders by serving their needs. Stakeholder involvement promotes successful implementation of projects (Gumbe, 2016). This study applies stakeholders' theory in investigating all the four independent variables.

During project planning, the study looks at stakeholders' involvement in project planning meetings, incorporation of ideas, and division of project tasks. For communication the study investigates clear communication structure, feedback framework, and community grievances mechanism. Finally, under project monitoring and evaluation the study investigates involvement of Kamungi Conservancy members in project monitoring and evaluation, sharing project evaluation findings, and feedback to beneficiaries after project monitoring.

2.8 Conceptual Framework

It is the researcher's understanding on how to describe a topic (Regoniel, 2015). Implementation of wildlife conservation projects is dependent variable, while project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project monitoring and evaluation are the independent.

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

PROJECT PLANNING

- Planning meetings
- Incorporation of ideas
- Project scope defined
- Division of tasks

COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING

- Adequate Project trainings
- Adequate Human-Wildlife Conflict workshops/forums
- Adequate community education on conservation
- Adequate exposure visits/bus trips

COMMUNICATION

- Clear communication structure
- Adequate communication strategies
- Sharing of information
- Community grievances/feedback mechanism

PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION

- involvement of Stakeholders' in M&E
- Frequency of M&E
- Simplicity of tools
- Sharing project evaluation findings

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

IMPLEMENTATION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PROJECTS

- Within planned time
- Within budget
- Quality outcome
- Improved wellbeing
- Improved perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife

MODERATING VARIABLE

- National Government Laws and Policies on wildlife conservation
- Makueni County Government wildlife related by-laws

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

2.9 Summary of the Literature Reviewed and Research Gaps

Table 2.1: Literature reviewed, and research gaps identified

Author	The focus of the study	Methodology used	Findings	Gap in Knowledge	The focus of the current study
Avedi <i>et al.</i> (2020)	influence of Project planning strategy on energy access projects implementation in Kenya's underserved Counties	Descriptive survey (questionnaires, interviews, and observation)	Implementation of energy access projects was significantly influenced by project planning in Kenya's underserved counties.	There was a knowledge gap with other projects because the study focused on the Implementation of Energy Access Projects	Project planning on implementation of wildlife conservation projects
Awuor & Daniel (2020)	Influence of Project Resource Planning on Elephant Conservation performance at Kenya's Tsavo National Park	Descriptive survey (questionnaires)	Performance of Elephant conservation is influenced by project resource planning.	This study is biased as it focused on a protected area, Elephant conservation, and the respondents were only Kenya Wildlife Service officials.	Project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Mixed method was used. Focuses on wildlife conservation projects outside state-managed

					protected areas. Respondents included different key stakeholders
Binitah & Otieno (2021)	Project Management Practices and implementation of environmental projects by WWF-Kenya in Kwale County	Survey (questionnaires)	Stakeholders' Engagement had the highest influence with a significant positive change of 77%. Project Team Competence was ranked second with 72%, Monitoring and Evaluation was ranked third with 63%, and Project Planning Process was ranked fourth with 47%.	The study focused broadly on environmental projects. Also, it only used a questionnaire. There is a knowledge gap on wildlife conservation projects	Project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. mixed method was used.

Nyabera (2015)	Stakeholders' involvement and implementation of projects by Compassion International in Mwingi Sub-County, Kenya	Descriptive design (Interview guide, focused group discussion, and questionnaire)	stakeholders' involvement in project initiation, project planning, and project execution respectively had a strong influence while participation of stakeholders' in monitoring and evaluation influence was weak.	There is a knowledge gap in wildlife conservation projects.	Project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects.
Ndonye <i>et al.</i> (2021)	Project beneficiaries' capacity building and community-based conservation projects performance focusing on Laikipia conservation region	Cross-sectional (questionnaire, focus group discussions, and document analysis)	Building the capacity of project beneficiaries has a significant impact on community-based conservation projects' performance.	This study is focused on project performance. There is a knowledge gap on implementation of wildlife conservation projects. The indicators were biased	Community capacity building and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. The study investigated project trainings, conservation education,

	conservancies			to sustainable livelihood framework.	bus trips/exposure visits, and HWC forums as some of the indicators.
Roba & Kikwatha (2021)	Involvement of women and Community Conservation Project sustainability	Descriptive survey (questionnaires and focus group discussions)	Women involvement in implementation of conservation projects by Jaldesa Conservancy had significant and positive influence on their sustainability and long-term existence. The study recommended more capacity building for women and an increase in	Knowledge gap in implementation of wildlife conservation projects as the study focused on sustainability. It also focused on women creating a knowledge gap in terms of men's participation.	Community capacity building and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Inclusivity as both men and women were equally involved.

			women's participation		
Mwangunya (2016)	Factors influencing implementation of wildlife conservation projects by WWF-Kenya	Descriptive survey (semi-structured questionnaire)	Implementation of wildlife conservation projects was significantly influenced by political, social-cultural, economic, and legal factors. The study recommended the government conduct awareness on how communities can participate.	The study was biased because it only consulted Project Managers and Project Officers. There is a knowledge gap on community capacity building.	Community capacity building & implementation of wildlife conservation projects. The study used mixed-method and data was collected from Project Manager, Project Officer, Kamungi Conservancy members, Kamungi leaders, KWS Administrator, National government Administrator, and Makueni County Government Administrator

Maiyo (2015)	Factors influencing implementation of construction projects in public institutions in Ainamoi Sub-County, Kericho County.	Descriptive survey design (questionnaire)	Project Management Committee training, funding, access to information, and stakeholder involvement had significant and positive influence on construction projects implementation.	Focused on construction projects in public institutions. There is a knowledge gap in wildlife conservation projects	Community capacity building and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Mixed method was used.
Odhiambo (2020)	Communication as a driver of the Commercial Banks projects performance in Kenya	Descriptive survey (questionnaire)	Communication is critical for ensuring that all project stakeholders are on the same page. And improved communication necessitates optimal	The study focused on Commercial Banks projects. Only Project Managers were consulted. Questionnaire was the only instrument used	Communication and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. The study used mixed method. The study was inclusive

			communication.		
Mang'eni (2019)	Influence of organizational factors on contractors' performance in public sector building projects	Descriptive survey (questionnaires and interviews)	performance of contractors in public building projects was influenced by communication systems, procurement procedures, staff competence, financial services, and effective client communication.	The study was biased as it focused on public building projects creating a knowledge gap for other types of projects implemented by NGOs.	Communication and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. The study focused on non-Governmental projects
Sharon (2019)	Project meetings and implementation performance of classrooms sponsored by constituencies development fund in Aldai Constituency Financial	Descriptive survey (structured questionnaire)	Performance of constituency development fund sponsored classroom projects was found to be influenced by kick off meetings, project status	The study focused on government funded classroom projects. There is a knowledge gap in wildlife conservation projects implemented	Communication and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. The study used mixed method and focused on non-Governmental projects.

	Year 2017/2018		meetings, special project meetings, and project management review meetings	by Non- Governmental Organizations	
Cheruiyot <i>et al.</i> (2021)	Participatory Evaluation influence on conservation programme of Mau Forest	Descriptive survey (questionnaires and interviews)	Implementation of forest conservation programme was influenced by involvement of stakeholders in evaluating forest conservation activities.	The study focused on participatory evaluation and left out monitoring. There was a knowledge gap on how M&E influences implementation in specific. Focused on Forest Programme	Project M&E and implementation of wildlife conservation projects
Ndege (2017)	Factors influencing wildlife conservation projects performance focusing on a Lion Project	Descriptive survey (self- administered questionnaires)	Lion Rover Project performance was impacted by involving community, social- cultural	The study was biased singling out the managers and selected community leaders. The study took	Project M&E and wildlife conservation projects implementation. The study used mixed method.

	in Kenya's Meru National Park		factors, project M&E, and project management team competence respectively.	place in a state managed protected area.	Inclusive by involving different project stakeholders i.e., Project Manager, Project Officer, Kamungi Conservancy members, Kamungi leaders, KWS Administrator, National Government Administrator, and Makueni County Government Administrator. The study was conducted in a community conservancy
King'ori (2019)	Influence of community involvement on wildlife conservation	Descriptive survey (questionnaire and interviews)	Wildlife conservation project performance and involving	The study was biased because it only investigated	Project M&E and implementation of wildlife conservation

	project performance focusing on Loisaba Community Trust in Laikipia County in Kenya		community in identification of project, design of project, implementation of project, and monitoring and evaluation of project had a significant and positive relationship.	community involvement and excludes other important stakeholders	projects. The study was inclusive by involving different project stakeholders i.e., Project Manager, Project Officer, Kamungi Conservancy members, Kamungi leaders, KWS Administrator, National Government Administrator, and Makueni County Government Administrator.
Rumenya & Kisimbi (2020)	Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems on Non-Governmenta	Descriptive survey (structured questionnaires)	M&E organizational structures, monitoring and evaluation plan, and	Education sector projects was the focus. It was biased only involving	Project M&E on the implementation of wildlife conservation projects. The study was

	<p>l Organization s education projects Performance in Mombasa County, Kenya</p>		<p>M&E human resource capacity were found to have a constructive influence on education projects performance in Non- Governmenta l Organizations . However, the M&E work plan had a weak constructive relationship with education projects performance in Non- Governmenta l Organizations</p>	<p>project staff & those working in education sector.</p>	<p>inclusive because different stakeholders were involved. The study used mixed method</p>
<p>Ocharo <i>et al.</i> (2020)</p>	<p>Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks influence on Agricultural</p>	<p>Descriptive (questionnair es and interview schedules)</p>	<p>Monitoring and Evaluation framework had a positive nfluence on</p>	<p>The study was skewed because it concentrated on frameworks</p>	<p>Project M&E and implementati on of wildlife conservation projects. The</p>

	Projects performance in public sector in Kilifi County, Kenya		projects performance	for monitoring and evaluating public agricultural projects. The study was biased as it only consulted project managers leaving other project actors	study was inclusive by involving different project stakeholders
Wanjiru <i>et al.</i> (2020)	Monitoring and evaluation practices and livelihood ventures performance by conservation projects executed by youths in Nairobi County, Kenya	Descriptive survey (questionnaire and focus group discussion)	The study established a constructive relationship between performance and M&E practices	Focused on urban set up excluding rural setup associated with wildlife conservation projects The study was biased as it only sampled youths. Looked into solid waste management projects only. The projects	Project M&E and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Focuses on a conservancy which is in a rural set up. It was inclusive as it involved People of different age. Not for profit projects.

				are for profit making.	
--	--	--	--	---------------------------	--

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The chapter explains methodology used in addressing the stated research questions. It emphasizes research design, target population, sample size and sampling technique, research instruments, procedures followed while gathering information, how data was analysed, ethics that were considered, and operationalization of the variables.

3.2 Research Design

Concurrent Triangulation was used. Concurrent Triangulation Design refers to collecting both qualitative and quantitative data instruments are used concurrently. The main goal is to enrich the findings by capitalizing on the strength of each method. Concurrent Triangulation Design allowed the researcher to determine and report on project management practices and implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy.

3.3 Target Population

The study target population was 164 People. This includes community members from Kamungi Conservancy, Project Managers / Project Officers from Tsavo Trust and Zoological Society of London, Kenya Wildlife Service – Tsavo West National Park Administrators (Senior Warden, Deputy Senior Warden, Community Warden, Education Warden, and Warden Fencing), National Government Administrators – Assistant County Commissioner and Chief, and Makueni County Government Administrators (Wildlife Liaison Officer, Member of County Assembly, Ward Administrator, Ward Manager, and Village Administrator).

Table 3.1: The study target population

Population description	Target Population	Percentage (%)
Members of Kamungi Conservancy	140	85.4
Project Managers/ Project Officers	11	6.7
Kenya Wildlife Service Administrators	6	3.7
National Government Administrators	2	1.2
Makueni County Government Administrators	5	3.0
Total	164	100.0%

3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The sample size of Kamungi Conservancy members by Slovin's Formula.

$$n = N/(1+Ne^2)$$

Whereby;

n = the sample size

N = the population size

e = the margin of error.

A margin of error of 0.06 was used.

Therefore $n = 140 / (1 + 140 (0.06 \times 0.06)) = 93$.

The 93 Kamungi Conservancy members were selected through simple random sampling. This reduced biasness because each Kamungi Conservancy member had an equal probability of being selected. 5 key informants comprising of Project Manager, Project Officer, Kenya Wildlife Service Administrator, National Government Administrator, and Makueni County Government Wildlife Liaison Officer were selected through purposive sampling. 10 Kamungi Conservancy leaders were selected through purposive sampling for the Focus Group

Discussion. Therefore, the total number of respondents was 108. In descriptive survey design, a sample size of between 10-50% is acceptable (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003).

Table 3.2: The study sample size

Population description	Target Population	Sample Size (%)	Sample Size
Kamungi Conservancy members	140	73.6	103
Project Managers/ Project Officers	11	18.2	2
Kenya Wildlife Service Administrators	6	16.7	1
National Government Administrators	2	50.0	1
Makueni County Government Administrators	5	20.0	1
Total	164	65.9%	108

3.5 Research Instruments

Primary data was collected by use of Questionnaire for quantitative, and Interview guide, and Focus Group Discussion guide for qualitative data. Quantitative data from Kamungi Conservancy members were collected by the questionnaire. The questionnaire was used because of the following reasons a) It gives respondents enough time to respond to items, b) provides anonymity to respondents, and c) It reduces biasness by an interviewer. The questionnaire was structured using Likert scale questions. The questionnaire had seven sections. Section one was introduction and consent, section two was general information of the respondent while the other remaining five sections consisted of the five variables under the study.

Qualitative data from Project Officer, Project Manager, Kenya Wildlife Service – Tsavo West National Park Administrator, National Government Administrator, and Makueni County Government Administrator was collected by Interview guide. The interview guide enabled the researcher to obtain detailed qualitative data. Qualitative data from Kamungi Conservancy leaders was collected by FGD guide because it is the most appropriate method in obtaining the qualitative data from Kamungi Conservancy leaders with regards to project management practices being used. All the instruments were employed in addressing each of the research objectives.

3.5.1 Piloting the Instruments

A pilot test was conducted to ensure questionnaire can collect accurate, valid, and reliable information that can be used to draw conclusions and recommendations. The researcher conducted a pilot test at Kyusyani Village which is one of the Villages that neighbours Kamungi Conservancy. Kyusyani Village has similar characteristics to Kamungi Conservancy. The researcher administered the questionnaire on 10 respondents who were picked based on convenient, willingness to participate, and availability.

3.5.2 Validity of the Instruments

Refers to the extent to which a research instrument is free of random and systematic errors. It is the accuracy in measuring the intended construct. The questionnaire was subjected to review by two experts and the University supervisor who checked the clarity of the questions, the adequacy of the instruments in addressing the research problem, and the length research will take.

The FGD and interview guides were subjected to respondent validation. Additionally, researcher used peer debriefing where a peer debriefer asked questions about the qualitative study. Validity was also enhanced by triangulation.

3.5.3 Reliability of the Instruments

Refers to degree of which an instrument demonstrates consistency on repeat trials. Cronbach Alpha was used to establish questionnaire reliability.

Table 3.3: Cronbach Alpha

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.932	.929	21

Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.932 shows a high reliability coefficient. A Cronbach's value of above 0.7 shows that the questionnaire was dependable (Neuman, 2013 and Gliem and Gliem 2003).

Qualitative reliability/dependability is the degree to which a qualitative researcher can show that qualitative findings do not vary with the actual primary data collected. The researcher determined the reliability of qualitative research instrument by the following three methods: i) Audit trail where a researcher (outside the research process) trailed the research processes, ii) Ensured transcripts are free of errors, and iii) Inter – coder reliability / Inter rate agreement, where three independent researchers cross checked the way, the data has been categorized from the same text. The three independent researchers reached the same decisions and thus the instruments were confirmed dependable.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

First, obtained an introduction letter from the University of Nairobi, followed by NACOSTI permit, then obtained an approval from Kamungi Conservancy. The Researcher then visited Kamungi Conservancy. The Researcher then hired three locals as Research Assistants and

trained them for two days. The Researcher conducted Kamungi Conservancy members meeting to inform the Conservancy members about the survey and book an appointment. The researcher too booked an appointment with Kamungi Conservancy leaders, Kenya Wildlife Service Administrator, National Government Administrator, Makueni County Government Wildlife Liaison Officer, Project Manager, and Project Officer.

The Research Assistants administered the questionnaires to Kamungi Conservancy members using Kobo Collect. The Researcher conducted key informant interviews to Project Manager, Project Officer, Kenya Wildlife Service Administrator, National Government Administrator, and Makueni County Government Wildlife Liaison Officer. The Researcher with assistance of the Research Assistants will conducted a Focus Group Discussion for Kamungi Conservancy Leaders. Secondary data was obtained from related literature on the internet, peer-review journals, periodicals, books, reports, and other relevant materials to the study.

3.7 Data Analysis Technique

To ensure completeness and consistency, primary data was cleaned, edited, and coded. Quantitative data was analysed using SPSS, whereas qualitative data was analysed descriptively by categorizing aspects into thematic areas. For quantitative data, Frequencies, mean, standard deviation, Spearman's correlation coefficient, and regression analysis were conducted.

3.8 Ethical Consideration

An approval was obtained from NACOSTI and Kamungi Conservancy. The purpose of the investigation was made clear that it is for academic purposes, respondents voluntarily participated, confidentiality was observed. Used language that is easily understood by the respondents and observed all the other ethical considerations.

3.9 Operationalization of variables

Table 3.4: Operationalization of variables

Objectives	Type of variable	Indicators	Measurement scale	Method of data collection	Instrument/ collection tools	Data Analysis technique
To determine the influence of project planning on the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya	1. Project planning Independent variable	Planning meetings	Ordinal	Conducting interviews, Questionnaires, and Focus Group Discussion	Interview guide, Questionnaires, and Focus Group Discussion guide	Mean, Standard Deviation, Spearman Correlation Coefficient, Regression analysis
	2. Implementation of wildlife conservation projects Dependent variable	Incorporation of community ideas	Ordinal			
		Project scope defined	Ordinal			
To assess the influence of community capacity building on the implementation of wildlife conservation	1. Community capacity building Independent variable	Adequate Project trainings	Ordinal	Conducting interviews, Questionnaires, and Focus Group Discussion	Interview guide, Questionnaires, and Focus Group Discussion guide	Mean, Standard Deviation, Spearman Correlation Coefficient, Regression analysis
	2. Implementation of wildlife	Adequate Human-Wildlife Conflict	Ordinal			

projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya	conservation projects Dependent variable	workshops/forums Adequate community education on conservation issues Adequate Exposure visits/bus trips	Ordinal Ordinal			
To determine how communication influences the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya	1. Communication Independent Variable 2. Implementation of wildlife conservation projects Dependent variable	Clear communication structure Adequate communication strategies Sharing of information Community grievances/	Ordinal Ordinal Ordinal	Conducting interviews, Questionnaires , and Focus Group Discussion	Interview guide, Questionnaires, and Focus Group Discussion guide	Mean, Standard Deviation, Spearman Correlation Coefficient, Regression analysis

		Feedback mechanism				
To assess how project monitoring and evaluation influences the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya	1. Project monitoring and evaluation Independent variable 2. Implementation of wildlife conservation projects Dependent variable	Involvement of stakeholders in M&E Frequency of M&E Simplicity of M&E tools Sharing of evaluation findings	Ordinal Ordinal Ordinal	Conducting interviews, Questionnaires, and Focus Group Discussion	Interview guide, Questionnaires, and Focus Group Discussion guide	Mean, Standard Deviation, Spearman Correlation Coefficient, Regression analysis

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION, AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This study aimed at investigating project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project M&E on implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy. Findings are presented in this chapter.

4.2 Response Rate

105 People participated in the study. 90 of 105 People responded to the questionnaires, 10 People participated in the Focus Group Discussion, and 5 People were interviewed. 90 out of 93 responded to the questionnaires. This represent 97% response rate. In a survey, response rate above 70% is sufficient (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2012).

Table 4.1: Questionnaire Response Rate

Status	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Responded	90	97.0
Not responded	3	3.0
Total	93	100.0

Thus, 90 (97%) questionnaire response rate shows that all the respondents were satisfactorily involved.

4.3 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Data on gender, age, education level of respondents, duration that respondents have been members of Kamungi Conservancy, and duration of respondents' involvement in Kamungi Conservancy Projects will be presented below.

4.3.1 Gender of the Respondents

Table 4.2: Gender of the Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	60	57.14
Female	45	42.86
Total	105	100.00

Table 4.2 above shows male were 60 respondents (57.14%) of 105 and 45 respondents (42.86%) female. This indicates that the study was gender inclusive as both genders were involved, and hence a representative information was collected.

4.3.2 Age of the Respondents

Table 4.3: Age of the Respondents

Age of the Respondents	Frequency	Percentage (%)
18-25	8	7.62
26-35	27	25.71
36-45	25	23.81
46-55	24	22.86
56 and above	21	20.00
Total	105	100.00

Table 4.3 above shows most of 105 respondents, 27 (25.71%) were 26-35 years. 25 respondents (23.81%) were 36-45 years. 24 respondents (22.86%) were 46-55 years. 21 (20.00%) were 56 years and above. Finally, 8 respondents (7.62%) were 18-25 years. Most Kamungi Conservancy members are 26 years and above. At this age, majority of the people have married, started a family, and either allocated a piece of land by their parents or purchased. A piece of

land is a key requirement for one to become a member of Kamungi Conservancy. Also, the government officials and project management team interviewed were above 26 years.

4.3.3 Level of Education of the Respondents

Table 4.4: Levels of Education of the Respondents

Levels of Education	Frequency	Percentage (%)
No formal Education	19	18.10
KCPE Certificate	63	60.00
KCSE Certificate	15	14.29
Diploma	4	3.81
Degree	4	3.81
Total	105	100.00

Table 4.4 above shows most of 105 respondents, 63 (60.00%) had KCPE certificate, 19 respondents (18.10%) had no formal education, 15 respondents (14.29%) had KCSE certificate, 4 respondents (3.81%) had a Diploma, and 4 respondents (3.81%) had a degree. This means that a larger percentage had no basic education. This is because Kamungi Conservancy is located within a semi-arid area and most households are low income and marginalized thus cannot afford secondary education.

4.3.4 Duration that Respondents have been members of Kamungi Conservancy

This section will be presenting data on duration that respondents have been members of Kamungi Conservancy.

Table 4.5: Duration that Respondents have been members of Kamungi Conservancy

Duration	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 1 Year	8	8.00
Between 1 to 3 Years	17	17.00
Over 3 Years	75	75.00
Total	100	100.00

Table 4.5 above shows majority of the 100 respondents, 75 (75.00%) have been members of Kamungi Conservancy for over 3 years. 17 respondents (17.00%) have been members between 1-3 years while 8 respondents (8.00%) have been members for less than 1 year. This means that most of the respondents have been members of Kamungi for more than 3 years which is sufficient time to have good understanding and knowledge of project management practices and implementation of wildlife conservation projects.

4.3.5 Duration of Respondents Involvement in Kamungi Conservancy Projects

This section will be presenting data on duration that respondents that were interviewed had been involved in Kamungi Conservancy projects.

Table 4.6: Duration of Respondents Involvement in Kamungi Conservancy Projects

Duration	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 1 Year	0	0
Between 1 to 3 Years	3	60.00
Over 3 Years	2	40.00
Total	5	100.00

Table 4.6 above shows duration of involvement in Kamungi Conservancy projects by project management team and governmental officials that were interviewed. Majority of 5 respondents,

3 (60.00%) have been involved in Kamungi Conservancy projects between 1 to 3 years and 2 respondents (40.00%) for over 3 years. This shows that all the respondents had sufficient knowledge and understanding on variables studied.

4.4 Project Management Practices and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

The five scale Likert scale questionnaire was used. Whereby 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly agree.

4.4.1 Project Planning and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

Table 4.7: Descriptive statistics for Project Planning Influence

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Kamungi Conservancy members are actively involved in project planning meetings	3.62	1.137
Ideas and contribution of Kamungi Conservancy members are incorporated in the design of wildlife conservation projects	3.53	1.062
Implementation steps for wildlife conservation projects are made clear during project planning meetings	3.43	1.071
Project tasks are divided amongst project implementers, Kamungi Conservancy members, partners, and stakeholders during project planning meetings	4.04	0.886
Composite Mean and Std. Deviation	3.66	1.039

According to the data presented in table 4.7 above, descriptive statistics shows a composite mean of 3.66; implying respondents agreed on the four statements under project planning. This means that on average, the studied wildlife conservation projects adhered to the stated four project planning practices. Composite standard deviation = 1.039, implying respondents had almost similar views on the provided four statements under project planning.

Respondents agreed that Kamungi Conservancy members are actively involved in project planning meetings (M=3.62), Ideas and contribution of Kamungi Conservancy members are

incorporated in the design of wildlife conservation projects (M=3.53), and Project tasks are divided amongst project implementers, Kamungi Conservancy members, partners, and stakeholders during project planning meetings (M=4.04). Respondents were neutral that Implementation steps for wildlife conservation projects are made clear during project planning meetings (M=3.43).

This findings concurs with Avedi et al. (2020) study that observed that energy projects implementation in Kenya’s underserved Counties was significantly influenced by project planning and Bosibori & Otieno (2021) study showed that Project Planning Process had a significant positive change of 47%.

Hypothesis was tested by use of Spearman’s correlation coefficient.

H0: Project planning does not significantly influence wildlife conservation projects implemented by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

Table 4.8: Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient test Project Planning and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

			Correlations	
			Project Planning	Implementati on of wildlife conservation projects
Spearman's rho	Project Planning	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.440**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	90	90
	Implementation of wildlife conservation projects	Correlation Coefficient	.440**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	90	90

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.8 above shows that the Spearman’s Rho value is .440, and significant at 0.01 level. Findings showed significant and a strong positive relationship between project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy in Makueni County, Kenya (r = .440, N = 90). The p = 0.000 is less than the alpha = 0.05. Therefore, the

null hypothesis is rejected. This means that project planning was associated with implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy.

Findings from Focus Group Discussion revealed that Kamungi Conservancy members are moderately involved in project planning meetings through the Conservancy Board meetings and members general meetings. However, their ideas and contribution are not always incorporated in the design of wildlife conservation projects. The implementation steps sometimes are not always made clear during project planning meetings. One respondent said, *“sometimes we leave the planning meetings without knowing the next steps”*. Project tasks are divided during project planning meetings. One respondent said, *“during project planning meetings, we are told the organization that is funding the project, stakeholders involved, and the role of Kamungi Conservancy members in that project. We normally support with labour and taking care of the project”*.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether Kamungi Conservancy members are actively involved in meetings for project planning. The study noted that Kamungi Conservancy members are involved in planning meetings either through their representatives or selected community members. During planning meetings ideas and contribution of Kamungi Conservancy members are not always incorporated in the design of wildlife conservation projects. This was attributed to sustainability aspects and budget implications.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether implementation steps for wildlife conservation projects are made clear during project planning meetings. From the responses, implementation steps are defined as much as possible. However, there have been planning meetings where it was difficult to define implementation steps exhaustively due to high community expectations.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether project tasks are well defined and divided amongst project implementers, partners, and stakeholders during project planning meetings.

From the responses, project tasks are explained and assign to each party involved during the project planning meetings.

4.4.2 Community Capacity Building and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

Table 4.9: Descriptive Statistics for Community Capacity Building Influence

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Adequate project trainings are received	3.44	1.273
Adequate Human-Wildlife Conflict workshops/forums are received	3.43	1.112
Adequate community education and sensitization on conservation issues is received	3.77	1.082
Adequate wildlife exposure visits/Bus trips to National Parks or developed conservancies is received	3.32	1.235
Composite Mean and Std. Deviation	3.49	1.176

Table 4.9 above showed a composite mean of 3.49; implying the respondents agreed on the four statements under community capacity building. This means that on average, the studied wildlife conservation projects practiced community capacity building to a moderate extent. Composite standard deviation = 1.176, implying respondents had almost similar views on the stated four statements under community capacity building.

The respondents agreed that adequate community education and sensitization on conservation issues is received (M=3.77). However, respondents were neutral that adequate project trainings are received (M=3.44), adequate Human-Wildlife Conflict workshops/forums are received (M=3.43), and adequate wildlife exposure visits/Bus trips to National Parks or developed conservancies is received (M=3.32).

This findings concur with Ndonye et al. (2021) study that established that building the capacity of project beneficiaries significantly impacted community-based conservation projects performance.

The researcher used Spearman’s correlation coefficient to test hypothesis

H0: Community capacity building does not significantly influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

Table 4.10: Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient Test Community Capacity Building and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

			Correlations	
			Community Capacity Building	Implementati on of wildlife conservation projects
Spearman's rho	Community Capacity Building	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.316**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.002
		N	90	90
	Implementation of wildlife conservation projects	Correlation Coefficient	.316**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.
		N	90	90

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.10 above shows the Spearman’s Rho value = 0.316. Significant at 0.01 level. The findings showed a significant and moderate positive relationship between community capacity building and implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy in Makueni County, Kenya ($r = .316$, $N = 90$). Since the $p = 0.002$ is less than the $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows that community capacity building was associated with implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy.

Findings from Focus Group Discussion revealed that project trainings conducted are not sufficient as they are few and only selected people are trained. One respondent said, “*majority of Kamungi Conservancy members lack basic education, so project trainings should be intensified and supported with learning materials such as brochures and booklets translated*

in local language’. Another respondent added *“skilled Kamungi Conservancy members should be identified and given further trainings to enable them to conduct project trainings to Kamungi Conservancy members in local language”*. Since Human-Wildlife Conflict is a major issue, more workshops are still required. One respondent said *“selected few have been involved in Human-Wildlife Conflict forums. The few to convince many who are not involved is a major task.”* Kamungi Conservancy members have been educated and sensitized on conservation issues through community meetings, and household visits. There is need to use more strategies such as involving schools, videos, conservation competitions, peer to peer learning etc. The exposure visits/bus trips received are not sufficient. Exposure visits to a developed conservancy with a similar set up for example Lewa Wildlife Conservancy are preferred over those to Tsavo West National Park.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether wildlife conservation projects incorporate aspects of project training. From the responses, not all projects have had adequate project trainings. This was attributed to the nature of projects and financial constraints. The interviewees were asked to indicate whether adequate Human-Wildlife Conflict forums are conducted. From the responses, Human-Wildlife Conflict being of the greatest challenges due to proximity to Tsavo West National Park, more Human-Wildlife Conflict sensitization forums and workshops are required on regular basis. Unlike currently when they are mainly done on quarterly basis.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether adequate community education on conservation issues is conducted. From the responses, the conservation education conducted is not well structured and much more need to be done. There is no curriculum and learning materials to make the program effective and efficient. Conservation education is not regularly conducted but rather community meetings and household level visits are used to create awareness on community-based conservation.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether adequate wildlife exposure visits are conducted. From the responses, limited wildlife exposure visits are conducted. There have been one exposure visit to Lewa Wildlife Conservancy, one visit to Elephants and Bees Project, one visit to Nurisha Gaia Project and two visits to Tsavo West National Park. The few wildlife exposure visits were attributed to lack of budget to support the exposure activities.

4.4.3 Communication and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

Table 4.11: Descriptive Statistics for Communication Influence

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
There is a clear communication structure between Tsavo Trust/ZSL and Kamungi Conservancy members	3.39	1.158
The communication strategies used by Tsavo Trust/ZSL are adequate	3.30	1.136
Information about wildlife conservation projects is frequently received	3.80	0.767
Community grievances/concerns and feedback on wildlife conservation projects are acted upon	3.46	0.950
Composite Mean and Std. Deviation	3.49	1.003

Table 4.11 above shows a composite mean of 3.49; implying the respondents agreed on the four statements under communication. This means that on average, the studied wildlife conservation projects practiced communication to a moderate extent. Composite standard deviation = 1.003, implying respondents had almost similar views on the four statements under communication.

Respondents agreed that information about wildlife conservation projects is frequently received (M=3.80) and Community grievances/concerns and feedback on wildlife conservation projects are acted upon (M=3.46). However, respondents were neutral that there is a clear communication structure between Tsavo Trust/Zoological Society of London and Kamungi

Conservancy members (M=3.39), the communication strategies used by Tsavo Trust/ZSL are adequate (M=3.30).

These findings concur with Sharon (2019) study that showed that project meetings influences performance of constituency development fund sponsored classroom projects.

Spearman’s correlation coefficient was used to test hypothesis.

H0: Communication does not significantly influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

Table 4.12: Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient test Communication and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

			Communication	Implementation of wildlife conservation projects
Spearman's rho	Communication	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.378**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	90	90
	Implementation of wildlife conservation projects	Correlation Coefficient	.378**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	90	90

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.12 above shows Spearman’s Rho value = 0.378 and that significant level = 0.01. The findings shows a significant and moderate positive relationship between communication and implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy in Makueni County, Kenya (r = .378, N = 90). Since p = 0.000 is less than alpha = 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. This shows communication was associated with implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy.

Findings from Focus Group Discussion revealed that information takes long to reach Kamungi Conservancy members due to limited communication structure. The communication strategies used are community meetings, word of mouth, and WhatsApp. During community meetings,

Kamungi Conservancy members are updated on wildlife conservation projects. Community grievances/concerns and feedback on wildlife conservation projects are not always acted upon. One respondent said, *“I once raised concern about a project training, but nothing was done”*. The interviewees were asked to indicate whether regular and adequate information regarding the implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy is shared. From the responses, the information is mainly shared through community meetings, and stakeholders’ meetings. There was a general feeling that the communication channel should be broadened, and more communication strategies used to reach more people. The interviewees were asked to indicate how community concerns/grievances/feedback captured and addressed. From the responses, there is no clear framework to record community concerns/grievances/feedback and follow up mechanism. The case-by-case basis is used.

4.4.4 Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

Table 4.13: Descriptive Statistics for Project Monitoring and Evaluation Influence

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Kamungi Conservancy members are actively involved in M&E of wildlife conservation projects	3.62	1.045
M&E of wildlife conservation projects is regularly conducted	3.56	1.040
The tools used in M&E of wildlife conservation projects are simple to understand	3.59	1.111
Evaluation findings of wildlife conservation projects are regularly shared with Kamungi Conservancy members	3.33	1.142
Composite Mean and Std. Deviation	3.53	1.085

According to the data presented in table 4.13 above, the descriptive statistics showed a composite mean = 3.53; implying the respondents agreed on four statements under project monitoring and evaluation. This means that on average, the studied wildlife conservation

projects practiced project monitoring and evaluation. Composite standard deviation = 1.085, implying respondents had almost similar views on the provided four statements under project monitoring and evaluation.

The respondents agreed that Kamungi Conservancy members are actively involved in M&E of wildlife conservation projects (M=3.62), M&E of wildlife conservation projects is regularly conducted (M=3.56), and the tools used in M&E of wildlife conservation projects are simple to understand (M=3.59). However, respondents were neutral on evaluation findings of wildlife conservation projects are regularly shared with Kamungi Conservancy members (M=3.33).

In support of this findings, Cheruiyot et al. (2021) study established that the effective and efficient execution of forest conservation programs was influenced by the involvement of stakeholders in evaluating forest conservation activities. Bosibori & Otieno (2021) showed that Monitoring and Evaluation had a significant positive change of 63%.

Spearman’s correlation coefficient was used to test hypothesis

H0: Project monitoring and evaluation does not significantly influence wildlife conservation projects implemented by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

Table 4.14: Spearman’s Correlation Coefficient test Project monitoring and evaluation and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

			Correlations	
			Project Monitoring and Evaluation	Implementati on of wildlife conservation projects
Spearman's rho	Project Monitoring and Evaluation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.350**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.001
		N	90	90
	Implementation of wildlife conservation projects	Correlation Coefficient	.350**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.
		N	90	90

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.14 above shows Spearman's Rho value = 0.350, and its significant at 0.01 level. The findings showed significant and moderate positive relationship between project M&E and implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy in Makueni County, Kenya ($r = .350$, $N = 90$). Since $p = 0.001$ is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that project M&E was associated with implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy.

Focus Group Discussion revealed that Kamungi Conservancy members participate in project M&E. One respondent said, "*we are involved in project monitoring and evaluation through socio-economic surveys and routine monitoring*". Monitoring and evaluation should be conducted regularly, and the tools made easier to understand. Evaluation findings are not always shared with Kamungi Conservancy members.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether Kamungi Conservancy members are involved in project M&E of wildlife conservation projects. From responses, Conservancy members were involved in evaluation through socio-economic surveys, interviews, and Focus Group Discussion. The beneficiaries are also involved during project monitoring.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether Monitoring and Evaluation of wildlife conservation projects conducted regularly. From the responses, there was regular monitoring and evaluation activities. However, challenges with resources constraints were identified as an obstacle to effective M&E.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether Monitoring and Evaluation reports for wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy is shared with stakeholders. From the responses, the reports are not always shared.

4.4.5 Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

Table 4.15: Descriptive Statistics for Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation
Wildlife conservation projects are completed within planned time	4.00	1.039
Wildlife conservation projects are of high quality	4.27	0.700
Wildlife conservation projects improves the wellbeing of Kamungi Conservancy members	3.97	0.854
Wildlife conservation projects improves perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife conservation	3.97	0.800
Monitoring and evaluation keep wildlife conservation projects within the budgets	3.68	0.846
Composite Mean and Std. Deviation	3.98	0.848

According to the data presented in table 4.15 above, the descriptive statistics showed a composite mean = 3.98; implying respondents agreed on five statements under implementation of wildlife conservation projects. This means on average; the studied wildlife conservation projects were being implemented properly. The composite standard deviation is less than 1; implying that respondents had same views on the provided statements under implementation of wildlife conservation projects.

The respondents agreed that wildlife conservation projects are completed within planned time or earlier (M=4.00), wildlife conservation projects are of high quality (M=4.27), wildlife conservation projects improves the wellbeing of Kamungi Conservancy members (M=3.97), wildlife conservation projects improves perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife conservation (M=3.97), and Monitoring and evaluation keep wildlife conservation projects within the budgets (M=3.68).

Focus Group Discussion revealed that projects are normally completed within planned time, projects are of high quality, wildlife conservation projects have improved the wellbeing of

Kamungi Conservancy members has improved, wildlife conservation projects have improved perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife conservation, and project monitoring and evaluation keeps the projects within budget. One respondent said *“Before establishment of Kamungi Conservancy, life was very difficult. But now it is better due to interventions such as water project, elephant exclusion fence, 10% Fence Plan (mitigation measure against Human-Elephant Conflict), Ngiluni Dispensary Infrastructural upgrade, school support, employment opportunities, among others”*. Another respondent added *“Before we started Kamungi Conservancy, community members used to kill wildlife for bushmeat. But nowadays community members live in harmony with wildlife on their pieces of land. Some of the community members are employed as Conservancy Rangers, and community members give information on illegal wildlife activities”*.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether wildlife conservation projects are completed within planned time. From the responses, the study noted that organizations used Gantt Chart and Google Calendars to ensure projects are completed within planned time.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether wildlife conservation projects are of high quality. From the responses, the study noted that though the organizations do not have total quality management, there were checks and balances that ensured quality projects. Checks and balances used are active involvement of government, involvement of stakeholders, outsourcing in cases where there is limited expertise, regular monitoring during implementation, among others.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether wildlife conservation projects improves the wellbeing of Kamungi Conservancy members. From the responses, the study noted that the projects are normally targeted based on the needs assessment. Due to the interventions on the most pressing issues such water scarcity, Human-Wildlife Conflict, food insecurity, high poverty levels, drought, etc. Findings from project specific socio-economic surveys and social

assessment of protected and conserved areas showed that the wellbeing of Kamungi Conservancy members has improved.

The interviewees were asked to indicate whether wildlife conservation projects improves perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife conservation. From the responses, the study noted that interaction with Kamungi Conservancy members has shown that they acknowledge the fact that wildlife conservation projects are because of their coexistence with wildlife. Cases of retaliatory wildlife killings and poaching are very rare. In case of any illegal wildlife activities, some community members share useful information with Kenya Wildlife Service and conservation organizations.

The interviewees were asked whether monitoring and evaluation keep wildlife conservation projects within the budgets. From the responses, the study noted that monitoring helps to ensure that the projects are implemented within planned budget. Monitoring ensures projects are completed within planned time or earlier and this helps to avoid cost overruns. Findings from monitoring and evaluation activities inform decision making leading to adjustments that support implementation of wildlife conservation projects within the budgets.

4.4.6 Regression Analysis

Table 4.16: Model summary of regression analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			Sig. F Change
						F Change	df1	df2	
1	.615 ^a	.378	.349	.46837	.378	12.923	4	85	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Project Monitoring and Evaluation, Project Planning, Communication, Community Capacity Building

b. Dependent Variable: Implementation of wildlife conservation projects

Table 4.16 above shows R Square = 0.378. This means that 37.8% implementation of wildlife conservation projects are because of project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project monitoring and evaluation when holding other factors constant.

Project management practices not studied account for 62.2% of the implementation of wildlife conservation projects.

Table 4.17: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.340	4	2.835	12.923	.000 ^b
	Residual	18.647	85	.219		
	Total	29.986	89			

Table 4.17 above shows significance value = 0.000 is less than 0.05 and therefore the model is significant in predicting how project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project M&E influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects. F = 12.923, P = 0.000.

Table 4.18: Regression coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Correlations		
		B	Std. Error				Zero-order	Partial	Part
1	(Constant)	2.323	.243		9.546	.000			
	Project Planning	.233	.091	.321	2.567	.012	.562	.268	.220
	Community Capacity Building	.041	.081	.068	.506	.614	.488	.055	.043
	Communication	.069	.092	.093	.747	.457	.488	.081	.064
	Project Monitoring and Evaluation	.141	.084	.226	1.676	.097	.527	.179	.143

Table 4.18 above shows regression coefficients. The regression model equation is shown below:

$$Y = 2.323 + 0.233(X1) + 0.041(X2) + 0.069(X3) + 0.141(X4).$$

From regression, all the four project management practices influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Increasing project planning by a unit will improve implementation of wildlife conservation projects by 0.233 while a unit increase in community capacity building would improve implementation of wildlife conservation projects by 0.041. Communication would improve implementation by 0.069 and lastly project M&E improves implementation by 0.141.

23.3%, 14.1%, 6.9%, and 4.1% of variations in execution of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy was because of Project planning, Project monitoring and evaluation, communication, and community capacity building respectively.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of Findings

This section provides a summary of findings for each objective under the study.

5.1.1 Project Planning and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

The first objective was to determine the influence of project planning on the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya. The mean = 3.66 and a standard deviation = 1.039. Spearman's Correlation Coefficient was used to test hypothesis. The null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant and strong positive relationship between project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. From multiple regression, 23.3% of variations in execution of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy was because of project planning.

5.1.2 Community Capacity Building and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

Second objective was to assess influence of community capacity building on implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya. Mean = 3.49 and a standard deviation = 1.176. Hypothesis was tested by Spearman's Correlation Coefficient. The null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant and moderate positive relationship between community capacity building and execution of wildlife conservation projects. From multiple regression, 4.1% of the variations in execution of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy was because of community capacity building.

5.2.3 Communication and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

The third objective was to determine how communication influences the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

Mean = 3.49 and standard deviation = 1.003. Spearman's Correlation Coefficient was used to test hypothesis. The null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant and positive relationship between communication and execution of wildlife conservation projects. From multiple regression, 6.9% of the variations in execution of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy was because of communication.

5.2.4 Project Monitoring and Evaluation and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects

Fourth objective was to assess how project M&E influences the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

Mean = 3.53 and a standard deviation = 1.085. Spearman's Correlation was used to test hypothesis. The null hypothesis was rejected. There was significant and moderate positive relationship between project M&E and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. From multiple regression, 14.1% of the variations in execution of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy was because of project M&E.

5.3 Conclusion of the Study

The study investigated influence of project planning on implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya. To this objective it concludes there was a significant and a strong positive relationship between project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy in Makueni County, Kenya. Project planning is vital in implementation of wildlife conservation projects is concerned. Project owners must ensure active involvement of Kamungi conservancy members, partners, and stakeholders in planning of wildlife conservation projects.

The study assessed influence of community capacity building on implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya. To this objective the study concludes there was a significant and a moderate positive relationship between

community capacity building and execution of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy in Makueni County, Kenya. Community capacity building plays a crucial role as far implementation of wildlife conservation projects is concerned. Project owners should build the capacity of project beneficiaries through project trainings, Human-Wildlife Conflict forums, community education on conservation issues, and wildlife exposure visits.

The study determined how communication influences implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya. There was a significant and a moderate positive relationship between communication and execution of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy in Makueni County, Kenya. Communication is crucial in wildlife conservation projects. Project owners should ensure regular and clear communication structure with project beneficiaries, partners, and stakeholders. Additionally, they should put in place a clear framework to record and address concerns, grievances, and feedback.

The study assessed how project M&E influences implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya. There was a significant and a moderate positive relationship between project M&E and execution of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy in Makueni County, Kenya. Project M&E plays a crucial role as far implementation of wildlife conservation projects is concerned. Project owners should ensure effective and efficient project monitoring and evaluation by active involvement of project beneficiaries, conducting regular monitoring and evaluation, using monitoring and evaluation tools that are simple to understand, and sharing evaluation findings with project beneficiaries.

All the above project management practices promote successful implementation of wildlife conservation projects within planned time, within budget, high quality projects, improved wellbeing, and improved perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife conservation.

5.4 Recommendations of the Study

Recommendations include:

- i. The project owners of wildlife conservation projects should actively involve project beneficiaries, partners, and stakeholders in project planning.
- ii. The project owners of wildlife conservation projects should incorporate community capacity building aspects in the project plans. Key aspects are project trainings, Human-Wildlife Conflict forums, community education on conservation issues, and wildlife exposure visits to similar set up such as developed conservancies.
- iii. The project owners of wildlife conservation projects should put in place a clear communication structure and adequate communication strategies with project beneficiaries, partners, and stakeholders. Additionally, there should be a framework to record and address community concerns, grievances, and feedback.
- iv. The project owners of wildlife conservation projects should put in place effective and efficient project monitoring and evaluation system that promote active involvement of project beneficiaries in project M&E, regular project M&E, use of M&E tools that are simple to understand and sharing of evaluation findings.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies

This study suggests further research on other projects apart from wildlife conservation projects. Other studies are also recommended to cover other project management practices such as project design, project risk management, among others.

REFERENCES

- Avedi, E. K., Mulwa, D. A. S., & Kyalo, P. D. N. (2020). Influence of Project Fund Mobilization Strategy on Implementation of Energy Access Projects in Underserved Counties in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 11(4), 335–350. <https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss.v11n4a4>
- Awuor, A. E., & Daniel, W. (2020). *Influence of Project Resource Planning on Performance of Elephant Conservation at TSAVO National Park , Kenya*. 4(2), 273–281.
- Binitah Bosibori, O., & Otieno, M. (2021). Influence of Project Management Practices on The Implementation of Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations' Projects: A Case of World-Wide Fund for Nature- Kenya, Kwale County. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management*, 6(1), 24–48. <https://doi.org/10.47941/jepm.543>
- Cheruiyot, J. K., Omutoko, L. O., & Rambo, C. M. (2021). Determining the Influence of Participatory Evaluation on Conservation of Mau Forest Programme in Bomet County, Kenya. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 14(3), 78. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v14n3p78>
- Chevallier, R., & Harvey, R. (2017). Is community-based natural resource management in Botswana viable? *Botswana Documents*, April, 12. https://library.wur.nl/ojs/index.php/Botswana_documents/article/view/16074
- Chirenje, L. I., Giliba, R. A., & Musamba, E. B. (2013). Local communities' participation in decision-making processes through planning and budgeting in african countries. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*, 11(1), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10042857.2013.777198>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). Mapping the field of mixed methods research. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 3(2), 95-108.
- Despot Belmonte, K., & Bieberstein, K. (2016). Introduction. In *Protected Planet Report 2016.How Protected Areas contribute to achieving Global Targets for Biodiversity*. [https://wdpa.s3.amazonaws.com/Protected_Planet_Reports/2445 Global Protected Planet 2016_WEB.pdf](https://wdpa.s3.amazonaws.com/Protected_Planet_Reports/2445%20Global%20Protected%20Planet%202016_WEB.pdf)
- Gumbe, S. A. (2016). *Influence of Stakeholders Involvement on Implementation of Projects in the Aviation Industry: a Case of Kenya Airways a Research Project Report Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Award of the Degree Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management of the University of Nairobi*.
- Ipara, H., Kimanzi, J., & Odwori, P. (n.d.). *Strategies for promoting community participation in wildlife conservation : Examples from the field*. 4(1), 89–99.

Karanja, J. W., & Yusuf, M. (2018). *ROLE OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION ON PERFORMANCE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS PROJECTS IN KIAMBU COUNTY*. 6(1), 649–664.

Kenya Vision 2030

Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association. KWCA. (2022, October 3). Retrieved November 8, 2022, from <https://kwcakenya.com/>

Key challenges facing conservancies in Kenya. KWCA. (2017, December 6). Retrieved November 8, 2022, from <https://kwcakenya.com/conservancies/key-challenges-facing-conservancies-in-kenya/>

Kimario, F. F., Botha, N., Kisingo, A., & Job, H. (2020). Theory and practice of conservancies: Evidence from wildlife management areas in Tanzania. *Erdkunde*, 74(2), 117–141. <https://doi.org/10.3112/erdkunde.2020.02.03>

Kiwango, W. A., Komakech, H. C., Tarimo, T. M. C., & Martz, L. (2015). Decentralized environmental governance: A reflection on its role in shaping wildlife management areas in tanzania. *Tropical Conservation Science*, 8(4), 1080–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1177/194008291500800415>

Lee, D. E., & Bond, M. L. (2018). Quantifying the ecological success of a community-based wildlife conservation area in Tanzania. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 99(2), 459–464. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyy014>

Mang'eni, B. K. (2019). *Organizational Factors Influencing Performance Of Contractors In Public Building Projects In Pokot Central Sub-County, Kenya*. <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle/11295/109340>

Muchapondwa, E., & Stage, J. (2015). *Whereto with institutions and governance challenges in African wildlife conservation ? Whereto with institutions and governance challenges in African wildlife conservation ?* <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/10/9/095013>

Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Nairobi: Acts Press

Ndege, A. W. (2017). *FACTORS INFLUENCING PERFORMANCE OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PROJECTS: A CASE OF LION ROVER PROJECT IN MERU NATIONAL PARK , KENYA*. 2(1), 316–334.

Ndonye, H., Mulwa, A., & Kyalo, D. N. (2021). Capacity Building of Project Beneficiaries and Performance of Community Based Conservation Projects: A Case of Laikipia Conservation Region Conservancies. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable*

- Development*, 12(2), 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jesd/12-2-08>
- Nyabera, T. M. (2015). *INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECTS IN KENYA: A CASE OF COMPASSION INTERNATIONAL ASSISTED PROJECTS IN MWINGI SUB-COUNTY*.
- Ocharo, D. R., Charles Rambo, A., & Ojwang, B. (2020). Influence Of Monitoring And Evaluation Frameworks on Performance of Public Agricultural Projects in Galana Kilifi County, Kenya. *European Journal of Physical and Agricultural Sciences*, 8(1), 1–10.
- Odhiambo, A. A. (2020). *COMMUNICATION AS A DRIVER OF PERFORMANCE OF PROJECTS IN KENYAN COMMERCIAL BANKS*. 3(6), 100–112.
- Oduor, A. M. (2020). Livelihood impacts and governance processes of community-based wildlife conservation in Maasai Mara ecosystem, Kenya. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 260, 110133.
- P, Z. (2018). What is Limiting Success of Community-Based Approach to Conservation of Natural Resources in Southern Africa? *Journal of Ecology & Natural Resources*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.23880/jenr-16000139>
- Roba, R., & Kikwatha, R. W. (2021). Influence of Women Participation on Sustainability of the Community Conservation Project Implemented by Jaldesa Community Conservancy in Marsabit County, Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 6(3), 188–194. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.3.898>
- Rumenya, H., & Kisimbi, D. J. M. (2020). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems on Performance of Projects in Non-Governmental Organizations: A Case of Education Projects in Mombasa County, Kenya. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management*, 5(2), 46–66. <https://doi.org/10.47941/jepm.494>
- Social Assessment for Conserved and Protected Area study on Tsavo Trust 2021 Report
- Sharon, J. (2019). *Influence of Project Meetings on Implementation Performance of Constituencies Development Fund Sponsored Classroom Projects . a Case of Aldai Constituency Financial Fy Year 2017 / 18*.
- Shereni, N. C., & Saarinen, J. (2021). Community perceptions on the benefits and challenges of community-based natural resources management in Zimbabwe. *Development Southern Africa*, 38(6), 879–895. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835X.2020.1796599>
- Submitted, R., Partial, I. N., Of, F., Requirement, T. H. E., The, F. O. R., Of, A., Of, D., Of, M., In, A., & Planning, P. (2016). *FACTORS INFLUENCING IMPLEMENTATION OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PROJECTS : THE CASE OF WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE IN NAIROBI , KENYA BY*.

- Tereso, A., Ribeiro, P., Fernandes, G., Loureiro, I., & Ferreira, M. (2019). *Project Management Practices in Private Organizations*. 50(1), 6–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/8756972818810966>
- The Republic of Kenya. (2017). *The Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Policy Draft April 2017. April*.
- Us, A., & PMI, L. What is Project Management? Retrieved 26 February 2022, from <https://www.pmi.org/about/learn-about-pmi/what-is-project-management>
- Waithaka, J. (2012, January). Historical factors that shaped wildlife conservation in Kenya. In *The George Wright Forum* (Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 21-29). George Wright Society.
- Wanjiru, N. B., Kyalo, D. N., Mulwa, A. S., & Mbugua, J. (2020). Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of livelihood ventures: Focus; Nairobi youths conservation projects, Kenya. *European Scientific Journal ESJ*, 16(31), 300–318.
<https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p300>
- Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1: Introduction and Consent

I'm **Peter Mophat Ojiambo**. A student at the University of Nairobi. I am conducting a study as a requirement for the Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management. The survey is designed to gather data about project planning, community capacity building, communication, and project monitoring & evaluation and implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy. This survey is voluntary and will take approximately 45 minutes. The data provided will be confidential and only used for academics. You are encouraged to answer the questions as honestly as possible.

Do you give your consent to be part of this survey?

Yes [] No []

GPS Coordinates of the household

.....

Section 2: General information of the respondent

What is the name of your Village?

Ngiluni [] Kamunyu []

How old are you?

18 - 25 years () 26 – 35 years () 36 – 45 years () 46 – 55 years () Over 56 years ()

What is your gender?

Male () Female ()

What is the highest level of education obtained?

None () KCPE () KCSE () Certificate () Diploma () University ()

How long have you been a member of Kamungi Conservancy?

Less than 1 year () 1-3 years () Over 3 years ()

The following are several statements on project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Kindly indicate your extent of agreement or disagreement for each statement based on a Likert scale of 1-5. where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Section 3: Project Management Practices

Part 1: Project planning and implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy

Statements of project planning elements	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Kamungi conservancy members are actively involved in project planning meetings					
Ideas and contribution of Kamungi Conservancy members are incorporated in the design of wildlife conservation projects					
Implementation steps for wildlife conservation projects are made clear during project planning meetings					
Project tasks are divided amongst project implementers, Kamungi Conservancy members, partners, and stakeholders during project planning meetings					

Part 2: Community capacity building and implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy

The following are several statements on community capacity building and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Kindly indicate your extent of agreement or disagreement for each statement based on a Likert scale of 1-5. where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Statements of community capacity building elements	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Adequate project trainings are received					

Adequate Human-Wildlife Conflict workshops/forums are received					
Adequate community education and sensitization on conservation issues is received					
Adequate wildlife exposure visits/Bus trips to National Parks or developed conservancies is received					

Part 3: Communication and implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy

The following are several statements on communication and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Kindly indicate your extent of agreement or disagreement for each statement based on a Likert scale of 1-5. where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Statements of communication elements	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
There is a clear communication structure between Tsavo Trust/ZSL and Kamungi Conservancy members					
The communication strategies used by Tsavo Trust/ZSL are adequate					
Information about wildlife conservation projects is frequently received					
Community grievances/concerns and feedback on wildlife conservation projects are acted upon					

Section 4: Project monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy

The following are several statements on project monitoring and evaluation and implementation of wildlife conservation projects. Kindly indicate your extent of agreement or disagreement for

each statement based on a Likert scale of 1-5. where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Statements of project monitoring and evaluation	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Kamungi Conservancy members are actively involved in monitoring and evaluation of wildlife conservation projects					
Monitoring and evaluation of wildlife conservation projects is regularly conducted					
The tools used in monitoring and evaluation of wildlife conservation projects are simple to understand					
Evaluation findings of wildlife conservation projects are regularly shared with Kamungi Conservancy members					

Section 7: Implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements of implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy

Statements of implementation of wildlife conservation projects elements	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
Wildlife conservation projects are completed within planned time or earlier					
Wildlife conservation projects are of high quality					

Wildlife conservation projects improves the wellbeing of Kamungi Conservancy members					
Wildlife conservation projects improves perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife conservation					
Monitoring and evaluation keep wildlife conservation projects within the budgets					

APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. How long have you been working with KWS/MCG/NG/TT/ZSL in this area?
2. Are wildlife conservation projects completed within planned time?
3. Are wildlife conservation projects of high quality?
4. Does wildlife conservation projects improve wellbeing of Kamungi Conservancy?
5. Does wildlife conservation projects improve perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife?
6. Does monitoring and evaluation keeps wildlife conservation projects within budget?
7. Are Kamungi Conservancy members involved in project planning meetings? Kindly explain.
8. Are ideas and contribution of Kamungi Conservancy members incorporated in project design?
9. Are implementation steps for wildlife conservation projects made clear during project planning meetings?
10. During project planning meetings, are project tasks well defined and divided amongst project implementers, partners, and stakeholders during project planning meetings?
11. Does wildlife conservation projects incorporate aspects of project training? Kindly explain?
12. Do you think adequate Human-Wildlife Conflict forums are conducted?
13. Do you think adequate community education on conservation issues is conducted?
14. Do you think adequate wildlife exposure visits are conducted?
15. Is regular and adequate information regarding the implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy shared? Kindly explain.
16. Which communication strategies are used?
17. How are community concerns/grievances/feedback captured and addressed? Kindly explain
18. Are Kamungi Conservancy members involved in project monitoring and evaluation of wildlife conservation projects?
19. Is Monitoring and Evaluation of wildlife conservation projects conducted regularly?
20. Are the Monitoring and Evaluation reports for wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy shared with stakeholders?
21. Do you have any other information you would wish to share with regards to the topic discussed?

APPENDIX III: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

1. What is your opinion on implementation of wildlife conservation projects in Kamungi Conservancy? (The Researcher to probe discussants on implementation of projects within planned time, within budget, quality outcome, improved wellbeing, and improved perceptions and attitudes towards wildlife).
2. How does project planning influences implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya? (The Researcher to probe discussants on planning meetings, incorporation of community ideas and contribution, project scope defined, and division of tasks).
3. How does community capacity building influence the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya? (The Researcher to probe discussants on Project trainings, Human-Wildlife Conflict workshops/forums, community education on conservation issues, exposure visits/bus trips).
4. How does communication influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya? (The Researcher to probe discussants on clear communication structure, adequate communication strategies, sharing of information, and community grievances/feedback mechanism).
5. How does project monitoring and evaluation influence the implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya? (The Researcher to probe discussants on stakeholders' involvement in M&E, M&E frequency, simplicity of M&E tools, and sharing of evaluation findings)
6. What other project management practices influence implementation of wildlife conservation projects by Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya? (The Researcher to encourage the participants to discuss any other project management practices that affect implementation of wildlife conservation projects that may not have been discussed)

APPENDIX IV: INTRODUCTION LETTER



UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

Telegrams: "Varsity",
Telephone: 020 491 0000
VOIP: 9007/9008
Mobile: 254-724-200311

P.O. Box 30197-00100, G.P.O.
Nairobi, Kenya
Email: fob-graduatestudents@uonbi.ac.ke
Website: business.uonbi.ac.ke

Our Ref: L50/38672/2020

September 7, 2022

National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation
NACOSTI Headquarters
Upper Kabete, Off Waiyaki Way
P. O. Box 30623- 00100
NAIROBI

RE: INTRODUCTION LETTER: PETER MOPHAT OJIAMBO

The above named is a registered Master of Project Planning and Management Student at the Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, University of Nairobi. He is conducting research on "**Project Management Practices and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects, A Case of Kamungi Conservancy, Makeni County Kenya.**"

The purpose of this letter is to kindly request you to assist and facilitate the student with necessary data which forms an integral part of the Project.

The information and data required is needed for academic purposes only and will be treated in **Strict-Confidence**.






Your co-operation will be highly appreciated.



PHILIP MUKOLA (MR.)
FOR: ASSOCIATE DEAN,
FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

PM/mi

APPENDIX V: RESEARCH LICENSE

 <p>REPUBLIC OF KENYA</p>	
Ref No: 426645	Date of Issue: 20/September/2022
RESEARCH LICENSE	
	
This is to Certify that Mr.. Peter Mophat Ojiambo of University of Nairobi, has been licensed to conduct research in Makueni on the topic: Project Management Practices and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects, A Case of Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya for the period ending : 20/September/2023.	
License No: NACOSTI/P/22/20372	
426645	
Applicant Identification Number	Director General NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SCIENCE,TECHNOLOGY & INNOVATION
Verification QR Code	
	
NOTE: This is a computer generated License. To verify the authenticity of this document, Scan the QR Code using QR scanner application.	

APPENDIX VI: KAMUNGI APPROVAL LETTER



Dominic Mutua Muia,
Chairman,
Kamungi Conservancy,
PO Box 208, Mtito Andei, 90128,
Kenya.

21st September 2022

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: APPROVAL LETTER : PETER MOPHAT OJIAMBO

This letter serves to approve **Mr. Peter Mophat Ojiambo** to conduct a research in Kamungi Conservancy on the topic: Project Management Practices and Implementation of Wildlife Conservation Projects, A case of Kamungi Conservancy, Makueni County Kenya.

On behalf of Kamungi Conservancy, I kindly request you to assist and facilitate him with any necessary information and data.

Yours sincerely,

KAMUNGI CONSERVANCY
P. O. Box 208, MTITO ANDEI 90128

Dominic Mutua Muia
Chairman
Kamungi Conservancy

kamungiconservancy.org

APPENDIX XII: MAP

