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**ABSTRACT**

Sustainability of community based projects has been an intricate process. However, effective community participation, monitoring and evaluation, and financial factors plays crucial role in determining the existence of the projects. This study assesses the factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in Rumbek East County, 100 respondents were randomly sampled. Questionnaires were administered to 100 respondents.

Quantitative approaches were deployed to analyses data involving descriptive and inferential statistics using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 23rd version.

On the other hand, there was significant relationship between local community involvement, monitoring and evaluation, financial factor, and sustainability of CBPs. Results implies that, most of the CBPs in Rumbek East County does not meet expected impacts and goals since they are conducted with ineffective community participation, poor monitoring and evaluation and funded solicited are mostly not released on time or mismanaged. Researcher recommends that, government and other stakeholders should enforce proper mechanisms that will encourage mutual benefits to the local communities in CBPs; and CBPs should be designed with self-financing mechanisms in order to ensure their survival even after phasing out of donors funds.
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**Chapter One**

1. **Introduction**

This chapter covers the background of the research problem, statement of problem, objective of the study, research questions, and significance of the study and limitation of the study.

* 1. **Background of the study**

The community based projects (CBPs) are core initiatives for intervention of common problems while enhancing development in most communities. With this in mind, different projects are formulated and carried every year with different purposes such as ensuring clean water supply improving community health, reducing poverty ,promoting human rights and peace, managing natural resources, climate change adaption and many more. These projects work to provide solutions and hope to communities in need such as rural areas where majority of population in developing Countries dwells (Oino, 2015). Most of the CBPs are meant to be sustainable, with implication of delivering positive impacts beyond the funding support. However, the sustainability of these projects has been a major issue.

According to UNHCR, 2016 report, most of community Based projects in developed Countries have long life cycle because they have well developed systems of monitoring project implementation. About 40 percent of many new projects fall short of life after first few years since the termination of initial fund (Fabietti & Giovannoni, 2014). Most of projects fail to sustain in rural areas (Persoon, 2016). Failure of projects to sustain associated with different factors. Among of them including; political regime transition (Adam 2015); lack of community participation Tifow (2013); community not owning projects (Harvey and Reed, 2007) and; low community technical capacity, projects technical and innovation capacities and community technological competencies (Jones & Brandis, 2008; Persoon,2005).

In Western Lakes State, only 40 percent of existing rural water points are functional and a quarter of the newly installed systems fail after only two years of operation. Lack of sustainability is associated with lack of finance especially for operation and maintenance, lack of technical personnel at the project level, lack of spare parts and lack of community participation. Some of CBPs which has not sustain includes, wells and boreholes conducted in Aduel Payam and Pacong Payam which was financed by International Donor Agencies. The question of its sustainability was due to poor technology choice, poor supervision and lack of expertise and experience. (International project leadership Academy Report, 2006).

The sustainability of community based projects is determined by many factors, among of them are community participation, Financial support, monitoring and evaluation, Leadership Capacity of community Leaders and Community awareness about different projects (Harvey and Reed, 2007; Lachapelle, 2008, Nwankwoal, 2011; and Nkongo, 2009). Taking into account the important of sustainability of community based projects, this study assess the extended the factors mentioned by different studies affect the sustainability of project in rural areas in Rumbek East Counties.

* 1. **Statement of the Problem**

The community Based projects are meant to be sustainable with implication of delivering positive impacts beyond the funding support. South Sudan like other developing Countries, have been positively impacted by community based projects efforts (NBs, 2013). The CBPs are planned for a certain period of time after which they come to an end while the community is expected to continue running the project and make them self-sustaining. While this is expected to be in south Sudan sustainability of community based projects is referred as a major issue for many implementing agencies and beneficiaries. Also the full potential of the CBPs has yet to be tapped due to the existence of a number of constraints such as lack of ownership, lack of planning, improper financing and poor management (Longenecker, et al, 2006). Poor governance has also been identified as one of the most serious constraints facing the sustainability of CBPs and hence hindering their profitability (Oketch, 2000). Most of CBPs in South Sudan fails to sustain themselves, become self-reliant and the communities have failed to continue running them after funding organizations withdraw their support (World Vision, 2009). On top of that, the sustainability of community based projects in South Sudan has raised debate among donors, for example a water project which carries out in Lakes state success due community participation during project planning and implementation (Shayo, 2013). Also an irrigation project which was done in Mathiang village proved failure due to misuse of project Fund. Therefore this research look study seeks an understanding on the factors affecting sustainability of CBPs.

* 1. **General Objective**

The general objective of this study is to assess factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in Western Lakes State (South Sudan).

* + 1. **Specific Objectives**

1. To examine the role of community participation in the sustainability of CBPs in Rumbek East County
2. To assess how monitoring and evaluation affect sustainability of CBPs in Rumbek East County
3. To assess how financial factor affect the sustainability of CBPs projects in Rumbek East County.
   1. **Research Questions**
4. What is the role of community participation in the sustainability of CBPs in Rumbek East County
5. To what extend do monitoring and evaluation affect sustainability of the CBPs in Rumbek East County
6. To what extend do financial factor affect the sustainability of the CBPs projects in Rumbek East County

**1.5 Purpose of Study**

The study “Assessment of Factors Affecting Sustainability of Community Based projected in Rumbek East County areas” will endeavor to determine the factors that would make the community development project self-reliant and sustainable after phasing-out.

* 1. **Significance of the Study**

This study is significance for a number of reasons. The sustainability of CBPs has been a continuous debate and different studies have come out with different results, thus doing study for specific County is of great importance since it is easier to capture County specific characteristics which may be ignored when one is one cross-sectional study. The study also assists policy makers in policy selection and decision making as through it, they will able to understand well the factors affecting sustainability of the CBPs. Furthermore this study contributes more to the library of knowledge especially by updating already available information since the study includes current statistics which are unavailable in other studies. Lastly, the study also helps researchers to gain knowledge and understanding in attainment of the partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the Diploma Program

* 1. **Scope of the Study**

The scope of this study has been designed by considering three major factors namely limited resources, quality control and time. The study covers only four major factors affecting the sustainability of community based projects namely; community participation, financial support as well as monitoring and evaluation. This gives a researcher a confined area of the study which is easy to control and easy to understanding the effect of those factors. Geographically, the study covers only villages in Rumbek East County whereby questionnaires be administered to community leaders and communities.

* 1. **Limitation of the study**

The researcher faced various draw backs while conducting the study. Considering the fact that the study adopted a survey design, collecting data from the vast number of respondents were very cumbersome. To counter this, the researcher were obliged to seek the help of research assistants to aid in data collection. Securing appointment from the selected respondents also proved troublesome. To solve this problem, the researcher booked appointments early enough and make a follow up.

**Chapter Two**

**Literature Review**

1. **Overview**

This chapter includes related theories to the research problem. It is organized into conceptual definitions, theoretical and empirical reviews leading to the derivation of knowledge gaps existing in various studies. The Study consists of a conceptual framework which shows variables on sustainability of community based projects in rural areas.

* 1. **Conceptual Definitions**

**2.1.1 Community Based Projects**

Community based projects (CBPs) are core initiatives for intervention of common problems while enhancing development in most communities. With this in mind, different projects are formulated and carried every year with different purposes such as ensuring clean water supply, improving community health, reducing poverty, promoting human rights and peace, managing natural resources, climate change adaptation and many more. These projects work to provide solutions and hope to communities in need such as rural areas where majority of population in developing Counties dwells (Oino, 2015).

**2.2.2**. **Project Sustainability**

Project sustainability has been defined by the World Bank (1992) as – the ability of a project to maintain an adequate level of benefit flows through its valued economic life”, Further, Khan (2000) defined project sustainability as the capability of a project to maintain its benefits for projected life time. Therefore, for a project to be sustainable, it should maintain its benefits to a projected life time. Basing on various project purposes and objectives, project sustainability can be regarded in different aspects. This study regards the project sustainability as the ability of the project meet project needs.

**2.2.3. Community**

According to UNHCR (2008) community is referred as group of people that recognize it or recognized by outsiders as sharing common cultures, religion or other social features, background and interest that forms collective identity. Therefore a community can be large or small depending on the members’ commonality. In conjunction to title community may be the beneficiaries or partners in the concerned project. Although, it is difficult to give a comprehensive definition of community because people are changing their ways of life due to environment, economy and communications and intermingling through intermarriages and migrations, this study adopted this definition since it fit well Western Lakes State environment.

**2.2.4. Financial Management and Practices on Financial Sustainability**

This involves how the organizations manage their funds and the existing finance policies to govern expenditure. Kumar (2004) asserts that a financial management and practices supported by strong governance, high quality standards, and sound regulatory frameworks is essential to economic development. Indeed, high quality standards of financial reporting, auditing, and ethics underpin the trust that investors place in financial and nonfinancial information thus play an integral role in contributing to a Country’s economic growth and financial stability.

According to Kumar (2004), globally consistent and uniform financial systems provide cost- efficiencies to business and greater safeguards to the public. The public is entitled to have confidence that regardless of where a business activity occurs, the same high quality standards is be applied. It is widely recognized that investors are more willing to diversify their investments across borders if they are able to rely on financial information based on a similar set of standards. The benefits of a global financial reporting framework are numerous and include: greater comparability of financial information for investors, greater willingness on the part of investors to invest across borders, lower cost of capital, more efficient allocation of resources, and higher economic growth.

**2.2.5. Project Monitoring and Evaluation**

Project monitoring is stakeholders’ continuous process of tracking performance indicators of project initiatives. This ensures that project implementation proceeds as anticipated and modifications to designs and plans are effected on the basis of arising need for change based on the external and internal policy environment. Evaluation and control on the other hand involve systematic assessment of effectiveness and efficiency on project achievement while determining the gaps for remedial policy formulations. These processes assess the utilization of resources providing basis for improving the existing strategy that enhances post implementation sustainability. End users active involvement in demand specification for development initiatives is one of the drivers of process innovation Hakkinen and Belloni, (2011). In management projects, monitoring can be used to improve the way governments and private organizations achieve results and ensure project sustainability. This can be ensured through investing in strengthening a national monitoring and evaluation system; which is important as it saves resources that may otherwise be spent inefficient programs or overlapping activities supported by different partners 9Global Fund, 2004). A mature and sustained monitoring and evaluation system has the potential to lead the organization towards meeting its responsibilities and achieving its goals, even when faced with socio-political crises that mar the development sector so often (IFAD, 2002). Monitoring and evaluation systems are designed \_ to inform project management of whether implementation is going as planned or corrective action is needed. A well-designed monitoring and evaluation system provides data on the progress of a project and whether it is meeting objectives 9World Bank, 2002).

* 1. **Theoretical Reviews**

**2.3.1 The Participatory Theory**

Participation theory has a lot to tell about community based projects, the theory provides that effective participation of important stakeholders of the related project can enhance enduring project impact. Jennings (2000) defined participation, as the total involvement by a local population and at times, addition stakeholders in the creation, content and conduct a program or policy designed to change their lives, built on the belief that, citizens can be trusted to shape their own future. Therefore participatory theory encourages mutual involvement of all stakeholders, especially the use of local communities’ decision making and capacities to guide and define the nature of an intervention.

**2.3.2 The Top-Down Model Theory**

The theory of top down places emphasis on participation of one another from the management to the people concerned (Grahame, 2001). Capitalism, top-down approaches to development and or poverty itself are seen as sources of disempowerment that must be challenged by “lowering” – the poor and disenfranchised (Chambers, 1997) into the management of community and development processes. The growth of civil society and participatory development methods are usually proposed as the mechanisms by which empowerment takes place (Friedman, 1992; Chambers 1997). The Top down Model Theory helped the researcher to understand how communities are involved in designing and implementation of projects. Taking into account the importance of community involvement this theory provided ground on how the two variable links and how to be considered to ensure project sustainability.

**2.3.3. Theory of Change**

INSP (2005) defined a theory of change as an expression of the important strategies that are critical for brining outcomes and improvement guided by service delivery strategy. Theory of change represents the need of the expected project beneficiaries and what strategies facilitated them to encounter those needs. The strategy establishes a framework for bearing connections between and organization’s mission, project strategies and actual results, while creating relations among the project implementers, the strategies that are implemented and project end results. This theory showed fundamentals of project sustainability as the theory has defined actions, necessary strategies for long term project outcomes as well as desired project outcomes. By applying theory of change in executing the community based project provides an opportunity to ensure that project staffs, community, and other key stakeholders, all share a common understanding on the expected outcomes that are expected to occur and their contribution in the change (WCED, 1987). The theory of the change also helped the researcher to understand what the project variables and factors determine the change of the project sustainability at the research area. By knowing this critical information, it enable the researcher to measure the community project results and compare them against the original intent, in order to detect the relative change. Therefore this study put into consideration the theory of change as the researcher assessed the sustainability of various projects in the study area, mainly by looking on the expected results and the change it has influenced.

**2.3.4 Financial Distress Theory**

This theory is characterized by decline in the firm’s performance, value and failure ( Opler and Titman, 1994). Organizations with projects that are supposed to yield profits have to ensure their project perform as per expectations. Projects for profits should first recoup the initial capital invested then yield profits. This theory is important when addressing financial challenges affecting the sustainability of CBPs.

The CBPs financial management practices have a gap they do not operate within budget shave weak internal controls. The major challenges of this theory is it cannot recognize symptoms of failure early enough in order to make corrections. The performance of CBPs has been declining and there is need to track and ensure they improve. This theory therefore guided in the understanding of the important role that financial factor plays in the survival and persistence of project.

**2.4 Empirical Literature Review**

**2.4.1 Role of Community Participation in sustainability of CBPs**

Shayo (2013) observed on community participation and sustainability on national water projects in Chalinze. The study was conducted in Chalinze whereby 130 respondents were selected to obtain both quantitative and qualitative data. Structured questionnaires, focus group discussion, observations, interview of key informants and documentary reviews were used to obtain relevant information. Checklist and observation kits were used for interviews and focus groups discussion and observation. The findings show that the community participation in planning and implementation of Chalinze water supply project was very poor, as well as monitoring mechanism of operation management and community participation on decision making was not satisfactory.

Women (2010) based on an examination of factors affecting women’ participation in project planning and implementation, case the TASAF program in the Rufiji district Tanzania. The findings have revealed that women’s participation in development projects and TASAF in particular, was affected by social, political and economic factors embedded at community, national and global levels. The study used qualitative research method to obtain information.

Boru (2012) conducted a study on determinants of community ownership of water project in Kenya. The study revealed that community involvement influences community ownership of water projects. The study also concluded that there is a significant and inverse relationship between distances from the water sources and ownership of water projects. Furthermore the established that technology use, ease of operation and maintenance cost, availability of spare parts influences community ownership of water projects. Therefore, this study examined the extent which community get involved in designing and implementation of projects.

Nkongo (2009), the study on management and regulation for sustainable water supply schemes rural communities in Tanzania revealed that community participation and ownership have valuable role to play in achieving sustainability, but can create other challenges. In particular how realistic is participatory decision making where community members have very little understandings on various management technological options and their implication on long run. This raises the question of whether it is appropriated to try and bridge such a vast and costly knowledge gap for the sake of ownership

Lachapelle (2008), revealed that applying the concept of ownership makes it easier in determining show the interest and actions of individuals or organization contributes to community development work. The level of dedication to the process and outcome is enhanced that is if individuals are engaged authentically and intimately, engaging individual lead to greater chances of support in implementation and realization of community development goals. This study examined the extent which individual are engaged on community based projects.

**2.4.2. Project monitoring and evaluation in sustainability of CBPs**

Tadesse, et.al (2013) conducted study titled –Rural Water Supply Management and sustainability, a case of central western Lakes State. The study assesses the important of community participation in water project whereas qualitative and quantitative methods are used to collect data. The findings indicated that the community participation in planning and implementation was very good while monitoring mechanism of operation and management as well as community participation on choice of technology was poor. The finding also reveal that there is lack of control mechanism in monitoring and evaluation of water project lead the poor management of water project properly for it sustainability. Kayaga (2015) conducted a study on the role of monitoring and evaluation in improving sustainability in water projects in Rumbek East County. Both quantitative data obtained though prepared questionnaires and qualitative data from interviews done with villager’s payams and county official and government members were used together with documentary evidences. Findings of study showed that the most applied monitoring and evaluation practices in water projects is field visited and meetings. It well known that regular monitoring and evaluation can help track any intervening changes in many CBPS, even though the research above have revealed that there is little consideration of monitoring and evaluation of water projects in the county, and therefore, this study engage more finding on monitoring and evaluation related factors which in one way or another affect the sustainability of community based projects, it also recommend more action points to which all CBPS stakeholders consider for more improvements.

Norman (2012) on his study investigated the reasons for failure of community-based projects at Rumbek east county areas. Questionnaires, and interviews were employed to collect data. The study revealed that lack of funds , poor project management, poor management of funds , lack of commitment and motivation , low level of education of project members , lack of community involvement , lack of monitoring and evaluation by government officials and community leaders , lack of monitoring and evaluation by government authority , community leaders , lack of training and unavailability of workshops for project members and government officials involvement in addressing project challenges were identified as the reasons for failure of community-based project.

**2.4.3 The Financial Support and Sustainability of CBPs**

Nyakkundi (2014) conducted a study that aimed at identifying on how stakeholder’s involvement influences project monitoring and evaluation and to establish the influence of project technical skills on the implementation of community based projects. The study used interview and questionnaire to collect data. The study reveal that very low stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation of donor funded project implementation. The study recommended that, project managers should be in-charge to provide resources for donor funded project to be sustainable. Hayson (2006) conducted a research in assessing the sustainability of water project in the areas of Rumbek East County, Rumbek Center County. Both qualitative and quantitative methods are used to collect information a purposive survey was undertaken covering 10 villages in different Counties. The study revealed positive correlation between project sustainability and fund management. Moreover the water project in the said areas failed to sustain due to improper management of project fund.

**2.6 Research Gap**

Different studies conducted by different authors have pointed out a mixture of factors, which tend to affect sustainability of community Based Projects in the world. There are numerous case studies that make similar claims, but which are based or may be limited to a single out for attention seem to miss the point. In accordance to Norman (2012) Kayaga (2015); state that lack of proper mechanism of monitoring and evaluation is one of the factor which tend to affect sustainability. Shayo (2013); found out that one of the reasons for project failure is community participation. Also Hyson (2006) and Nyakundi (2014) both explained financial factors as the cause for failure of community project to sustain but no hints on whether the financial support was sustainable not. The reports did not clearly state the capacities of the project to the community population involved it should be accompanied by many factors, among others financial strength and sustainability, community participation, monitoring and evaluation. Therefore this study put an emphasis on assessing to what extend community participation affect the sustainability, how financial support and monitoring and evaluation affect the sustainability of community based projects in Rumbek East County.

**2.7 Conceptual Framework**

The study makes review on the effect of both independent and dependent variables in CBPs sustainability of community based projects. This study conceptualized variables (independent and dependent) that affect the sustainability of community based projects. The sustainability of community based projects is dependent variables under this study determined by independent variables namely, community participation, Monitoring and Evaluation, Financial support.

The Figure 2.7 shows the conceptual framework of the proposed study.

**Community Participation**

* Participation in designing & Implementing project
* Labor and local materials contribution

**Financial Support**

* Grants Sustainability
* Self-Finance scheme/infrastructure
* Financial management

**Monitoring & Evaluation**

* Frequency of tracking the project
* Two way communication/feedback
* M&E Tools

**Sustainability of community Based Projects**

**Figure 2.7. Conceptual Framework**

**Source:** Field Data November, 2019

The figure 2.1 show that community based community projects is dependent variable which depends on the independent variables such as community involvement, financial support and monitoring and evaluation. Therefore this conceptual provides the summary of the study by showing which factors is put into consideration in assessing factors affecting sustainability of CBPs in Rumbek East County.

The ***independent variables***can be defined as all factors that can be controlled, subjected to change or test, independent variables affect dependent variable either positively or negatively (Mosby, 2009). In this study independent variables include financial support, project monitoring and evaluation, community participation and project implementers and controllers to mention few. The ***dependent variables*** can be defined as factors that measured learned the effect of one or more independents variables (Mosby, 2009). In this study titled factors affecting sustainability of CBPs sustainability; the dependent variables is sustainability of CBPs sustainability which can be measured to determine the effect of independent variables such as financial support, project monitoring and evaluation and community participation.

**Chapter Three: Research Methodology**

**3.1. Overview**

This chapter focused on the research methodologies that were followed during the study. It includes aspects such as the research methodology, research design, population of the study and sample size, data collection and data analysis method will be used.

**3.2 Research Design Approaches**

This study adopted a descriptive survey design because it describes the factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in Rumbek East County. According to Kothari (2004), descriptive survey is a method of collecting information by interviewing and administering questionnaires to a sample of individuals. Quantitative approached have been used for data collection and data analysis. Information and opinions have been collected directly from individuals who participate in community projects and those who are responsible for community development in the community.

Numerical descriptions of things and their relationships have been done in this study and more emphasis is on interpretation of respondents’ views and opinions for in depth understanding of the topic (Tewksbury, 2009). An interview was conducted to workers in nongovernmental organizations; community based organizations, political leaders, communities’ leaders and selected community members available in the communities that this study was carried. The involvement of these people assisted greatly in getting relevant information for the sustainability of community based projects. Advantage of conducting interview assisted in exploring information on how the selected factors for the study affects sustainability of the projects being implemented in Rumbek East County. The findings also assisted in recommending approaches for sustainability in a positive or negative ways. Quantitative data were collected to assess the statistical the relationship existing between the independent and dependent variables as well as reliability of the study tools being used.

**3.3. Area of the Research Study**

This study was conducted in Rumbek East County, the County was purposively selected based on evidence of existence of different community based projects such as health, water, education, agriculture, tourism, and other projects introduced by the government, donors and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

**3.4. Sampling Techniques and Sample Size**

Based on complexity structure and allocation of awards in Rumbek East County, the study employed both probability and non-probability sampling techniques in selected the sample size of 150 where by 120 were administered questionnaire and 30 were interviewed. The researcher applied a sampling formula provided by Kothari, (2004). Since the study involves multiple respondents, simple random sampling technique was used obtain study participants. This is a probability sampling whereby all members in the population have equal chance of being selected to form a sample (Adam and Kamuzora, 2008). The use of this method gives each participant an equal and independent chance of being selected. The technique is good when the population is made up of members of similar characteristics, as the size of random sample depends on the homogeneity (Shaughnessy et al.2000).

**3.5. Sample Size**

Sample size refers to the number of units or people that are chosen from which the researcher wish to gather information or data. Since the population of this study was small (60), there was no need of determining sample size order to achieve accuracy. Instead the entire population was considered as the sample size because it was possible to collect data from the whole population.

**3.6. Data Collection and Sources**

Both primary and secondary data were collected primary data were gathered through interviews and questionnaire methods. 30 respondents were interviewed face to face and questionnaires were administered to 120 respondents. Secondary data were collected from ministry of Physical infrastructure and social development office of rural activities and the even was collected from World Banks ‘World Development Indicators (WDI), National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) and reports from other recognized sources such as REPOA.

**3.7. Data Analysis**

Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected from primary source and compiled sorted, edited for accuracy and clarity, classified, coded into a coding sheet and analyzed using a statistical Package of Social Science 23rd version (SPSS).

**3.8. Instrument Validity**

Orodho (2009) defines validity as the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which was based on the research results. In other words, validity on the research results obtained from analyzes of the data actually represents the phenomenon under study. Due to time constraints, the research instruments were not piloted on a sample to find out if everything works well and detect any potential misunderstanding or biasing effects of different questions. However, the questions were posed across the cohorts and responses of more qualified respondents were used to determine the validity of the responses of the lesser qualified contenders. To improve the validity of the instruments open ended questionnaires were used I order to obtain personal responses from the respondents.

**3.9. Instrument Reliability**

Orodho (2009) defined reliability as measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. The stability of questions was assessed in terms of test-retest reliability. Due to time constraints, the questionnaires were not administered twice to the same group of respondents. However, the questions were posed across the cohorts and responses of more qualified respondents were used to determine the reliability of the responses. Questions used in the questionnaires were open ended to influence personalized responses from the contenders. These were then monitored for consistency across the responses and ascertain reliability of the questions.

3.10 **Research Ethics**

According to Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003), ethical considerations are important for any research. Ethical issues that were taken into consideration included proper conduct of the researcher and confidentiality of the information obtained from the respondents. An introductory letter to meet the respondents was obtained from the University and County Commissioner. Respondents were encouraged to participate voluntarily and before administering the questionnaire, the researcher sought informed consent from respondents. The researcher ensured anonymity and confidentiality of all the information collected.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS**

4.0 **Chapter Overview**

This chapter presents research findings and discussions on the assessment of the factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in rural areas. Findings were analyzed, presented and tested according to the specific objectives. Results were presented and analyzed as tested according to the specific objectives which were as follows:

(i) To examine the role of community participation in the sustainability of CBPs Rumbek East County.

(ii) To assess how monitoring and evaluation affect sustainability of CBPs in Rumbek East County.

(iii) To assess how financial factor affect the sustainability of the CBPs projects in Rumbek East County.

**4.0.1 Demographic information**

This section presents the findings on the general information and characteristics of the respondent’s

**4.1. Figure showing distribution of Gender of Respondent's**

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

The study found that 62.5% of the respondents were male while the remaining 37.2% were females. This shows that majority of the respondents in the study were male. The results are summarized in the figure 4.1. Above. This is an indication that community based projects are dominated by men. However it’s important to note that the gender ratio as per government regulations has been surpassed. This should be evident in the quality of decisions made to support the growth and sustainability of CBPs.

4.2. **Figure Showing Distribution of Age group of Respondent’s**

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

The study revealed that 35.7% were aged of 18\_30 year’s respondent’s, 32.1% were aged between 30\_40 years, and another 17.9% were aged between 45\_50 years while remaining 14.3% were aged above 60 years. These results are summarized and presented in the figure. The results imply that majority of the respondents were aged 30 years.

Demographic information on age showed that the community based projects are in the hands of young and vibrant populations. As shown in the figure, over 35.7% were aged below 30 years, a clear indication that they are well informed on the developments on the community based project issues and challenges. This should provide candid views on sustainability of CBPs in the County. These finding point to the fact that most of the respondents are in an age bracket (18\_30 years) which is informed on most issues concerning the area of the study and thus the researcher was confident that these were the right people to involve in a study.

4.3. **Figure showing Distribution of marital status of Respondent’s**

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

It was necessary to establish the marital status of the respondents. The study established that 39.3% were married, 32.1% were not married, and 12.5% were respondents from widow while 16.1% were respondents of divorced. The marital status were essential in establishing the opinion of different marital categories in regard to the study objectives. The results of the study were recorded in the figure above for interpretation purposes.

4.4. **Figure showing distribution of education level of Respondent’s**

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

In terms of the respondent’s level of education, the study found that 12.5% were primary level and below 7 levels of education, 25% were respondents of secondary level education, and 35.7% had university degree and 26.8% were respondents of diploma level in education. These results are summarized and presented in figure. The results imply that majority of the respondents had at least degree education.

The educational background points to the fact that most of the respondents are properly educated and thus easily understood the issues raised in the questionnaire concerning the area of the study. Given the level of education the respondents also clearly understood the ethics of research and thus were expected to give honest and informative responses which would add to the credibility of the final research finding and report.

4.5. **Pie chart showing distribution of respondents from community based project implemented in their Area of Yes and No respondent’s**

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

The results indicated that majority were from (80.4%) respondents from yes project implemented of such kind of activities, while (10.7%) were No respondents, (8.9%) were respondents of I don’t know of sure of projects activities.

4.6. **Figure showing distribution of various project have been undertaken in Rumbek County**

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

It was necessary to establish the various projects from the respondents. That were; 26.8% were from agriculture, 35.7% were respondents from education projects, 1.8% reveals that tourism projects is less concern in their villages, 17.8% were respondents from infrastructure development is low in the County. Majority of the respondents came from education. This were beneficial to the study since they were the main target of the study. Their opinions were held with high esteem.

4.7. **Table of Respondent’s showing distribution** **to what extend does the community contribute to the sustainability of Community Based projects (CBPs)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Design of Program | 5 | 8.9 |
| Monitoring | 10 | 17.9 |
| Provision of HR | 5 | 8.9 |
| Part Financing | 5 | 8.9 |
| Security | 25 | 44.6 |
| Project Implementers | 5 | 10.8 |
| **Total** | **55** | **100** |

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

Security were significantly more represented (44.6%) in the sample indicating some respondent’s imbalance. Part of the reason for security dominance in the study is their higher time availability to participate in the project life cycle in the area.

**Table 4.8 Showing distribution of Responses of geographical factors affecting the sustainability of community based organizations (CBOs) in Rumbek East County**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Natural Resource | 1 | 1.8 |
| Environmental | 10 | 17.9 |
| Climate | 5 | 8.9 |
| Topography | 5 | 8.9 |
| Stability | 34 | 62.5 |
| **Total** | **55** | **100** |

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

It were necessary to establish if the community entirely know the geographical factors for sustainability of community were majority of respondents came from 62.5% reveals that stability of project. It was apparent that they do as shown by the majority of the respondents that were represented by 62.6% of them.

**Table 4.9. Showing distribution of Responses involvement in Community Based Projects (CBPs) in Rumbek East County**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 40 | 71.4 |
| No | 15 | 28.6 |
| **Total** | **55** | **100** |

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

In the table 4.9, shows that 71.4% of the respondents were yes, 28.6% of the respondents were No. the researcher concluded that 71.4% of respondents who had yes contributed much in this study because they had plenty of time to engage in NGOs and granted information regarding significance of community Based Projects (CBPs) in Rumbek East County (REC)

**Table 4.10. Showing distribution of Responses for how long have a respondent’s been in this Village living**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Frequency** | **Percent** |
| Below 1 years | 5 | 8.9 |
| Between 1\_5 Years | 15 | 26.8 |
| Between 5\_10 Years | 10 | 17.9 |
| Above 10 Years | 25 | 46.5 |
| **Total** | **55** | **100** |

**Source**: Field data 2020, January

This table 4.10 reveals that, 8.9% of the respondents were below 1 year, 26.8% of respondents were resident between 1\_5 years, while 17.9% indicated participation between 5\_10 years in the village 46.5% showed the participation who show all of the above in the study and 100% is the total participation of all respondents at their various residents. Hence the researcher concluded that the majority of respondents were above 10 years and it was indicated by highest percentage which is 46.5% participation in the study.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**5.0 Chapter Overview**

This chapter presents summary, conclusion and recommendations based on findings of the study. In addition this chapter also includes areas for further research.

**5.1. Summary**

The general objective of this study is to assess factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in Rumbek East County specifically designed to examine the role of community participation in the sustainability of CBPs Rumbek East Cunty, to assess how monitoring and evaluation affect sustainability of CBPs in Rumbek East Cunty and assessing on how financial factor affect the sustainability of the CBPs in Rumbek East Cunty. Consistent with the research objectives, three research questions were developed which were as follows: firstly, what is the role of community participation in the sustainability of CBPs Rumbek East Cunty? Secondly, how does monitoring and evaluation affect sustainability of CBPs in Rumbek East County?

Thirdly, how does financial factor affect the sustainability of the CBPs projects in Rumbek East County? Results from the findings have convincingly demonstrated and that all the research objectives have been met and research questions answered as shown in the preceding chapter and appendix pages.

**5.2. Conclusion**

This study concludes that CBPs are more meaningful and effective where the local community members are fully and mutually involved and reap significant benefits.

The study come up with facts that local community members in Rumbek East County are not involved in project designing and planning as well as budgeting and prioritization.

However, the communities are involved in the implementation stage of different projects or activities. The study concludes that in order for CBPs to ensure long term impacts, project implementers, government and donors should consider local communities ‘priorities and give them mutual ownership of the projects in their areas.

**5.3. Recommendations**

This study puts forward recommendations as follows

(i) Funders of CBPs should think through local community‘s priorities than coming up with already made project plans that ultimately do not have expected impacts to the intended beneficiaries.

(ii) CBPs should be designed with self-financing mechanisms that will sustain

them later after donor‘s funds.

(iii) As CBPs is successful in providing benefits to communities and sustainably conserve resources, valuable benefits should be shared among stakeholders, at the same time linkage should be made clear between the communities and other

CBPs stakeholders.

(iv)The sustainability of the CBPs and activities are key elements of poverty alleviation and sustainable development. Therefore local communities living in Rumbek East County should be active players in decision making processes during project formulation and implementation.

(v) It is necessary to create awareness among communities about the need to participate, manage, and own their CBPs. Government officials and NGO agents should not ignore indigenous knowledge systems so that they do not propose and impose irrelevant solutions to the communities they seek to assist.

Moreover there is need for authorities to create a rapport and trust with communities and to advance their interests above all other things.

(vi) Rumbek East County should speed up the process of empowering and capacitating the community so that conservation activities could take effect.

Legal empowerment as well as capacity building of major groups such as women, youth, traditional leaders and the physically handicapped is paramount for attaining full community participation in local decision-making through planning and budgeting.

**5.4. Areas for Further Research**

This study focused on assessment of factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in Western Lakes taking Rumbek East Cunty as a case study.

(i) The researcher recommends that further research should be carried on finding the correlation between factors affecting sustainability of CBPs and community development. This recommendation is based on the fact that this study were based on researching factors affecting sustainability of CBPs but did not find an extent to which each factor significantly affect the community development.

(ii) This study has not analyzed real costs and benefits of community participatory decision-making through designing, planning and budgeting; therefore, further research should be conducted to clarify the win-win situation.
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**Appendices**

Appendix 1 Questionnaire Mangar Marik Dit

**Strategia Netherlands University**

Introduction Letter

**Dear respondent**,

I am a Diploma student in the online Studies at Strategia Netherlands carrying out research on Assessment of the Factors Affecting Sustainability of Community Based Projects in Rural Areas: Case Study Rumbek East County. The purpose of this letter is therefore to kindly request your voluntary participation in this study by filling the attached questionnaire. The information gathered shall be treated confidentially and shall be used for this research only.

Kindly sign this form if you agree to participate in this study

Sign ………………………………. Date ………………………………

Yours Sincerely,

Mangar Marik Dit

Index No: SN331/05/2019

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix I: Questionnaire**

**Section A: General Information**

1. **Questionnaire Number.......................................** Date ………………………..
2. Name of Location ……………………………
3. Gender: (a) Male (b) Female
4. Age (a) 18 – 30 Years (b) 30-45 Years (c) 45-60 Years (d) 60 Years and above
5. Education Level
6. Primary level and below
7. Secondary Level
8. Post-secondary, certificate diploma
9. Degree level
10. Retired
11. Others
12. Marital Status
13. Married
14. Not Married
15. Widow
16. Divorced
17. How long have you been in this Village?
18. Below 1 Year
19. Between 1-5 Years
20. Between 5-10 Years
21. Above 10 Years
22. Are you involved in Community Based Projects in Rumbek East County?
23. Yes (b) No

If Yes, please specify how ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………….

**SECTION B: OVERVIEW OF COMMUNITY BASED PROJECT AT RUMBEK EAST COUNTY**

*Identifying community development projects which have been implemented in Rumbek East County.*

**1.** Is there any community based project implemented currently in your areas?

a. Yes

b. No

c. I don‘t know

2. Various projects have been undertaken in Rumbek East County, the following are the fields which these projects are based on; with reference of your area, agree or disagree with the following fields of project if they are undertaken in your area.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Field | **Strong Agree** | **Agree** | **Neutral** | **Disagree** | **Strong Disagree** |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| Water |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tourism |  |  |  |  |  |
| Infrastructure i.e. Road, Feeder Roads |  |  |  |  |  |
| Health |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Fields |  |  |  |  |  |

3. To what extend does the community contribute to the sustainability of CBPs at Rumbek East County in the following roles? Please tick your corresponding responses that are in a scale of

1 No Extent, 2 Low Extent, 3 Moderate Extent, 4 Great Extent, and 5 Very Great Extent

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Roles Played by Community** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Design of Program |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monitoring |  |  |  |  |  |
| Provision of Human Resources |  |  |  |  |  |
| Part Financing |  |  |  |  |  |
| Security |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Implementers |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others (**Specify Please**) |  |  |  |  |  |

**Section C**: To what extent do the following geographical factors affecting the sustainability of CBOs in Rumbek East County? Please tick your corresponding responses that are in a scale of

1 No Extent, 2 Low Extent, 3 Moderate Extent, 4 Great Extent, and 5 Very Great Extent

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Geographical Factors** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| Natural Resources |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental |  |  |  |  |  |
| Climate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Topography |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stability |  |  |  |  |  |
| Infrastructure |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others ( please Specify) |  |  |  |  |  |

**APPENDIX II: RESEARCHER BUDGET PROPOSAL**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NO** | **DESCRIPTION** | **AMOUNT (SSP)** |
| 1 | Data Collection/Transport expenses | 20, 000 |
| 2 | Data Analysis (SSP) | 10,000 |
| 3 | **Stationaries and Printing**   1. 4 reams of printing papers 2. Pens 3. 50 envelops 4. Printing/Binding | 17,200  2000  1500  40,000 |
| 4 | Miscellaneous | 12,000 |
| **5** | **Total** | **102,700** |