

DETERMINANTS OF SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: A CASE OF MOMBASA COUNTY KENYA

¹SHARON SARA ALUOCH AYIECHO,

²DR. MOSES M. M. OTIENO JOHN BOSCO KISIMBII

Abstract: This study sought to ascertain determinants of sustainability of the projects funded by The National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities (NDFPWD) in Mombasa County, Kenya. The study used descriptive research design. The target population for this study was a total of 3300 beneficiaries of the fund from 100 groups in Mombasa that have been funded by The NDFPWD between the period between 2012 and 2016. Using Yamane's formula for sample calculation and purposive and stratified sampling, the study sample was 330 respondents. Data was collected using a structured questionnaire. The study established that organizational capacity building and training was found to affect the sustainability of projects run by NDFPWD. Operational project office, project integration into the operations of the organization office, awareness and documentation of the projects' vision and mission statements, leadership efficiency in management of staff and other resources and presence of organizational systems that are available to support the needs of the projects affect the sustainability of projects. Monitoring and evaluation was also confirmed to affect the sustainability of projects. Implementation of the planned activities as stipulated in quarter plans, reporting of short term and intermediate outcomes, evaluation results serve as a basis for project planning and implementation. Further, the application of the evaluation results in demonstrating progress and success to funders and other key stakeholders affects sustainability of the projects. Further analysis revealed that beneficiaries and community participation affect the sustainability of the projects. Community members were found to be involved in project identification, planning and implementation while varied community organisations are involved in the project success. Further, aspects like if the project communicates with and involves community leaders and if members are passionately committed to the project and development of project goals, sustainability of the project is affected. Analysis also established that sustainability is determined by aspects such as when a project has management support from within the organisation and outside of the organization. In return, the project emphasises on increased community awareness of the implementation and projects demonstrate their value to the public. Utilisation of locally available material was also found to positively affect the sustainability of the projects. Analysis of the findings revealed that when a community can afford to purchase adequate materials to sustain the project without assistance from external donors and tap these resources with the skills they have without external help then the project can be sustained. In addition, when a project exists in a supportive economic environment and it pursues and undertakes policies which ensure continuous funding then it can be deemed sustainable. Further findings showed that when the project has sustained funding which is both stable and flexible, sustainability can be guaranteed. The study made several recommendations. One, all projects should ensure that their leadership effectively articulates the project vision to external partners for sustainability. Two, the projects should build capacity for quality project monitoring, evaluation and control to ensure that the process is periodic. Three, project leadership should develop communication strategies that can secure and maintain public support. Four, the project should exhaustively utilise locally available material and skills from the community around because it's more affordable.

Keywords: Organizational Capacity, Monitoring, Evaluation, Beneficiaries, Local Resource.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS:

CDF	Constituency Development Fund
GOK	Government of Kenya
KNBS	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
NDFPWD	National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities
NCPWD	National Council for Persons with Disabilities
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PWDs	Persons with Disabilities
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNFPA	United Nations Populations Fund

1. INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study:

To transform the needs of Persons with Disabilities into reality it is essential to understand the presently obtaining situation with respect to the 'excluded populations' after which plans are put in place to build on the same. The Kenyan government, in its proposed key strategies, emphasises an inclusive and rapid poverty reduction. This is seen in its support for decentralised and results based planning. The government projects to better the effectiveness of its growth programs and to facilitate all-encompassing development. Inclusivity is supposed to be achieved by ensuring unbiased involvement and profit distribution by underprivileged social groups (Slater & Mphale, 2008).

Evidence indicates that those who are impaired and impoverished suffer from dual disfavor and are prone to becoming poorer (Hussein, 2013). This is also true for people living in poverty, who, because of the fact that they have fixed exposure to basic services such as education, medical services, hygiene and have elevated rates of exposure to a harmful professional environment, have a higher danger of facing disabling conditions. The situation is even more daunting for women with disabilities as they suffer two tiered discrimination, both on the basis of sex and disability. Opondo (2016) expresses this position when he says that the outcomes of insufficiencies and disablement are mainly grave for those of the female gender. This is chiefly because women suffer societal, cultural and economic challenges that hinder their approach to education, training and employment, healthcare and other opportunities. Where, additionally, they suffer physical or mental disability, the chances of them overcoming their disablement is significantly lessened, with the result that their participation in community life is significantly hampered.

Yet all persons with disabilities have the ability to be productive societal additions. To promote more inclusive societies and employment opportunities for people with disabilities governments need to enhance access to education, training relevant to labor market needs and jobs suited to their skills, with modifications and adjustments where required. In a number of communities there is the recognition of the necessity to do away with impediments, for example, by making the physical environment friendly by ensuring that it is more accessible. Information is also provided in alternative formats, and the negative mindset and prejudices about PWDs are also accordingly confronted.

Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in the Economic Work Force:

Because those who are poor usually are short of resources to stave off undernourishment and starvation, and they have no access to sufficient health facilities that may guard them against certain disabilities, poverty is clearly a cause of disability. Disability arises from poverty as people living with disabilities usually cannot access medical services, education and they do not have income-generating ventures. In this way, according to Bukhala and Ganesh (2016), the poor are often deprived of their humane and socio-economic rights. Similarly, PWDs are rarely considered to be

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

productive human capital of the state despite them forming a huge population. No wonder the positive correlation between disability and poverty is often disregarded by those in authority, with the consequence that failure to look at poverty vis a vis disability generates a malicious circle as the prospects for the disabled to produce and get an income is greatly limited yet they spend more, which results in those with disabilities and their families ending up being poorer than the other members of the society (Caswell, 2003).

UNESCO data reveals that several causes for example inadequate education and training prevent most PWDs from earning their bread and butter. Only a paltry percentage of one to two of PWDs in the third world countries go to school (UNICEF, 1998). Again, negativity can be found among those around and, sometimes, the PWDs themselves who possess fixed views about the status of the disabled with regard to their capabilities and accessibility to services and opportunities. Unemployment among PWDs is usually high compared to their able-bodied peers' (Opondo, 2016). Even worse is the situation of women with disabilities, who suffer more discrimination and fewer opportunities. Thus, PWDs are mostly considered as burdens (Seline, 2015).

Globally, about 650 million people have disabilities. 80% of them (nearly 520 million) live in the less developed countries. In addition, 80-90% of PWDs of working age are without work compared to 50-70% of the same group in developed world (Mont, 2007).

Statement of the Problem:

There have been a lot of challenges in the utilisation of this resource which has negated the benefits of NDFPWD activities. Amongst the challenges include inappropriate implementation of the projects resulting in some projects not being completed as planned and others not being completed at all despite the enhanced participatory management mechanisms contained in the establishing policy documents. Some of the challenges which the management faces include: organisational structure in managing implemented projects and project identification criteria. This is attributable to the none utilisation of monitoring and evaluation tools in project implementation (Mwanzia, 2004).

There is centrality of public participation, diversified funding, adaptability, results orientation, program evaluation, organisational capacity, communications, clear vision and good leadership in the success and to an extension sustainability of projects (Hayes, 2002; Scheirer, 2005; Savaya & Spiro, 2011; Schell et al., 2013). In view of the sustained increasing fund allocations to the NDFPWD in Kenya by the national government and the centrality of sustainability in economic growth, this research study proposed to assess factors affecting sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD.

Objectives of the Study:

The following were the objectives of the study:

- i. To examine the effect of organizational capacity and training on sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities;
- ii. To assess the effect of monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities;
- iii. To determine the effect of beneficiary and community participation on sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities; and
- iv. To establish the effect of utilization of locally available resources on sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities;

Research Questions:

This study was guided by the following questions:

- i. What is the effect of organizational capacity and training on sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities?
- ii. What is the effect of monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities?

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

- iii. What is the effect of beneficiary and community participation on sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities? and
- iv. What is the effect of utilization of locally available resources on sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities?

Research Hypotheses:

The study tested the following research hypotheses:

- i. H_1 =There is relationship between organizational capacity and training and sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities;
- ii. H_1 =There is a relationship between monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities;
- iii. H_1 =There is relationship between beneficiary and community participation and sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities;
- iv. H_1 =There is a relationship between utilization of locally available resources and sustainability of projects funded by National Development Fund for Persons with Disabilities

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Looking at the literature that deal with the subject of sustainability we find that a few scholars have done some research on the issues that affect sustainable development in Mombasa County, but none has been done on the NDFPWD and its activities. However, the few studies that have been conducted by scholars and other organisations have yielded enlightening revelations on some underlying issues which are of great significance to the study.

Kamuku (2015) while examining factors affecting sustainability of micro and small-scale enterprises funded under the women enterprise fund in Mombasa County, points out that the factors that influence sustainability in Mombasa include religion, marketing strategy, and technology. She further argues that for the Women Enterprise Fund to have an impact on livelihood in the county it needs to look into these issues at the needs analysis stage. This research is helpful to my study since the factors it delineates may be applicable to my research problem.

Walukhu (2015) looked at the Youth Enterprise funded projects: a case of selected projects in Mombasa County. According to Walukhu, the main issues affecting sustainability include the creation of awareness of the fund and its activities among the larger public. This is important because it opens up access to the funds and it also encourages social networking which Walukhu states to be done through the social media.

Mombasa County shares a few important similarities with Nairobi County being that both are the leading urban centers in Kenya. This similarity calls into question a look into how the issue of sustainability with regards to government initiatives at mitigating social inequities goes. In her study of experiences of PWDs in the utilisation of the economic empowerment fund in Nairobi County, Opondo (2016) argues that one of the most outstanding challenge experienced by the disabled in accessing the fund include communication in terms of inability of the deaf not being able to communicate with the officials who do not know how to communicate with the deaf; also the inability of a huge number of the disabled to travel to the offices due to lack of mobility equipment.

Hussein (2013) argues that there are key determinants which influence the degree to which a community participates in implementation of projects which are important for the overall vision of government bringing progress to her people. He opines that involvement decision making affected community participation in Garissa Sewerage development project. Issues of managerial involvement influenced community participation and when the local members of Garissa revealed that they were not involved by the Government in the operations and running of the sewerage project in 2008, it became a major issue that affected the sustainability of the project in the region since the local community did not feel any kind of "ownership" towards the project.

This study was reveals sustainability of projects funded by the NDFPWD in Mombasa County was determined by various variables. First, it emphasises the importance of conducting a needs analysis assessment and thereby ensuring that the nature of the project that Government is bringing to its people, should be as wholly involving as possible and that all

relevant stakeholders are involved so that there is goodwill from the community. The implication of this in this research was the question of the extent to which the NDFPWD projects targeting the disabled community involved the other sections of the Mombasa society in their implementations, because when the status of the disabled is improved the overall welfare of the county improves.

Another scholar who looks at the issue of sustainability in Mombasa County was (Ngoe, 2013). In her work she states that as part of their character of being creative and innovative, youth entrepreneurs should be able to devise ways of raising funds for their businesses without relying heavily on debt financing. They need not depend exclusively on financial institutions and government agencies for resources (Scarborough, 2011). A focus on debt or transfer of part or full ownership when the enterprise is still young and growing may not be a very wise option for the entrepreneur. Scarborough et al. (2009) observe that, immoderate borrowing at the initial stages of the business exerts severe strain on its financial health, and this may have a negative effect on the founder whose passion to make the business successful may be dampened. None of the outcomes offer bright prospects for the company involved. Some of the internal methods of financing include personal savings which is the least costly source of funds. This explains the expectation of lenders and investors that entrepreneurs would use their own finances in business start-ups. Where entrepreneurs are averse to risking their own money, prospective financiers are unlikely to keen on risking their money in the business too (Scarborough et al., 2009). She also lists conversion of personal assets to business use. Apart from personal savings there are personal assets that can be converted into cash. According to Holt (2003), a personal car may provide money by way of refinancing. A home can likewise be converted into cash value in the form of mortgages based on its market value. Insurance contracts such as life and additional assets, for instance collectable coins and stamps that bear monetary worth may be changed into money. He also adds that "some assets may also be converted into business use, including personal trucks or vans, computers, telephone answering systems, furniture and tools among others".

According to Opondo (2016) in Experiences of PWDs in the Utilisation of the Economic Empowerment Fund in Nairobi County, the basic problem facing the project is managerial. Golla et al. (2012) define Economic Empowerment as a state whereby a person succeeds and advances in a wholesome manner, and acquires the authority to make and execute economic influence. Caswell (2003) concurs that economic empowerment comprises economic advancement and power and agency. Caswell (2003) asserts that both are crucial in attaining an improved life. He explains that to succeed and move forward economically, skills and resources are required to gain just and equitable right to financial institutions and to compete in the market. Authorities and agencies should enable one to make decisions, act on them and control resources at his or her disposal (Golla et al., 2012). When PWDs become capable of controlling and sharing in resource use, they can make and execute decisions, hence move forward economically (Slater & Mphale, 2011). Just as there are different interpretations of what economic empowerment entails, there are different methodologies used in evaluating economic empowerment. Literature indicates that economic empowerment is a complex process and there is not a one-size fits all evaluation design. Whichever framework one adopts should only act as a guide and will have to be adapted to meet the goals of a specific project. Further, Golla et al. (2012) argue that utilization of a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods is most effective in measuring change and outcomes. They say as long as mixed methods are of good quality, they are optimal in providing rigorous evidence on the impact of interventions. Taylor and Paola (2014) agree with the assessment adding that mixed methods also provide good learning materials and can be used to improve subsequent project designs.

Maredia (2013), however, argues that evaluations that use qualitative and participatory approaches give a more in-depth analysis of how and the reasons as to why change has happened. He further asserts that in a situation of low resources, either qualitative or quantitative data alone is useful if the evaluation design is robust.

Qualitative evaluations are usually more transparent about why the research design was adopted compared to quantitative evaluations (Taylor & Paola, 2014). While acknowledging that even though qualitative evaluations are not representative of a population, Taylor and Paola (2014) say that they shed light on the change process and findings should therefore be contextualised accordingly. Maredia (2013) however says that a common problem with qualitative designs is the small sample size. He adds that qualitative evaluations have added value when they use quotes and text boxes as these increase legitimacies to findings and bring the issues to life. It is therefore important with regards to Mombasa County for our study to assess the evaluation and monitoring modalities of NDFPWD to establish the sustainability of the funding given.

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Determinants of Project Sustainability:

There are various factors that play to influence project sustainability. Organisational capacity and training, monitoring and evaluation, beneficiary and community participation and utilisation of locally available resources are the four main factors identified in this study

Organisational Capacity Building, Training and Project Sustainability:

Focus has indeed been on capacity building in the past 20 years (Ontario Trillium Foundation, 2005). The increased attention placed on capacity building has taken place at a time when there has also been a change in the charitable and community sectors' pool of accessible funding, heightened expectation to perform more with less, and added general community expectations of accountability.

Ironically, financiers have regularly failed to appreciate and recognize the relationship between sustainability on one hand and success and organisational strength (The California Wellness Foundation, 2001). Time and again, non-profits have preferred to get funds for particular projects with concrete product instead of find capital to build themselves from within. Yet, where organisational capability is fragile, programs and services usually suffer. Indeed, evidence abounds that points to the fact that organisational capacity is critical in attaining programmatic outcomes (Light & Hubbard, 2002). Luckily, an increasing number of funders are beginning to recognise this significant connection by mounting capacity building funding to support their grantees.

One of the most fashionable yet rarely understood concepts in the non-profit sector is the term capacity building (Light & Hubbard, 2002). Its definition is often contested as consensus is not always achieved with regard to its definition and perception on its features and basic essentials. Financiers often refer to capacity building programs, whereas capacity builders may prefer capacity building engagements. Organisations on the other hand may talk about it as a cluster of activities or procedures geared towards a precise objective.

Capacity building has attracted various dissimilar definitions. While a number of authors refer to it as an unclear term that refers to an extensive series of ideas, activities, and resources that non-profits require to be effectual, there are also those who have been keen on looking at it in terms of a process (Connolly & Lukas, 2002; Light & Hubbard, 2002). In the literature reviewed two definitions seem prevalent: McPhee and Bare's definition and Connolly and Lukas' (2002). The former define capacity building as "the ability of nonprofit organisation to fulfill their missions in an effective manner", while the former define it as "a wide range of capabilities, knowledge and resources that nonprofits need in order to be effective". Considering other definitions, there are those which include ideas of capacity that go outside organisations. There are also those that express the idea that capacity building can also be at a personal and at a community level, and so these concepts should also be included in the definition. That there is lack of agreement on what capacity building is exactly is evident. Light and Hubbard (2002) says further that the absence of consensus on the understanding of the term capacity building is further aggravated when focus is directed towards the direction to which capacity building efforts are put – whether they are organizations, geographical or interest communities, the non-profit sector or individuals. For purposes of this study, the elements and features of capacity building are considered in terms of how they are directed towards organisations.

Findings in an overview of capacity building work in the US carried out in 2002 revealed that the bulk of what is normally called "capacity building" focuses on the organisational level (Light & Hubbard, 2002). With such focus it seeks to support the capacity of an organisation or agency with the objective of accomplishing a desired result.

To comprehensively enable non-profits to attain the aforesaid, it is crucial to grasp the structures and components of organizational sustainability. Time and again, the impact of capacity building is overlooked as financiers, non-profits and capacity prioritize the process of capacity building. Improved appreciation of the elements of organizational sustainability in all likelihood assists capacity building endeavors to be potent and specific

Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Sustainability:

Traditionally monitoring and evaluation are usually approached as one undivided process of project management. An advantage of this approach is that any changes can be made during several stages as the project proceeds since the results are tested as real time therefore providing a real perspective.

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Monitoring and evaluation have always been necessary effective tools for enhancing project management. This is both applicable for short and medium term projects that require various levels of complexity in their execution. They are particularly necessary tools to ensure accountability of the project both in terms in financial distribution and execution of various aspects of the project that relate to its intended results and sustainability. (Dobrea et al., 2010). The various components of monitoring is meant to be designed in such a way that the both the staff and the management feel encompassed. Both parties are to be updated on whether the project is on course as per the planned schedule of activities, if the intended outcomes are being realized and for the intended purpose, both parties are to be brought to speed on whether the set dealines are being met or not and whether the resurces allocated are sufficient enough, (Solomon & Young, 2007).

Eventually, an outcome of monitoring is that the cost of running the project is regulated and if possible reduced while still achieving the intended result (Crawford & Bryce, 2003). This is done while ensuring that the quality of the project is not compromised and high value standards is the result of the project. Evaluation can be considered as a means of facilitating the planners and those in the development team with the necessary resources to annalyse if the project is delivering the planned output as per the guiding blue print. (Field & Keller, 1997).

While there is a tendancy to combine the two processes it is important to be cognizant of their differences and that monitoring and evaluation are carried out at different periods of a project cycle. (Pollack, 2007). Monitoring utilizes the existing management structures and culture and its overall aim is to better service delivery by improving procedures and ensuring best practices are utilized on a daily basis on the other hand evaluation uses empirical information to investigate the extent bto which the project is meeting its initial purpose. (Sheperd, 1994).

As per Yaghootkar and Gil (2011), for the success of a project, unfluctuating monitoring and evaluation systems and seamless workflows need to be developed. When it is intergarted into the project at the stage of inception all the parties involved will have access to crucial information regarding how the various components are working and those that are not working at all, this constant feedback is necessary since it informs decision making (Stead & Stead, 2003) this expedited decision making leads to prompt action intervention where necessary.

Beneficiary and Community Participation and Project Sustainability:

Community participation is a comprehensive process whereby various social components of the society, that is family, individuals and various communalities own up and become accountable for their well being while actively partaking in the growth of the community by being part of the decision-making procedures, setting targets and prioritizing on matters they believe are most pressing, for instance, the type of service to be offered and funds distribution. According to Mikkelsen (2005), participation was defined considered as Active Participation, Passive Participation and Interative Participation. Active participation is characterized by being direct and exposed. The society is frontline throughout the project cycle and most of the time, they determine the general direction of the project. The society participates in various steps of the cycle of the project. Significant activities such as the making of decisions co-management, monitoring and evaluation are mostly implemented by the community. However, passive participation, is whereby the stakeholders and the society is excluded from major activities regarding the project (Creighton, 2005). The community is sidelined without any intervention or input in activities from them. This kind of implementation is regarded as an imposition, where by the community is only informed of what is to occur or that which has already occurred. Finally in Interactive Participation, the project is regarded as a partnership between the management and the community. The project is co-managed and that responsibility of planning and implementation is shared. By doing this, the risk of the project is also shared. This is the most empowering kind of participation to the community because their capacity is enhanced through the constant interaction with the management (Roodt, 2001).

Participation of the community enhances the ability of the community to analyse different situations and solve conflicts more effectively. Participation also fosters a more tolerate community due to the different backgrounds that come together. Understanding and acquisition of knowledge is therefore encouraged eventually leading to a community that is independent (Nampila, 2005). Once the community has refined its ability to resolve conflicts it develops the ability of self analysis and look at various situations without biase and develop long lasting solutions. Because of the unity among the people creativity is enhanced for a desired future. While the capability of the community is improved the voluntary ventures such as resource mobilization increases in an effort to achieve independence from the government eventually

leading to an approach that prioritises the community, (Nampila2005). In that manner, advancement does not just entail provision of service apathetic consumers rather, it entails ensuring that the consumers develop the ability to produce therefore becoming self reliant, (Callaghan,1997). Interactive participation results in the creation of an enabled community that clearly understands its current situation, social status and circumstance and is very much in touch with reality. (Davids, 2009).

The participation of the community in project development creates an enabling environment for the capacity of the community to be enhanced resulting in their effectiveness and efficiency when it comes to impelentation of various stages of the cycle of the project, that includes, recognizing potential projects, executing and making the constant follow up to ensure that the agreed upon plans are being followed (Davids 2009). De Beer (1998), stated that through the constant meeting of the wants of the people, the realization of objectives becomes simplified. It is a system that allows the community to set their own terms and prioritize according to their own developed criteria and act on the set action points. It is only when the community is fully able to understand their capabilities and use these capabilities to attain defined plans are they considered to be operating at maimum potential (Freire, 1993). Development that is centered on the people focuses more on the indivuals affected by the project, how their skills are enhanced and how they become empowered. This is to ensure that they during various implementation processes they can meaningfully participate. This eventually improves self-reliance (Kotze, 1997).

Utilisation of Locally Available Resources and Project Sustainability:

It is agreed that even the most insufficiently served and under privileged communities are abundantly availed with an unparralled resource that is useful to the people within and around that particular community and has aided in sustenance of their livelihood for a certain number of years (McConnell, 2002).When the asset is regenerated in a purposeful manner in any way whether big or small the advantages out weigh the disadvantages and this ultimately benefits the larger community by filling in the existing gaps they may experience. A resource can be defined as an item that can fulfill human wants (Miller& Spoolman, 2011). A project that has been competently visualized must have a sustainability plan with the intention of drawing resources that are locally available for its successful implementation.Since the local environment is loaded with means to improve the welfare of the community, these very means should be tapped to ensure sustenance of the project (Lewis, 2004).

To realize sustainability, designs based on anticipated inputs from the local environment are most advised. This while ensuring that there is a system that is designed to ensure that the resource being tutilized is not depleted and that there are mechanisms to ensure that thre is consistent association between that which is being utilized and its input. This is done through the incorporation of innovative practices, and favorable ideologies (Baumgartner, and Ebner, 2010). A project that is to be viable and sustainable should have an adaptability plan and should be able to accommodate changes in the environment which it exists. This should be done while ensuring that it actively communicates with the relevant partners and constantly meeting demands of its beneficiaries and that they desired results are met and benefits all. A sustainable adaptability plan is one that identifies local resources and taps from.The resources must be readily available and affordably utilized while taking into consideration the needs of the generations to come. (Mekonnen, 2007)

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design:

Descriptive research design was used as it had merits such as researcher having no control over the variables and only reporting what happened based on the information and data gathered from participants (Creswell & Clark, 2007).Descriptive design is also found appropriate for the study because it involves collecting information to respond to pertinent queries regarding the position of subjects under study (Patton, 1997). The research design provided facts and suggestions on major connections between the variables.

Target Population:

A population is the entire assembly of items an investigator intends to draw conclusions from (Cooper and Emory, 2005). Apart from being homogenous it should fit parameters under investigation (Mugenda&Mugenda, 2009). The target group of this study was 3300 beneficiaries from 100 groups in Mombasa that have been funded by The NDFPWD within the ime frame of 2012 and 2016.

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Sample Size and Sampling Procedure:

Out of the target population a sample is selected. The selected sample is investigated, and the conclusions and recommendations drawn applied to the entire target population. Of utmost importance is the selection of a sample that is flexible, reliable efficient and is a true representation of the target. Because of the type of study, the researcher adopted The Yamane Formula by Yamane University of Florida (2013) to calculate the sample size for respondents and a combination of stratified and purposive sampling technique to select sample. The researcher stratified the respondents according to the present six constituencies of Mombasa County after which researcher purposely selected the 55 respondents per constituency on the criteria of whether they had ever received training from NDFPWD or not.

The sample size at 10% level of significance was obtained as presented below:

$$n = N / [1 + N(e)^2]$$

n being the size of the sample,

N= the estimate of the population size,

e= error limit

At 95% level of confidence and with an error limit of 5 %

$$n = 3300 / \{(1 + 3300(0.1)^2)\} = 327$$

Table1 shows the size of the sample

Table 1: Sample Size Summary

Subject	Population	Sample	Percentage
Beneficiaries	3300	330	100
Total number of respondents	3300	330	100

The sample size is 10% of the the target poplutaion. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2009) a sample size of between 10% to 30 % of the target population is acceptable.

Data Collection Instruments

These are the instruments used by the researcher on the respondents to gather information on a particular research topic that is being investigated Cresswell (2003). The researcher used questionnaires to collect the data from the respondents. As per Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a questionnaire is a record of accepted questions designed to accommodate a particular inquisition. The questionnaire had closed questions. For those respondents who could neither read nor wite the process was facilitated by interviews. This tool was preferred since its use allowed the researcher to save on both cost and time.

4. DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

Organizational Capacity Building and Training:

This section focused on the 1st objective that was aimed at determining the effect of organizational capacity and training on sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD. The actual question from the study that coincided with the objective: What is the effect of organizational capacity and training on sustainability of projects run by NDFPWD? Using a 5-point Likert scale where 1-1.499 was Strongly disagree, 1.500 - 2.499 Disagree; 2.500 - 3.499 Neutral, 3.500 - 4.499 Agree and 4.500 - 5.000 was Strongly agree, those who were queried indicated their level of agreement with effect of various organizational capacity and training aspects on sustainability of projects run by NDFPWD. Table shows a summation of the results.

Table 2: Organizational Capacity and Training

Organizational Capacity Building and Training	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
a) There is proper combination of the project into the systems of the organization.	302	3.80	1.23
b) There exists structural systems to meet the requirements of the project	302	3.51	1.32
c) Management clearly communicates the vision of the project to outside partners	302	2.86	1.42
d) Resources such as staff are efficiently controlled	302	3.65	1.25
e) The project has enough manpower to finalize the project’s objectives	302	3.54	1.36
f) The project has training channeled towards improving community's contribution to this project	302	3.42	1.50
g) The project has an operational office	302	3.88	1.19
h) The project has a strategic plan/ annual plans	302	3.15	1.54
i) The project has a documented vision and mission statement	302	3.67	1.41
j) The vision and mission of the project known by all members	302	2.51	1.53
k) Institutional capacity contributes towards sustainability of the project	302	3.52	1.58

The study findings indicate that a good number of respondents believed that organizational capacity and training affects sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD with highest mean of 3.88 (using a likert scale 1-5) agreeing to the narrative. Thus 234 (77.6%) respondents (mean of 3.88) agreed to the narrative that project has an operational office. Although there were those who disagreed with the narrative they were few. This shows their belief in organizational capacity and training in enhancing success and sustainability of projects. The research also shows the respondents believed that institutional capacity building and training affects sustainability of projects going by the mean of 3.52 (using a likert scale 1-5) who agreed with the notion.

The findings showed that several organizational capacity and training aspects affect the sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD. They include; operational office (mean 3.88 and standard deviation 1.19), proper combination of the project into the systems of the organization (mean 3.80 and standard deviation 1.23), awareness and documentation of the projects’ vision and mission statements (mean 3.67 and standard deviation 1.41), resources such as staff are efficiently controlled (mean 3.65 and standard deviation 1.25) and presence of structural systems to meet the requirements of the project (mean 3.51 and standard deviation 1.32).

Hypothesis testing of the significance of organizational capacity and training as a measure of sustainability of projects

H₁= Organisational capacity and training affects sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD;

Table 3: Hypothesis test summary on the significance of organizational capacity and training as a measure of sustainability of projects

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The categories defined by Influence of organizational capacity and sustainability of projects = Agree and Disagree occur with probabilities 0.5 and 0.5.	One-Sample Binomial Test	.000	Reject the null hypothesis.

The researcher sampled three hundred and two respondents to answer the research question how does capacity building and training influence sustainability of projects? The results showed that the null hypothesis stating that capacity building and training does not influence sustainability of projects was rejected and the alternative hypothesis stating that capacity building and training influences sustainability of projects was accepted. The summary of the test statistic of the output in table is given as $X^2(2) = 299, p > 0.05$ indicating that there is a relationship between capacity building and training and sustainability of projects.

Monitoring and Evaluation:

This section focused on the 2nd objective that was aimed at determining the effect of monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD. The actual question from the study that coincided with the objective: What is the effect of Monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD? Respondents rated their perceived agreement with various monitoring and evaluation aspects’ effect on sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD using a 5-point Likert scale where 1-1.499 was Strongly disagree, 1.500 - 2.499 Disagree; 2.500 - 3.499 Neutral, 3.500 - 4.499 Agree and 4.500 - 5.000 was Strongly agree. Table shows a summation of the findings.

Table 4: Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
a) Implementation of the planned activities as stipulated in quarter plans	302	4.29	1.35
b) The project has the capability for enhanced evaluation	302	3.38	1.46
c) The project has feedback mechanism on short and middle plan achievements	302	3.61	1.55
d) Monitoring findings enhance planning and implementation	302	4.41	1.41
e) Monitoring findings are shared with stakeholders and donors to show success	302	4.54	1.47
f) Concrete evidence is given to the public that the project is working	302	4.23	1.32
g) The project constantly adjusts to alterations in its surrounding	302	3.87	1.47
h) The project decides on aspects that are not effective and should be discontinued	302	3.84	1.38
i) The opinion and needs of the community is incorporated in project implementation	302	1.87	1.40
j) The project plans for future resource needs	302	3.01	1.62
k) The project has a long-term financial plan	302	3.23	1.35
l) The project has a sustainability plan	302	2.58	1.48

Respondents observed (strongly agreed, with mean of 4.54) that Monitoring findings enhance planning and implementation. The respondents believed that if there is enhanced monitoring and evaluation, then sustainability of projects would be a reality. Furthermore, the respondents believed that implementation of the planned activities are done as stipulated in quarter plans with mean of 4.29 on a likert scale (1-5) agreeing so. This high figure implies there is monitoring and evaluation when projects are being undertaken. Further, the research findings indicate that the respondents mostly agreed with the aspect of monitoring and evaluation such as; Monitoring findings enhance planning and implementation (mean 4.41) as well as; Monitoring findings are shared with stakeholders and donors to show success (mean 4.54) as the most rated items favorably, being mostly agreeing and strongly agreeing respectively.

Findings show that implementation of the planned activities as stipulated in quarter plans (mean 4.29 and standard deviation 1.35) The project has feedback mechanism on short and middle plan achievements (mean 3.61 and standard deviation 1.55), monitoring findings enhance planning and implementation (mean 4.41 and standard deviation 1.47) and the monitoring findings are shared with stakeholders and donors to show success.

Further findings show that project sustainability is affected by the project reports which provides Concrete evidence is to the public that the project is working (mean 4.23 and standard deviation 1.32), The project constantly adjusts to alterations in its surrounding (mean 3.87 and standard deviation 1.47) and The project decides on aspects that are not effective and should be discontinued (mean 3.84 and standard deviation 1.38).

Hypothesis testing on the significance of monitoring and evaluation as a measure of sustainability of projects

H₁= Monitoring and evaluation affects sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD

Table 5: Hypothesis test summary on the significance of monitoring and evaluation as a measure of sustainability of projects

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The categories defined by Influence of monitoring and evaluation in sustainability of projects = Agree and Disagree occur with probabilities 0.5 and 0.5.	One-Sample Binomial Test	.000	Reject the null hypothesis.

The researcher sampled three hundred and two respondents to answer the research question how does monitoring and evaluation influence sustainability of projects? The results showed that the null hypothesis stating that monitoring and evaluation does not influence sustainability of projects was rejected and the alternative hypothesis stating that monitoring and evaluation influences sustainability of projects was accepted. The summary of the test statistic of the output in table is given as $X^2(2) = 300, p > 0.05$ indicating that there is a relationship between monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of projects.

Beneficiaries and Community Participation:

The third objective of the study set out to establish the effect of beneficiary and community participation on sustainability of projects run by NDFPWD. The specific study question that corresponded to this objective was: What is the effect of

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

beneficiary and community participation on sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD? Using a 5-point Likert scale where 1-1.499 was Strongly disagree, 1.500 - 2.499 Disagree; 2.500 - 3.499 Neutral, 3.500 - 4.499 Agree and 4.500 - 5.000 was Strongly agree, the respondents indicated their level of agreement with effect of beneficiaries and community participation on sustainability of projects run by NDFPWD.

Table shows a summary of the findings; Where community members were found to be involved in project identification, planning and implementation (mean 4.22 and standard deviation 1.46 Different community groups are interested in the project sustainability (mean 3.84 and standard deviation 1.50), the project communicates with and involves community leaders and members are passionately committed to the project and development of project goals (mean 3.29 and standard deviation 1.58).

Further analysis showed that the project has management backing inside the organization (mean 3.75 and standard deviation 1.19) and outside of the organisation (mean 3.59 and standard deviation 1.48). Results show that in return, the project shows its worth to the community (mean 4.14 and standard deviation 1.49).

Table 6: Beneficiaries and Community Participation

Beneficiaries and Community Participation	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
a) Community members were involved in project identification, planning and implementation	302	4.22	1.46
b) Different community groups are interested in the project sustainability	302	3.84	1.50
c) The project communicates with and involves community leaders	302	3.54	1.52
d) Community members are passionately committed to the project and development of project goals	302	3.29	1.58
e) The project has management backing inside the organization	302	3.75	1.19
f) The project has significant backing from external partners	302	3.59	1.48
g) Project has communication channels to reach out to the community and get support	302	3.16	1.35
h) Project employees inform the community of the relevance of the project	302	3.20	1.42
i) The project has interesting strategies for selling itself	302	3.96	1.32
j) The project raises awareness in the community on different matters	302	4.13	1.40
k) The project shows its worth to the community	302	4.14	1.49

Respondents observed that community members were involved in project identification, planning and implementation with a mean of 4.22 of respondents agreeing so. The respondents believed that if there is a higher level of community participation, then project sustainability would be a reality. Furthermore, the respondents believed that diverse community organisations are invested in the project success with mean of 3.84 indicating so. This high figure implies there is involvement of the stakeholders when projects are being undertaken. Further, the research findings indicate that the respondents mostly agreed with the aspect of community involvement such as The project raises awareness in the community on different matters, The project shows its worth to the community, community ownership is key and great community communication being the foundation for the creation of a shared vision and plans as most rated the items favorably, being mostly agreeing and strongly agreeing.

The findings show that sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD is affected by the participation of the beneficiaries and the communalities within which the projects are being implemented.

Hypothesis testing on the significance of Community participation as a measure of sustainability of projects

H₁= Beneficiary and community participation positively affect sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD

Table 7: Hypothesis test summary on the significance of community’s participation as a measure of sustainability of projects

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The categories defined by Influence of community’s participation in project sustainability = Agree and Disagree occur with probabilities 0.5 and 0.5.	One-Sample Binomial Test	.000	Reject the null hypothesis.

The researcher sampled three hundred and two respondents to answer the research question how does community’s participation influence sustainability of projects? The results showed that the null hypothesis stating that community’s

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

participation does not influence sustainability of projects was rejected and the alternative hypothesis stating that community’s participation influences participation was accepted. The summary of the test statistic of the output in table is given as $X^2(2) = 296, p > 0.05$ indicating that there is a relationship between community’s participation and community’s participation.

Utilisation of Locally Available Resources:

In the fourth objective, the study aimed to establish the effect of utilization of locally available resources on sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD. Using a 5-point Likert scale where 1-1.499 was Strongly disagree, 1.500 - 2.499 Disagree; 2.500 - 3.499 Neutral, 3.500 - 4.499 Agree and 4.500 - 5.000 was Strongly agree, the respondents indicated their level of agreement with effect of utilization of locally available material on sustainability of projects run by NDFPWD. Table shows a summation of the findings:

Table 8: Utilization of Locally Available Resources

Utilization of Locally Available Resources	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
a) The community can afford to purchase adequate materials to sustain the project without assistance from external donors	302	3.59	1.62
b) The community can tap these resources with the skills they have without external help	302	3.58	1.43
c) The project is in an economic state that supports it	302	3.90	1.45
d) The project has policies that promote consistent funding	302	3.74	1.43
e) The project receives money via multiple agencies	302	3.80	1.41
f) The project has both of consistent and flexile supply of money	302	4.12	1.30
g) The project has assured funds	302	4.39	1.29
h) The community has the ability to acquire the required resources	302	4.41	1.56

The findings show that the community can afford to purchase adequate materials to sustain the project without assistance from external donors (mean 3.59 and standard deviation 1.62) and tap these resources with the skills they have without external help(mean 3.58 and standard deviation 1.43). In addition, the project is in an economic state that supports it (mean 3.90 and standard deviation 1.45) and has policies that promote consistent funding (mean 3.74 and standard deviation 1.43). Further findings showed that the project has both of consistent and flexile supply of money (mean 4.12 and standard deviation 1.30), assured funds (mean 4.39 and standard deviation 1.29) and the community is able to acquire the required resources(mean 4.41 and standard deviation 1.56).

Hypothesis testing of the significance of utilization of local resources in sustainability of projects

H_1 = Utilization of local resources influences sustainability of projects.

Table 9: Hypothesis Test summary for the significance of utilization of local resources

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The categories defined by Utilization of local resources influence of sustainability of projects = Agree and Disagree occur with probabilities 0.5 and 0.5.	One-Sample Binomial Test	.000	Reject the null hypothesis.

The researcher sampled three hundred and two respondents to answer the research question how does utilization of local resources influence sustainability of projects? The results showed that the null hypothesis stating that utilization of local resources does not influence sustainability of projects was rejected and the alternative hypothesis stating that availability of utilization of local resources influences sustainability of projects was accepted. The summary of the test statistic of the output in table is given as $X^2(2) = 301, p > 0.05$ indicating that there is a relationship between utilization of local resources and sustainability of projects.

Correlation Analysis:

A correlation is any digit in the middle of -1 and +1 that gives the level of association that two levels may have. A positive value on the correlation is an implication a + relationship. A negative value on the correlation is an implication of a – relationship or no relationship (Zigmund et al, 2013). Table shows a summation of the correlation coefficient results.

Table 10: Correlation Coefficients

		Sustainability of funded Projects	Organisational Capacity Building and Training	Monitoring and Evaluation	Beneficiaries and Community Participation	Utilisation of Locally Available Material
Sustainability of funded Projects	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	302				
Organisational Capacity Building and Training	Pearson Correlation	.660	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000				
	N	302	302			
Monitoring and Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	.696	.688	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
	N	302	302	302		
Beneficiaries and Community Participation	Pearson Correlation	.660	.577	.771	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		
	N	302	302	302	302	
Utilisation of Locally Available Resources	Pearson Correlation	.860	.641	.788	.750	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	302	302	302	302	302

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two tailed)

The correlation analysis indicates a positive relationship between the organizational capacity and training and sustainability of funded projects, where the correlation coefficient was 0.660 and a p-value of 0.000. The research revealed that monitoring and evaluation correlates positively with sustainability of funded projects with correlation coefficients of 0.696 and p-value of 0.000. The findings revealed there is a positive relationship between beneficiaries and community participation and sustainability of funded projects with a correlation coefficient of 0.660 and p-value of 0.000. Additionally, the findings showed there is a positive relationship between utilization of locally available material and sustainability of funded projects with a correlation coefficient of 0.860 and a p-value of 0.032.

Regression Analysis

In order to establish the relationship between organizational capacity building and training; monitoring and evaluation; beneficiaries and community participation and utilization of locally available material and sustainability of funded projects a regression analysis had to be undertaken. The major reason for regressions is to get more information regarding the relation between a dependent variable and many independent variables. Regression tests were conducted that involved Model goodness of fit. The coefficient of determination is an indication of how accurately a statistical model is likely to infer future results (Table). The coefficient of determination, R² elaborates the degree to which variations in dependent variable can be demonstrated the variation in the independent variables.

Table 11: Coefficient of Determination

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate
Organization Capacity and Training	0.097	0.009	0.003	0.718
Monitoring and Evaluation	0.257	0.066	0.06	0.697
Beneficiaries and Community Participation	0.365	0.133	0.076	0.564
Utilisation of Locally Available Resources	0.275	0.076	0.194	0.82

A multiple regression analysis was conducted and table shows a summation of the multiple regression analysis.

Table 12: Multiple Regression Analysis

	Unstandardised Coefficients	Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
(Constant)	3.374	0.842		4.009 0
Organization Capacity and Training	0.205	0.105	0.09	0.849 0.0067
Monitoring and Evaluation	0.118	0.084	0.02	0.954 0.0046
Beneficiaries and Community Participation	0.753	0.146	0.17	2.276 0.0015
Utilisation of Locally Available Resources	0.853	0.088	0.33	1.379 0.0041

From the above regression model, for every added unit in organizational capacity and training; monitoring and evaluation; beneficiaries and community participation and utilization of locally available resources, there will be an adjustment in successful project implementation by 0.09, 0.02, 0.17 and 0.33 respectively. These results are an implication that all the independent variables of the study are mathematically significant ($P = 0.0067$, $P = 0.0046$, $P = 0.0015$, $P = 0.0041$). In statistics, a significant level of $p < 0.05$ is said to be significant. This means that the four independent variables are useful for predicting the sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD

Table 13: Regression Model Goodness of Fit

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.981(a)	0.962	0.691	0.752

Table is a presentation of the regression model goodness of fit statistics to determine whether sustainability of NDFPWD funded project has a linear dependence on capacity building and training; monitoring and evaluation; beneficiaries and community participation and utilization of locally available material. The study indicated a value of correlation of 0.981. This is an indication of a strong linear dependence between sustainability of NDFPWD funded projects and the four independent variables. An R² value of 0.962 was established in the model and adjusted to 0.691. The coefficient of determination shows that the four independent variables determine almost 96.2% to the dependent variable in performance while various matters not included in the study contribute 3.8% to the performance. Consequently, additional research should be done to establish the other factors (3.8%) that affect sustainability of NDFPWD funded projects.

Further, Table is an indication of the ANOVA findings as explained by the P-value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05 (significance level of 5%) establishing the presence of correlation in the independent variables and project sustainability. The model is an indication of the model fitness. The total of squares provides the model fit therefore the variables fit the regression model. As per the findings, F ratio of 0.587 and the significance of 0.000 showed there wasn't significant difference in the means. Since F calculated is more than the F critical (value = 2.371), this is an indication the general model was significant.

Table 14: ANOVA

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig or P-value
Regression	6.797	2	3.399	0.587	000 ^a
Residual	11.582	2	5.791		
Total	18.379	4			

Predictors (Constants): capacity building and training; monitoring and evaluation; beneficiaries and community participation and utilization of locally available resources.

5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to ascertain determinants of sustainability of projects funded by the NDFPWD in Mombasa County, Kenya. Specifically, the study researched the effect of capacity building and training; monitoring and evaluation; beneficiaries and community participation and utilisation of locally available resources on sustainability of NDFPWD funded projects.

The findings showed that organizational capacity building and training affect the sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD. Indicators such as operational project office, proper combination of the project into the systems of the organization, awareness and documentation of the projects' vision and mission statements, resources such as staff are efficiently controlled and existence of structural systems to meet the requirements of the project affect sustainability. Thus 234 (77.6%) respondents (mean of 3.88) agreed to the narrative that project has an operational office. Although there were those who disagreed with the narrative they were few. This shows their belief in organizational capacity and training in enhancing success and sustainability of projects. The research also shows the respondents believed that institutional capacity building and training affects sustainability of projects going by the mean of 3.52 (using a likert scale

1-5) who agreed with the notion.

Monitoring an evaluation was also confirmed to affect the sustainability of the projects. Implementation of the planned activities as stipulated in quarter plans, project having feedback mechanisms on short and middle plan achievements, Monitoring findings enhance planning and implementation and monitoring findings being shared with stakeholders and donors to show success affects sustainability of the projects. These were in concurrent with the conclusion by Dobrea et al., (2010); Monitoring and evaluation have always been necessary effective tools for enhancing project management. This is both applicable for short and medium term projects that require various levels of complexity in their execution. They are particularly necessary tools to ensure accountability of the project both in terms in financial distribution and execution of various aspects of the project that relate to its intended results and sustainability.

Project sustainability was also found to be affected by the project reports which give concrete evidence to the public that the project is working, the project constantly adjusting to alterations in its surrounding and the ability of the project to decide on aspects that are not effective and should be discontinued. According to Yaghootkar and Gil (2011), for the success of a project, unfluctuating monitoring and evaluation systems and seamless workflows need to be developed. When it is intergarted into the project at the stage of inception all the parties involved will have access to crucial information regarding how the various components are working and those that are not working at all, this constant feedback is necessary since it informs decision making.

Analysis of the findings revealed that beneficiaries and community participation affect the sustainability of the projects. Indicators such as community members were found to be involved in project identification, planning and implementation while different community groups are interested in the project sustainability were fund to affect project sustainability. Further, the project communicates with and involves community leaders and members are passionately committed to the project and developments of project goals were aspects that were found to affect sustainability. Analysis also established that when the project has management backing inside the organization and outside of the organization sustainability increases. In return, the project emphasizes on increased community awareness of the implementation and projects demonstrate their value to the public.

The findings show that sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD is affected by the participation of the beneficiaries and the communalities within which the projects are being implemented. According to Davids et al., (2009) the participation of the community in project development creates an enabling environment for the capacity of the community to be enhanced resulting in their effectiveness and efficiency when it comes to impelentation of various stages of the cycle of the project, that includes, recognizing potential projects, executing and making the constant follow up to ensure that the agreed upon plans are being followed De Beer (1998) concluded that through the constant meeting of the wants of the people, the realization of objectives becomes simplified. It is a system that allows the community to set their own terms and prioritize according to their own developed criteria and act on the set action points. It is only when the community is fully able to understand their capabilities and use these capabilities to attain defined plans are they considered to be operating at maimum potential

Discussions of the Findings:

On the effect of organizational capacity and training, the study established that leaders with good management skills are necessary for project success. All projects should ensure that their leadership effectively articulates the project vision to external partners for sustainability. The findings are like those of Light and Hubbard (2002) and Temali (2012) who concluded that capacity building entails a thorough breakdown of prevailing capacity, recognizing capacity required and crafting of applicable steps to close the capacity gap. It can assume several levels comprising financial capacity, social resources and human resources and through it project sustainability is not compromised.

Langran(2002) concluded that as a crucial tactic, development organs employ capacity building as a means to safeguard the continuity of development projects. Positive capacity building heads to personal and group empowerment. Such collective empowerment is what supports the project team to add continuity into projects. This is concurrent with the findings of the research which established for the effective impenlettation of the project objectives and functions the management has to to be able to to gain the conficdnec of both the stakeholders and the staff by employing key

management skills.

The study further revealed that training is necessary to make staff and leaders and project implementers more productive and projects sustainable. The findings further revealed that sound management skills ensure that project resources are directed in the right direction and only used for the purposes intended. These findings are concurrent with those of Light and Hubbard (2000) who concluded that, organisational capacity is critical in attaining programmatic outcomes. Most significant resource which is human labor can be harnessed through training.

The study revealed that monitoring and evaluation are necessary tools for the effective implementation of projects and also for the sustainability of the project itself. Monitoring and evaluation assesses the efficiency of the project team and therefore any derailments are identified in a timely fashion. These findings are concurrent with those of Dobrea et al. (2010). They are particularly necessary tools to ensure accountability of the project both in terms of financial distribution and execution of various aspects of the project that relate to its intended results and sustainability. This is both applicable for short and medium term projects that require various levels of complexity in their execution.

The study further revealed that the consistent and regular reporting creates an environment for unbiased monitoring and evaluation to take place. Monitoring should occur from the preproject stage through to after the implementation stage. The reports generated assist the management team and the implementers and beneficiaries to make well informed decisions on the aspects of the project that are not performing. These findings are concurrent with those of Yaghootkar and Gil (2011) who stated that for the success of a project, unfluctuating monitoring and evaluation systems and seamless workflows need to be developed. When it is integrated into the project at the stage of inception all the parties involved will have access to crucial information regarding how the various components are working and those that are not working at all, this constant feedback is necessary since it informs decision making.

Further the study revealed that the implementation as per the agreed quarter plans and the strategic plan are necessary for the creation of proper monitoring and evaluation systems. These findings are concurrent with those of Wiersma (2004) who concludes that monitoring should be detailed by the occasional or constant selection of a representative to gauge the various levels of variable parameters.

The study revealed that when the community and beneficiaries participate in the development of projects from the planning stage the likelihood of ownership of the project is increased. This also increases the sustainability of the project overall. When diverse community groups are invested in the project then there is the possibility of common initiatives like resource mobilization drives and joint accountability of the results of the project. In this manner both the beneficiaries and the community own the project since they are bound by the common need of seeing to the success of the project.

These findings agree with those of Davids et al. (2009), who concluded that the participation of the community in project development creates an enabling environment for the capacity of the community to be enhanced resulting in their effectiveness and efficiency when it comes to implementation of various stages of the cycle of the project, that includes, recognizing potential projects, executing and making the constant follow up to ensure that the agreed upon plans are being followed. Further findings revealed that when the community is invested in the project then they are more prone to volunteer their services and time towards the implementation of the various aspects of the project. This together with the harnessing of strong leadership support creates the ownership necessary to support the sustainability of the project. These findings are in concurrence with those of De Beer (1998) who stated that through the constant meeting of the wants of the people, the realization of objectives becomes simplified. It is a system that allows the community to set their own terms and prioritize according to their own developed criteria and act on the set action points. It is only when the community is fully able to understand their capabilities and use these capabilities to attain defined plans are they considered to be operating at maximum potential.

The study further revealed that when the community openly and actively participates in the process of decision making, management, and monitoring and evaluation, then they are more likely to show to both donors and management that the project is a success since they feel directly responsible for the success as they are a large part of the process. Community participation trains the community in the process of conflict resolution and it also gives the community the ability to make decisions whenever the need arises. These findings agree with those of Roodt (2001) who concluded that when the project is co-managed and responsibility of planning and implementation is shared project sustainability

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social SciencesVol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

improves. By doing this, the risk of the project is also shared. This is the most empowering kind of participation to the community because their capacity is enhanced through the constant interaction with the management. It is important for the project to be regarded as a partnership between the management and the community for sustainability to be realized.

The study established that when a community is able to access local resources cheaply and consistently during project implementation, the project is most likely to be sustainable and self sufficient. According to Mc Connell (2002), communities are rich in resources and need to be enabled on the proper mechanisms to tap the resources. The findings further revealed that due to the constant change in the economy a project must have the ability to exist in various economic states and adapt accordingly at no cost. These findings are similar to those of Mekonnen (2007), who concluded that, a sustainable project is one that should be viable and should have an adaptability plan and should be able to accommodate changes in the environment which it exists. This should be done while ensuring that it actively communicates with the relevant partners and constantly meeting demands of its beneficiaries and that they desired results are met and benefits all. A sustainable adaptability plan is one that identifies local resources and taps from. The resources must be readily available and affordably utilized while taking into consideration the needs of the generations to come.

The findings further revealed that a project should be able to have a sustainability plan and therefore all policies implemented should have the capacity to ensure sustained funding from either external or internal sources. This findings agree with those of Mekonen (2010), who states when a project relies mostly on resources that have been imported, the maintenance may be compromised and therefore the sustainability of the project is put in question. This leads to an imbalance whereby the project challenges the very resources that the project seeks to improve and the intervention sought is not realized.

Conclusions of the Study:

According to the findings, project sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD is affected by organizational capacity and training, monitoring and evaluation, beneficiary and community participation and the utilization of local resources. Organizational capacity and training affects project sustainability since it is a reflection of the management capabilities. The study revealed that when a project has management that is able in various aspects, project sustainability is improved. Sustainability can be enhanced by incorporating training in the projects' strategic and annual plans. The vision and mission of the projects should be made known to all members. This will ensure that community's contribution to the projects is improved.

The study concluded that project sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD is affected by monitoring and evaluation. The study concludes that the consistent monitoring of the project process affects its sustainability. When reports from the monitoring and evaluation activities are shared to the various stakeholders accountability is enhanced and this leads to the sustainability of the project. The monitoring and evaluation process should have plans for short-term and long-term resource needs. This will enhance timely availability of reports of all the significant project milestones and coordinates internal monitoring and evaluation of the supply chain function in respect of the project being undertaken. In addition, when monitoring and evaluation incorporates the opinion and needs of the community in project implementation the project becomes sustainable.

The study concluded that project sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD is affected by community and beneficiary participation. When there are clear channels of communication and clear structures enabling the community to participate in the identification, planning and implementation of a project the project becomes sustainable. The passive participation of a community in various aspects of a project can lead to the ultimate failure of a project as the ownership of the project is not clearly defined by all stakeholders. The study concluded that when the community and beneficiaries are in support of the project publicly they are more likely to participate in the initiatives like resource mobilization drives towards the project. The study concludes that it is necessary for a project to address its relevance to the public by creation of awareness. This builds the passion of community members' commitment to the project and development of project goals.

The study concluded that project sustainability of projects funded by NDFPWD is affected by the utilization of locally available resources. When the community and beneficiaries are able to tap into local resources consistently and freely

for the purpose of project continuity the project becomes sustainable. The study also concludes that the use of imported resources compromises the sustainability of the project. When a project has reliable source of money which can be accessed regularly for purposes of project implementation then sustainability becomes likely. During the designing of a project, a contingency and maintenance plan is necessary to ensure sustainability of funding.

Recommendations:

The study recommended that groups of persons with disabilities select and appoint managers with appropriate management skills. The managers should be visionary and fully understand the objectives of the project and its overall goal.

Government should ensure that as funds are being allocated towards projects of persons with disabilities there is also adequate funding to ensure that the proper monitoring and evaluations tools have been budgeted.

Government should only allocate funds towards the projects of persons with disabilities after a comprehensive needs analysis has been established

Project managers should ensure that prior to the implementation of a project, the targeted beneficiaries should have the capability and capacity to be self sufficient in the event of withdrawal of donors. This involves the training of the community and beneficiaries in alternative sources of income

REFERENCES

- [1] Africa Union of the Blind (2007). *State of Disabled Peoples Rights in Kenya (2007) Report*. Nairobi, Kenya: Africa Union of the Blind.
- [2] Alkin, M. (1969). *Simulated Evaluation Exercise Materials Supplement*. Washington, D.C.: California University. Center for the Study of Evaluation
- [3] Anesi, V. (2009). Moral Hazard and Free Riding in Collective Action. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 6(2), 197-219. Springer
- [4] Babbie, E. R. (2008). *The Basics of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth
- [5] Barasa, R. (2014). *Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Tools on Project Completion in Kenya: A Case of Constituency Development fund projects*.
- [6] Baumgartner, R and Ebner, D. (2010). Corporate Sustainability Strategies: *Sustainability Profiles and Maturity Levels*. *Sustainable Development*. Wiley Interscience
- [7] Best, J.W. and Kahn, J.V. (2004). *Research in Education*. (7th ed.). New Delhi, India: Prentice Hall.
- [8] Bukhala, S. M. & Ganesh, P. (2016). Factors Influencing Programme Sustainability of Organisations for Persons with Disability in Kenya: A case of Kenya society for the blind. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 2 (1), 54-69.
- [9] Caswell, P. (2003). *Christian Blind Mission International Report to the Partnership Committee on Vocational Training and Employment*. Unpublished report.
- [10] Callaghan, S. (1997). Participative development: Adopting a holistic approach.
- [11] Cobley, D.S. (2012). Towards Economic Empowerment: Segregation Versus Inclusion in the Kenyan Context. *In Disability and Society* 27(3):371- 384. Routledge.
- [12] Connolly, P. and Lukas, C. (2002). *Strengthening Nonprofit Performance: A funder's guide to Capacity Building*. St. Paul, MN: Amherst Wilder Foundation.
- [13] Cooper, C. R., and Emory, D. W. (2005). *Business Research Methods*. Brunel University.
- [14] Crawford, P. and Bryce, P. (2003). Project Monitoring and Evaluation for Enhancing Efficiency and Effectiveness of Projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21 (5)363-373

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

 Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

- [15] Creighton, J.L. (2005). *The Public Participation Handbook. Making Better Decisions Through Citizen Involvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [16] Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (2nd ed.). California, USA: Sage. New Jersey, US: Prentice Hall.
- [17] Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [18] Davids, I. T. (2009). *Participatory development in South Africa: A Development Management Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- [19] De Beer, F. S. (1998). *Community Development and Beyond: Issues, structure and Procedures*. Pretoria: Van Schaik
- [20] Dobrea, R. C., Ciocoiu, N. & Tipa, S. (2010). Investments Characteristics in Infrastructure Industry, *Economia. Seria Management*, 13(6), 204-210
- [21] Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (1992). *Making a Difference: NGOs and Development in a Changing World*. The University of California Earthscan Publications, 1992
- [22] Eunice Opondo, (2016): *experiences of persons with disabilities in the utilization of the economic empowerment fund in Nairobi County, Kenya*. University of Nairobi.
- [23] Field, M., and Keller, O. (1997). *Project Management*, Andover, Thomson Learning, Emea
- [24] Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum
- [25] Funnell, S. C., and Rogers, P. J. (2011). *Purposeful Program Theory: Effective Use of Theories of Change and Logic Models*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- [26] George, D. & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A simple Guide and Reference*. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- [27] Golla A., Maihotra A., Nanda P. and Mehra, R.(2012). *Understanding Measuring Economic Empowerment: Definition, Framework and Indicator*. Washington D.C: International Center for Research on Women.
- [28] Government of Kenya (2006). *National Disability Policy*. Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services, Nairobi, Kenya.
- [29] Government of Kenya (2003). *The Persons with Disabilities Act, 2003*. Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 111 (Acts No. 14). Government Printer, 9 January 2003, Nairobi, Kenya.
- [30] Greene, R and Schriver M (2016) ,*Human Behavior and the Social Environment: Engaging Diversity and Difference in Practice*; Handbook of Human Behavior and the Social Environment, A Practice-Based Approach. Routledge.
- [31] Gyorkos T. (2013). Monitoring and Evaluation of large Scale Helminth Control Programmes. *ActaTropic*, 86(2): 275 –282.
- [32] Holt, D.H. (2003). *Entrepreneurship-New venture creation*. New Delhi, India: Prentice Hall.
- [33] Hussein Abdi Ali(2013). *Determinants of community participation in the implementation of development projects: a case of Garissa sewerage project*. University of Nairobi.
- [34] Joppe, M. (2000). *The Research Process. Journal of Development Agriculture Economics*. Vol 8(11).408-418. Journal of the Community Development Society, 34(1), 18-35.
- [35] Kamuku, S. (2015). *Factors Influencing Sustainability of Micro and Small Scale Enterprises (SMES) Projects Funded Under the Women Enterprise Fund in Mombasa County, Kenya*. University of Nairobi
- [36] Karani, N. F., Bichanga, W. O., & Kamau, C. G. (2014). Effective Use of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Managing HIV/AIDS Related Projects: A Case Study of Local NGOS in Kenya. *Science Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 67-76.

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

 Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

- [37] Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (2009), *Statistical Abstract*. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
- [38] Kaufman, R. (1983). A Holistic Planning Model. *Performance & Instruction Journal*. Washington DC.
- [39] Kotze, D. a. (1997). Participation and Managerial Approaches to Development. : *Development Administration and Management: A Holistic Approach* . Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- [40] Langi, P. P. (2008). Approaches, Frameworks and Tools for Monitoring and Evaluation Psychosocial Programs For Young People; *A Scoping Study*. Sydney NSW 2000; Canteen Australia
- [41] Langran, I. (2002) Empowerment and the Limits of Change: NGOs and Health Decentralization In the Philippines. University of Toronto
- [42] Leedy, P. (2000) *Planning and Design, Practical Research*. 6th Edition London. Edward Arnold Publishers London: Oxford University Press
- [43] Lewis, R. (2004). Communication Technology in the Developing Nations. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 20(6): 159-159
- [44] Light, P.C. and Hubbard, E. T. (2002). *The Capacity Building Challenge*. The Brookings Institute: Washington, DC.
- [45] Maredia, M. (2013). *Paper presented at the Workshop for Managers of Impact Evaluation organized by the Michigan State University*. Washington D.C.
- [46] McConnell, C. (2002). Making Change Work for You—Or at Least Not Against You. *The health Care Manager*. 20. 66-77.
- [47] McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in Education: Evidence-Based Inquiry* (6thed.). Boston: Pearson
- [48] Mekonen, G. (2007). *Characterization of Small Holder Poultry Production and Marketing System of Dale, Wonsho and Loka Abaya Weredas of Southern Ethiopia*. Awassa (Ethiopia): Hawassa University
- [49] Mikkelsen, B. (2005). *Methods for development work and research: A new guide for practitioners* (6th ed.). New Delhi: SAGE Publication
- [50] Miller, G .and Spoolman, S, (2011). *Living in the Environment: Principles, Connections, and Solutions*. Cengage Learning Brooks
- [51] Mont, D. (2007). *Measuring Disability Prevalence*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- [52] Mugenda, O. M. and Mugenda, A. G. (2009). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative approaches*. Nairobi. Kenya: Acts Press.
- [53] Muchelule, Yusuf. (2017). *Effect of Monitoring Techniques on Project Performance of Kenyan State Corporations*. *European Scientific Journal*. 13..
- [54] Mwangi, A. W. & Iravo, M. A. (2015). How Monitoring and Evaluation Affects the Outcome of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Kenya: A Case Study of Projects in Gatanga Constituency. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* March 2015, Vol. 6, No. 3.
- [55] Mwanzia, J. (2004). Tracking Performance of Kenya's Development Plan.
- [56] Mwinamo, C. A. (2015). *The influence of the monitoring & evaluation Report on project External audit plan: a case of International development association funded Projects in Mombasa county, Kenya*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- [57] Nachmias, C. and Nachmias, D. (2008) *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. 6th Edition, Worth, New York
- [58] Nampila, T. (2005). *Assessing Community Participation: The Huidare Informal Settlement*. University of Stellenbosch
- [59] National Coordinating Agency for Population and Development (2008). *Kenya National Survey for Persons with Disabilities Report*.

International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences

 Vol. 5, Issue 4, pp: (385-406), Month: July - August 2018, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

- [60] Ngoe, O. (2012). *Factors Influencing Financial Sustainability of Enterprises Funded under the Youth Enterprise Development Fund Programmes in Mombasa County*, Kenya. Nairobi of University.
- [61] Nillson, Lisbeth (2011). Communication Mediated by a Powered Wheelchair: People with Profound Cognitive Disabilities. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 3.
- [62] Ontario Trillium Foundation. (2005). Building Capacity, Granting for Impact. Canada. Ontario Trillium Foundation
- [63] Patton, M.Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused Evaluation*. Sage Publications.
- [64] Pollack, J. (2007). *The contribution of Project Management and Change Management to Project Success*, New York. Sage Journals
- [65] Pretty, J. (1995). *Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture*, World Development. Washington DC
- [66] Reeve, R. (2002). Policing *International Trade in Endangered Species: the CITES Treaty and Compliance*. The Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) and Earthscan, London, UK,
- [67] Roodt, M. (2001). Participation, Civil Society and Development In Coetzee: *Development Theory, Policy and Practice*. South Africa: Oxford University Press: 469-482
- [68] Scarborough, N.M. (2011). *Essentials of entrepreneurship and Small business management*. (6th edn.)
- [69] Scarborough, N.M., Wilson, D.L., and Zimmerer, T.W. (2009). *Effective small business management- An entrepreneurial approach*. (9th edn.). New Jersey, US: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [70] Schneiberg, M., and Soule, S. (2005). Institutionalization as a Contested, Multilevel Process: The Case of Rate Regulation in American Fire Insurance; *Social Movements and Organization Theory* (Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics, pp. 122-160). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [71] Scott, Z., Wooster, K., Thomson, A., and Tarazona, M. (2016). "Monitoring and evaluating disaster risk management capacity; *Disaster Prevention and Management*
- [72] Seline, K. (2015). *Factors influencing sustainability of micro and small scale Enterprises (smes) projects funded under the women enterprise Fund in Mombasa County, Kenya*, University of Nairobi.
- [73] Shepherd, R. (1994). "Dimensional structure of the Perceived Behavioural Control". World Vision International
- [74] Slater R. and Mphale M. (2008). "Cash Transfers, Gender and Generational Relations: Evidence from a Pilot Project in Lesotho". World Vision International.
- [75] Solomon, P. & Young, R. (2007). *Performance Based-Earned Value*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd Publishing House, San Francisco trade-offs. International Initiative for Impact Evaluation, European Management Journal, 25(6), 298-309.
- [76] Stead, W.E. & Stead, J.G. (2003). *Sustainable Strategic Management: Strategic Management*. ME Sharp INC, New York
- [77] Swierczek, F. W., & Carmichael, L. (1985). *Assessing training needs: A skills approach*. Public Personnel Management.
- [78] Tafara, A. C. (2013). Factors Influencing Sustainability of Rural Community Based Water Projects in Mtito Andei, Kibwezi Sub-County, Kenya. (Doctoral Dissertation), University of Nairobi.
- [79] Taylor, G. and Paola, P. (2014). "Review of Evaluation Approaches and Methods used by Interventions on Economic Empowerment". Unpublished.
- [80] Temali, M. (2012). *The Community Economic Development: Strategies and Tools to Revitalize Neighborhood*. Nashville: Fieldstone Alliance