Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management

Determinants of Sustainable Implementation of Food Programs for Marginalized Communities in Kenya: A Case of Plan International, Kwale County

[1]Bintiali Ali Mwameli, [2]Mr. Johnbosco M Kisimbii & [3]Dr. John Mbugua

ISSN: 2616-8464

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

Determinants of Sustainable Implementation of Food Programs for Marginalized Communities in Kenya: A Case of Plan International, Kwale County

***[1]Bintiali Ali Mwameli, [2]Mr. Johnbosco M Kisimbii & [3]Dr. John Mbugua**

[1*] Postgraduate Student, University of Nairobi

[2]Lecturer, School of Open and Distance Learning, University of Nairobi

[3]Lecturer, School of Open and Distance Learning, University of Nairobi

***E-mail of corresponding author: binsa93@gmail.com**

***How to cite this article*: Mwameli, B., A., Kisimbii, J. M. & Mbugua, J. (2019). Determinants of Sustainable Implementation of Food Programs for Marginalized Communities in Kenya: A Case of Plan International, Kwale County, *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management,* 3(4), 27-40**

Abstract

Program implementation can be achieved by viewing and adopting development strategies and sustainability standards historical successfully implemented at a community level. The main purpose of the study was to examine the Determinants of Sustainable Implementation of Food programs for Marginalized Communities in Kwale County. The study resorted to descriptive research survey design. Target population was 100 employees from 4 departments of Plan International Organization in Kwale County. Questionnaires were used for data collection and reliability was tested using test-retest technique and analyzed using Cronbach's alpha. Validity of the questionnaire was tested by use of content validity as well as experts' opinion. Data was analyzed by descriptive statistics with the aid of the software for social sciences (SPSS) and presented using frequency tables. Hypothesis was tested after each question using Chi-square test and regression analysis was initiated to exhibit the extent of the association among the inconstant. Hypotheses test was done and the results were as follows; $H_0$1: Financial resources don't have significant influence on sustainable programs with Chi-square statistic of 746.741, P-value of 0.000, was rejected and H1 was accepted and concluded that Financial resources had statistically significant influence on sustainable implementation of programs. $H_0$2: Community

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

involvement has no significant influence on sustainable implementation of programs with Chi-square statistic of 707.697, P-value of 0.559 was accepted and H2 rejected and confirmed that

Community involvement had no statistically influence on the sustainable implementation of programs. $H_0$3: Monitoring and evaluation have no significant influence on sustainable programs with Chi-square statistic of 685.558, P-value of 0.000, was rejected and H3 was accepted and confirmed that Monitoring and Evaluation had statistically significant influence on sustainable implementation of programs. $H_0$4: Capacity building has no significant influence on sustainable programs with Chi-square statistic of 880.867, P-value of 0.001, was rejected and H4 was accepted and concluded that Capacity building had statistically significant influence on sustainable implementation of programs. From regression analysis, the findings further showed that all the four determinants have a positive influence on sustainable implementation of food programs in Kenya as per model equation; $Y=1.679 + 0.177 (X_1) + 0.231(X_2) + 0.103(X_3) + 0.245(X_4)$

Key words: *Sustainable implementation, financial resources, community involvement, Monitoring and Evaluation and capacity building.*

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Historically first occurrence linked with matters of sustainability was the depletion of natural resources. Several philosophers were on the concern that natural resources are limited hence could not sustain the expected high growing rate of inhabitants globally. However some thinkers like Taylor, (1993) were on the view that resources should be generally elaborated to include technical know-how because capabilities and competencies keep on increasing as time goes by. The perception of project sustainability has for long been diverse and has gained a lot of significance in different arenas. Locally sustainable community development implemented programs therefore involve the cost-effective development backing from the public which are transparent and through available capabilities and competence to ensure stability in service delivery (Elizabeth, 2006). According to Oriola, (2009), complexity in the analysis on distributing resources to the society, involving them in participation of decision making, funding and handling provision or distribution of services is a major problem regarding to sustainability of community programs. This work thus was intended to query the determinants on sustainable implementation of food programs for marginalized communities.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Hitchcock and Willard, (2009), donor dependence syndrome has led to certain communities over spending funds meant for projects and donor funded programmes. More effort needs to be put in place to sustain the so called donor funded projects/Programmes. World Vision, (2009) revealed that most of projects/programmes donated to communities were unsuccessful in sustaining themselves. Many community projects are abandoned halfway hence unsustainability for lack of community involvement Githinji (2018). This study aimed at analyzing a number of determinants on the sustainable implementation of food programs for marginalized communities in Kwale County.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The investigation's main aim was to examine the determinants of sustainable implementation of food programs for marginalized communities in Kwale County.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study objectives were guided by how the following influence sustainable implementation of food programs for marginalized communities: financial resources, community involvement, monitoring and evaluation and finally capacity building

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Sustainable Implementation of food programs

(Larson et al, 2009) found sustainable programs can be achieved by observing holistically successful sustainability standards. Dunphy et al, (2007) emphasized introduction of policies to guide donor funded programs. The notion of sustainability is therefore very important and should be included in all organizational activities and it also involves each and every staff member in an organization and its stakeholders.

2.2 Financial resources and sustainable implementation of programs

World Bank and OXFAM, (2017) has indicated that sustainability in relation to food refers to the concept of implementing food production programs that ensure the natural resources are used to the maximum to produce food that satisfies the population. Sustainability can be assessed by the level of the flow of benefits the program current and future generations

2.3 Community involvement and sustainable implementation of programs

Wong, (2012) encouraged community accountability that allocates funds transparently to the right place in public and prevents all sorts of fraud and mismanagement of funds. Self-reliance is paramount in program sustainability because it helps reduce overdependence on donors and funds from agencies by the organisation and also improves project ownership and acceptance, Comwall, (2008).

2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation and Sustainable Implementation of programs

Stephen, (2010) found that record keeping of program activities benefited community as it motivated communities to donate and contribute resources willingly in order to achieve sustainable projects. Patton, (2008) stated that stakeholders' involvement is paramount for monitoring and evaluation to be effective. He further argues that participation of stakeholders reflects the community needs and stimulates people's interests in the program implementation.

2.5 Capacity Building and Sustainable Implementation of programs

Oxfam, (2010) recognizes the importance of trained and skilled project team which enhances local ownership and self-reliance hence transformation in leadership. Ochieng and Price, (2010) supports the idea of project team commitment in shearing individual skills to achieve sustainable program objectives.

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

3.1 Research Methodology

The research work applied descriptive survey design which involved measurement, categorization, comparability as well as explaining the statistics on the data gathered from a comparatively huge population in a specific period. Descriptive survey design was therefore chosen since the research questions needed gathering of data by means of questionnaires and also because the research population was relatively huge. Researcher adopted chi-square in determining the hypothesis. In this study, a five (5) point Likert scale was utilized .ranging from

(1) =Strongly Disagree to (5) = Strongly Agree. Participants were requested to give their views on how financial resources influenced sustainable implementation of programs. Statements which displayed high mean showed participants agreed (>3.00) while the statements with a low mean signifies participants disagreement (<3.00). Moreover, Standard Deviation (SD) shows extent at which the dimensions of the data values are spread out from the mean; therefore it's used to measure the spread because it improves interpretation by removing the variance square. The Small SD (<1) denotes, nearly all of the means near center (Mean) thus a good estimator of the population mean. The large SD (1>) shows that the sample mean is a poor estimator of the population mean.

4.0 Analysis and Findings

4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Financial Resources

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviations for Financial Resources

Descriptive Statistics				
		N	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
6a.	The organisation always makes sure there are adequate funds to ensure sustainable implementation programs.	77	4.82	.479
6b.	The organisation encourages community self- financing as a factor which leads cost effectiveness for sustainable implementation of programs	77	3.68	.924
6c.	The organisation in its planning makes sure that there are always a convenient ways of getting funds to run the programs for implementation of a sustainable program	77	4.65	.602
6d.	The organisation ensures there is monthly submission of reports for proper accountability measures of funds measures for implementation of sustainable programs.	77	4.45	.619
6e.	The organisation encourages small percentage contributions from the community to enhance implementation of program sustainability	77	3.03	1.405
Valid N (listwise)		77		
Composite Mean Score and Standard Deviation			**4.126**	**0.8058**

The results from Table 1 shows participants were in agreement that the organization always makes sure there are adequate funds to ensure sustainability of the programs, this statement scored the top mean of 4.82 (SD= 0.479), the SD lower than one indicated closeness of the

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

Measurements to the mean. The statement on organizations encouraging community self-helping as a factor which leads cost effectiveness scored 3.68 (SD = 0.924); which implied existence of variations on the respondent responses. Organizations on their planning ensuring there is always convenient ways of getting funds to run the programs had a mean of 4.65 (SD=0.602), which indicated agreement with the statement by a big number of the participants. The Statement concerning organizations encouraging small percentage contributions from the community gave the lowest mean of 3.03 (SD=1.405), an indication of disagreement from most respondents over the statement and their responses were far from the mean due to SD greater than one. It's therefore evident from these outcomes that participants disagreed with financing of the programs from the community

4.2 Inferential statistic on the Financial Resources

Null and alternative hypotheses were tested on financial resources influence on sustainable implementation of food programs for marginalized communities. The effect of financial resources was proven by Chi-Square test as shown on table 2.

Table 2: Chi square results for Financial Resources on Sustainable Implementation

Chi-Square Tests	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	746.741[a]	546	.000
Likelihood Ratio	285.959	546	1.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.060	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	77		

a. 594 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

The results in Table 2 shows that the value of the Chi-square statistic is 746.741 while the P-value in the asymptotic significance column is 0.000. The result is significant if the value is equal to or less than the designated alpha level of 0.05. In this case the P-value is smaller than the standard value and therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. The large Chi-Square statistic (746.741) alongside its small significance level ($p < .001$) shows unlikelihood these variables are independent of each other thus association exists among financial resources and sustainable implementation of food programs.

4.3 Analysis of the influence of Community Involvement on Sustainable implementation of Food programs.

Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviations for community involvement

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviations for Community Involvement

Descriptive Statistics				
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
7a.	The organisation empowers the community in order to improve efficiency for better yields, better outcomes on programs and greater transparency and accountability on service delivery for sustainable program implementation.	77	4.73	.641
7b.	The organisation through community participation creates awareness among stakeholders hence accountability and a sense of ownership and built trust on projects hence sustainable implementation of programs.	77	4.29	.582
7c.	The organisation makes sure that the community is developed with skills for collective action to ensure sustainable implementation of programs	77	4.34	.771
7d.	The organisation has developed mediums on awareness for community members on project concerns which make them aggressively participate in decision processes for the implementation of sustainable programs	77	4.48	.736
7e.	The organisation develops capacities to transform community development interventions in order to stimulate self-reliance and to reduce outside agencies dependency hence sustainable implementation of programs	77	4.23	.872
Valid N (listwise)		77		
Composite Mean Score and Standard Deviation			4.414	0.7204

The results from Table 3 shows that empowering community had a mean of 4.73 (SD=0.641). The creation of awareness had a mean of 4.29 (SD=0.582). Item on skills development had a mean of 4.34 (SD= 0.771). Organizations developed mediums on awareness for community members on project concerns which make them aggressively participate in decision processes for the implementation of sustainable programs resulted into a mean of 4.48 (SD=0.736). From the research findings, it's evident on participants to have agreed on community involvement having impact on the implementation of sustainable programs; with composite mean score of 4.414 and 0.7204 as the standard deviation

4.4 Inferential statistics on the Community Involvement

Null and alternative hypotheses were tested on Community involvement influence on sustainable implementation of food programs for marginalized communities by Chi-Square test and outcomes displayed in table 4

Table 4: Chi square outcomes for Community Involvement on Sustainable Implementation

Chi-Square Tests	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	707.697[a]	714	.559
Likelihood Ratio	284.145	714	1.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.983	1	.322
N of Valid Cases	77		

a. 770 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .01.

The results in Table 4 shows the Chi-square statistic value of 707.697 whereas the P-value in asymptotic significance column as 0.559. The outcome is significant if the value is equal to or less than the designated alpha level of 0.05. Since P-value is greater than the standard alpha value, the null hypothesis accepted in this situation. Thus the study accepted the null hypothesis which denoted community involvement has no significant influence on sustainable implementation of programs. This therefore signifies no statistical association among community involvement and sustainable implementation of programs.

4.5 Analysis of the influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on Sustainable implementation of Food programs

Analysis of the influence of monitoring and evaluation on sustainable implementation of food programs is shown in table 5

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

Table 5: Mean and Standard Deviations for Monitoring and Evaluation

Descriptive Statistics				
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
8a.	The organisation ensures that the setting of goals is done collectively with stakeholders to ensure transparency and accountability for sustainable implementation of programs.	77	4.64	.742
8b.	The organisation gives feedback on the progress of projects to the stakeholders through information gathered via monitoring and evaluation; this minimizes risks of failure and ensures sustainability of programs implemented.	77	4.43	.616
8c.	The organisation uses monitoring and evaluation as a tool for quality assurance as well as ensuring retention of project benefits for sustainable programs.	77	4.21	.800
8d.	The organisation through Monitoring and Evaluation is able to allocate resources to achieve the best results for sustainable implementation of programs.	77	4.53	.661
8e.	The organisation has a monitoring and evaluation system in place which facilitates feedback.	77	4.39	.746
Valid N (listwise)		77		
Composite Mean Score and Standard Deviation			4.44	0.713

The results from Table 5 depicts that monitoring and evaluation constructs had strong influence on the implementation of sustainable programs as per the respondents; this is evident from the average mean score of 4.44 as well as a standard deviation of 0.713. Organization setting of goals with stakeholders to ensure transparency and accountability for sustainable implementation of programs gave the greatest mean of 4.64 (SD=0.742). The participants were also in agreement that organizations gave feedback on the progress of the projects to stakeholders, this item had a mean of 4.43 (SD=0.616). Organization through Monitoring and Evaluation being able to allocate resources to achieve the best results had a mean of 4.53 (SD=0.746) and this implied that participants agreed with the statement. The item of organization having monitoring and evaluation system in place got a mean of 4.39 (SD=0.746) indication that participants agreed it's vital to have a monitoring and evaluation systems. From these results it's evident that monitoring and evaluation influences implementation of sustainable food programs.

4.6 Analysis of the effect of Capacity Building on Sustainable implementation of Food programs

The analysis of the effect of capacity building on sustainable implementation of food programs is presented in Table 6

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

Table 6: Mean and Standard Deviations for Capacity Building

Descriptive Statistics				
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
9a.	The organisation trains its staff and develop them with skills to achieve a competitive team hence sustainable implementation of programs	77	4.47	.754
9b.	The organisation ensures that there is project team commitment through motivational factors like incentives for to implementation of sustainable programs	77	4.23	.705
9c.	The organisation has strong leadership to ensure project and programs sustainability	77	4.53	.598
9d.	The organisation's staff competencies lead to adaptive structures which improve on organisation sustainability in program implementation	77	4.25	.861
9e.	A trained project team is significant for effective execution of schemes by the organisation	77	4.42	.784
Valid N (listwise)		77		
Composite Mean Score and Standard Deviation			4.38	0.7404

The Findings tabulated on 6 showed participants were in agreement with all the elements on capacity building. All constructs on capacity building held means greater than 4 which was a clear indication of the level of agreement. The organization having strong leadership to ensure project and programs sustainability had the greatest mean of 4.53 (SD=0.598), the element on organization training its staff and developing them with skills to achieve a competitive team produced a mean of 4.47 (SD=0.754). The organization ensuring project team commitment through motivational factors gave a mean score of 4.23(SD=0.705) the participants were also in agreement that a trained team was the key to successful implementation of the programs, this produced a mean score of 4.42 (SD=0.784). Therefore, from the findings it's evident that capacity building influences the implementation of sustainable food programs

4.7 Descriptive Statistics of Sustainable implementation of programs

Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics of sustainable implementation of programs

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

Table 7: Mean and Standard Deviations for Sustainable implementation of programs

Descriptive Statistics	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Community self- financing, availability of funds accessibility and accountability of financial resources will lead to timely completion of cost-effective programs	77	4.66	.576
Community participation leads to acceptance and ownership of the grogram hence sustainability	77	4.34	.576
Monitoring and evaluation keeps the programs/projects on track and within budgets hence efficiency and cost effectiveness of programs.	77	4.55	.575
Monitoring and evaluation ensures transparency and accountability in giving feedback hence a good communication tool for achievement of quality program objectives	77	4.45	.575
Capacity building through trainings, will result to commitment and leadership thereby resulting to completion of projects in time hence sustainability	77	4.30	.796
Valid N (listwise)	77		
Composite Mean Score and Standard Deviation		**4.46**	**0.6196**

The results on table 7 above reveal that respondents were in agreement on the level of implementation of programs with regard to time completion, quality and cost effectiveness. This is evident on the average mean score of the constructs which was 4.46 and standard deviation of 0.6196. From these study findings, a bigger number of the participants were in agreement that self- financing, availability of funds, accessibility and accountability of financial resources lead to timely completion of cost effective programs with a mean of 4.66 (SD=0.576). The respondents were also for the opinion that community participation lead to acceptance and ownership of programs, this item had a mean of 4.34 (SD=0.576). Monitoring and evaluation keeping the programs on track and within budgets hence efficiency had a mean of 4.55 (SD=0.575) that the participants agreed to. The respondents also agreed with the opinion that capacity building through trainings would result to commitment and leadership thereby resulting to timely completion of projects, this item had a mean of 4.30 (SD=0.796). In conclusion it was denoted that the participants agreed that all the four determinants of the study influenced the sustainability of implemented programs.

4.8. Regression Analysis

Since the study revealed existence of statistically significant relationships, a multiple regression got initiated in examining magnitude of the relationships. The outcomes on regression analysis were displayed on tables 8, 9 and 10.

Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing
Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management
Volume 3||Issue 4||Page 27-40||October||2019|
Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464

Table 8: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.586[a]	.343	.307	.43517

a. Predictors: (Constant), monitoring and evaluation, community involvement, capacity building, financial resources

From the results on Table 8, R^2=0.343 which indicates how much of the total difference in the dependent variable can be clarified by the independent variables. In this instance, the four independent variables explained 34.3% of the variability in sustainable implementation and 65.7% variation in sustainable implementation being described by extra external issues not discussed in this research work.

Table 9: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.132	4	1.783	9.416	.000[b]
	Residual	13.635	72	.189		
	Total	20.767	76			

A. Dependent Variable: Sustainable Implementation

B. Predictors: (Constant), Monitoring Evaluation, Community Involvement, Capacity Building, Financial Resources

Table 9 presents the results of Analysis of variance (ANOVA) which determines whether there exist significant differences between the study variable means. The findings show that F (4, 72) =9.416; P value = 0.000, the F value was above 2 and P value less than 0.05 therefore entailing the variables are statistically significant.

Table 10: Regression Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.679	.512		3.279	.002
	Capacity_Building	.177	.082	.214	2.169	.033
	Financial Resources	.231	.101	.261	2.280	.026
	Community_Involvement	.103	.084	.121	1.228	.223
	Monitoring_Evaluation	.245	.090	.304	2.712	.008

a. Dependent Variable: SUSTAINABLE_IMPLEMENTATION

Table 10 shows the beta coefficients of constructs that constitute the four independent variables that predict the dependent variable (Sustainable implementation of programs).This model shows that all elements have a positive influence on the sustainable implementation programs. This regression equation has proven that when all other elements are held constant (no determinants or elements) sustainable implementation of programs would be 1.679.

Regression model equation can be represented as shown below.

$$\mathbf{Y= \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \varepsilon}$$

$$Y=1.679 + 0.177\ (X_1) + 0.231(X_2) + 0.103(X_3) + 0.245(X_4)$$

5.1 Conclusion

The study concluded that financial resources, staff training, community involvement, monitoring and evaluation, Setting of achievable goals involving all parties transparently; and capacity building are significant determinants of success of the implementation of sustainable programs

6.1 References.

Hodgkin. J (1994). *Sustainability in Water Supply and Sanitation*. London press;:15.Draft wash Report February

Honadle, G., and J. VanSant. (1985). *Implementation for Sustainability:* Lessons from IFAD (2009) *Sustainability of rural development projects Best practices and lessons*

IFAD(2006) *People's Participation Programme. Participation in Practice. Monitoring and Integated Rural Development*. West Hartford, Conn.: Kumarian Press.

IRC. (1981). *Community Participation In Water and Sanitation: Concepts, Strategies, and Methods.IRC Technical Paper Series No. 17*.The Hague: International Reference Centre.

Kaplan, A. (2002). Development Practitioners and Social Process:Artists of the Invisible. London: Pluto Press.

Kerzner, H. (1998). "*In Search of Excellence in Project Management:* Successful Practices in High Performance Organizations": New York. Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Kombo, K., & Delno, L. (2006). *Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction.* Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa,.

Kothari, C. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited.*learned by IFAD in Asia.*The eighth in a series of discussion papers.the Asia and the Pacific Division, IFAD

Liverman, D. M., M. E. Hanson, B. J. Brown, and R. W. Merideth, Jr. (1988). "Global Sustainability: *Towards Measurement."Environmental Management 12: 133-143. Local Level:* AQ Case Study from a Small Under-Developed Area in Chile, Environment, Development and Sustainability 7:417-431.

Lundin, R.A. and Söderholm, A. (1995) *A Theory of the Temporary Organization.Scandinavian Journal of Management, 11, 437-455. Management of Sustainable Water Supply and Sanitation Projects. WASH Technical R Management. (Ed. K Keith).* (Australian academic Press: Brisbane).

Mazibuko, J. B., (2007) *Enhancing Project Sustainability Beyond Donor Support*. MastersThesis University Of South Africa

Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research Methods.* Nairobi: African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS) Press.

OECD. (1989). *Sustainability in Development Programmes*: A Compendium of Evaluation Experience.Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2008). *Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities: Factsheet 2008.* OECD.

Orodho, J. (2002). *Techniques of writing research proposals and reports in education and social sciences.* Nairobi: Masola Publishers.

Orodho, J. (2002). *Techniques of writing research proposals and reports in education and social sciences.* Nairobi: Masola Publishers.

Otoo, S., Agapitova, N., & Behrens, J. (2009). *The Capacity Development Results Framework: A strategic and results-oriented approach to learning for capacity development* Washington DC: The World Bank Institute.

Patterson, G. (1990). *Ensuring the Sustainability of CDD Efforts.PRITECH Field mplementation Aid. Arlington, Va.*: Technologies for Primary Health Care Project Management Institute (2006). *Project Management Body of Knowledge*: 3rd edition, 329 PMI

Patton, M. (2008). Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use. New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2008.

Raark, P. (1990).*Evaluation Guidelines for Community-Based Water and Sanitation Projects.WASH Technical Report No. 64. Arlington, Va*.: Water and Sanitation for Health Project.

Robson, G. (2005). *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-researchers.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Soldsmith, A. A. (1990). *Institutional Sustainability:* The SCOPE Framework. . College Park, Md.: International Development Management Center, University of Maryland.

Srinivasan, L. (1990). *Tools for Community Participation: A Manual for Training of Trainers in Participatory Techniques*. New York: United Nations Development Programme*successful implementation of enterprise systems".* Business Process Management Journal.Vol.7, No. 3.

Thompson, R. J. (1990). "*Focus on Sustainability*." Overview. A.I.D. Evaluation News, July-August

Turner, J.R. and Müller, R. (2003) *On the Nature of the Project as a Temporary Organization*. International Journal of Project Management, 21, 1-8.

United Nations Development Programmee. (2009). *Capacity Development: A UNDP Primer*. (K. Wignaraja, Ed.) New York: United Nations Development Programmee (UNDP).

USAID. (1988).*Sustainability of Development Programs: A Compendium of Donor Experience.A.I.D. Program Evaluation Discussion Paper No. 24.* Washington, D.C: U.S.Agency for Intemational Development.

USAID. (2015, June 29). *USAID Leadership*. Retrieved June 29, 2015, from Dollars to Results: http://results.usaid.gov/

VanSant, J. (1987). *Benefits of Sustainability. Prepared for the Advisory Committee for Voluntary Foreign Aid.* Washington, D.C.: Development Alternatives, Inc.

Waterman, R. H., Peters, J. T., & Philips, J. R. (1980, June). Structure is not Organization. (J. Dollinger, Ed.) *Business Horizons, 23*(3), 14-26.

World Bank (2008) *Assessing Aid: What Works. What Doesn't, and Why, New York: Oxford University Press.*

World Health Organization. (2004). *The World Health Report 2004.* World Health Organization.

Yacoob, M. (1990)."*Community Self-Financing of Water Supply and Sanitation: What Are the Promises and Pitfalls?" Health Policy and Planning 5(4): 358-366.*

Yacoob, M., and P. Roark.(*2012). Tech Pack: Steps for Implementing Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Projects.WASH Technical Report No. 62. Arlington, Water and Sanitation for Health Project.*

Yamane, T. (2007). *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.