

Role of Participatory Management in the Sustainability of Constituency Development Fund Projects: A Case Study of Maragua Constituency

Walter Odhiambo Ojwang

Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, School of Human Resource Development, P.O. Box 62000-00200, Nairobi, Kenya
Email: walojwang@gmail.com

Prof. Henry M. Bwisa.

Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, School of Human Resource Development, Kenya. P.O. Box 62000-00200, Nairobi
Email: bwihem@yahoo.com

DOI Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i10/1212>

Published Date: 09 October 2014

Abstract

In the light of bureaucratic governance hitherto observed, introduction of Constituency Development Fund (CDF) in Kenya was viewed as a sovereign panacea to the dwarfed and imbalanced local level development that was then common place. In spite of this heavy billing however, impacts accruing from the initiatives remain a pale shadow of the anticipated with a number of them ending up being 'white elephants' and majority recording low sustainability levels. This research sought to determine contribution of Participatory Management in influencing determinants of Constituency Development Fund projects' sustainability. The research study adopted a case study design with target population being CDF project stakeholders within Maragua constituency in Kenya. Semi-structured questionnaire was administered to a sample of 89 stakeholders randomly selected from stratified target population distributed across the constituency. Descriptive and inferential data analysis was then applied to determine and assess the relationships through SPSS Version 20.0. The analysis showed that Participatory Management is crucial in inculcating the determinants of sustainability in CDF projects. However, the findings further showed that there was very little stakeholder participation in the entire cycle management of the projects within Maragua Constituency which contributed to low ownership of the projects. The research recommends review of CDF policy to expressly capture procedures of stakeholder engagement. The research further recommends elaborate documentation of data generated from participatory exercises in form of lessons learnt.

Key Words: Participatory Rural Appraisal, Constituency Development Fund, White elephant projects

1. Introduction

One policy tool for parliamentary involvement in community development growing in a number of countries including Kenya, Uganda, Pakistan, Bhutan, Jamaica, and India among other very many countries is Constituency Development Fund (CDF). The fund, generically termed and variously called in different countries is dedicated to political administrative sub divisions as per pre-established allocation ratios. Baskin (2010) wrote that while it's important to view CDF against the background of national strategies of development, its central key goal's to nurture the integration of diverse communities and cultures into a common set of political and social values in support of the existing system. He further argued that Constituency based initiatives are a means of protecting communities from the impersonal administration of inflexible and centralized state institutions that more often overlook individual communities in the pretext of administrative rationality.

In Kenya, CDF was established under the CDF Act 2003 with an underlying mandate of taking development to the citizens at the lowest levels within the shortest time possible (CDF Act, 2003). As one of the devolved funds from the central government, the principle aim of CDF was to control imbalances in regional development through provision of equalization funds based on poverty index (20%), Population (45%), Land Area (8%), Fiscal Responsibility (2%) and Basic Equal share of 25% (CDF Act, 2013). The pilot phase over a 5 year period was implemented in Migori, Vihiga, Tetu, Mbeere, Kwale and Kapenguria (Ochieng and Tubey, 2013). In January 2013, the CDF Act 2003 (as amended in 2007) was repealed and replaced with CDF Act 2013 with an overarching aim of aligning the Act to the major principle provisions of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 including transparency and accountability, separation of powers and more importantly; participation of the people. The drive for grassroots' development combined with absolute desire by the government to attain the set 8 Millennium Development Goals and Vision 2030 have seen a sustained increasing CDF fund allocations from its inception to date as shown below.

Table 1.1: CDF Allocations from Financial Year 2003/2004 to Financial Year 2012/2013

Financial Year	Allocations (Kshs Millions)	Financial Year	Allocations (Kshs Millions)
2003/2004	1.26	2008/2009	10.1
2004/2005	5.6	2009/2010	12.329
2005/2006	7.245	2010/2011	14.283
2006/2007	10.038	2011/2012	22.978
2007/2008	10.1	2012/2013	21.763

The District Focus for Rural Development (DFRD) incepted in 1983 attempted distinct level coordination of development activities and services and was a key system in planning, implementing and managing development activities. It has been argued though that DFRD was a mere dispersal of central government control outside the national capital as it had no advocacy for local level participation in decision making (World Bank, 2002). According to Otieno (2007), the flip side of the DFRD was failure to achieve the envisaged impacts, a fact identified to have been a result of non involvement of locals during inception and implementation of the projects. The Constituency Development Fund was therefore an

establishment emanating from the reality that the local level development participants have a deeper understanding of the underlying issues and whose involvement would enhance the success level of the projects. District Focus Strategy encouraged and harnessed local initiatives from the Ministries which to an extent improved the performance of local projects especially on implementation. The strategy drew on the synergies and resourcefulness spread across the entire district at the lowest implementation level. Ochieng and Tubey (2013) summarized that the essences of CDF and DFRD were similar in that the funding were targeted at community based projects with the only difference being the administrative sub units.

As a reaction to the failures of DFRD, There was a revived interest in the devolved system delivery in 2003 and thus emergence of Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS) which had a view of establishing sector-wide support strategy. Various sectors devised mechanisms and structures that incorporated community level participants in decision making concerning development and service delivery. This was through inclusion in management committees charged with the responsibilities of managing the service delivery at various points. The local level participants were also included in the distinct structures meant to undertake tasks of resource mobilization, planning, implementation and supervision throughout the period. The provision of oversight over resource utilization was an effort to cultivate the culture of ownership hitherto identified as an essential ingredient in project sustainability, World Bank (2004). Community participation generally is more successful when the community takes over much of the responsibility than when higher designated public agencies attempt to impose responsibilities through barazas or meetings (Otieno, 2007). Baskin (2010) thus summarized that CDF operations have been controversial with fundamental questions arising on the efficacy of Project Management Committees to deliver, the extent to which they could be held accountable and more importantly, the oversight role of the PMCs and how other stakeholders were being meaningfully engaged in identifying, selecting, prioritizing and executing the whole process of project cycle management.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Otieno (2007) indicated that ERS for Wealth and Employment Creation established participatory management approach to the interventions as it was a panacea to the lack of projects' ownership and sustainability earlier observed during the implementation of District Focus for Rural Development (DFRD). The CDF Act 2013 which replaced CDF Act 2003 as amended in 2007 re-invigorated the centrality of public participation in the success and to an extension sustainability of CDF projects.

However, The National Taxpayers Association's Citizen Report Card (CRC) for Maragua Constituency (2012) indicated that an equivalent of 36.89% (Category A) of the Constituency Development Fund implemented projects completed within the acceptable quality and budget while the rest were found to be of poor quality, behind schedule and over budget. Further scrutiny of the report revealed that of the Category 'A' projects billed as completed on time and of acceptable quality, a substantial proportion remained unused after completion in spite of the enhanced participatory management mechanisms contained in the establishing policy documents.


In view of the sustained increasing fund allocations to the CDF kitty by the national government and the centrality of sustainability in economic growth, this research study proposed to assess the role of Participatory Management in the sustainability of CDF projects within Maragua Constituency.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This research project was informed by the Theory of Public Participation which anticipates projects sustainability to coalesce around core factors of genuine participation characterized by partnerships and controls (Amstein, 1969). Stakeholder participation through Participatory Rural Appraisals play a vital role in shaping a uni-directional push towards realization of a project set target goal which can only be attained through among others inculcated project ownership, objective diagnostic project reviews, utilization of local resources and project continuity through linked project phases.

2.2 Conceptual Framework



2.3 Project Sustainability

Sustainability as a concept arose from the debate on sustainable development and has been a pertinent issue in the development circles for a long time. Maintaining service provision or benefits from an effort over time has been the center of focus for project initiators. Indeed, many definitions of sustainability have been put forward. Weaver and Rotman (2006) conceptualized sustainability as a cyclical, participatory process that entails scoping, envisioning, experimenting and learning through which a shared interpretation of development for a specific context is developed. They summed up the key concept of sustainability to be the whole notion of sustainable development describing it as development that places priority on the needs of the poor and future generation with a caveat on the extent of exploitation of the environment. It's further been defined as the continuity of economic development, environmental performance and social equity (Chu-hua and Kuei, 2013). IFAD (2007c) defined sustainability as the continuation of benefit flows with or without the programmes or organizations that stimulated those benefits in the first place. What begins, if anything, at project end is ultimately more important than the project itself; what continues represents the real contribution of the project. In summary, development sustainability is the maintenance of capacity to produce on one hand and on the other hand, continuance of outcomes and impacts that ensue from the development initiatives. It's the

ability of a system to perpetuate itself through localized appropriate strategies predetermined by the governance of the system.

Sustainability at the community level involves a viable production system that satisfies both economic and social needs. The national sustainability on the other hand places emphasis on population's conformity to a changing natural environment, factors contributing to (or constraining) social equity and the coherence of national policy frameworks. Among project participants, sustainability is coalesced around continued production gains and increased income streams resulting from project initiatives (Pope et al. 2005).

Sustainability aspect has fronted in major sustainable development tenets of limited resource availability, interdependence of human activities for both current and future generations and equity in trickling down of benefits. The practical application of project sustainability thus encompasses broader governance issues about how different institutions and partakers work to maintain economic, environmental and social benefits over time.

2.4 Dimensions of Project Sustainability

Sustainability exhibits a number of dimensions including environmental, social, economic and financial, political, and technical dimensions. Project Social Sustainability dimension entails empowering poor and marginalized rural inhabitants to develop resilience and thus spur structural change in poverty within the structures of the community. It entails factoring of resource constraints in the selection of interventions with a design that espouses elaborate risk mitigation mechanisms. This is achieved through community support and acceptability based on commitment and social cohesion. It accords great emphasis on intergenerational equity for the social resources besides equal access to those social resources within the current generation. Social sustainability generally encompasses social cohesion, rights diversity, safety, governance structures and maturity

Project Institutional or management sustainability refers to policy frameworks that promote ownership of development initiatives through systematic decision making procedures that control human interaction in order to achieve specific sustainability goals. This dimension of sustainability guarantees successful transfer of decision-making to lower administrative levels in management of projects and build sufficient follow-through capacity within the key institution to adapt to the dynamics of the external environment (IFAD, 2007). It also pertains to prevailing structures and processes that provide capacity for continuance of bestowed functions over a long time.

Economic and Financial Sustainability employ optimization of resources that creates resilience to economic shocks. This is achieved through viable financial schemes that minimize household susceptibility and increase capacity to cope with risks and financial shocks. Economic sustainability besides promoting interventions that enhance household incomes and assets create platforms on which households and communities are able to handle dynamic and unexpected changes without collapsing (Cascio, 2007). Essentially, resilience created anticipates and adapts to change through sufficiently laid down policies, collaboration and management of resources internal and external to the project initiative. Political aspect of project sustainability on the other hand entails government commitment to enactment of pro-initiative policies and project environmental conditions that spur and sustain stakeholder

interest in development. This is through support and sustenance of strong pro-development lobby groups that ensures ratification of dynamic policies responsive to the dynamics of the changing environment.

Environment Sustainability first arose from within the environment movement and attempts to preserve finite natural resources and ecological systems from over-extraction and shocks or stresses. The dimension conserves the natural capital through ecologically resilient systems that responds effectively to climatic disturbances. Environmental sustainability is critical in maintenance of household income and asset streams. It focuses on a participatory approach that anchors environment risk management lens on the holistic design that guarantees free ecological harm to the operating environment. Technical sustainability aspect ensures perpetual technical soundness through appropriate technical solutions that wades through dynamics of innovations and renovations. It guarantees access and availability of economical spare parts as well as repairs.

2.5 Participatory Approaches and Sustainability

A number of factors including economic policies, social definitions, technological shifts arising from innovation and renovation, political regimes, and many others wield an influence on the sustainability of CDF projects. This research however only centered on the social aspect and investigates the role of Participatory Management in influencing sustainability of CDF projects within Maragua Constituency.

2.6 Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)

Developed in late 1970s and early 1980s as an alternative to conventional sample surveys, PRA is an iterative and systematic participatory management family of approaches that seeks to assimilate the perspectives of sector-wide development stakeholders and involve them directly in planning follow-up strategies (Chambers, 1994). It's an avenue for including poor people's views in the analysis of necessary development interventions and the formulation of pro-poor strategies. It entails groups of local people analyzing their own conditions and choosing their own means of interventions geared towards improving the conditions. PRA evolved from Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and is one of the several participatory approaches for enhanced design, implementation and supervision of rural development initiatives. The methodology recognizes that popular participation as well as localized technologies coupled with community incorporation is an elemental facet in the management of development initiatives that guarantee sustainability.

The ultimate goal of PRA is to accord the intended beneficiaries more control over the development process. As a drastic departure from the previous practice, the approach exhibits a multidisciplinary approach which deepens the understanding of the lives of the poor with the paradigm suggesting two perspectives: Substantively involving local people in the prioritization, design, planning and implementing initiatives that will affect them. This ensures that local perception, attitudes, values and knowledge are taken into account as fully as possible. The second perspective encompasses a more continuous and comprehensive feedback as an integral part of all development initiatives. PRA uses a combination of techniques that enable local level sharing, knowledge analysis, planning and acting. The locals' own values, needs and priorities are the point of departure where they themselves develop criteria to classify dimensions of their life. This, besides increasing chances for realistic plans,

enable better situation comprehension for all development participants and spawns higher commitment from the local beneficiaries to the planned activities.

PRA is a multi-sectored, systematic yet semi-structured approach premised on rapid acquisition of new information on rural development fronts. It's anchored on the theory that effective development is reliant on cohesive and committed local leadership based on functioning rural institutions. PRA integrates relevant sectors linking and defining prevailing environmental situation of the local setup while formulating relevant policy interventions. It's a mechanism through which local resources are mobilized and at the same time previous successes and capacities are all reviewed for enactment of specific strategies for adoption and implementation. PRA forms an avenue in which prioritized development needs of the community and available resources and skills of all stakeholders are brought together.

PRA methods are based on simple principles which characterize a reversal of learning;

- i. To learn with and from the rural people directly on the site, face to face while gaining from local, physical, technical and social knowledge.
- ii. Learning rapidly and progressively, with flexible use of methods, improvisation, iteration, and cross-checking, being adaptable in a learning process.
- iii. Seeking diversity, looking for and investigating contradictions, anomalies and differences among the local level development participants.
- iv. Triangulating; using a range of methods to ensure reliability and validity, and to enable cross-checking.
- v. Facilitating by the local people; Facilitating, investigation, analysis, presentation and learning by rural people themselves so that they present and own their own outcomes.

The PRA approach is particularly important as it accords room to all vulnerable groups in a community to have a representation voice and impart their views on issues of development from which they are most often excluded. Participation by different groups in planning and management of projects paint a realistic picture of community needs. PRA techniques can also be used to prioritize competing development needs of the rural poor. The intention of this paper is to identify the roles of PRA in ensuring that project sustainability factors are inherent in CDF project management structures.

2.7 Factors of Sustainability

2.7.1 Project Ownership

A proper analysis and understanding of stakeholder participation can be better achieved when it is viewed against a theoretical framework built on decision-making. The background includes social organization, political process (which includes decision-making), and planning theories and ideologies in light of society. Oakley (1991) drew participation in two perspectives of contribution and empowerment. The author describes contribution dimension as enlisting primarily during implementation and maintenance of facilities created which includes ideas, judgments, money, materials, and labor. The empowerment dimension is described as an involvement that entails learning with and from the people that enable development of skills and abilities to better manage and negotiate with existing development systems. Bwisa (2010) while referring to a U.S educationist famous cone of experience emphasized that retention of what one learns is higher when active methods of learning (participation) are used as opposed to passive ones. The empowerment is attained through

strategic and triangulated amplified voices of decision actions that are core to spurring local level development.

Project ownership entails the area of responsibility that ensures project initiatives come to fruition. Participation means involving local people in the development of plans and activities designed to change their lives (Alam and Ihsan, 2012). It's a continuous process of negotiation and decisions making that occur at various stages with all stakeholders (Chambers, 1992) and influence the sharing and control of prioritization, resource allocation and access, and policy making. Hakkinen and Belloni (2011) on evaluating the barriers and drivers for sustainable building concluded that the most important action to promote sustainability in projects is development awareness of clients about benefits, mobilization of development resources and team working. In the process of networking, beneficiary understanding about the project environment dynamics help overcome hindrances to sustainability through benchmarking on new processes and methods.

Pope et al. (2005) found that providing for community participation on development initiatives especially by the lowly disadvantaged minorities created a sense of belonging that resulted in embracing and owning of the initiatives. A cultivated sense of belonging in initiatives begets equity and ultimately recognition of diversity recognized as an essential factor in project sustainability. Ayres (1995) on the study of IRDP projects in South Africa argued that external expertise that does not understand the geological, political and social contexts of projects contributed to the projects' failure. This is further corroborated in the studies by Swanepoel and De Beer (2000) who concluded that success in rural development programmes depended on how the community was integrated in the whole process of project cycle management from inception to post-ante impact assessments and Bwisa (2011) who observed that highly cohesive teams of development have member commitments and thriving willingness to strive for excellence.

Crane (1979) suggested participation as a management style writing that participants feeling a sense of involvement will always identify with the initiative, taking responsibilities and striving to contribute to the objectives of the initiative. As a typical means of transforming bureaucracy hitherto identifiable with governments, participatory management provides a platform for participatory decision making about the welfare of the community (Jongjoo and Houston, 2009). Clusters of community beneficiaries, federations and apex bodies lobby for pro-policies that protect the interest of the members. This stems from innate understanding of the local

contexts of culture and beliefs that facilitates even more intense interaction among the development participants.

Mathur et al (2008) in review of stakeholder engagement in the context of sustainability and its assessment conceptualize the engagement in three perspectives of strategic management, ethical and social reporting that stakeholder engagement is a means of reducing conflict, increasing ownership by users and facilitating spin-off partnerships. Alam and Ihsan (2012) during the study of implementation of Participatory Rural Appraisal in Barani Area Project found that the approach, exhibiting self help and self decisions in any developmental activities without any discrimination empowered the community and raised levels of participation and consequently ownership contributing to the sustainability of the initiatives.

2.7.2 Objective Monitoring, Control 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 user's active involvement in demand specification for development initiatives is one of the drivers of process innovation (Hakkinen and Belloni, 2011). Mathur et al (2008) in their review conceptualized stakeholder engagement in social and ethical perspectives as a means of capturing knowledge that encourage innovation and enhance inclusive decision making creating a shared vision and objectives. Dialogue, usually useful in increasing awareness, changing attitudes and affecting behaviors is anchored in public policy cases where the desire for involvement of ordinary citizens is strongly rooted in the dimension of participatory governance, equity and transparency. Pope et al (2004) on assessing sustainability assessment models for the Gorgon Gas Development in Australia concluded that assessment for sustainability that uses sustainability criteria set by the local community offered the most promising avenue. Decentralized and effective development rests on the efficiency and effectiveness of participatory assessment that addresses central challenges.

According to Alam and Ihsan (2012), Participatory Rural Appraisal tools can easily identify community bedeviling problems through tools with mixed applications including stakeholder identification, decision making, planning, conflict management, information collection among other uses. In learning from and with the community members, investigations and evaluations of constraints and opportunities regarding development initiatives are expedited which enhances timely decisions. Establishment of local level supervision policy and providing for bottom-up project designs through participatory approach at every stage of design process improve background comprehension of the project environment that enables accurate and complex problem analyses and needs assessment (IFAD, 2007). Participatory Rural Approach embraces flexible project framework that encourages community input and effectively incorporates significant lessons learned thereby increasing community resilience in their dynamic risk environment. Community cultures in their degree of tolerance for uncertainty determines coping mechanisms at least partially by cultural programming through rules, technologies, laws and rituals which standardize society members and make outcome of social processes more predictable (Bwisa and Ndolo, 2011) . This consequently augments project efficiency and efficacy greatly enhancing project sustainability.

2.7.3 Utilization of Local Resources

Sustainability of lower level project institutions is of immense importance to the sustainability of local level development initiatives. Resources concentrated at the village and community level form stable sources that establish functioning institutions and are integral to sustainability of the development progresses attained. Local resources are always embedded in the local areas of community development initiatives and are effective for local projects (Agholor et al. 2013). This is manifested in concrete skills and knowledge outcome realized by local development participants when local resources are used for training. Bwisa (2008)

asserted the very importance of recognizing these immediate possibilities concluding that projects that do not fit “our” resources tended to be economic failures. Successful strategies for initiatives involve formulating frameworks which not only create accommodating avenues for use of local resources but also underlines ingenuity of the locals and inspires them to learn and accept innovation.

A case study of Community Managed CDF initiatives in Bangladesh revealed that strong commitment arising from motivated community members are an integral ingredient in managing community needs and demands (IFAD 2007). The study further revealed that participation builds both individual and group capacity to manage both internal and political conflicts as well as balancing individual interests. This is corroborated by Manfred (2004) who stated that the use of local resources promotes learning activities with the resulting empowerment stimulating existing leadership skills that become an eventual spark of new development fronts. Alam and Ihsan (2012) also supports the assertion reporting that PRA approaches are useful for accelerated knowledge acquisition not only just on overall speed, but rapid rounds of field relations that results in increased precise knowledge. Participatory approach that utilizes local resources from communities and enhances participation of vulnerable and marginalized groups in CDF processes is a central determinant of sustainability in the initiatives (Kimani et al. (2009). The authors concluded that peoples’ participation that cultivates learning from localized skills and strategies that work, and subsequently infuse the skills and strategies in the intervention frameworks guarantee sustainability of the initiatives.

2.8 Critique of Literature Relevant to the Study

Research in Participatory management has largely been carried out in other countries of the world including India and South Africa. However, despite its acknowledged and venerated spot in the circles of development, no substantial literature on its implementation progression and contribution to CDF projects’ sustainability has been documented in Kenya to date. Kariuki and Misaro (2013) supports this assertion in their assessment of socio-economic status and participatory development in Kenya where they concluded that, ‘in spite of poverty paradox in Kenya attracting renewed attention among researchers, policy makers and common public in equal measure, very little attention has been directed at the relationship between socio-economic factors and popular participation in management of CDF projects’. This research study sought to fill this gap through investigating the role of Participatory management through participatory rural appraisal in the sustainability of CDF projects.

3.0 Methodology

A Case Study Research Design was employed during the study and entailed administering well structured questionnaires to the sampled target population within Maragua Constituency. The study sampled stakeholders involved in the management of CDF projects which included the area Member of Parliament, Constituency Development Fund Committees, Government Technical Departmental Heads, Project Management Committees, beneficiaries and the general public with a focus on the 94 projects implemented during the 2011/2012 financial year.

Primary data was collected using semi-structured questionnaires. To avert the possibility of bias, competent enumerators were contracted to administer the questionnaires with an aim of improving the response rate. Desk review of previous published and unpublished research

works was used to obtain secondary data pertaining to the research topics which also included internet materials. A pilot survey was conducted on a 5 randomly sampled CDF project management stakeholders and the data generated tested using SPSS to determine its validity and reliability Data collected was processed, coded then analyzed to facilitate answering of the research questions through descriptive and inferential statistics. Qualitative analysis encompassed examining and combining evidence along the main theme of the research to ease consolidation of information for interpretation and generalization about the population parameters.

4.0 Research Findings and Discussion

4.1 Sustainability

This was the dependent variable. The research sought to determine the sustainability levels of the CDF projects based on the parameters of ownership, complete implementation of the planned projects, utilization of locally available resources in implementing the projects, level of benefits accruing from the complete projects, and whether the funded projects were complete and functional.

Table 4.1: Status level of CDF projects

Assertion	Frequency									
	Very High		High		Neutral		Low		Very Low	
	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)
Project Ownership	2	2.2	21	23.6	25	28.1	28	31.5	13	14.6
Completion in relation to planning	1	1.1	23	25.8	23	25.8	30	33.7	12	13.5
Utilization of local resources	7	7.9	25	28.1	27	30.3	25	28.1	5	5.6
Benefits accruing from projects	3	3.4	34	38.2	34	38.2	11	12.4	7	7.9

From the findings, majority (46.1%) of the respondents were of the view that there was low ownership of the CDF projects. On the other hand, 25.8% of the respondents believed there was adequate ownership of the projects. This suggest that while in majority of the areas constituents were detached from the projects, this was not the case in other areas where community identified with the projects hence higher level of ownership. 26.9% of the respondents positively concurred that the projects were completed in relation to their plans. However, a majority of the respondents represented by 33.7% and 13.5% respectively reported that projects' completion in relation to their plans was low and very low respectively. This may suggest that either the scope of the projects were not adequately determined which led to the underestimation of the project costs or there was improper utilization of the assigned resources resulting in deficits in the observed areas.

The researcher further sought to determine the extent of utilization of local resources in management of CDF projects. From the findings, 40% of the respondents were of the view that local resources were being put to use while 33.7% of the respondents dissented. This almost balanced view could be from the fact that a significant number of resources were being provided locally while some still got imported from other areas. On benefits, the research results indicate that a majority of the respondents represented by 3.4% and 38.2% (Combined total of 41.6%) approved the projects' benefits as very high and high respectively. On the other hand, only 12.4% and 7.9% respectively of the respondents rated the projects' benefits to be low and very low. Further, there was an observed significant number of respondents (38.2%) concurring that the benefits derived from the projects were neither high nor low. This

could have arisen from the sizeable number of projects funded in phases but which were still not complete though they were being put to use.

Table 4.2: Completion status of CDF projects

Assertion	Frequency									
	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)
All funded CDF projects completed	21	23.6	38	42.7	15	16.9	10	11.2	5	5.6
Completed CDF projects functional	13	14.6	32	36.0	22	24.7	19	21.3	3	3.4

From the results, 11.2% and 5.6% agreed and strongly agreed respectively that CDF projects funded were completed with 21.3% and 3.4% of the respondents agreeing and strongly agreeing respectively that completed projects were functional. However, majority of the respondents represented by 23.6% and 42.7% strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively with the assertion. Further, 14.6% and 36.0% of the respondents strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively that all completed projects were functional. Only 24.7% of the respondents concurred that the completed projects were functional. This corroborates the National Taxpayers Association Citizen Report Card for Maragua Constituency (NTA CRC, 2012) that a significant number of CDF projects were never completed. The research results also further indicate that a significant number of the respondents represented by 16.9% were unaware of the status of the projects which implied that they were not involved at any stage of the projects.

Table 4.3: Sustainability Determinants

Assertion	Frequency									
	Very High		High		Neutral		Low		Very Low	
	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)
Government Policies	16	18	40	44.9	9	10.1	15	16.9	9	10.1
Social Characteristics	5	5.6	15	16.9	45	50.6	18	20.2	6	6.7
Stakeholder Involvement	9	10.1	20	22.5	31	34.8	21	23.6	8	9.0
Political Regimes	19	21.3	35	39.3	10	11.2	16	18.0	9	10.1

The researcher sought to gauge the influence of determinants of sustainability graded from 1 being very high and 5 being very low and how they affect the performance of CDF projects. From the research findings, political regimes and government policies had joint highest influence on the performance posting mean of 2.56. Stakeholder involvement posted a mean of 2.99 with social characteristics posting a mean of 3.06. The result could be attributed to the phenomenon that CDF projects are mainly associated with the incumbent political leaders who are further believed to have upper hand in selecting management teams for the projects.

4.2. Role of Participatory Management

4.2.1. Cultivating the Culture of Project Ownership

Table 4.4: Role of Participation in CDF projects

Assertion	Frequency										
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean					
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)						
Community involvement create sense of belonging	8	9.0	17	19.1	5	5.6	29	32.6	30	33.7	3.63
Community involvement lead to assumption of responsibility	8	9.0	20	22.5	17	19.1	29	32.6	15	16.9	3.26
Participation enhance involvement of minority groups	17	19.1	18	20.2	17	19.1	21	23.6	16	18.0	3.01

The research question sought to assess the impact of participatory management (graded from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree) in inculcating ownership of the projects through partaking in the management of the projects. From the research findings, majority of the respondents represented by means of 3.63, 3.26 and 3.01 respectively positively rated the impact of participatory management in creating sense of belonging, assumption of responsibilities and enhancing involvement of minority groups.

4.2.2. Objectivity in Monitoring and evaluation of projects

This objective sought to assess the role of participatory monitoring and evaluation on the generation of projects' performance data necessary for timely project reviews in order to address the dynamics of the external environment and to plan for contingencies.

Table 4.5: Influence of participatory M&E on generation of project data

Assertion	Frequency										
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean					
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)						
Participatory M&E eliminates biased individual opinions	25	28.1	40	44.9	11	12.4	10	11.2	3	3.4	2.17
Participatory M&E produce sufficient data for contingency planning	14	15.7	43	48.3	20	22.5	11	12.4	1	1.1	2.35
Participatory M&E produces up-to-date data	13	14.6	37	41.6	23	25.8	12	13.5	4	4.5	2.52
Participatory M&E enhance effective project review	23	25.8	43	48.3	18	20.2	2	2.2	3	3.4	2.09

From the research findings and (with a rating of 1 for strong agreement and 5 for strong disagreement), 28.1% of the respondents strongly agreed that participatory monitoring and evaluation eliminates biased individual opinions with 44.9% reporting agreement. On the other hand, 11.2% and 3.4% reported disagreement and strong disagreement respectively. The mean rating for the assertion stood at 2.1 indicating that there was a strong concurrence that participatory monitoring and evaluation neutralizes individual biased opinions. 15.7% and 48.3% of the respondents respectively strongly agreed and agreed with the assertion that participatory monitoring and evaluation produces sufficient data necessary for contingency

planning,. The respondents further reported a mean rating of 2.52 for the assertion that participatory monitoring and evaluation produces up-to-date data. Whether participatory monitoring and evaluation enhance effective project review, the respondents reported an average assertion of 2.09 signifying positive recognition of participatory monitoring and evaluation.

Table 4.6: Extent of participation in monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects

Assertion	Frequency										Mean
	Very High		High		Neutral		Low		Very Low		
	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	
Continuous review of ongoing projects	5	5.6	22	24.7	21	23.6	27	30.3	14	15.7	3.26
Project variations	3	3.4	10	11.2	33	37.1	29	32.6	14	15.7	3.46
Formulation of effective performance indicators	4	4.5	11	12.4	20	22.5	35	39.3	19	21.3	3.61

On a rating of 1 for very high and 5 for very low, the researcher further sought to gauge the extent to which participatory monitoring and evaluation activities were participative in Maragua constituency. From the results, 5.6 of the respondents reported that continuous review of ongoing CDF projects were very highly participative, 24.7% reported they were highly participative while 30.3% and 15.7% respectively reported that participation was very low and low. In project variations, 3.4% and 11.2% of the respondents respectively concurred that the exercise was very highly and highly participative respectively. On the other hand, 32.6% and 15.7% of the respondents were of the view that participation in project variations was low and very low respectively. Formulation of project performance indicators had 4.5% and 12.4% of the respondents concurring on very high participation and high participation respectively. On the other end, 39.3% of the respondents indicated that participation on formulation of performance indicators was low with another 21.3% of the respondents posting a verdict of very low participation. The average ratings for the activities were 3.26, 3.46 and 3.61 respectively for continuous review of project activities, project variations and formulation of effective performance indicators respectively. The results suggest that monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects were not very participatory.

4.2.3. Utilization of existing local resources

Table 4.7: Role of local resources in enhancing project performance

Assertion	Frequency									
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)	Freq	(%)
Participatory management enhance resource mobilization	24	27.0	48	53.9	9	10.1	5	5.6	3	3.4
Participatory management build local leadership	14	15.7	34	38.2	24	27.0	14	15.7	3	3.4
Participatory management enhance use of local resources	16	18.0	38	42.7	17	19.1	15	16.9	3	3.4

The research objective sought to determine the contribution of participatory management in provision of local resources to the cycle management of CDF projects. From the findings, 27% and 53.9% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that participatory management enhances resources mobilization. 5.6% and 3.4% of the respondents respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed. On whether participatory management build local leadership, 15.7% and 38.2% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively. 15.7% of the respondents disagreed while 3.4% strongly disagreed. 18% of the respondents strongly agreed that participatory management enhance utilization of local resources with 42.7% in agreement. On the other hand, 16.9% and 3.4% of the respondents reported disagreement and strong disagreement respectively.

Table 4.8: Rating of participatory management in sensitization of community

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very High	9	10.1	10.1	10.1
High	37	41.6	41.6	51.7
Neither High nor Low	26	29.2	29.2	80.9
Low	13	14.6	14.6	95.5
Very Low	4	4.5	4.5	100.0
Total	89	100.0	100.0	

From the results, 10.1% of the respondents rated as very high influence of participatory management in sensitization of the community. 41.6% of the respondents concurred that the influence was high. On the other hand, 14.6% and 4.5% respectively of the respondents rated influence of participatory management on sensitization of community to be low and very low respectively.

The researcher finally asked the respondents to suggest ways through which sustainability of CDF projects could be improved. From the suggestions, three major themes were deciphered;

1. Most of the respondents opined on the need for review of the current CDF policy to expressly capture procedures of stakeholder engagement at all stages of CDF project cycle management.
2. Funding of projects need be done in single installments to obviate projects from stalling after first disbursements. Complex projects that must be funded in phases need be recognized in the CDF act for mandatory funding during subsequent financial years more so after political regime change.
3. Participatory management need be inculcated in the entire project cycle management.

5.0. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Summary

This research analysis is based on the objectives of the study which sought to assess the role of Participatory Rural Appraisal as an approach of participatory management in sustainability of CDF projects within Maragua constituency. From the research, the researcher established that majority of the stakeholders represented by 57.3% identified with the projects as merely members of the general public despite the fact that they were actually beneficiaries in some

aspect of the CDF projects. Only 22.5% of the respondents acknowledged being beneficiaries of the project. This is an indication of low levels of ownership of the projects by the target beneficiaries. The study revealed that there was low ownership of the projects by beneficiaries with a mere 25.8% rating. In relation to project completion, only 26.9% of the respondents positively concurred that the projects were completed according to their plans with 47.2 of the respondents dissenting. This suggest that either the scope of the projects were not clearly determined which caused underestimation of the project costs or there was improper utilization of the assigned resources.

The research findings further revealed that local resources were being utilized with 40% of the stakeholders confirming the assertion. On benefits accruing from the initiatives, 41.6% of the stakeholders confirmed the assertion. 38.2% of the respondents were undecided on the level of benefits accruing from the projects which could have arisen from a sizeable number of projects funded in phases and which were still not complete though partially operational. The findings further reveal that only 24.7% of the respondents concurred that complete projects were functional. This corroborate the National Taxpayers Association Citizen Report Card for Maragua Constituency (NTA, 2012) that a significant number of the CDF funded projects were never completed with a substantial number of the complete projects lying unused. 16.9% were unaware whether the funded projects were complete or not which could be attributed to the projects funded in phases with majority stalling in the process.

On determinants of sustainability, the research findings indicated that political regimes and government policies ranked joint highest with a mean index of 2.26 (ranked 1 for highest and 5 for lowest) followed by stakeholder involvement at a mean index of 2.99. The results confirm the perceived overwhelming influence of political leaders on the projects. Participatory management (ranked 1 for strongly disagree and 5 for strongly agree) had a mean impact rating of 3.63, 3.26 and 3.01 respectively for creating sense of belonging, assumptions of responsibilities and enhancing involvement of minority members groups. The results indicate that the communities are involved more in the project initiation (mean index of 3.54) than in implementation (mean index of 3.81) ranked in the scale of 1 for very high and 5 for very low.

The research findings show that participatory monitoring and evaluation had positive impact on elimination of biased opinions and production of sufficient data for effective project review represented by respondent ratings of 73% and 64% respectively. However, the average ratings (1 for high and 5 for low) for stakeholder participation in PM&E activities were 3.26, 3.46 and 3.61 respectively for continuous review of project activities, project variations and formulation of effective performance indicators. The results suggest that monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects were not very participatory. On utilization of local resources, 80.9% of the respondents were of the view that participatory management enhance resource mobilization, 53.9% of the respondents concurred that participatory management build local leadership while 51.7% of the respondents reported that participatory management enhances stakeholder sensitization.

5.2. Conclusions

The research findings revealed that while there was acknowledged benefits accruing from CDF projects, majority of the projects were never fully completed implying that only partial benefits were being derived from the initiatives. The research results indicate that there was low stakeholder participation at all stages of the CDF projects' cycle management with only a section of the stakeholders involved at the conception stage of the projects. This

consequently had a direct impact on the ownership of the projects and hence their performance. The research established that majority of the projects were not completed according to their plans with a significant number stalling in the process. It was further revealed that a substantial number of the completed projects were not being put to use. The research established that political regimes and government policies were the joint highest influencers of performance of the CDF projects followed closely by stakeholder participation. Participatory management as established by the research had a positive impact in enhancing project reviews, sensitization of local communities, enhancing resource mobilization from among the project stakeholders and finally ensuring institutionalized local leadership

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the research, the following recommendations ensue;

- a. CDF policy need be reviewed to expressly capture procedures of stakeholder engagement at all the stages of the CDF project cycle management. This ought to include provisions for funding of the exercises right from the project preliminary stages.
- b. There ought to be proper documentation of project data in order to enhance improvement in implementation of subsequent projects on the account of lessons learnt. The documentation should include project design reports and data gathered through participatory approaches including participatory monitoring and evaluation.
- c. The CDF policy should expressly capture procedures of funding projects done in phases. The provisions ought to include clauses on mandatory allocations to already incepted projects till their completion especially after political regime change.
- c. The CDFC which is the supreme committee at the constituency level charged with overseeing implementation of CDF projects need be expanded to include the heads of government technical departments. This will ensure availability of technical expertise for backstopping of the various technical works in the management of the CDF projects.

The researcher further recommends the following areas for further research;

- a. As the research was only carried out in Maragua constituency as opposed to all the 290 constituencies country wide due to constraints of time and finance, a similar study ought to be undertaken in other constituencies to cross-check the findings.
- b. Based on the research findings, the researcher recommends study on the effects of composition of CDF committees on the sustainability of the projects

Acknowledgement

To my family, my wife Quinter, my daughters Michelle, Nicole and Joy and my son Chris, the endurance of my absence and the support you accorded me during the period is paramount. My sincere gratitude further extends to the Ministry of Devolution and Planning, to Madam Fresia Kamau, CEISP Project manager, Mr. Elijah Kinaro, CDPO Murang'a and to all those who contributed in one way or the other to the successful compilation of this research piece. I acknowledge your contributions with lots of appreciation

References

Alam, A. & Ihsan, S. (2012). Role of participatory rural appraisal in community development. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(8), 25-38. Retrieved from <http://www.hrmars.com/admin/pics/963.pdf>

Amstein Sherry R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35 (4), 216-224. DOI: 10.1080/01944366908977225

Ayres, D. (1995). *Development studies: An introduction through selected readings*. Greenwich Readers.

Baskin, M. (2010). *Constituency development funds as a tool of decentralized development*. SUNY/CID. 56th Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Nairobi, Kenya. Retrieved from <http://www.cid.suny.edu/publications1/cdf%2520-%2520CPA%2520Background%2520paper.pdf>

Belloni, K. & Häkkinen T. (2011). Barriers and drivers for sustainable building. *Building Research & Information*, 39(3), 239-255. DOI: 10.1080/09613218.2011.561948

Bwisa, H.M. & Ndolo J. M. (2011). Culture as a factor in entrepreneurship development: A case of Kamba culture of Kenya, *Opinion* 1(1), 20–29. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary%3Fdoi%3D10.1.1.301.7694>

Bwisa, H. M. (2010). Towards the improvement of entrepreneurship education in Africa. Retrieved 18th December 2013, from <http://www.elearning.jkuat.ac.ke/Home/2010/Bwisa>

Bwisa, H. M. (2008). Cottage industry. *Entrepreneurship Resource Website*. Retrieved from <http://www.professorbwisa.com/index.php>

Cascio, J. (2007). *The resilient world. Open the future*, retrieved from http://openthefuture.com//the_resilient_world.html.

Chambers, R. (1994). Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): challenges, potentials and paradigm. *World Development*, 22(10), 1437-1454. DOI: 10.1016/0305-750x(94)90030-2.4

Chambers, R. (1994). Participatory Rural Appraisal: Analysis of experience. *World Development*, 22(9), 1253-1268. DOI: 10.1016/0305-750x(94)90003-5

Chu-hua, K. & Min H. L. (2013): Integrating quality management principles into sustainability management. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 24(1), 62-78. DOI: 10.1080/14783363.2012.669536

IFAD (2007c). *IFAD's approach to sustainability*. Retrieved on 16th Sept. 2013 from www.ifad.org/qbdocs/repl/presentationhs/sustainability.pdf

Kariuki, D. K., & Misaro J. (2013) Socio-Economic Status and Participatory Development in Kenya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 3(1), 183-193. Retrieved from http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol3_No_1_January_2013/22.pdf

Kimani, F., Nekesa, P., Ndungu, B. (2009). *Best practices in constituency development fund (CDF)*. Nairobi: Collaborative Centre for Gender and Development. Retrieved from http://gate.unwomen.org/resources/docs/genderequality/CCGD_Best%2520Practices%2520in%2520CDF_2008.pdf

Mathur, V. N., Price, A. F. & Simon, A. (2008). Conceptualizing stakeholder engagement in the context of sustainability and its assessment. *Construction Management and Economics*, 26(6), 601-609. DOI: 10.1080/01446190802061233

McCommon, C. (1993). Community management of rural water supply and sanitation services: water and sanitation for health (WASH) technical report. Washington DC: US AID. Retrieved from <http://www.developmentinpractice.org/reviews/projects-people-practice-participation-rural-development>

Muraguri, P. (2011). *An analysis of factors influencing sustainability of CDF projects in Kiharu constituency*. Retrieved from <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke:8080/handle/123456789/4145>

Oakley, P. (1991). *Projects with people: The practice of participation in rural development*. Geneva: ILO. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0021859600067150>

Ochieng, F. O. & Tubey, R. (2013). Factors Influencing Management of CDF Projects: A Case of Ainamoi Constituency. *International Journal of Science & Technology*, 2(1), 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.journalofsciences-technology.org/archive/2013/Jan_vol2_no_1/32342135413916.pdf

Otieno G.O. (2007). *Measuring effectiveness of constituency development fund on poverty reduction in Siaya district*. Economics and Social Sciences Department, Maseno University.

Pope, J., Morrison-Saunders, A. & Annandale, D. (2005). Applying sustainability assessment models. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal*, 23(4), 293–302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3152/147154605781765436>

Republic of Kenya (2013). Kenya Gazette Supplement. Revised CDF Act.

Swanepoel, H. & De Beer, F. (1996). *Community capacity building*. Johannesburg: International Thomson Publishing (South Africa) (pty) Ltd.

TANGO International (2009). Sustainability of rural development projects: Best practices and lessons learned by IFAD in Asia. IFAD. Occasional Paper No. 8. May 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.ifad.org/operations/projects/regions/pi/casestudies/vietnam.pdf>

World Bank. (2004). World Development Report: *Making Services Work for Poor People*. Washington DC: World Bank. Retrieved from <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/EXTWDRS/0,,contentMDK:23062333~pagePK:478093~piPK477627~theSitePK:477624,00.html>