

Effects of Motivating Factors of Community Participation in Project Sustainability in Rwanda: A Case Study of the Climate Resilient Post-Harvest Agribusiness Support Project (PASP) IFAD-Funded Project in Rwanda

Gisagara Emmanuel¹, Dr. Patrick Mulyungi²

^{1,2}Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

Abstract: *In Rwanda, Project sustainability has always been a serious issue and there is no much documented knowledge on factors that motivate community members to participate in development in the community driven development approach specifically in Rwandan context. This study was to assess the motivating factors which promote community participation in project sustainability in Rwanda. The research used descriptive research design. Therefore, the sample size was derived from population of 155,535 targeted beneficiaries of PASP project, cooperative managers (35) under the support of PASP, Cooperative support officers (68) from Rwanda Youth in Agribusiness Forum (RYAF) who are under the support of PASP grant also PASP field staff (12) was contacted during this research study. The researcher was used structured questionnaires to collect data from the targeted beneficiaries and other related stakeholders of PASP project. Primary data was used for data collection. Most of respondents agreed that Community Consultation influence the Project Sustainability of PASP Project. Participation of community during project implementation influences the PASP Project Sustainability at the level of 56.2% and 29.6% respectively. This means that during the period of project implementation; Post-Harvest and Agri-Business Support Project accommodated its beneficiaries suggestions at 85.8% and this accommodation of beneficiaries' suggestions contributed to the performance of Post-Harvest and Agri-Business Support Project. Communication has influenced the PASP Project Sustainability, 100% of respondents were appreciated and 97.2% were strong agreed on how communication is very important for the PASP Project Sustainability while 2.8% were agreed. Community consultation, community awareness, community development interest and community involvement in planning and evaluation determines by 87.9% to post-harvest agribusiness support project (PASP) IFAD-funded project. This is as given by the R square value of 0.879. The adjusted R square value is 0.805 which shows that the study result is 80.5%, this show the reliability of the study. ANOVA results further show that community consultation, community awareness, community development interest and community involvement in planning and evaluation explains project sustainability funded by IFAD-project. The sig value (0.000) less than the level significance (0.05). The F-statistics (F=214.145) is far greater than the P-value (0.000) hence a further confirmation that aspects of community consultation, Community awareness, community development interest and community involvement in planning and evaluation significantly influenced the project sustainability of Post-Harvest and Agribusiness Support Project. The PASP Project has been successfully achieved its goal. The results shown in chapter four, shown that the majority of beneficiaries have been participated on community consultation and community awareness. PASP Project staff should continue and improve on working closely with beneficiaries because, working together with beneficiaries have a significant impact in project sustainability.*

Keywords: Project, sustainability, Monitoring, Operation, Implementation

1. Introduction

The cornerstone of community based development initiatives is the active involvement of defined community in all aspects of project design and implementation. Community participation involves a proactive process in which the beneficiaries influenced the development and management of development projects, rather than receiving a share benefit. Community participation creates an enabling environment for sustainability by allowing users to select the level of services for which they are willing to pay, to guide key investment and management decision and commit resources in support of these choices. When beneficiaries also make decisions, participation becomes a self-initiated action, which is known as the exercise of voice and choice of empowerment by Oakley, 2009. Participation is a rich concept that varies with its application and definition by Oakley, 2009.

2. Statement of the Problem

Community participation in project sustainability in Rwanda has been through a long process of economic reforms and has played a major role in providing services to the public. However, it is not clear and identified whether community participation on projects leads to their sustainability. Many projects have been identified and developed for the benefits of the community, but after their completion period they collapse. Rwanda hosts a large number of local and international Non-Governmental organizations which engage in local activities of uplifting the lives of the community. In Rwanda, Project sustainability has always been a serious issue and there is no much documented knowledge on factors that motivate community members to participate in development in the community driven development approach specifically in Rwandan context. The intended community on the other hand has little community participation in project sustainability activities and the

projects end up collapsing after closure. Therefore, this study aims at assessing the motivating factors which may promote community participation in project sustainability in Rwanda, after the implementation and closure of PASP project designed for reducing post-harvest losses during harvesting period. In this context, a gap that formed statement and necessitated need for this study.

3. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study was to assess the effects of motivating factors of community participation in project sustainability in Rwanda

Its specific objectives were:

- 1) To examine the effect of Community involvement in planning and evaluation of community participation in project sustainability,
- 2) To assess the effect of Community Awareness community participation in project sustainability,
- 3) To assess effect of Community Development interest on community participation in project sustainability,
- 4) To identify the effect Community Consultation on community participation in project sustainability.

4. Conceptual Framework



5. Research Methodology

- **Research Design:** In this study a descriptive research design was applied
- **Target Population:** The target population was the beneficiary of PASP project who are the residents of PASP intervention Districts who have benefited from PASP grant under post-harvest infrastructures out of the targeted beneficiaries from which sample size was selected.
- **Sample Size:** The total sample of participants came up with a sample of 399 respondents from beneficiaries and 17 employees and this gives a total of 416 respondents.
- **Data collection instruments:** Primary data was used for data collection. Mixed methods both qualitative and quantitative were used for data collection. The reason for the choice of both quantitative methodologies was used to enhance collaboration, diversification, verification and enrichment of data to be collected through multiple methods.
- **Data processing and analysis:** After data have been collected the research was needed to analyze, assess and test them. The study sought to establish the position held by respondents (Kothari, 2009), argues that data collected has to be processed, analyzed and presented in accordance with the outlines laid down for the purpose at the time of developing the research plan. Data analysis involves the transformation of data into meaningful information for decision making. The main advantage of content analysis is that it helps in data collected being reduced and simplified, while at the same time producing results that may then be measured using quantitative techniques (Krippendorff & Bock, 2012). It involves editing, error correction, rectification of omission and finally putting together or consolidating information gathered. The collected data was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

6. Summary of Study Findings

6.1 Descriptive analysis

The table below shows different agreements of respondents on statements related to the influence of Community Consultation in project sustainability.

Table 1: The influence of Community Consultation in promoting community participation in project sustainability

Statements	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1) Participation of community during project implementation influence the PASP Project Sustainability	(29.60%)	(56.20%)	(1.40%)	(12.70%)	-
2) During the closure of project life, the community consultation may influence the PASP project sustainability	(47.80%)	(43.00%)	(9.10%)	-	-
3) The activity of PASP influence the level of beneficiaries satisfaction	(94%)	(6%)	-	-	-
4) Encouraging community to be part of project implementation may influence the PASP project sustainability	(50.50%)	(27.40%)	(15.40%)	(6.70%)	-

Source: Primary Data, 2019

The Findings in the above Table 1 show that most of respondents agreed that Community Consultation influence the Project Sustainability of PASP Project. Participation of

community during project implementation influences the PASP Project Sustainability at the level of 56.2% and 29.6% respectively. This means that during the period of project

implementation; Post-Harvest and Agri-Business Support Project accommodated its beneficiaries suggestions at 85.8% and this accommodation of beneficiaries' suggestions contributed to the performance of Post-Harvest and Agri-Business Support Project. During the implementation of Post-Harvest and Agri-Business Support Project activities 75% of respondents are agreed that the decisions taken are reviewed. This means that most of decisions taken during the project implementation are well reviewed by the project Manager and others Post-Harvest and Agri-Business Support Project staffs. As shown in the above Table 4.5 during the project lifecycle all needs are identified, where the majority of respondents agreed with this statement with 77.9%. All respondents show that all decisions applied by Post-Harvest and Agri-Business Support Project were succeeded and have relation to decision making.

Maslow's Pyramid of hierarchical need has been very well spoken and discussed in the HR industry which is an integral part of Project Management. While working on the projects the most inconsistent variable which a project manager faces is a human resource. Understanding Maslow's pyramid helps project manager to identify problems related to human resources management. Maslow typically says that there are five levels of human needs and it is through their accomplishment one by one that the human can reach self-actualization. The pyramid consists of physiological needs, security requirements, social relationships, recognition and self-actualization (William, 2009). Project management has emerged as a discipline of high level decision making with

the help of analogue and digital tools which would help augment the intuition of a Project Manager and his team for taking decisions in favor of the future of the project. These decision making tools are general, they are based on common sense and are used in all the trades for backing up the decisions taken by the decision making authorities. This theory of understood properly can help a project manager a great deal while working with human resources. Time, cost and scope are the triple constraints of any project. Any variation in the stipulated value of these constraints is bound to affect the project's outcome. There are different decision project manager can order to keep three constraints in check. Through decision making models manager and his team they can plan the risks but manager and his team can perform a reality check with what should be the step which shall be taken in response to a particular situation. Choi-Fitzpatrick, (2014). This situation may account for positive or negative risks and for the risks manager and his team can deduce a risk response plan accordingly.

Important decisions needed for implementation requirements include identifying the human and financial capital required, and choosing communication methods and timelines. It begins by determining leadership roles and responsibilities, and getting commitment for budget and equipment required. Davids, (2011), decide on a timeline for task completion and review dates and then identify tasks or areas of the plan that may require additional hires or external consultants and finally choose a method and timeline for communicating updates on the project or program to staff and customers.

Table 2: The influences of Community Awareness in motivating community participation in project sustainability

Statements	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1) Communication has influence on the PASP Project Sustainability	(83.4%)	(16.6%)	-	-	-
2) Communication is very important for the PASP Project Sustainability	(97.2%)	(2.8%)	-	-	-
3) The needs of community participation influence the PASP project Sustainability	(69.6%)	(26.6%)	(3.8%)	-	-
4) The needs of communities equal with the PASP Project Sustainability	(78.3%)	(21.7%)	-	-	-
Total	416	100.0			

Source: Primary Data, 2019

The Table 2 shows different views of respondents related on how Community Awareness on promote community participation in project sustainability. Communication has influenced the PASP Project Sustainability, 100% of respondents were appreciated and 97.2% were strong agreed on how communication is very important for the PASP Project Sustainability while 2.8% were agreed. The above basic consensus on development communication has been interpreted and applied in different ways throughout the past century. Both at theory and research levels, as well as at the levels of policy and planning-making and implementation, divergent perspectives are on offer. The needs of community participation influence the PASP project Sustainability as appreciated by 96.2% and the needs of communities are equal with the PASP project sustainability at 100%. Participation, here does not simply being involved in the agriculture project facilities, it means contributing ideas, making decisions and taking responsibility. Community participation can be loosely defined as the involvement of

people in a community in projects to solve their own problems. People cannot be forced to participate in projects which affect their lives but should be given the opportunity where possible. This is held to be basic human right and a fundamental principle of democracy. Community participation is especially important in emergency sanitation programmes where people may be unaccustomed to their surroundings and new sanitation facilities.

There are often strong genuine reasons why people wish to participate in agriculture project programmes. All too often aid workers assume that people will only do anything for remuneration and have no genuine concern for their own predicament or that of the community as whole. This is often the result of the actions of the agency itself, in throwing money or food at community members without meaningful dialogue or consultation. Remuneration is an acceptable incentive but is usually not the only, or even the primary motivation.

Table 2: The effect of community activities influencing the project sustainability

Statements	SA	A	UN	D	SD
1) The communities activities influence the PASP Project Sustainability	(50.5%)	(44.7%)	(4.8%)	-	-
2) Infrastructure development influence the PASP project sustainability	(49.5%)	(50.5%)	-	-	-
3) The Community infrastructure ownership have positive impact on PASP Project Sustainability	(64.27%)	(41.3%)	-	-	-
4) Infrastructure development have an impact of PASP project sustainability	(99.1%)	(0.9%)	-	-	-

Source: Primary Data, 2019

The findings in Table 2 revealed that the communities' activities influenced the PASP project sustainability; the views of respondents 95.2% of respondents were agreed. And the infrastructure development influenced the PASP Project Sustainability, the views of respondents' shows that revealed that 100% of respondents were agreed. Stakeholder participation is a major concern regarding the sustainability of community development projects and that the international community continuously pushed the less developed world to engage community members in discussing issues that affect their wellbeing.

6.2 Regression analysis

Table 3: Regression Results for all independents variable and dependent variable

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.941 ^a	.879	.805	.143

a. Predictors: (Constant), Community Consultation, Community Awareness, Community Development interest and Community involvement in planning and evaluation

According to results in Table 3, community consultation, community Awareness, community development interest and community involvement in planning and evaluation determines by 87.9% to post-harvest agribusiness support project (PASP) IFAD-funded project. This is as given by the R square value of 0.879. The adjusted R square value is 0.805 which shows that the study result is 80.5%, this show the reliability of the study.

Table 4: ANOVA Test

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	21.930	4	5.483	214.145	.000 ^a
	Residual	2.202	394	.026		
	Total	24.132	398			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Community Consultation, Community Awareness, Community Development interest and Community involvement in planning and evaluation
 b. Dependent Variable: project sustainability

ANOVA results further show that community Consultation, community Awareness, community development interest and community involvement in planning and evaluation explains project sustainability funded by IFAD-project. The table above 4 shows the sig value (0.000) less than the level significance (0.05). The F-statistics (F=214.145) is far greater than the P-value (0.000) hence a further confirmation that aspects of community consultation, Community awareness, community development interest and community involvement in planning and evaluation significantly influenced the project sustainability of Post-Harvest and Agribusiness Support Project. Further, Tables 4.10 indicates that the residual value (2.202) is less than the regression

value (21.930) which means that all independent variables contributed to the sustainability of PASP project.

Table 5: Regression Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.671	.145		4.618	.000
Community Consultation	.648	.085	.505	5.264	.000
Community awareness	.783	.084	.329	3.361	.000
Community development interest	.545	.069	.057	.653	.001
Community involvement in planning and evaluation	.545	.069	.057	.653	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Project sustainability

Using linear regression analysis from SPSS data bases, shows that all sub-variables were significant with (sig=0.000 and 0.01). This means that all variables influence the project sustainability of PASP-funded project.

$Y = 0.671 + 0.648x_1 + 0.783x_2 + 0.545x_3 + 0.545 + \epsilon$. This therefore reveals that, given a unit increase in the community Consultation would positively change by 0.648 times. Also, a unit increase of community awareness would result to 0.783 times increases in the PASP sustainability.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

The IFAD-funded project with a case study of the climate resilient post-harvest agribusiness support project (PASP) was conducted in twelve districts. The study helped to evaluate the effects of motivating factors of community participation in project sustainability in Rwanda. The project brought many changes in the lives of the beneficiaries of project during implementation of the project and those changes should be kept improving so that the population (beneficiaries), could continue develop themselves and their family in general. The result reflects that the community participation contributes to the project sustainability in Rwanda. Based on the objectives of the study, PASP Project has been successfully achieved its mandate. The findings shown that, the majority of beneficiaries have been participated on community consultation and community awareness.

7.2 Recommendations

After the research conducted in twelve districts in Rwanda, to investigate the effect of motivating factors of community participation in project sustainability in Rwanda, it is recommended the following:

- 1) PASP funded Projects should involve all beneficiaries in the project review and sharing the feedback of the ongoing and ended project's activities, because poor sharing of feedback between project team and beneficiaries can affect negatively the project sustainability.
- 2) The government of Rwanda should continue to encourage many agricultural projects to support rural farmers in order to reduce the number of poor people's lives in rural area.
- 3) Beneficiaries should keep the sense of project ownership developed since the beginning even after the closing of the project so that they could continue benefit from it.
- 4) PASP project should organize trainings for beneficiaries of project in partnership with Districts which would help in providing advisory services on the good management and maintenance of the project implementation so that these can remain productive.

References

- [1] Aarhus, (2009), *Sustainability in Projects Management : Eight Principles in Practice*. Jan. 2016.
- [2] Armitage (2011), *Program Sustainability : Developing Strategies for Maintaining Programs over the Long-term*.
- [3] Ashton, (2012), *Economic, social, and environmental sustainability in development theory and urban planning practice*. Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers. The Environmentalist 19, 145-161.
- [4] Bawole, & Ahenkan, (2012), *Getting funding and planning successful projects : Big Lottery Fund's guide to outcomes*, March 2012.
- [5] Bens, (2014), *Critical factors for sustainable social projects*. The Journal of the South African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, Vol. 106.
- [6] Bernard, L.T, B., and Harier, J.L (2011). Making sense of sustainability management. New York exodus: Explorus Group Inc.
- [7] Bizimana, et al. (2012), *A Resource Guide for Enhancing Potential for Sustainable Impact: Food and Nutrition Security*. Project Concern International.
- [8] Bossert, (2010), *Does your Project make a difference ? A guide to evaluating environmental education projects and programs*. Sydney, Dec. 2011
- [9] Brodie et al (2009), *Managing sustainable development programmes; a learning approach to change*. London: Gower Publishing.
- [10] Brodie et al (2011), *The contribution of beneficiary participation to development project effectiveness*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1987.
- [11] Brown, (2010), *Project Management and Sustainable Development Principles*. Newtown Square, Pennsylvania, USA. Project Management Institute, Oct. 2014.
- [12] Castro, & Ariño, (2011), *The Rise and Fall of Community Development in Developing Countries, 1990-2005. A Critical Analysis and an Annotated Bibliography*. Michigan State University. Michigan.
- [13] Cleaver, (2011), *The Management of International Development Projects: Enhancing Sustainable Outcomes with Improved Project Management Education and Training*. Maastricht School of Management. Maastricht, the Netherlands, Sept. 2013.
- [14] Davids, (2011), *Factors Affecting Successful Implementation of Information Technology Projects : Experts' Perception*. European Scientific Journal, edition vol.9, No.27.
- [15] Elkington, (2013), *Factors Affecting Implementation of Community Projects: Case of Kimira – Oluch Smallholder Farm Improvement Project in Homa Bay County, Kenya*. Universal Journal of Management 1(2): 111-118
- [16] FAO Report. (2014), *Community Participation in Development Projects*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C., USA. Febr.1987.
- [17] Fearon, & Ochieng, (2013), *Considering Sustainability Factors in the Development Project Life-Cycle: A Framework for Increasing Successful Adoption of Improved Stoves*. Michigan Technological University, 2010.
- [18] Gareis et al. (2014), *Sustainability in Project Management: Vision, Mission, Ambition*. HU University of Applied Sciences. Utrecht, the Netherlands.
- [19] Gerard, (2010), *A Maturity Model for Integrating sustainability in Projects and Project Management*. Amersfoort, the Netherlands.
- [20] Goldsmith & Brinkerhoff, (2012), *Participatory Impact Assessment of Women Income Generating Groups under CARE intervention in Borena, Ethiopia*. Care Ethiopia, Pastoralist Programs, Sept. 2009.
- [21] Golicha, (2010), *Third water supply and sanitation project-participatory, consultative and empowering*. New Delhi, India: Asian Development Bank.
- [22] Goyet, (2009), *Effects of community participation on perception of sustainability of rural water projects in Oyun Local Government Area of Kwara State, Nigeria*. J. Food, Agric. Environ., 4(384): 257-261.
- [23] Harrington & McNellis, (2016), *In Kenya, consultation and partnership are factors for success*. One Country, 11(1): 1-5.
- [24] Harris, (2011), *Innovator Workshops in Bangladesh*. In: Chambers et al.(eds). Farmer First. IT Publications, London.
- [25] Harvey, (2012), *People's Participation: NGOs and the Flood Action Plan*. Research and Advisory Services, Dhaka.
- [26] Hazernberg, (2012), *Towards Green Villages: A Strategy for Environmentally Sound and Participatory Rural Development*, Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi.
- [27] Honadle & Van Sant as cited in Kamarah, (2011), *Participation in Sustainable Development: The Roles of Non-governmental Organisations*. Presentation to the 20th Waigani Seminar, Environment and Development, 22-27 August 1993, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea
- [28] IFAD, (2010), *The Scope for NGO-Government Interactions in Agricultural Technology Development: An International Overview*. Agricultural Administration

- (R&E) Network Paper 33, Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London.
- [29] Isham and Kahkonen, (2009), *Participatory Rural Development in Agriculture and the Environment*, (ed. E. Lutz, with H. Binswanger, P. Hazell, and A. McCalla. Washington, D.C.
- [30] Jiang et al., (2012), *Participatory Monitoring and evaluation of community projects*. Paulines publications Africa, Nairobi Kenya.
- [31] Joseph & al (2011), *The Government of Rwanda National Poverty Reduction Programme, Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*.
- [32] Kaufman and Alfonso, (2017), *A Handbook of Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines*. Department of Environment, Kuala Lumpur (July 1987, reprinted May 1988).
- [33] Khwaja et al., (2014), *NGOs, Agricultural Technology and the Rural Poor*, Food Policy, December, 479-491.
- [34] Khwaja, (2013), *Beneficiary Participation in Development Projects: Empirical Tests of Popular Theories*. *Econ. Development and Cultural Change* 37 (3) 573-593.
- [35] Kinnander, (2011), *Prioritizing Institutional Development: A New Role for NGO Centres for Study & Development*. Sustainable Agriculture Programme Gatekeeper Series SA35. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London.
- [36] Korten (2010), *Perspectives on Participation. An Inventory of Institutions in Africa*. International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), London.
- [37] Kothari (2009), *Participatory Development: "When Culture Creep"* Stanford University Press, *Journal of Public Economics* 83(3): 375 – 404.
- [38] Kumar, (2010), *International Institute for Environment and Development, 1998. Journal of Participation, Literacy and Empowerment* 27 (2):60 - 78.
- [39] Kwak., (2015), *Agriculture project planning in Tanzania IDM*, Mzumbe and the United Kingdom Department for International Development. 76pp.
- [40] Maina, (2013), *Institutionalizing adaptive planning and local level concerns; looking to the future*. International technology Publication, London, UK. 155-157pp
- [41] Mansuri and Rao (2013), *Indigenous Farmer-Managed Irrigation in Sonjo, Tanzania*. *The Geographical Journal*.
- [42] Martens et al., (2011), *Case Studies of Project Sustainability: Implications for Policy and Operations from Asian Experience*". The World Bank, Washington, DC
- [43] Middler, et al (2016), "Impact and Sustainability of Community Water Supply and Sanitation Programmes in Developing Countries" in *Journal of the Chartered Institution of Water and Environment*", Vol. 13, pp292-296,
- [44] Mugenda and Mugenda (2009), "Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century". IDS Discussion Paper 296. Brighton: IDS,
- [45] Oakley, (2009), "Project planning, analysis, selection, financing, implementation and review". 6th edition. Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company. New Delhi
- [46] Obbo, (2013), *Sustainability indicators for natural Resource management and policy: A review of indicators of Agricultural and rural Livelihood sustainability*.
- [47] Robert (2013). *The importance of community involvement in the planning and design phases of rural water supply development projects in the Koro Region of Mali, West Africa*.
- [48] Robert, (2009). *Social learning in environmental management building a sustainable future*. Earthscan Publications, London, UK.
- [49] Roy (2013), *Resource guide to concepts and methods for community based and collaborative problem solving*: Johns Hopkins University.
- [50] Saunders et al. (2009), *Community Participation in the Management of Public Good: Myth or Reality, Case Study of Two Villages in India*, ISS Research Paper, The Hague, Holland.
- [51] Smith, (2011), *Stakeholder Participation in the Striver Project*. Striver Policy Brief, PB No. 21
- [52] Spoul, (2015), *International development projects: challenges and opportunities*. Istanbul, Turkey. Project Management Institute, 2013.
- [53] United Nations, (2011), *The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE)*. Project Sustainability Checklist.
- [54] Wester gaard, (2016), *Income-Generating Programmes*. UNESCO Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. Bangkok, 1993.
- [55] William, (2009), *Managing the Project Environment*. Vancouver, B.C., Canada. AEW Services, 1999, 2001.
- [56] Williams (2011). *Managing International Development Projects – Lessons Learned*. Maryland, USA. Project Management Journal, June, 1999.
- [57] Williams (2015), *Influence of community participation on the performance of agriculture project, Kajiado county Kenya*: Unpublished MA Thesis UoN
- [58] World Bank, (2012), *An assessment of factors influencing sustainability: The case of community agriculture projects in Keekonyokie Central Location of Kajiado District, Kenya*.