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# **ABSTRACT**

The study examined the relationship between stakeholder participation and project sustainability of Distance Support Program (DSP) of Save the Children in Juba, South Sudan. The specific objectives of the study were; to examine the impact of stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability of DSP; to ascertain the effect of stakeholder participation in implementation on project sustainability of DSP. And to determine the degree to which stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation affects project sustainability of DSP. The study employed descriptive and case study research design which involved an intensive analysis of the research variables.

A sample size of 136 respondents was used from a population of 210 people including, DSP’s managerial and operational staff, and social workers from two implementing, representatives from the funders, a community development officer, probation officer from the government, direct beneficiaries. Purposive, simple random and convenience sampling techniques were used to select the respondents. The respondents were issued with self-administered questionnaires which had closed ended questions and face to face interviews were conducted among DSP’s managerial staff, Probation staff, Community Development Officer and Funders.

The study found out that stakeholder participation through effective stakeholder participation in planning, stakeholder participation in implementation and stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation was as a prerequisite for improved project sustainability of DSP at Save the Children in Juba South Sudan. The researcher therefore, concluded that stakeholder participation in planning enhanced project sustainability of DSP as evidenced by the positive significant correlation value of 0.58.4, stakeholder participation in implementation enhanced project sustainability of DSP with positive significant correlation value of 0.651 and that stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation led to improved project sustainability of DSP by 62.2%.

The researcher recommended for feasibility studies, before any project starts operating, in order to establish the actual problem on the ground, need to ensure that engage all stakeholders who can impact the project both positively and negatively from the beginning of the project and for Monitoring & Evaluation team to come up with the right tools that will help to identify some of the loopholes in the implementation process like stakeholders lack of understanding of their role and the overall aim of the project.

Therefore, suggests that more studies should be conducted on the level of participation of stakeholders in a project and incorporation of sustainability in the project lifecycle.
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# **CHAPTER ONE**

# **INTRODUCTION**

1. **Introduction**

The study aimed to examine the relationship between Stakeholder participation and Project Sustainability of Distance Support Program (DSP) at Save the Children in South Sudan. Stakeholder Participation which was the Independent Variable was defined as magnitude to which all stakeholders are planned for by the organization irrespective of their influence on the organization and their chances to have a positive or negative influence on Organization (Pernille Eskerod; Martina Huemann; Claudia Ringhofer, 2016). The variable was measured through Planning, Execution, and Monitoring, as well as Evaluation. Project sustainability which was Dependent Variable in this study was defined as the possibility and prospect of the aids obtained during the project life-cycle to be sustained after the financial support comes to end (ADB, 2010) as cited by (Salla & Salla, 2014).

In this chapter, attempt is made to position and introduce the subject matter of the study. The background to the study provides an overview of what the study variables. Statement of the problem highlights the main variables under consideration. From the objectives of the study the research questions are derived, which questions, the study will attempt to answer and suggest possible solutions to the problem. Scope of the study specifies the boundaries of the study in terms of geographical location, and population type and size. Significance of the study are also outlined and the chapter is concluded the conceptual framework used to explain the relationship between the study variables.

* 1. **Background to the Study**

The background of the study is sub-divided into historical, theoretical, conceptual and contextual perspectives as indicated below;

* + 1. **Historical Background**

Sustainability has advanced into a significant challenge today. (G. Silvius, 2017). Hans Carl von Carlowitz, a German forester, devised the phrase "sustainability" in the 1950s. 1712 to refer to ways in which forest resources needed to be managed sustainably. (Komalawati, 2008). In the 1960s &1970s, Sustainability became broadly known through the world of the member of the club of Rome that made the two related concepts of sustainable development and Inter-generational equity known (Garcia & Staples, 2000) as cited in (Komalawati, 2008). The concept and analysis of sustainable development were additionally advanced by the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) which was founded in the 1980s, they presented modern description of development that is long-term known today “Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generation to meet their own needs” (WCED,1987), as cited in (Scoones 2007,) who is cited by (Komalawati, 2008). In recent times, since sustainability necessitates change, and projects are undergoing change, Project management has been linked to sustainability (Silvius & Schipper, 2016).

Concern with subject of project sustainability came because of many pressures from internal constituencies to slightly lessen or probably end foreign aid and programs (Brown, 1998) as cited in (Komalawati, 2008). More than ever, the environment of many organizations faces too many changes and has become very competitive. The ability to come up with accurate changes that are organized and managed effectively and efficiently, is considered as a serious success factor for projects agility and continuous success, these changes are being accomplished as projects (Silvius et al., 2016). Organizations are now required to present accountability to all stakeholders in regards to sustainability strategy instead of the previous reliance on economic performances to shareholders (Visser 2002) as cited by (Silvius & Schipper, 2016). Tom Taylor, former Chairman of the Association for Project Management (APM), acknowledges that "Planet Earth is in jeopardy due to a number of fundamental environmental issues," and program managers are in a unique position to help improve management activities that are long-term. (Association for Project Management 2006) as cited by (Komalawati, 2008).

Concerns about sustainability prompted the donors to consider their options whether it would be preferable for donors to provide assistance that would allow recipients to become self-sufficient rather than offering them charity in the future, this is inefficient and leads to a reliance on international assistance (Bossert,1990, p.1015) as cited by (Komalawati, 2008). Post-development theorists see beneficiaries as conceiving and capable of implementing projects completely on their own (e.g. Escobar 1995) as cited in (Wiek, 2014). Projects have also been recognized as being important in the adoption of more sustainable business practices, as well as the connection between projects and long-term sustainability is becoming a hot research subject in project management (Silvius, 2017).

* + 1. **Conceptual Background**

Actors in development work define project sustainability in different ways, but the predominant concept is related to the continuation of initiated activities after funding and other types of involvement have ended. The idea is that a project team will have a huge effect on how both within a business, tangible and intangible "project sustainability" metrics are introduced (Silvius & Schipper, 2014), as cited by (Salla & Salla, 2014).

Project sustainability is characterized by the Asian Development Bank (ADB), African Development Bank (ADB), and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), as well as probability of such profits being sustained once monetary backing has terminated. (ADB 2010, 4.) Cited in (Salla & Salla, 2014). According to the research, the word "project sustainability" is interpreted to include words like "stability," "resilience," in addition to "risk" to be able to indicate the need to handle the project's sustainability foundations constructively while mitigating project vulnerability and - resiliency (Gachie, 2019;Luvega, & Malunga, 2020).

Creation, implementation, and managing of project-organized policy change, assets, processes, and services, or establishments, while taking into account the six sustainability concepts in the project and its results, as well as consequences, in project and project management, this is referred to as sustainability (Silvius & Schipper, 2016).

Sustainable Development (SD) can be characterized at the project level as part of a comprehensive management strategy that separates the by SD procedure based on SD material addressing the interconnected Activities for generating value for the project and the parent organization has economic, environmental, and social dimensions while also contributing to the aim of a better planet or the term "sustainability". (Huemann & Silvius, 2017). The study will adopt the definition of Project Sustainability advanced by (Salla & Salla, 2014). Interested parties Participation serves as both a means and an end in itself. As a method, it is a mechanism in which individuals and groups work together to create a project. (Magassouba, Malek, Tambi, Alkhlaifat, Aziz, Abdullah, et al., 2019).

Stakeholder Participation according to (Pernille Eskerod; Martina Huemann; Claudia Ringhofer, 2016) was described as the extent to which all stakeholders, regardless of their level of influence within the organization or their ability to support or damage the organization, are regarded by the organization. As a result, members of the company make efforts to recognize and meet the needs and desires of stakeholders to ensure that they are not adversely surprised (Kinyoda, 2019). The study adopted the definition of Stakeholder Participation advanced by (Pernille Eskerod; Martina Huemann; Claudia Ringhofer, 2016).

* + 1. **Theoretical Background**

Stakeholder theory directed the research, the concept of this theory according to Megan Blackburn, 2019 was originally laid out by Ian Mitroff (1983), he wrote about it in his publication “Stakeholders of the Organizational Mind,” The theory was later advanced by a Professor of business management and philosopher R. Edward Freeman (1984), who said Stakeholder theory was developed as a result of discussions at the Stanford Research Institute, rather than citing Mitroff as a source whose use of the word was coined to describe & broaden the idea of stockholders as the only party to which management must react. Therefore, originally the term "stakeholder" was described as “those groups without whose support the organization would cease to exist.” Shareholders, staff, clients, vendors, lenders, and the community were all on their initial list of stakeholders (Blackburn, 2019).

Stakeholder theory stresses the interconnectedness of businesses and organizations with all those that have an interest in them, including workers, consumers, vendors, financiers, communities, public agencies, political parties, labor associations, trade unions, and even rivals (Freeman, Jeffrey, Wicks &Parmar, 2010). According to the theory, company should represent interests of all stakeholders, not only the shareholders. According to Freeman et al. (2010), it is better to represent the needs of stakeholders because increasing shareholder capital is not a long-term target for companies. He also drew six principles that he said were important to control the stakeholders' relationship and the corporation. The first was the theory of entry and departure, which states that specific guidelines must be in place to establish the relationship, such as when recruiting workers and terminating their jobs. The second concept was governance, which is concerned with how the laws regulating the stakeholder-firm partnership can be complicated changed.

The theory of externalities was the third principle which is interested in how a community that does not profit from a corporation's activities will express itself and face certain difficulties as a result of the corporation's actions. According to the principle, anyone who bears the costs of other stakeholders and is affected by a business has the right to become a participant. Contract costs was the fourth concept; this means that each contracting party should either bear equal costs or costs proportional to their benefit in the company. The fifth principle was the Agency principle, which states that a company's management is its representative and thus has obligations to all clients and shareholders. The sixth principle, was selective immortality, which is concerned with a company's survival. It implies that the organization's survival, as well as the success of its owners, is contingent on the organization's existence for an extended duration. If the business only lasted for a limited period, it would be advantageous to some stakeholders but detrimental to others (Freeman et al. 2010).

The theory was relevant to this study because it guided it in terms of comprehension of how the stakeholders' partnership ought to be treated to guarantee the DSP Project's long-term viability. The first principle which was entry and exit helped the study to understand how the different DSP stakeholders were brought on board or let go, whether any rules are governed their relationship, and its effect on the sustainability of the project. The second principle was governance; this principle aided the analysis in determining if the terms of amending the rules that regulate the stakeholder relationship affect the project's long-term viability. The third theory was externalities, which aided the analysis in determining if all groups that bear the burden of the project's operations were included among the project's stakeholders, and if not, how this was affecting the project's long-term viability. The fourth principle which was contract costs, it helped the study to understand whether all the stakeholders involved in the DSP play the roles that are expected of them for ensuring plan long-term viability. The fifth principle was the theory of agency, which stated that a company's manager was an employee of the company, with obligations to both owners and shareholders. This concept aided the investigation into whether the manager treats all customers and participants in a manner that guarantees the project's long-term viability. The sixth principle, minimal immortality, was concerned with a company's sustainability. This concept directed the investigation into whether there were policies in place to ensure that the project was sustainable so that all stakeholders profit from it achieving its objective.

* + 1. **Contextual Background**

Distance Support Program (DSP) is a program under Save the Children International that supports Orphaned and vulnerable children in South Sudan. Save the Children has been working with and for children, their families and communities in South Sudan since 1991. Its original goal was to ensure that Orphaned and Vulnerable Children within their operational areas receive inclusive and equitable quality education and complete basic level of education (nursery to senior six or tertiary) and contribute to the reduction of a high rate of school dropout, especially among vulnerable children through payment of school fees. DSP operates in 5 states of South Sudan and currently supports over 3370 vulnerable children together with key stakeholders who include over 3800 donors, 19 implementing partners, the government, schools, probation officers, parents, and community members. (DSP, 2018). In 2017, the objectives of DSP were revised to incorporate the entire Households of the supported children. These objectives are; increased completion rate of beneficiaries in primary, secondary and vocational school assured (through school fees payment and provision of scholastic materials), Strengthened economic status of Households (HHs) through Village Loans and Saving Associations(VSLA), Income Generating Activities(IGA), increased adoption of good health hygiene and nutrition practices among beneficiaries and their Households, Increased psycho-social wellbeing of beneficiaries and increased capacity of IPs and project staff. (DSP Annual Report 2019). The Objectives were revised after an analysis of the database showed that a high percentage of children who lost donors due to unforeseen circumstances, failed to continue with school because their parents or guardians were not able to continue supporting them. This was intended to economically empower and enable the parents/guardians to start up income Generating Activities and then earn money that they would use to support the children in case of funders withdrew. Despite the effort to solve the above problem, the percentage of children seeking re-enrolment after they have lost support between 2016 to2017 and 2018 to2019 has shot up to over 97% and 91% respectively, compared to that between 2010-2011, 2012-2013, and 2014-2015, 81%, 72%, and 84% before the intervention (DSP Database, children’s list (2010- 2019), (DSP, 2018b), Quarterly Reports). This indicated that the efforts that were put in place did not address the gap which is the failure by the organization stakeholders and the direct beneficiaries and their associates to clearly understand, accept, visualize, own, and commit to the projects that they called for in their communities. If this problem continued, it would threaten the sustainability of the program. In this context, the research aimed to evaluate relationship between stakeholder participation and project sustainability in the Distance Support Program.

## **Statement of the Problem**

Project sustainability is increasingly becoming critical for project success, as stakeholders demand ethical behaviour, environmental stewardship, and cost-effectiveness over the project lifecycle. (Dangelico & Nonino, 2019). This is achieved when all stakeholders put in their contribution either physically, economically, socially, or emotionally in ensuring smooth implementation and sustainability of their projects. However, the most significant obstacles to project sustainability are revealed to be in the area of stakeholder engagement and collaboration, where personal disputes and poor coordination seem to plague working relationships between individuals and organizations. (Salla & Salla, 2014). DSP is facing a similar challenge, their stakeholders, the direct beneficiaries plus their associates are seen not to clearly understand, own, commit to, and play their roles in the projects that they called for in their communities as it is expected of them (DSP, 2018).

As a consequence, a number of the supported children drop out of school without completing their studies as shown by the result of an assessment of the database which confirms that, in the period between 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 59%, 67%, 52%, 68%, 72% & 67% respectively, were the average number of children affected, DSP Database (2010-2019). The drop-out reasons include loss of interest in studies, jobs, marriage, moving too far places, and loss of Donors. In a bid to try to address the issues mentioned above, DSP created new sister projects like Village Saving & Loans Associations, Farmer Field Schools, Financial Literacy & IGA. However, these projects although very good, do not directly address the gap. Therefore, further assessment of the database showed that the rate of dropout in subsequent years remains the same, in 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 at 63%, 65%, 57% & 53% respectively (DSP Database 2010-2019). The study contributed knowledge that helped in addressing the problem. 2017).

## **1.3. Purpose of the Study**

The study examined the relationship between stakeholder participation and project sustainability of Distance Support Program (DSP) of Save the Children in Juba, South Sudan.

## **Objectives of the Study**

The study was guided by the following objectives;

1. To examine the impact of stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability of DSP.
2. To ascertain the effect of stakeholder participation in implementation on project sustainability of DSP.
3. To determine the degree to which stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation affects project sustainability of DSP.
	1. **Research Questions**

From the above study objectives, the following questions were formulated;

1. How does participation of stakeholders in planning affect project sustainability of DSP?
2. What is the effect of stakeholder participation in implementation on project sustainability of DSP?
3. What is the effect of stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation on project sustainability of DSP?

## **1.6 Hypothesis of the Study**

H1: There is no statistical positiverelationship between stakeholder participation in planning and project sustainability of DSP.

H2: There is no statistical significant positive relationship between stakeholder participation in implementation and project sustainability of DSP

H3: There is no statistical significant positive relationship between stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation and project sustainability of DSP.

## **1.7 Scope of the Study**

The scope of the study captured the subject scope, geographical scope and time frame within which the study was conducted.

## **1.7.1. Content Scope**

Conceptually, the study examined the relationship between stakeholder participation and Sustainability of projects in the Distance Support Program as a case study. To be specific, the study emphasized the participation of Beneficiaries in project interventions, looking at their influence in planning, execution, and assessment and monitoring. The Independent Variable was conceived as stakeholder participation, the Dependent Variable as Project Sustainability, study was restricted to the economic dimension of variable.

## **1.7.2. Geographical Scope**

The study was carried out at Save the Children International Offices in Hai Malakal, Juba in South Sudan. Its coordinates are Latitude: 4.8421426, Longitude: 31.6073979, 4°50'31.7"N 31°36'26.6"E.

## **1.7.3. Time Scope**

The study focused on a period of five years i.e. 2011-2020. This period was important simply because this was the time the program started archiving data in the database (2011-2020). This period was sufficient to investigate stakeholder participation and sustainability of projects.

## **1.8. Significance of the Study**

The research findings and recommendations may be of importance to the following stakeholders:

Study's results may be helpful to policymakers particularly in government directorates such as the Ministry of Interiors and the National NGO board. This may enable government institutions in their efforts to develop programs and formulate policies that may ultimately engage Stakeholders in the rural areas to participate in development programs increasing Project sustainability.

The study findings may help those in charge of DSP like the board, project manager, and their donors to establish strong systems and structures that will better inform their day-to-day operations.

The results of the research might also contribute to the body of information already in existence by providing empirical evidence based on the impact of stakeholder participation on the project's long-term viability, which could be used in decision-making processes not only on a local but also on a national scale.

The study findings may also benefit academicians and researchers by providing literature on matters associated with stakeholder involvement and project longevity.

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.0. Introduction**

The chapter contained summary of literature about the study's variables, theoretical overview and literature on the Stakeholder involvement in project planning and sustainability, stakeholder participation in project execution and project sustainability, and stakeholder participation in project monitoring and evaluation and project sustainability.

## **2.1. Literature Survey**

Empirical studies that have been done include a study by Imran (2019) who uses primary data on development projects in Northern Pakistan to provide empirical support to illustrate the effects of community participation on project performance. His findings do provide evidence supporting the theoretical claim, that greater community participation in non-technical decisions is associated with higher project outcomes. Castro and Arino (2021) analysed the performance of water systems in a variety of countries. They found that the performance of water systems were markedly better in communities where households were able to make informed choices about the type of system and the level of service they required, and where decision making was genuinely democratic and inclusive. In contrast, projects which were constructed without community supervision and where project management was not accountable to the community, tended to be poorly constructed by private contractors.

In a related study conducted by Ofuoku and Oino (2019) to assess the effect of community participation on sustainability of rural water projects in Delta Central Agricultural Zone of Delta State, Nigeria. The study was concentrated in the rural settlements where water projects were executed. The community citizens were rarely often or always involved in the various stages of the projects as the community development committees’ executives represented the communities. In most communities, the water projects were funded by the respective communities and other bodies. Those jointly funded were highly sustainable than those solely funded by governments. The various communities were mostly organized through formation of community development committees, weekly meetings and formation of social groups. There was a significant relationship between participation and sustainability of water projects (r-cal= 0.652 and r-critical = 0.632). This study concentrated on functional participation, with a little focus to optimal participation, which the researcher could explore to fill the literature gap.

Based on these findings, Urasa & Kirui (2019) concluded that participation of local communities in World Vision Project interventions is generally limited to ‘contribution’ and therefore not ‘empowering’ to the local communities to take control of the development process. The researchers recommend some changes in terms of management structures and human capacity to help widen the scope of participation for local communities. This study also focused on passive participation variable but it failed to incorporate effective, function and optimum participation variables, which are of interest to the researcher. Njogu (2016) on the Influence of stakeholder engagement on performance of street children rehabilitation programs in Nairobi county Kenya. Despite the critical role played by stakeholder Involvement in the performance of the automobile Emission Control Program, a study seeking to determine the influence of stakeholder Involvement in performance of Automobile Emission Control Program in Nairobi remains elusive.

In another study conducted by Bal and Maina (2019) to evaluate the influence of local community in Project Planning on the sustainability of projects in Nakuru County, in Kenya’s Eastern province. The study revealed that individuals involved in coming up with objectives of the project are the project managers, project sponsors and project workers. The community members are never involved in this exercise and that the specifications of the projects are not written in consultation with the community members. This meant that there was lack of clear link between projects standard/ specifications and the needs or expectations of community members’ in projects within Nakuru County. It was also concluded that community members are never adequately involved in resource mobilization for the execution of the project. The few resources they contribute in small quantities are man-power, raw materials and financial resources. This has led to negative effects on the sustainability of projects within Nakuru County.

According to Nyabera (2015), according to an analysis carried out in Kenya to ascertain impact of project stakeholder participation execution, the majority of stakeholders are not involved throughout the project's life cycle. As a consequence, project operations are irrelevant to their needs, and the beneficiaries have no control of the projects, posing a long-term threat to their viability. The above studies were carried in various geographical locations like Kenya however, none of the studies was carried out in South Sudan, this study will therefore, bridge this geographical gap.

Furthermore, Urasa and Kirui (2019) conducted a study on the Analysis of Community Participation in Projects Managed by Non-governmental Organizations: A Case of World Vision in Central Tanzania. The study established that ‘community participation’ in the study programmes takes on different forms in different stages of the project cycle. Despite the time difference between the old and new programme, the nature and extent of participation for the Most of local communities in both programmes is generally limited to information giving, consultation and contribution. Local communities are generally not actively involved in decision-making, planning, monitoring and evaluation processes. Key factors identified as facilitatory inpromoting stakeholders’ participation are the NGO’s long term commitment in working with the poor, staff with knowledge and skills on participatory approaches, continuous community sensitisation and mobilisation, and perceptions that interventions being implemented are addressing participants’ needs. Poverty was seen to be main factor limiting local communities’ participation. Other factors are contradicting policies and approaches of different agencies working in the same area, non-flexible organisational policies, poor community leadership and dependency syndrome.

Locally, few studies have also assessed the link between stakeholders’ roles and project performance and sustainability management on the East African region and Burundi in particular, for instance, Ogwueleka (2020) assessed the influence of Stakeholders' Participation on Performance of Road Projects at Kenya National Highways Authority. Urasa & Kirui (2019) did a study on the analysis of community participation in projects managed by Non-governmental Organizations with particular reference to World Vision in Central Tanzania. Bal & Maina (2019) who conducted a study on the influence of stakeholders’ participation on the success of the economic stimulus programme with particular reference to the education projects in Nakuru County, Kenya. However the current study focuses on community development projects such as DSP of Save the Children in South Sudan which leaves both content and geographical gaps.

## **2.2. Theoretical Review**

The theoretical framework used in this study was according to R. Edward Freeman's Stakeholder Theory, which he developed as a philosopher and professor of business administration (1984). Stakeholder theory stresses the interconnectedness of businesses and organizations with all those that have an interest in them, including workers, consumers, vendors, financiers, communities, public agencies, political parties, labor associations, trade unions, and even rivals. Knowing how these relationships operate is essential to comprehending a company. And it is the executive's or entrepreneur's role to handle and form these relationships to help the project build value (Freeman et al., 2010).

Stakeholder theory is useful because it leads to more than just gains and productivity; it also has ethical implications. Companies discover that as employee job satisfaction rises; their mental wellbeing improves, elevating the social-economic status of the business standing in society. As one organization employs stakeholder theory, it fosters healthy competition among others, allowing both prospering and benefiting their stakeholders (Pernille et al., 2016).

Stakeholder theory, according to its critics like political philosopher Charles Blattberg, since the needs of different are impossible to match stakeholders against one another, and stakeholders are a wide and varied community of individuals, it is difficult to satisfy everybody. One or more stakeholders would have to take a backseat to other, more powerful stakeholders, causing long-term discord and disrupting the benefits of theory of stakeholders (Pernille et al., 2016).

According to Khazaei, Elliot and Joppe (2015), (as cited in Roloff 2018) noted that the customary say “organization focused” taking a proactive Stakeholder management strategy results in “overlooking stakeholders who are affected by the organization in favor of those who can affect it.” also suggested “issue-focused” stakeholder management, which emphasizes a joint effort to deal with a particular problem through a coalition of equally relevant stakeholders. The characteristics described above make the theory important to the study's goal of figuring out how the different variables are linked.

The study used this theory because several studies that have similar topics had used stakeholder theory, these include, (Pernille et al., 2016) they discover theoretical origins of stakeholder participation definition the industry's current situation in the study "Project Stakeholder Management History and Present" in Vienna, Austria. The other study that used stakeholder theory was (Mok, Shen, & Yang, 2015) in Melbourne, Australia, in a thesis titled "Stakeholder Management Research in Mega Building Projects." By reviewing selected papers published between 1997 and 2014, the thesis examined the most recent research developments in that domain. Stakeholder priorities and factors, management of stakeholder mechanism, investigation of stakeholder approaches, plus stakeholder participation are the four major research topics listed.

**2.3. Literature Review**

**2.3.1. Stakeholder participation in planning and Project sustainability**

In a study by Magassouba et al. (2019), it is stated that stakeholder participation in project planning stage, which includes activities such as defining the project's job specifications, standard, and goal, specifying the required resources and their distribution, defining the schedule, assessing various risks, and determining delivery methods, give project managers the ability to improve the method or result of the project's implementation. This is critical since the initiation processes are critical definitions and determinants of the project's scope and nature (Magassouba et al., 2019). The study further cited Magassouba et al. (2019) who stresses that if this process is not carried out properly, the project's progress and long-term viability would most likely be jeopardized in terms of achieving community standards, project goals, and overall viability.

Many studies for instance (Nyabera, 2015; Orimba, Mungai, Awiti, Orimba, & Mungai, 2018; Peenstra & Silvius, 2017) aggress with Magassouba et al, (2019) that including stakeholders in the team that sets the vision, identifies criteria for programs, excellence, and mission, specify resources required plus their allocation, defines the timeline, evaluates different risks, and determines delivery methods in the planning is critical to the project's success and overall sustainability.

From the foregoing review, there exist past studies on influence of stakeholder involvement on project performance and sustainability but most studies focus on developed countries. For instance, Slevin (2020) who carried out a study on extent to which awareness of stakeholder management influence construction project performance in the construction industry in Ireland. Other studies have been done in developing African countries such as Chifamba and Boon (2017) who investigated the influence of stakeholder Involvement in integrated water resource management in community water management projects in Zimbabwe and Bawole and Ahenkan (2019) who examined stakeholder management challenges and their impact on project management in the case of advocacy and empowerment in the upper east region of Ghana.

According to Minkler et al. (2008a), as cited for Orimba et al., (2018), stakeholder engagement in project start-up is important because it increases Stakeholder capacity, which improves the overall health of Beneficiaries and improves their capacity to recognize issues, engage when making a decision, and convert transforming issues into solutions or actions, increasing the project's chances of becoming sustainable. The study goes on to say that a lack of stakeholder interest hinders the engagement of the beneficiaries, undermining the capability to impact the project's outcome, affecting project's performance in the long run.

**2.3.2. Stakeholder Participation in Implementation and Project sustainability.**

Interested parties’ participation in development execution is one of the most crucial features of control of projects. Because, during the implementation period, project managers assist in the people’s organization, the resourceful resources management, and the accurate risk assessment to put the project plan into action. For instance, Bagire and Nalweyiso (2016), emphasized the importance of stakeholder involvement at implementation the project's lifecycle stage leads to efficiency, effectiveness capacity building of stakeholders or beneficiaries, self-reliance, empowerment, commitment, and project sustainability (Bagire & Nalweyiso, 2016).

A study conducted by Usadolo and Caldwel (2016), emphasized the fact that the Participation of stakeholders during the implementation stage Projects creates a mutual relationship between stakeholders. A partnership that enhances their involvement in rural development projects in the long run because it provides a forum they learn to respect each other's experiences and in addition to existing ones, create new ones. This cooperation of stakeholders is indispensable for sustainability and makes it effective and easy to address the implementation of decisions. (Richards, Black stock, & Carter, 2004) as cited in (Usadolo & Caldwel, 2016). As a result, better communication between businesses and customers, as well as between businesses and government agencies, is needed, resulting in increased cooperation. (Huemann & Silvius, 2017). The study found a strong link between stakeholder engagement and project sustainability. When stakeholders collaborate, they own the projects long after they are completed.

According to Orimba et al. (2018), stakeholder engagement is emphasized to be very critical in the carrying out process of project since the situation necessitates variety a party of individuals dedicated towards achieving project's goals, based on a training manual written in the Transportation Department of Edmonton (2006). It's also important to remember that involving a variety of stakeholders raises stakeholder conflict during the implementation phase; to mitigate this conflict, the project manager must ensure that the group is involved in monitoring the project schedule and implementation.

According to the Nguni Cattle Projects operational framework, a Participatory Rural Approach, a project should aim to bring stakeholders the project should seek to bring together stakeholders to recognize popular development issues, as well as an emphasis that will help or contribute to achievement a collection of mutually agreed-upon objectives, achieve a common understanding of the development problem, and incorporate perspectives, various stakeholders, comprehend the challenge's wider sense, and state the necessary changes that must take place (Hawkins, n.d., 2017).

**2.3.3. Stakeholder participation in Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and Project sustainability**.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation has been triggered by the value and need for basing development on the views and priorities of ‘the local population’ which has become widely acknowledged over the last decades, leading to a practice of working with and by communities (Hilhorst & Guijt, 2016;Fearon& Ochieng, 2020). Initially pioneered by action research-oriented initiatives and organisations, the use of participatory approaches and methods has become increasingly mainstreamed. The use of tools such as social mapping, Venn diagrams, wealth ranking, and transects have become normal practice in much development work (Hilhorst & Guijt, 2016). This led to ministries beginning to include participatory methodologies in guidelines provided to local governments for developing municipal development plans, such as in Benin and Mali. Participatory diagnosis, priority setting, and planning have become an accepted ethic and are practiced in hundreds of Northern and Southern development initiatives. However, it became important that ‘participation’ should also address implementation, monitoring and evaluation. There is a rapidly growing interest in ensuring wider participation, and since the mid-1990s, participatory Monitoring & Evaluation (PM&E) has received increasing attention (Hilhorst & Guijt, 2016). The above studies were carried in various geographical locations like Benin and Mali, however none of the studies was carried out in South Sudan, this study will therefore bridge this geographical gap.

In their study, Magassouba et al. (2019) remark that the Project Monitoring cycle where rigorous controlling and assessment takes place. It equates the planned works with actual results to determine the progress and performance. While Evaluation of an undertaking is the determination of real situation of a project, this process is essential to find out if the project is being operated properly or not (Magassouba et al., 2019).

According to Harris et al. (2016), since the position of its owners, the general public, or service consumers, is not listed in the reporting requirements for realist reviews, it is essential to have resources for assessment that allow participation evaluations for all times during the process of the project. Academics make up the majority of realist evaluation teams, which include specialist professionals, knowledge consumers, and politicians at the start and end of the process (Harris, etal., 2016).

According to Allison & Kaye, (2015), the strengths, drawbacks, opportunities, and challenges (SWOT) report, which can be performed at the organizational level or for each program, is one basic assessment process that is important for stakeholder engagement and project evaluation to ensure sustainability. This can be achieved through a survey, workshops, or a retreat; the goal is to get a lot of information. Use the SWOT system to help collect and organize information about the organizational strengths and weaknesses as well as the environment opportunities and threats. (Allison & Kaye, 2015).

It is important to note that active participation matters not only as a means of improving development effectiveness but also as the key to long-term sustainability and leverage (World Bank, 2018). Participation refers to the engagement of stakeholders in the development process in order to ensure that the intended benefits of projects and programmes reach the communities in focus. Although there is no commonly agreed definition of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation, the World Bank (2017a) indicates that it is ‘a process through which stakeholders at various levels engage in monitoring or evaluating a particular project or programme or policy, share control over the content, the process and the results of the monitoring and evaluation activity and engage in taking or identifying corrective actions’.

The Institute of Development Studies (2018) noted that providing stakeholders the chance to participate in M&E becomes an opportunity for development organisations to focus better on their ultimate goal of improving poor people’s lives and broadening involvement in identifying change of which a clearer picture can be gained of what is really happening on the ground. This can also be an empowering process since the skills of the people in charge are developed and show also that their views count (IDS, 1998:1). Nyaguthii and Oyugi (2018) stated that involving the local residents in monitoring of projects would increase the level of satisfaction for the beneficiaries.

In another study, Hilhorst and Guijt (2019) noted that while primary stakeholders are increasingly involved in some aspect of planning, their presence within the M&E of actions is very often lacking or inadequate. Ahenkan, Bawole and Domfer (2017) also observe that there are no clear structures and procedures for community involvement in the monitoring of development interventions in the districts though some structures for promoting community engagement during planning processes exist. Furthermore, Hilhorst and Guijt (2019) pointed out that access to complete project information provides people with a sound basis to voice their concerns and needs, which can be incorporated into project activities. Moreover, wide public dissemination helps to place control in the hands of communities and mitigates risks of manipulation by other actors and that once the project begun it is important to ensure that the communities stay informed, receive feedback on progress at different stages.

Relatedly, Oreyo, Munyua and Olubandwa (2016) stated that PM&E enhanced good governance with increased accountability, responsiveness to the needs of the citizens and level of transparency. Devas and Grant (2018) argued that there are still problems of lack of transparency, with publicly displayed information often being out of date and inaccessible to the majority because of the location of display or the language used and there continue to be major problems over corruption, rent seeking, abuse of tender procedures and poor relationships between paid officials and elected representatives.

In their study, Ahenkan et al. (2017) argued that the lack of space for stakeholder participation has constrained the promotion of effective, responsive and responsible government at the local level for poverty reduction and that procedures and structures for community engagement in monitoring and evaluation of development interventions seldom exist. Alfred (2015) also argued that there is a low level of stakeholder involvement in infrastructure project monitoring among MMDAs due to lack of public education, lack of collaboration between management and beneficiaries and poor monitoring information dissemination. Hassan et al. (2016) also stated that the scarcity a group of stakeholders’ interest in implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems obstructs proper monitoring and evaluation. He also emphasizes the importance of stakeholder involvement in the whole project since it is self-evident that the project will fail as soon as the donors agree and the technicians leave the project site (Hasan et al., 2016).

**2.3.4. Summary of Literature Review**

Stakeholder participation at all levels of the project cycle is critical for project progress and overall sustainability, according to the literature. According to the literature, most project operations are unrelated to the needs of beneficiaries since they are not actively engaged in the project cycle, which affects beneficiaries' ownership of projects and, as a result, their long-term sustainability. The literature shows that when donors exit the project site and technicians leave or withdraw funding, the majority of the projects fail. As a result, the studies show a good end-user buy-in, stewardship, and institutional project facilitation are all important factors for the organization to take concrete steps toward constructive control of all three environmental pillars. However, the research findings reveal a lack of commitment to the project, implying that an expert project team and leader are needed to positively contribute to project acceptance while also reducing project risk; there is little research on how to include the definition of project management and sustainability. Given the identified gaps, this research aimed to contribute information that will aid in understanding the relationship between project sustainability and stakeholder participation.

**2.4. Conceptual Framework**

In this analysis, Stakeholder participation was viewed as an independent variable that contributes to Project Sustainability, as illustrated in figure 2.1 below.

## **Figure 2.1: Conceptual framework showing the relationship between Stakeholder participation and Project sustainability.**

**Stakeholders Participation (I.V) Project Sustainability (D.V)**

**Participation in planning**

* Establish Scope
* State Objectives
* Develop a course of action for the objectives

**Participation in the Implementation**

* Directing people & resources
* Managing expectations
* Performing activities planned

**Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation**

* Tracking & Reviewing progress
* Identifying and Initiating required changes
* Economic Sustainability
* Environmental Sustainability
* Social Sustainability

***Source****:* ***Project Management Institute, 2013, with modifications from the researcher, 2021.***

Independent variable was Stakeholder Participation which was broken down into dimensions like Participation in Planning whose indicators were; Establishing scope, Defining Objectives, and Developing a course of actions. The Second Dimension was participation in implementation, whose indicators were; organizing people and resources, managing expectations, and carrying out scheduled events. The third dimension was participation in Monitoring & Evaluation whose indicators were; Track and review progress and identification or the initiation of required changes.

The Dependent Variable was Project sustainability with its first dimension as Economic Sustainability with indicators like improving access to direct economic performance, improved access to informal markets, and micro-enterprise schemes. Another Aspect was Environmental Sustainability with indicators like the Environmental effect of project activities on the environment. Additional Measurement was Social Sustainability with an indicator of community empowerment, the long-term viability of the project would be determined by its consistency, investments achieved during the course of the projects. However, this study assessed the Economic aspect of sustainability.

# **CHAPTER THREE**

# **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

# **3.0. Introduction**

This chapter presents issues relating to the research design that shall be adapted for the study; highlighting the study population, sample size as well as the sampling procedure or techniques. The methods and tools used for data collection, procedures to be followed during the collection of data, and data analysis techniques are also discussed in this chapter.

## **3.1. Research Design**

A research design is the structure, or the blueprint, of research that guides the process of research from the formulation of the research questions and hypotheses to reporting the research findings (Cooper and Schindler, 2010). This study used a descriptive and case study research design. Descriptive research design is a design that is used when the researcher wants to describe specific behaviour as it occurs in the environment (Creswell, 2017). Surveys do not manipulate variables nor arrange for events to happen, but focuses only on conditions or relations that exist, opinions held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing (Katamba and Nsubuga, 2014). The researcher used descriptive because it was one of the suitable methods to obtain information concerning current situations. A case study design is selected to get the required data since a case study is a complete study in itself can provide focused and valuable insights to phenomena that may otherwise be vaguely known or understood (Cooper and Schindler, 2010).

## **3.1.1. Research Approach**

The research approach is important because it can be used to test the validity of the research hypothesis. In the research approach, the researcher used a phenomenological approach which enabled the researcher to understand how respondents understand stakeholder participation and project sustainability that is to mean the work experiences of respondents.

## **3.1.2. Research Strategy**

This study relied on a case study approach since it was difficult to establish what goes on concerning stakeholder participation and project sustainability. For the reason of effective access, Distance Support Program (DSP) at Save the Children International Juba, South Sudan was selected.

## **3.1.3. Research Duration**

A cross-sectional research design was adopted for this study. This is where data was gathered just once from a cross-section of sources for purposes of answering questions. The cross-sectional design required the researcher to use several data collection methods and collect information from a cross-section of respondents.

## **3.1.4. Research Classification**

The study used quantitative and qualitative research which are generally associated with the positivist paradigm. It involved collecting and converting data into numerical form hence the use of statistical calculations where conclusions were drawn. To predict the possible relationship between the variables, the study used various instruments such as self-administered questionnaires and interview guide forms.

## **3.2. Study Population**

The study targeted a population of 210 including DSP’s managerial and operational staff, social workers from two implementing, representatives from the funders, a community development officer, probation officer from the government, direct beneficiaries from the two implementing partners.

**Table 3.1: Population of the Study**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category of Respondents**  | **Study Population** |
| DSP Managerial Staff | 10 |
| DSP Operational Staff | 40 |
| Probation Staff | 1 |
| Community Development Officer | 1 |
| Funders | 5 |
| Direct Beneficiaries | 153 |
| **Total** | **210** |

***Source: DSP Database (2020).***

## **3.3. Sample Size and Selection**

Kothari, (2004) described sample size as the total number of units or items used to represent the characteristics of the whole population sample size must satisfy some requirements such as representativeness, flexibility, efficiency, and reliability. To undertake this study, the researcher collected data from 136 persons.

**Table 3.2: Sampling Frame**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category of Respondents**  | **Study Population** | **Sample Size** | **Sampling Technique** |
| DSP Managerial Staff | 10 | 6 | Purposive |
| DSP Operational Staff | 40 | 26 | Simple random |
| Probation staff | 1 | 1 | Purposive |
| Community Development Officer (CDO) | 1 | 1 | Purposive |
| Funders | 5 | 3 | Purposive |
| Direct Beneficiaries | 153 | 99 | Convenience Sampling |
| **Total** | **210** | **136** |  |

***Source: DSP Database (2019) & Krejcie and Morgan (1970)***

## **Sampling Design**

According to McCabe (2005), sampling methods are important in identifying the population of interest. In this study, the following are the sampling methods employed

## **Purposive Sampling**

The researcher used the purposive method of sampling to select respondents from DSP’s managerial staff, probation staff, community development officer and the funders; these were expected to have firsthand information about the study variables. This method was important because it dictated the nature of the study which aims at getting information from specific respondents.

## **3.4.2. Simple Random Sampling**

Simple random sampling was also used to select respondents from the DSP Operational Staff. This method was important because it gave respondents an equal chance of participating in the study and as such eliminated elements of bias.

## **3.4.3. Convenience Sampling**

Convenience sampling involve in getting participants wherever they could be found and typically wherever it is convenient. Convenience sampling method applied by engaging random direct beneficiaries of DSP that were found at the organisation premises during the data collection period and were asked questionnaire questions concerning the study variables.

## **3.5. Data Sources**

According to Weiner, (1995), data collection is a standout amongst the most essential stages in carrying on research. It helped in figuring out what sort of data is needed.

## **3.5.1. Primary Data**

Primary data is data that is collected by a researcher from first-hand sources. In this study, primary data was collected directly from primary sources to gather a richness of information from the most reliable and informed respondents about the current situation of the study problem.

## **3.5.2. Secondary Data**

Secondary data is data gathered from studies, surveys, or experiments that have been run by other people or for other research. The current study gathered information from secondary sources because it has a pre-established degree of validity and reliability which needs not be re-examined by the researcher.

## **3.6. Data Collection Methods**

Data collection is defined as the process of gathering and measuring information on variables of interest, in an established systematic fashion that enables one to answer queries, stated research questions, test hypotheses, and evaluate outcomes (Nemanja. 2009). The researcher used the following methods for collection of data for this study.

## **3.6.1. Survey.**

According to Allen (2010), a questionnaire is a data collection method consisting of a series of questions and other prompts to gather information from respondents. The study used this data collection method because it is limited to the fact that respondents can read questions and respond to them and it saves time.

## **3.6.2. Face to Face Interviews**

Andrea (2014) states that the interview method of data collection is a verbal conversation between two people to collect relevant information for research. This method was used because it produces data based on information priorities, opinions and ideas focused on informants. Therefore, respondents had an opportunity to expand on their ideas, explore their views and also identify what they regard as their crucial factors. The purposes of the interview are to explore the views, experiences, beliefs, and/or motivations of individuals on specific matters and are particularly appropriate for exploring issues where participants do not want to talk about such issues in a group environment.

## **3.7. Data Collection Instruments**

According to Abawi (2014), the following are important in collecting valid and reliable information of the study

## **3.7.1. Self-Administered Questionnaire**

A questionnaire guide having questions with no open-ended answers was used to collect data from project beneficiaries. Each question in the survey was created to solve the study's specific goal, research question, or hypothesis. A closed-ended question on a Likert Scale, where 5= SD (Strongly Agree), 4 = A (Agree), 3= N (Neither agree nor disagree), 2= D (Disagree), 1 SD (Strongly disagree) was used to save time for respondents and ensure a quantitative analysis. (Brown, 2010) The questions tested the magnitude of the respondents who agreed or disagreed with statements testing participation in planning, execution, and monitoring and evaluation on the project's long-term viability; it was being a self-administered survey.

## **3.7.2. Interview Guide**

The researcher used semi-structured and face-to-face interviews because they provided first-hand information; data was collected because it is less costly and can clarify questions. Interview guide was designed to allow the researcher to collect qualitative data according to research objectives from the key informants. To realize this, the interviewer's guide was designed with open-ended questions which were important according to (Cresswell, 2017), and it lasted for a period of 1-2 hours with the respondents. The researcher was the moderator and respondents recorded as they gave information about stakeholder participation and project sustainability

## **3.8. Data Quality Control**

## **3.8.1. Validity of the Instruments**

Validity refers to the degree of instruments importance in measuring data, or accuracy of findings (Cresswell, 2001). This was tested by two experts administering the tools to obtain numerical ratings. It takes into consideration how well the questions measure the matters chosen to be studied. The researcher subjected their ratings to a formula by Amin (2005) to ascertain the suitability of the instruments.

In order to get valid results, the meters for measuring must be in order. Using experts as help and pre-testing are ways of ensuring that the questions are formed correctly and that they measure what they are wanted to be measuring (Cope, 2014). This was done to evaluate the relevance of each question in providing answers to the study. After which a Content Validity Index (C.V.I) was computed using the formula: CVI = K/N

C.V.I = Total No. of questions declared valid/relevant

Total No. of questions in the questionnaire

**Table 3.4: Content Validity Index Results Table**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Anchor** | **CVI (Content Validity Index)** | **No of Items** |
| Participation in the planning | 5-point | .843 | 10 |
| Participation in implementation  | 5-point | .811 | 10 |
| Participation in monitoring and evaluation | 5-point | .733 | 10 |
| Project sustainability  | 5-point | .793 | 10 |

***Source: Primary data, (2021)***

The research findings showed that the research constructs had all attained Content Validity Index scores of above 0.7, as indicated by the presentation in Table 3.4 above; hence being valid and good to be utilized in the primary research.

## **3.8.2. Reliability of the Instruments**

Reliability is the ability of an instrument to produces similar results in a different study setting. Accordingly, Amin (2005) echoes the fact that reliability can be used to measure the extent to which the instruments used can produce consistent results when repeatedly administered on the same group of individuals under the same conditions. A Pilot test of the questionnaire was conducted at the selected 24 respondents at distance Support Program (DSP) to ensure accuracy and dependability, as well as the questionnaire's ability to collect data. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyse the data. The results of the findings were presented for items contained for study variables.

Amin (2005) anticipates that the Cronbach alpha coefficient results for reliability was equal to or above 0.7. The results were presented using a table.

The study used the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient formula.

A= N.C

V+ (N-1).C

Where N=the number of items, C= average covariance between item-pairs, and V=average variance.

## **Table 3.3: Cronbach Alpha Coefficient Model Results Table**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Anchor** | **Cronbach Alpha Coefficient** | **No of Items** |
| Participation in the planning | 5-point |  .870 | 24 |
| Participation in implementation  | 5-point | .862 | 24 |
| Participation in monitoring and evaluation | 5-point | .834 | 24 |
| Project sustainability  | 5-point | .840 | 10 |

***Source: Primary data, (2021)***

The research findings showed that the research constructs had all attained Cronbach Alpha scores of above 0.7, as indicated by the presentation in Table 3.3 above; hence being reliable and good to be utilized in the primary research.

## **3.9. Data Collection Procedure**

When proposal defence was over, corrections were made as suggested by the panel, then the compliance report was written according to what was suggested and presented to the supervisor who endorsed data collection. An authorization letter was obtained from School of Business Administration and Information Technology, Nkumba University to embark on data gathering from DSP. Then the respondents were briefed after which consent was obtained. Then the questionnaire and interview guides were distributed and conducted among the respondents and key informants, respectively. After a specified time scale agreed with participants, the researcher collected the filled instruments. The collected data was at this point set for editing, coding, and analysis.

## **3.10. Data Processing and Presentation**

The quantitative collected data was edited, coded, and cross-checked for completeness using Ms. Excel and exported to Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23 for analysis. The quantitative data were presented in form of numeric using tables and charts representing frequencies and percentages of results. In regards to qualitative data, the researcher presented the findings in a narrative form by directly reporting respondents' responses through quotations.

## **3.11. Data Analysis**

The study used the regression statistical method to analyse the data to show and or predict relationship between stakeholder involvement and project long-term viability of DSP. The P-value was used to interpret and decide if the null hypothesis was to be rejected or held.

Inferential and descriptive approaches were assumed in analysing data. Frequencies and percentages ages, mean score, and standard deviation for study variables were presented. These were achieved using SPSS. For inferential analysis, Basic linear regression method was employed. To test the effect between study variables as reflected by the study objectives. Y= a + bx formula was adopted for establishing the influence of stakeholder participation and project sustainability.

Based on the research goals, content analysis methods such as thematic and logical analyses were put to use in analysing of qualitative data. The observations were transcribed in a notebook by writing down the answers. Content review was used to reorganize and edit data into more meaningful and shorter sentences. The data was grouped into themes and assigned codes, with the findings verbally reported using quotation marks.

## **3.12. Research Ethical Considerations**

Permission to conduct this study came from relevant authorities including Business administration and information Technology Nkumba University and DSP. In addition to that the respondents were assured of the confidentiality of the information that they provide to the researcher. In this study, the researcher observed not to be biased and subjective towards the study during interview sessions, the researcher never induced his own feeling towards the interviews, leaving them to give their views with regard to the research objectives.

Respect for all intellectual property where all primary sources was properly documented, referenced and Authors acknowledged. Further still as respondents filling the questionnaires were left free to answer what they know without some subjective directions on answering the questionnaires. However data collection was on single basis, in order to avoid data which is influenced by group members. Moreover confidentiality will be observed, no name was mentioned of any respondent or interviewee was mentioned in this study. The study was ethical free zone.

## **3.12. Limitations of the Study**

1. Lack of enough written records could reduce the accessibility of vital information that was required for our research. This was dealt with by reaching out to corned high people to access some information.
2. Limited outcomes in a quantitative research. This study used quantitative approach which involved structured questionnaire with close ended questions. This could lead to limited outcomes outlined in the research proposal, since some respondents could have had limited options of responses, however this was mitigated by adopting the mixed approach, where qualitative approach using interviews was used to back up questionnaires.
3. There were unstable work schedules due to Covid-19, which had forced may people who work to adopt to the new trends of working from home on some particular days. However, the researcher ensured that appropriate appointments were scheduled before time.

# **CHAPTER FOUR**

# **DEMOGRAPHC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS**

## **4.0. Introduction**

This part shows the general background information about the respondents of the study. This includes; gender, age bracket, level of education, marital status, level of education, department of the respondents of respondents and their working experience. The analysis is based on the data collected using questionnaires and interview guide which were answered by the target respondents. These findings were analyzed using SPSS version 23, Microsoft excel and Microsoft word and presented in tables and percentages as it gives a clear understanding of the study findings.

## **4.1. Response Rate**

Response rate in [survey](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statistical_survey) research refers to the number of people who answered the survey divided by the number of people in the [sample](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sample_%28statistics%29). It is usually expressed in the form of a [percentage.](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Percentage) Therefore, response rate is viewed as an important indicator of survey quality. According to Amin (2005), posits that higher response rates assure more accurate survey results. The researcher had a sample size of 136 respondents and a total of 136 sets of the instruments were distributed. Out of these, a total of 130 were returned making a response rate of 95.6% and therefore this was used in the analysis of findings.

**4.2. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents**

The demographic characteristic of the sample that were considered important for this study are; gender, age bracket, level of education, marital status, level of education of respondents and their working/benefiting experience as indicated in the tables below.

## **4.2.1. Gender of the Respondents**

A descriptive analysis of the respondent’s gender was carried out and the results were as presented in table 4.1 below.

**Table 4.1: Respondents’ Gender**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Male | 74 | 56.9 | 56.9 |
| Female | 56 | 43.1 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 4.1, the highest proportion 74 (56.9%) of the study respondents were males and the rest 56 (43.1%) were females. This result implies observance of gender balance in the study. Both men and women were given approximately equal opportunities to take part in the study. Creswell (2014) contends that data collection that integrates responses from both genders is consistent than data from a single gender.

#

# **4.2.2. Age of the Respondents**

A descriptive analysis of the age of the different study participants was carried out and the results were as presented in table 4.2 below.

**Table 4.2: Age of Respondents**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
|  | Below 26 years | 19 | 14.6 | 14.6 |
| 26-35 | 31 | 23.8 | 38.4 |
| 36-45 | 40 | 30.8 | 69.2 |
| 46-55 | 25 | 19.3 | 88.5 |
| Above 55 years | 15 | 11.5 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 4.2, 19 (14.6%) of the respondents were below 26 years, 31 (23.8%) of the respondents were between 26-35 years of age; 40 (30.8%) of the respondents were between 36- 45 years of age; 25 (19.3%) of the respondents were between 46-55 years of age where as 15 (11.5%) were above 55 years of age. This result implies that most of the employees and beneficiaries in DSP at Save the Children in the youthful age group (at most 35 years of age) and had acquired enough experience in taking favorable decision on stakeholder involvement and project sustainability.

These findings are supported by Amin (2005), who asserted, if majority age of the respondent is above 18 years, it adds value to the study since the responses given by mature people are well thought through. It is also in agreement with the findings by Price (2006) who maintained that there are two natural age peaks correlated to entrepreneurship, namely the late twenties and mid-forties.

# **4.2.3. Marital Status of the Clients.**

The study also established the marital status of the respondents, the table 4.3 shows the results relating to the marital status.

**Table 4.3: Marital Status**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Married | 58 | 44.6 | 44.6 |
| Single | 33 | 25.4 | 70.0 |
| Separated | 20 | 15.4 | 85.4 |
| Divorced | 12 | 9.2 | 94.6 |
| Widowed | 07 | 5.4 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 4.3, 58 (44.6%) of the respondents were between were married, 33(25.4%) of the respondents were single, 20(15.4%) of the respondents had separated from their partners and 12(9.2%) of the respondents had divorced from their partners while the rest 07(5.4%) of the respondents were widowed. The gender distribution of the respondents implies that most of the people working/benefiting from DSP were married indicating and they cannot easily leave their areas of operation in the process of providing their services to the health institute.

## **4.2.4. Level of Education of the Respondents**

Quantitative analysis of the level of education of the participants was considered and presented in tale 4.4 below.

**Table 4.4: Education Level**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Post Graduate Courses | 02 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Bachelors | 25 | 19.2 | 20.7 |
| Diploma  | 15 | 11.5 | 32.2 |
| Certificate | 19 | 14.6 | 46.8 |
| Primary-Secondary Levels | 27 | 20.8 | 67.6 |
| Never Studied | 42 | 32.4 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 4.4, 02(1.5%) of the respondents had done Postgraduate courses in various fields, 25(19.2%) of the respondents were Bachelor’s Holders, 15(11.5%) of the respondents were Diploma Holders, 19(14.6%) had had done certificates in various fields and 27(20.8%) had ended in Primary to Secondary Levels while 42(32.4%) of the respondents had never attended any kind of education. A good number of the staff respondents were Bachelors’ holders, this therefore implied that the respondents had acquired a reasonable level of knowledge about the subject under study. The results also indicated that the information got during the research can be depended on as majority of the staff respondents were educated with capability of internalizing issues and making independent decisions. In this regard, the information provided in this study can be relied upon since a good number of the staff respondents were learned and could do enough research and make informed decisions especially on the issues regarding the study variables.

However, majority of beneficiary respondents had never attended any kind of education, implying that there was need to improve their literacy levels for easy involvement in the projects of the organisation. This is in line with Fujii, (2017) investigations in social science research should have some acceptable level of learning in order for them to interpret the content of the study. Uma (2000) who argued that it is important in social investigation research to involve people that have attained an acceptable level of literacy and numeracy in order to be in position to understand and interpreted the content in questionnaire.

# **4.2.5. Working Experience**

Respondents were asked about their working experience and the study findings are indicated in 4.5 below;

**Table 4.5: Working Experience of the Respondents**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | 0-4 years | 36 | 27.7 | 27.7 |
| 5-9 years | 46 | 35.4 | 63.1 |
| 10-14years | 32 | 24.6 | 87.7 |
| 15 and above years | 16 | 12.3 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

Results from table 4.5 above indicate that 36(27.7%) of the respondents had worked/benefited from DSP for a period between 0-4 years, 46(35.4%) had worked/benefited from DSP for a period between 5-9 years and 32(24.6%) had worked/benefited from DSP between 10-14 years while 16(12.3%) had worked/benefited from DSP for over 15 and above years.

This reveals that quite a number of respondents in the population were not that very old in the system, but with a good blend to provide very good ideas and responses. The inclusion of both new and old workers was to provide a balance in responses and ideas. This result is consistent with previous empirical studies on the age of enterprises in South Africa by Rwigema and Karungu (1999), in a study of enterprises in Johannesburg, stipulate that forty seven percent (47%) of enterprises surveyed had operated between one and ten years.

# **CHAPTER FIVE**

# **STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING ON PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY IN DSP**

## **5.0. Introduction**

The study findings and analysis are presented in this chapter. The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between stakeholder participation and project sustainability in the Distance Support Program (DSP) of Save the Children in South Sudan. The discussions of the study findings were done in line with the study objectives.

The first objectives of the study was to examine the effect of stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability in DSP.As indicated in the research methodology, the data was collected using a closed ended questionnaire under different statements and the results of analysis are presented in the table below;

## **5.1.I understand what stakeholder participation in the project planning stage means**

The researcher saw that there was need to find out whether the respondents understood what stakeholder participation in the project planning stage meant. Therefore, different statements concerning this effect were posed to the respondents and the responses are presented as below in table 5.1 below;

**Table 5.1: I understand what stakeholder participation in the project planning stage means**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 14 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| Disagree | 20 | 15.4 | 26.2 |
| Not Sure | 11 | 8.5 | 34.7 |
| Agree | 68 | 52.2 | 86.9 |
| Strongly Agree | 17 | 13.1 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 5.1, 14(10.8%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 20(15.4%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 11(8.5%) were not sure of the statement response and 68(52.2%) of the respondents agreed with the statement, while 17(13.1%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The majority of the respondents, 65(52.2%) generally agreed with the statement and this is an implication that the organisation had done their best in making the beneficiaries understand what stakeholder participation in the project planning stage meant.

Stakeholder participation plays a vital role in the overall success and sustainability of a project. Given the fact that respondents are in influential position in the project, it was important to know their understanding of this concept.

One of the project officers was quoted saying, *“For one to be considered a key person, it means he has the knowledge, expertise or a certain level of influence in a given field.”*

In the interview with one of the project managers, it was revealed;

*“Stakeholder participation is all about ensuring that the key people are involved in the implementation of a project or program at different levels. These key people involved, the beneficiaries, leaders, whole community, funders….”*

**5.2. I have ever participated in the planning process of the DSP project**

The respondents were asked whether the respondents had ever participated in the planning process of the DSP project and the results attained are presented in table 5.2 below;

## **Table 5.2: I have ever participated in the planning process of the DSP project**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 19 | 14.6 | 8.6 |
| Disagree | 45 | 34.6 | 22.9 |
| Not Sure | 14 | 10.8 | 33.4 |
| Agree | 35 | 26.9 | 88.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 17 | 13.1 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 5.2, 19 (14.6%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 45(34.6%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 14(10.8%) were not sure of the statement response and 35(26.9%) of the respondents agreed with the statement and none strongly agreed with the statement, while 17 (13.1%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The majority, 45(34.6%) generally disagreed with the statement and this is an implication that majority of the stakeholders had never participated in the planning process of the DSP project, despite the role of stakeholder participation in the project planning.

One of the project officers was quoted saying,

*“Most often we implement projects starting from ideas, and not from the reality on the ground. So there is need for doing a research starting from the moment of the need of these people that we are going to support.”* However, this is only possible with the involvement of stake holder participation.

Further findings from qualitative study revealed from a respondent that most times they are not involved in all the stages of the project; they are only consulted or informed during implementation

*“We are however not invited at the planning level of the project activities so we are not able to give our full contributions”*. The respondents view shows dissatisfaction, which in the long run can impact the sustainability of the project.

## **5.3. I know how stakeholder participation is practiced in DSP**

## The respondents were asked whether the respondents knew how stakeholder participation was practiced in DSP. The results attained are presented in table 5.3 below;

**Table 5.3: I know how stakeholder participation is practiced in DSP**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 17 | 13.0 | 13.0 |
| Disagree | 58 | 44.6 | 58.3 |
| Not Sure | 9 | 6.9 | 65.2 |
| Agree | 31 | 23.8 | 89.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 15 | 11.0 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021).***

According to the findings in table 5.3, 17(13%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 58(44.6%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement, 9(6.9%) were not sure of the statement response; 31(23.8%) of the respondents agreed with the statement; 15(11%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Majority of the respondents, 58(44.6%) generally disagreed with the statement. This means that majority of the respondents never knew how stakeholder participation was practiced in DSP, a factor that affects stakeholder involvement and project sustainability.

The respondent’s emphasized an aspect of involvement in their definition of stakeholder participation. One of the participants was quoted saying,

*“The term stakeholder participation is where the person concerned feels involved in all the programs of a given project or program. For example, he/she must be in the know of the process, profits and beneficiaries, how they are supposed to operate and must participate when necessary”*

## **5.4. The project objectives are set according to the needs of the beneficiaries.**

The respondents were asked whether the project objectives were set according to the needs of the beneficiaries. The results attained are presented in table 5.4 below;

**Table 5.4: The project objectives are set according to the needs of the beneficiaries.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Disagree | 20 | 15.4 | 15.4 |
| Disagreed | 15 | 11.5 | 26.9 |
| Agree | 65 | 50.0 | 76.9 |
| Strongly Agree | 30 | 23.1 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 5.4, 20(15.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 15(11.5%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; none of the respondents was not sure of the statement response; 65(50%) of the respondents agreed with the statement; while 30 (23.1%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The largest percentage of the respondents, 50% generally agreed with the statement. This means that the project objectives at DSP were set according to the needs of the beneficiaries which improve stakeholder involvement and project sustainability.

## **5.5. I was informed or consulted about the outcome of the planning process before it was taken for implementation**

The respondents were asked whether they were informed or consulted about the outcome of the planning process before it was taken for implementation. The results attained are presented in table 5.5 below;

**Table 5.5: I was informed or consulted about the outcome of the planning process before it was taken for implementation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Disagree | 65 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Agree | 25 | 19.2 | 69.2 |
| Strongly Agree | 40 | 30.8 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 5.5, none of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 65(50%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; none of the respondents was not sure of the statement response; 25(19.2%) of the respondents agreed with the statement; while 40(30.8%) of the respondents agreed with the statement. Majority of respondents, 65(50%) generally disagreed with the statement, which implied that the respondents were never informed or consulted about the outcome of the planning process before it was taken for implementation.

**5.6. Participant Involvement in Formation process influences sustainability of projects**

The respondents were asked whether participant involvement in formation process influenced sustainability of projects and the results attained are presented in table 5.6;

**Table 5.6: Participant Involvement in Formation process influences sustainability of projects**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Disagree | 19 | 14.6 | 14.6 |
| Not Sure | 02 | 1.5 | 16.1 |
| Agree | 25 | 19.2 | 35.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 84 | 64.7 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 5.6, 19(14.6%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 02(1.5%) were not sure, 25(19.2%) of the respondents agreed with the statement, and 84(64.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The largest percentage of the respondents, 84(64.7%) generally disagreed with the statement.

The respondent mentioned the importance of having all stakeholders being involved at these different levels of the project.

*“Stakeholder participation is all about ensuring that the key people are involved in the implementation of a project or program at different levels”.*

One of the project funders had this to say, *“There is a need for the stakeholder feeling that they are part of the project. Levels of the program speaks about the different stages that a project goes through before it meets its goals.”*

The respondent emphasizes projects have different levels, although he does not specifically mention the level. From the research findings, stakeholder participation is understood as involving the key stakeholders in all the project life-cycle.

## **5.7. Relationship between stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability in DSP.**

The first hypothesis was that there was a positive significant relationship between stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability in DSP. To determine the degree of the relationship, a Pearson’s correlation coefficient analysis was run as follows;

**Table 5.7: Correlation for stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability in DSP**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Stakeholder participation in planning  | Project sustainability  |
| Stakeholder participation in planning | Pearson CorrelationSig. (2-tailed)N  | 1130 | .584\*\*.000130 |
| Project sustainability | Pearson CorrelationSig. (2-tailed)N  | .584\*\*.000130 | 1130 |
| \*\*. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability was r = 0.584, which was positive with probability value (p = 0.000) that is less than α = 0.01 level of significance showing a strong positive relationship between stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability. The results provide justification that if stakeholder involvement through stakeholder participation in planning is improved, this would enhance optimum level of project sustainability in DSP of Save the Children in South Sudan as illustrated in table 5.7 above.

## **5.8. Regression Analysis for Stakeholder participation in planning on Project sustainability in DSP.**

The first hypothesis was that there was no s no statistical positive relationship between stakeholder participation in planning and project sustainability in DSP. To determine the degree of the influence, a regression analysis was run as follows;

## **Table 5.8: Model Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .594a | .428 | .293 | 1.2046 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Stakeholder participation in planning |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

From the regression analysis result in table 5.8 above 56% variations in project sustainability of DSP was attributed to contract administration. The R-value is 0.594, which represents the moderate correlation and therefore, indicates a moderate degree of correlation. The R2 value of .428 indicates how much of the dependent variable (Project sustainability in DSP) is attributed to the independent variable (Stakeholder participation in planning). The standard error of the estimate is 1.2046 and the adjusted R square value is .293. This value, therefore, implied that stakeholder participation in planning positively predicted project sustainability in DSP. Based on these results of this regression analysis, project sustainability in DSP was dependent on stakeholder participation in planning by 43%.

The hypothesis of the study under investigation was, that there was no statistical positive relationship between stakeholder participation in planning and project sustainability in DSP. Thus the hypothesis that stated that there was no significant positive correlation between stakeholder participation in planning and project sustainability was rejected. Stakeholder participation in planning had a significant positive effect on project sustainability at DSP by 43%. This practically implied that on project sustainability at DSP improved with effective stakeholder participation in planning phase.

# **CHAPTER SIX:**

# **STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION IN IMPLEMENTATION ON PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY OF DSP**

## **6.0. Introduction**

The second objective of the study was to ascertain the effect of stakeholder participation in implementation on project sustainability of DSP. The frequency and percentage scores were computed using SPPS as presented below.

## **6.1. I understand what stakeholder participation in project implementation means.**

Respondents were asked whether they understood what stakeholder participation in project implementation means, the results obtained are presented in table 6.1 as below;

**Table 6.1: I understand what stakeholder participation in project implementation means.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 20 | 15.4 | 15.4 |
| Disagree | 05 | 3.8 | 19.2 |
| Not Sure | 10 | 7.7 | 26.9 |
| Agree | 65 | 50.0  | 76.9 |
| Strongly Agree | 30 | 23.1 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 6.1, 20(15.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 5(3.8%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 10(7.7%) were not sure of the statement response; 65(50%) of the respondents agreed with the statement; 30(23.1%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The largest percentage of the respondents, 65(50%) generally agreed with the statement and this implied that majority of the respondents understood what stakeholder participation in project implementation meant.

The study findings show that stakeholder participation leads to sharing of knowledge by the different stakeholders which when put to good use results to sustainability of the project. One of the participant confirmed this below.

*“Of course when we have all stakeholders involved in a project, it means knowledge will be shared across all the project”*

## **6.2.I feel that I am part of the project through my participation in the implementation process.**

The respondents were asked whether they felt that they were part of the project through my participation in the implementation process and the results attained are presented in table 4.16;

**Table 6.2: I feel that I am part of the project through my participation in the implementation process.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 12 | 9.2 | 9.2 |
| Disagree | 05 | 3.8 | 13.0 |
| Agree | 80 | 61.5 | 75.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 33 | 25.5 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 6.2, 12(9.2%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 5(3.8%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; none of the respondents were not sure, 80(61.5%) agreed with the statement; 33(25.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The largest percentage of the respondents, 80(61.5%) generally agreed with the statement. This means that majority of the stakeholders of DSP felt that they were part of the project through my participation in the implementation process.

**6.3. I know my roles and responsibility in ensuring the success of the DSP Program**

The respondents were asked whether they knew their roles and responsibility in ensuring the success of the DSP Program and the results attained are presented in table 6.3 below.

**Table 6.3: I know my roles and responsibility in ensuring the success of the DSP Program**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 24 | 18.5 | 18.5 |
| Disagree | 10 | 7.7 | 26.2 |
| Not Sure | 12 | 9.2 | 35.4 |
| Agree | 59 | 45.4 | 80.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 25 | 19.2 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 6.3, 24(18.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 10(7.7%) disagreed with the statement; 12(9.2%) were not sure of the statement response; 59(45.4%) agreed and 25(19.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. This means that majority of the stakeholders of DSP knew their roles and responsibility in ensuring the success of the program, which influenced their involvement and sustainability of the project.

The research found that some of the stakeholders do not understand their roles and the general objectives of the project. This was confirmed by respondent as follows;

“Sometimes some stakeholders do not understand the aim of the project or objectives, as a result, they do not efficiently contribute to the implementation of the project. They create delays or they are not reliable.”

One of the project officers was quoted saying, *“Parents and guardians do not understand their responsibility; we fight a lot to educate the children”*

The Respondents bring out the fact that even though the stakeholders are available to participate, they do not understand what they are engaging in, which ends up affecting the sustainability of the project in the long run.

## **6.4. The organization carries out capacity building to ensure that I play my roles well during project implementation**

The respondents were asked whether the organization carried out capacity building to ensure that I play my roles well during project implementation and the results attained are presented in table 4.4;

**Table 6.4: The organization carries out capacity building to ensure that I play my roles well during project implementation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Disagree | 19 | 14.6 | 18.4 |
| Agree | 78 | 60.1 | 78.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 28 | 21.5 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

Findings from table 6.4 indicates that, 5(3.8%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 19(14.6%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 78(60.1%) agreed to the statement and 28(21.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The largest percentage of the respondents, 60.1% generally agreed with the statement. This meant that the organization carried out capacity building to ensure that the stakeholders play their roles well during project implementation.

One of the participants was quoted saying,

*“Usually stakeholders are chosen or selected according to the experience they have on a particular project. For example, of DSP we have implementing partners; these are people who work directly on the ground in close contact with the children and families that we support. So they have knowledge of local reality which is of great help for the success of the project….”*

## **6.5. Does the group work together to identify issues and needs that can be addressed through the project mechanism?**

The respondents were asked whether the group worked together to identify issues and needs that could be addressed through the project mechanism. The results attained are presented in table 6.5 below;

## **Table 6.5: Does the group work together to identify issues and needs that can be addressed through the project mechanism?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 15 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Disagree | 06 | 4.6 | 16.1 |
| Not Sure | 02 | 1.5 | 17.6 |
| Agree | 85 | 65.5 | 83.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 22 | 16.9 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 6.5, 15(11.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement; 6(4.6%) of the respondents agreed with the statement; 2(1.5%) of the respondents were not sure, 85(65.5%) agreed whereas 22 (16.9%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Majority of the respondents, 65.5% generally agreed with the statement. This meant that group sat DSP worked together to identify issues and needs that could be addressed through the project mechanism.

The study shows that when stakeholders contribute knowledge or participate in a given project, the will feel like they are part of it, this means that even when the initiators have withdrawn, the stakeholders will continue running it. A participant confirms this statement

*“It means that the community will own the project given the knowledge, skills and involvement so that ownership which will be raised as result of participation will contribute to sustainability of a particular project or program.”*

Another respondent said, *“Stakeholders need to work together, most of them are not cooperative and as a result children are refusing to go to school and young girls are getting pregnant at a tender age.”*

The results therefore suggest that there is a lot of work that needs to be done in order to engage the stakeholders and ensure that there is a strong contribution to project sustainability. The findings from qualitative study further revealed that there are problems stemming from some of the stakeholders that hinders the level at which the participation translates into success and overall sustainability of the project.

*“You find that in some areas we are involved, but there are some areas where we are left out. As a department, we are always invited to some activities but they are selected.”*

The responded notes that when the community contributes knowledge and skills to the project, it will lead to ownership which later leads to project sustainability.

**6.6. Stakeholder participation throughout the execution phase of project influences overall sustainability of project**

The respondents were asked whether stakeholder participation throughout the execution phase of project influenced overall sustainability of project. Results obtained are indicated as follows in table 6.6.

## **Table 6.6: Stakeholder participation throughout the execution phase of project influences overall sustainability of project**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 03 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Disagree | 08 | 6.2 | 8.5 |
| Agree | 89 | 68.5 | 77.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 30 | 23.0 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

As shown in table 6.6, it is observed that the respondents that 3(2.3%) disagreed 8(8.5%) disagreed to the statement, 89 (68.5%) and 30(23%) strongly agreed. Majority of respondents as indicated, 68.5%) generally agreed with the statement, implying that stakeholder participation throughout the execution phase of project influenced overall sustainability of project.

The study revealed that in order for a project to be sustainable, it needs to meet the right needs and the best way to identify these needs is through stakeholder participation.

*“When all the stakeholders get involved, you can identify their needs and when implementing, you can do it according to their needs.”*

The respondent notes that stakeholder participation does not only lead to needs identification but it also guides the process of implementation, to ensure that those needs are met hence resulting to project success and sustainability.

However, he respondents suggest problems in the implementation process that pose a threat to the sustainability of the project.

*“Sometimes some stakeholders do not understand the aim of the project or objectives; as a result, they are not able to contribute as they should.”*

*“Sometimes there is risk if we give funds, you are not sure that they are used to your expectation. Because sometimes you find that the output from some implementing partners is lacking. When they plan, and then get the money, they change their plans.”*

## **6.7. Relationship between Stakeholder participation in implementation on Project sustainability of DSP**

The second hypothesis was that there was a strong significant relationship between stock taking and performance of Save the Children International. Further to determine the degree of the relationship, a Pearson’s correlation coefficient analysis was computed as shown in the table below;

## **Table 6.9: Relationship between Stakeholder participation in implementation on Project sustainability of DSP**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Stakeholder participation in implementation | Project sustainability |
| Stakeholder participation in implementation | Pearson CorrelationSig. (2-tailed)N  | 1130 | .651\*\*.000130 |
| Project sustainability | Pearson CorrelationSig. (2-tailed)N  | .651\*\*.000130 | 1130 |
| **\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for stakeholder participation in implementation and project sustainability was r = 0.651, which was positive with probability value (p = 0.000) that is less than α = 0.01 level of significance showing a positive strong relationship between stakeholders’ participation in implementation and project sustainability. The results provide justification that if stakeholder involvement was effective through stakeholder participation in implementation, then there is a high probability of improving project sustainability of DSP of Save the Children in Juba South Sudan as illustrated in table 6.7 above.

## **6.8. Regression Analysis for Stakeholder participation in implementation and Project sustainability of DSP.**

The first hypothesis was that there was no s no statistical positive relationship between stakeholder participation in planning and project sustainability of DSP. To determine the degree of the influence, a regression analysis was run as follows;

## **Table 6.8: Model Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .672a | .538 | .386 | 1.1836 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Stakeholder participation in implementation |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

From the regression analysis result in table 6.8 above 56% variations in project sustainability of DSP was attributed to stakeholder participation in implementation. The R-value is 0.672, which represents the moderate correlation and therefore, indicates a moderate degree of correlation. The R2 value of .538 indicates how much of the dependent variable (Project sustainability of DSP) is attributed to the independent variable (Stakeholder participation in implementation). The standard error of the estimate is 1.1836 and the adjusted R square value is .386. This value, therefore, implied that stakeholder participation in implementation positively predicted project sustainability of DSP. Based on these results of this regression analysis, project sustainability of DSP was dependent on stakeholder participation in implementation by 54%.

The hypothesis of the study under investigation was that there was no statistical positive relationship between stakeholder participation in implementation and project sustainability of DSP. Thus the hypothesis that stated that there was no significant positive correlation between stakeholder participation in implementation and project sustainability was rejected. Stakeholder participation in implementation had a significant positive effect on project sustainability at DSP by 54%. This practically implied that on project sustainability at DSP improved with effective sstakeholder participation in implementation of the project.

This finding was reinforced by one key informant who observed that “*While participation may require more time and resources and may be more difficult to implement; the results is an increase in commitment to the project. Stakeholders who are consulted and made part of the solution feel more willing to support the project”.*

The participants noted that the stakeholders are chosen according to knowledge and experience in a given subject or project. This means that they come in with a body of knowledge which if shared would lead to sustainability of the project.

# **CHAPTER SEVEN:**

# **STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION AFFECTS PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY OF DSP**

## **7.1. Introduction**

The third objective of the study was to determine the degree to which stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation affects project sustainability of DSP. The frequency and percentage scores were computed using SPPS as presented below.

## **7.1.1. I understand what Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) means**

Respondents were asked whether they understood what project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) meant, the results obtained are presented in table 7.1 as below;

**Table 7.6: I understand what Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) means**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 13 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Disagree | 32 | 24.6 | 34.7 |
| Not Sure | 5 | 3.8 | 38.5 |
| Agree | 57 | 43.8  | 82.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 23 | 17.7 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 7.1, 13(10.1%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 32(24.6%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 5 (3.8%) of the respondents were not sure of the statement response; 57(43.8%) of the respondents agreed with the statement and 23(17.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. A relative number of the respondents, 43.8% agreed with the statement and this implied that a relative number of the stakeholders of DSP understood what project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) meant.

However, the study found that majority of the stakeholders are not educated, so this affects their performance in playing their roles. A respondent had this to say concerning this category.

*“Most of the children do not have mentors or people they look up to because most of their parents are not educated”*

The respondent gives us an insight on how the lack of education is affecting the education of the children which is one of the major objectives of the project. This therefore means the ability to carry on the project in the future is also hindered

## **7.1.2.I have participated in the M&E process of DSP**

The respondents were asked whether they had participated in the M&E process of DSP and the results attained are presented in table 7.2;

**Table 7.7: I have participated in the M&E process of DSP**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 23 | 17.7 | 17.7 |
| Disagree | 33 | 25.4 | 43.1 |
| Not Sure | 6 | 4.6 | 47.6 |
| Agree | 53 | 40.8 | 88.5 |
| Strongly Agree | 15 | 11.5 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 7.2, 23(17.7%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 33(25.4%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 6(4.6%) were not sure, 53(40.8%) agreed with the statement; 11(11.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The largest percentage of the respondents, 53(40.8%) generally agreed with the statement. This means that a relative number of the stakeholders in Save the Children had participated in the M&E process of DSP.

The study finding shows that in order to work well with the stakeholders, it is essential to follow the right procedure of running a project. This is confirmed by the respondent,

*“Once a project is being introduced, we have to follow all the steps right from feasibility to the level of evaluation, ensuring that all stakeholders are involved at all levels. This is when we can have the project achieve as planned.”*

*“When it comes to monitoring, there are areas where we are not involved. We feel we have to contribute to all stages.”*And this has always brought serious issues in the long run leading to project breakdown and failures though.

The respondent noted that when the right steps are followed right from the project initiation, then the project will be more sustainable.

## **7.1.3. DSP has the right tools for monitoring and evaluating its project**

The respondents were asked whether DSP had the right tools for monitoring and evaluating its project and the results attained are presented in table 7.3 below.

**Table 7.8: DSP has the right tools for monitoring and evaluating its project**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 9 | 6.9 | 6.9 |
| Disagree | 19 | 14.6 | 21.6 |
| Not Sure | 10 | 7.7 | 29.2 |
| Agree | 69 | 53.1 | 82.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 23 | 17.7 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 7.3, 9(6.9%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 19(14.6%) disagreed with the statement; 10(7.7%) were not sure of the statement response; 69(53.1%) agreed and 23(17.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. This means that DSP had the right tools for monitoring and evaluating its project.

The study also found that engaging stakeholders has a lot of cost implications, this affects what kind of participation is done especially with stakeholders who are far from the headquarters of the project. This is confirmed by the following respondents.

*“It involves a lot of resources once you involve all, a big budget is earmarked to realize such”*

*“Some of the partners are very far, the distance between us sometimes defines what we do with them. The one who are near are more engaged than those who are far”*

The respondents note that for all the stakeholders to get actively involved there is a lot of money and resources that have to be earmarked; as a result, some are left out, especially those who are far. This in the long run affects the sustainability of the project.

The research also found out empowering the stakeholders and giving them refresher trainings is one approach of having all stakeholders to get fully engaged in the project activities. This is confirmed by the respondent.

*“Teach people about their responsibility, it will help them know what they are supposed to do.*”

The respondent has noted that different stakeholders need different types of support on terms of training and empowerment. When this is done, the project will be able to realize its goals and sustainability in the long run.

## **7.1.4. DSP implements projects according to the planned objectives**

The respondents were asked whether DSP implemented projects according to the planned objectives and the results attained are presented in table 7.4;

**Table 7.9: DSP implements projects according to the planned objectives**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 8 | 6.6 | 6.6 |
| Disagree | 14 | 10.8 | 17.4 |
| Agree | 84 | 64.6 | 82.0 |
| Strongly Agree | 24 | 18.0 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

Findings from table 7.4 indicates that, 8(6.6%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 14(10.8%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 84(64.6%) agreed to the statement and 24(18%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. The largest percentage of the respondents, 84 (64.6%) generally agreed with the statement. This means that DSP implemented projects according to the planned objectives.

**7.1.5. The project activities meet my needs and expectation**

The respondents were asked whether the project activities met their needs and expectation, and the results attained are presented in table 7.5 below;

## **Table 7.10: The project activities meet my needs and expectation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 7.7 | 7.7 |
| Disagree | 7 | 5.4 | 13.1 |
| Agree | 89 | 68.5 | 81.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 24 | 18.4 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 6.5, 10(7.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement; 7(5.4%) of the respondents agreed with the statement; 89(68.5%) disagreed whereas 24 (18.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. Majority of the respondents, 68.4% generally agreed with the statement. This means that the DSP project activities met the needs and expectations of stakeholders.

# **7.1.6. Participation of Stakeholders in M&E has effect on project sustainability**

The respondents were asked whether participation of stakeholders in M&E had an effect on project sustainability. Results obtained are indicated as follows in table 7.6.

**Table 7.6: Participation of Stakeholders in M&E has effect on project sustainability**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Disagree | 14 | 10.8 | 14.6 |
| Agree | 89 | 68.5 | 83.1 |
| Strongly Agree | 22 | 16.9 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

As shown in table 7.6, it is observed that the respondents that 5(3.8%) strongly disagreed to the statement, 10.8% of the respondents disagreed to the statement, none of the respondents was not sure, 89(68.5%), and 22 (16.9%) strongly agreed. Majority of respondents as indicated, 89(68.5%) generally agreed implying that participation of stakeholders in M&E had an effect on project sustainability.

According to the findings of the research, having the right tools helps to effectively engage the stakeholders, as noted by one of the respondents.

*“We use tools and all stakeholders have parts, those that apply to beneficiaries, staff, and donors. Inform of questions, and narratives.”*

The respondent confirmed that one of the approaches to effectively engage the stakeholders is the use of the right tools.

## **7.1.7. Relationship between Stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation on Project sustainability of DSP.**

The second hypothesis was that there was no significant relationship between stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation on project sustainability of DSP. Further to determine the degree of the relationship, a Pearson’s correlation coefficient analysis was computed as shown in the table below;

## **Table 7.7: Relationship between Stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation on Project sustainability of DSP**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Stakeholder participation in monitoring | Project sustainability |
| Stakeholder participation in monitoring | Pearson CorrelationSig. (2-tailed)N  | 1105 | .622\*\*.000105  |
| Project sustainability | Pearson CorrelationSig. (2-tailed)N  | .622\*\*.000105 | 1105 |
| **\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient for stakeholder participation in monitoring and project sustainability y was r = 0.622, which was positive with probability value (p = 0.000) that is less than α = 0.01 level of significance showing a positive strong relationship between stakeholder participation in monitoring and project sustainability. The results provide justification that if stakeholder involvement were effective through stakeholder participation in monitoring, then there is a high probability of improving project sustainability of DSP of Save the Children International in Juba South Sudan by 62.2% as illustrated in table 7.7 above.

## **7.1.8.Regression Analysis for Stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation on Project sustainability of DSP.**

The first hypothesis was that there was no s no statistical positive relationship between stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation and project sustainability of DSP. To determine the degree of the influence, a regression analysis was run as follows;

## **Table 7.8: Model Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .602a | .486 | .305 | 1.2342 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

From the regression analysis result in table 7.8 above 49% variations in project sustainability of DSP was attributed to stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation. The R-value is 0.602, which represents the moderate correlation and therefore, indicates a moderate degree of correlation. The R2 value of .486 indicates how much of the dependent variable (Project sustainability of DSP) is attributed to the independent variable (stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation). The standard error of the estimate is 1.2342 and the adjusted R square value is .305. This value, therefore, implied that stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation positively predicted project sustainability of DSP. Based on these results of this regression analysis, project sustainability of DSP was dependent on stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation by 49%.

The hypothesis of the study under investigation was that there was no statistical positive relationship between stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation and project sustainability of DSP. Thus the hypothesis that stated that there was no significant positive correlation between stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation and project sustainability was rejected. Stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation had a significant positive effect on project sustainability at DSP by 49%. This practically implied that on project sustainability at DSP improved with effective stakeholder participation in Monitoring and Evaluation of the project.

## **7.2.Level of Project Sustainability of DSP.**

## **7.2.1.I understand what project sustainability means.**

The respondents were asked whether they understood what project sustainability meant. The results attained are presented in table 7.8 below.

**Table 7.8: Table: I understand what project sustainability means.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 15 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Disagree | 41 | 31.5 | 43.0 |
| Agree | 54 | 41.6 | 84.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 20 | 15.4 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 7.8, 15(11.5%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 41(31.5%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 54(41.6%) agreed and 20(15.4%) strongly agreed. Results show that majority, 41.6% generally disagreed with the statement. This implied that a good number of the stakeholders at DSP understood what project sustainability meant.

There qualitative results were in agreement with the above results one respondent was quoted lamenting that, *“The wars in South Sudan however have not completely destroyed all the”*

## **7.2.2.I know how the sustainability as a concept might possibly be assimilated and implemented into a project life-cycle**

The respondents were asked whether they knew how the sustainability as a concept could possibly be assimilated and implemented into a project life-cycle. The results attained are presented in table 7.9.

**Table 7.9: I know how the sustainability as a concept might possibly be assimilated and implemented into a project life-cycle**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 05 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Disagree | 36 | 27.7 | 31.5 |
| Not Sure | 10 | 7.7 | 39.2 |
| Agree | 54 | 41.6 | 80.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 25 | 19.2 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 7.9, 5(3.8%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 36(27.7%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 10(7.7%) were not sure, 54(41.6%) agreed and 25(19.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. According to the results majority of respondents, 41.6%) generally agreed disagreed with the statement. This means that majority of the respondents new how the sustainability as a concept could possibly be assimilated and implemented into a project life-cycle.

The research found out that it is important to put the need into consideration if the project is to be sustainable. The respondent had this to say.

*“Most often we implement projects starting from ideas, and not from the reality on the ground. So there is need for doing a research starting from the moment of the need of these people that we are going to support. Because you will base your intervention on something that is theirs because you will know what the needs are and what the resources are.”*

The respondent affirms that for sustainability to be realized, there is need for a feasibility study that would guide the intervention, because that will mean that the intervention is actually solving a problem and the impact will be greatly felt after the project ends.

**7.2.3. I have other suggestions about measures that would lead to the sustainability of the DSP project**

The respondents were asked whether they had other suggestions about measures that would lead to the sustainability of the DSP project. The results attained are presented in table 7.10;

**Table 7.10:I have other suggestions about measures that would lead to the sustainability of the DSP project**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 19 | 14.6 | 14.6 |
| Disagree | 49 | 37.7 | 52.3 |
| Not Sure | 5 | 3.8 | 56.1 |
| Agree | 36 | 27.7 | 83.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 21 | 16.2 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 7.10, 19(14.6%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 49(37.7%) disagreed with the statement; 5(3.8%) were not sure and 36(27.7%) agreed while 21(16.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Majority of the respondents, 37.7% generally disagreed with the statement. This means that a relative number of the respondents had other suggestions about measures that would lead to the sustainability of the DSP project.

The idea of involving key stakeholders from the start helps in the process of ownership of the plans and decisions made, this will translate into the community caring on the project

*“Involve key stakeholders right from the planning process because they will know the loopholes where they are and they will guide accordingly other than bringing them onboard after everything has been done even after the lifespan has ended.”*

The respondent noted that when stakeholders are not engaged from the start, risks and challenges that would have been identified are missed may affect the sustainability of the project.

## **7.2.4.I will be able to lead the project if external donor funding is no longer available**

The respondents were asked whether they would be able to lead the project if external donor funding is no longer available and the results attained are presented in table 7.11;

**Table 7.11: I will be able to lead the project if external donor funding is no longer available**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 17 | 13.1 | 13.1 |
| Disagree | 61 | 46.9 | 60.0 |
| Not Sure | 6 | 4.6 | 64.6 |
| Agree | 36 | 27.7 | 92.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 7.7 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

According to the findings in table 7.11, 17(13.1%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 61(46.9%) disagreed 6(4.6%) were not sure, 36(27.7%) of the respondents agreed, 10(7.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Majority of the respondents, 46.9% generally disagreed with the statement. This means that majority of the respondents especially the beneficiaries never believed that they would be able to lead the project if external donor funding is no longer available.

According to the respondent, his relation to the project and his position of leadership gives him a good feeling that they would continue running the project even when donor funding has ended.

Over reliance on donor funding has been discovered to be a hindrance factor to sustainability of projects. The respondent had this to say concerning this category.

*“Currently we rely so much on external funding, so if they are not there, we are not able to pay the employees, staff and fees. That is why when external funds are delayed, it slows down the implementation.”*

The respondent has noted that absence of donor funding always interferes with the implementation of the project. This implies that they are not able to run the project without support hence the project is not in a position to be sustainable.

## **7.2.5.I received empowerment and training to carry on project activities once funding has been terminated**

Regarding whether they had received empowerment and training to carry on project activities once funding has been terminated, the results obtained are contained in table 7.12 below;

**Table 7.12: I received empowerment and training to carry on project activities once funding has been terminated**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 15 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Disagree | 58 | 44.6 | 56.1 |
| Agree | 47 | 36.2 | 92.3 |
| Strongly Agree | 10 | 7.7 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

Results from table 7.12, 15(11.5%) strongly disagreed with the statement; 58(44.6%) disagreed, 47(36.2%) of the respondents agreed and 10(7.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Majority of the respondents, 36.2%) generally agreed with the statement, implying that a relative number of the stakeholders of DSP had received empowerment and training to carry on project activities once funding has been terminated.

According to the study respondent, having a good relation with the project staff can help the project to continue running even if donor funding comes to an end.

*“I feel as head of community based service department. The organization has been working with us in the area of child protection where we offer social support and also giving referrals to other service providers. We also have good relations with project staff so we feel we can push forward the project.”*

## **7.2.6. The project has a solid exit plan that includes all stakeholders**

Respondents were asked whether the project had a solid exit plan that includes all stakeholders; results obtained are contained in table 7.13.

**Table 7.13: The project has a solid exit plan that includes all stakeholders**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| Valid | Strongly Disagree | 8 | 6.2 | 6.2 |
| Disagree | 31 | 23.8 | 30.0 |
| Not Sure | 5 | 3.8 | 33.8 |
| Agree | 66 | 50.8 | 84.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 20 | 15.4 | **100.0** |
| **Total** | **130** | **100.0** |  |

***Source: Primary data (2021)***

Results from table 7.13, 8(6.2%) strongly disagreed with the statement; 31(23.8%) disagreed, 5(3.8%) were not sure, 66(50.8%) of the respondents agreed, 20(15.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Majority of the respondents, 50.8% generally agreed with the statement. This implied that DSP project had a solid exit plan that includes all stakeholders.

##

# **CHAPTER EIGHT**

# **DISCUSSION OF STUDY FINDINGS**

## **8.0. Introduction**

This chapter presents the discussion of study findings in line with the study findings and correlates with findings of other scholars on how stakeholder participation influences project sustainability in terms of stakeholder participation in planning, stakeholder participation in implementation and stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation.

## **8.1. Stakeholder participation in planning and Project sustainability of DSP**

Under objective one, the study sought to examine the impact of stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability of DSP. The correlation results indicated a significant positive relationship between stakeholder participation in planning and project sustainability of DSP (r = 0.584 with probability value (p = 0.000) which implied that stakeholder participation in planning explained project sustainability of DSP by 58.4%.

While assessing stakeholder participation in planning, it was further analyzed using different statements and the outcomes of analysis were; majority of the respondents agreed that stakeholder participation in planning enhances project sustainability of DSP. For instance; 52.2% agreed that the organisation had done their best in making the beneficiaries understand what stakeholder participation in the project planning stage meant. And 50% of the respondents agreed that the project objectives at DSP were set according to the needs of the beneficiaries which improve stakeholder involvement and project sustainability. However, 34.6% of the stakeholders affirmed that had never participated in the planning process of the DSP project, despite the role of stakeholder participation in the project planning. And 44.6% of the respondents never knew how stakeholder participation was practiced of DSP, a factor that affects stakeholder involvement and project sustainability.

Findings further revealed that 64.7% of the respondents understood that participant involvement in formation process influenced sustainability of projects. However, 50% of the respondents affirmed that they were never informed or consulted about the outcome of the planning process before it was taken for implementation.

Given that findings established a strong positive relationship between stakeholder participation in planning and project sustainability of DSP, there is probably no assurance that the actual outcome will be similar in other private and public projects since the valuation process may differ according to factors such as availability of funds, human resource expertise, community needs among others.

Various authors concurred with the findings of Magassouba et al, (2019), who stated that stakeholder participation in project planning stage, which includes activities such as defining the project's job specifications, standard, and goal, specifying the required resources and their distribution, defining the schedule, assessing various risks, and determining delivery methods, give project managers the ability to improve the method or result of the project's implementation.

In a related study, Urasa & Kirui (2019) concluded that participation of local communities in World Vision Project interventions is generally limited to ‘contribution’ and therefore not ‘empowering’ to the local communities to take control of the development process. The researchers recommend some changes in terms of management structures and human capacity to help widen the scope of participation for local communities. This study also focused on passive participation variable but it failed to incorporate effective, function and optimum participation variables, which are of interest to the researcher. Njogu (2016) on the Influence of stakeholder engagement on performance of street children rehabilitation programs in Nairobi county Kenya. Despite the critical role played by stakeholder Involvement in the performance of the automobile Emission Control Program, a study seeking to determine the influence of stakeholder Involvement in performance of Automobile Emission Control Program in Nairobi remains elusive.

Lastly, in a study conducted by Bal & Maina (2019) to evaluate the influence of local community in Project Planning on the sustainability of projects in Nakuru County, in Kenya’s Eastern province. The study revealed that individuals involved in coming up with objectives of the project are the project managers, project sponsors and project workers. The community members are never involved in this exercise and that the specifications of the projects are not written in consultation with the community members. It was also concluded that community members are never adequately involved in resource mobilization for the execution of the project. The few resources they contribute in small quantities are man-power, raw materials and financial resources. This has led to negative effects on the sustainability of projects within Nakuru County.

## **8.2. Stakeholder participation in implementation and Project sustainability of DSP**

Under objective one, the study sought to ascertain the effect of stakeholder participation in implementation on project sustainability of DSP. The correlation results indicated a significant positive relationship between of stakeholder participation in implementation and project sustainability (r = 0.651 with probability value (p = 0.000) which implied that stakeholder participation in implementation explained project sustainability of DSP by 65.1%.

While assessing stakeholder participation in implementation, the researcher used various statements of stakeholder participation in implementation which were analyzed and the results revealed that; majority of the respondents agreed that stakeholder participation in implementation enhances project sustainability of DSP. For example majority of the respondents (50%) understood what stakeholder participation in project implementation meant, 61.5% of the stakeholders of DSP felt that they were part of the project through my participation in the implementation process and a relative number of the stakeholders of DSP (45.4%) knew their roles and responsibility in ensuring the success of the program, which influenced their involvement and sustainability of the project.

More so, 60.1% agreed that the organization carried out capacity building to ensure that the stakeholders play their roles well during project implementation,65.5% affirmed that the groups at DSP worked together to identify issues and needs that could be addressed through the project mechanism. And 68.5% of the respondents agreed that stakeholder participation throughout the execution phase of project influenced overall sustainability of project. The study revealed that in order for a project to be sustainable, it needs to meet the right needs and the best way to identify these needs is through stakeholder participation.

Various authors concurred with Bagire and Nalweyiso (2016) who emphasized the importance of stakeholder involvement at implementation the project's lifecycle stage leads to efficiency, effectiveness capacity building of stakeholders or beneficiaries, self-reliance, empowerment, commitment, and project sustainability. Castro and Arino (2021) analysed the performance of water systems in a variety of countries. They found that the performance of water systems were markedly better in communities where households were able to make informed choices about the type of system and the level of service they required, and where decision making was genuinely democratic and inclusive. In contrast, projects which were constructed without community supervision and where project management was not accountable to the community, tended to be poorly constructed by private contractors.

In a related study conducted by Ofuoku & Oino (2019) to assess the effect of community participation on sustainability of rural water projects in Delta Central Agricultural Zone of Delta State, Nigeria. The study was concentrated in the rural settlements where water projects were executed. The community citizens were rarely often or always involved in the various stages of the projects as the community development committees’ executives represented the communities. In most communities, the water projects were funded by the respective communities and other bodies. Those jointly funded were highly sustainable than those solely funded by governments. And Usadolo and Caldwel (2016), emphasized the fact that the Participation of stakeholders during the implementation stage Projects creates a mutual relationship between stakeholders. A partnership that enhances their involvement in rural development projects in the long run because it provides a forum they learn to respect each other's experiences and in addition to existing ones, create new ones.

## **8.3. Stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation and Project sustainability of DSP**

Under objective three the study sought to determine the degree to which stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation affects project sustainability of DSP. The correlation results indicated a significant positive relationship between stakeholder participation in monitoring & evaluation and project sustainability of DSP (r = 0.622 with probability value (p = 0.000) which implied that stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation explained project sustainability of DSP by 62.2%.

Stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation was measured using different statements which were later analyzed and the result of analysis revealed that; most of the respondents assented to the view that stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation leads to improved project sustainability of DSP. For instance 43.8% of the stakeholders of DSP understood what project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) meant.40.8% of the stakeholders in Save the Children had participated in the M&E process of DSP. And 53.1% of the respondents affirmed that DSP had the right tools for monitoring and evaluating its project.

More so, 64.6% of the respondents affirmed that DSP implemented projects according to the planned objectives. Majority of the respondents, 68.4% agreed that the DSP project activities met the needs and expectations of stakeholders and 68.5% affirmed that participation of stakeholders in M&E had an effect on project sustainability.

The above findings concur with Magassouba et al. (2019) who remarked that the Project Monitoring cycle where rigorous controlling and assessment takes place. It equates the planned works with actual results to determine the progress and performance. While Evaluation of an undertaking is the determination of real situation of a project, this process is essential to find out if the project is being operated properly or not. According to Allison & Kaye, (2015), the strengths, drawbacks, opportunities, and challenges (SWOT) report, which can be performed at the organizational level or for each program, is one basic assessment process that is important for stakeholder engagement and project evaluation to ensure sustainability. This can be achieved through a survey, workshops, or a retreat; the goal is to get a lot of information. Use the SWOT system to help collect and organize information about the organizational strengths and weaknesses as well as the environment opportunities and threats.

In their study, Ahenkan et al. (2017) argued that the lack of space for stakeholder participation has constrained the promotion of effective, responsive and responsible government at the local level for poverty reduction and that procedures and structures for community engagement in monitoring and evaluation of development interventions seldom exist. Alfred (2015) also argued that there is a low level of stakeholder involvement in infrastructure project monitoring among MMDAs due to lack of public education, lack of collaboration between management and beneficiaries and poor monitoring information dissemination. Hassan et al. (2016) also stated that the scarcity a group of stakeholders’ interest in implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems obstructs proper monitoring and evaluation.

**CHAPTER NINE**

# **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

## **9.0. Introduction**

This chapter presents the summary on the effects of stakeholder participation on project sustainability of DSP basing on the findings from the study. The data were analyzed inform of tables which were used to test the relationship between the independent variable (Stakeholder participation) and the dependent variable (Project sustainability of DSP).

## **9.1. Summary of study findings**

## **9.1.1. Stakeholder participation in planning and Project sustainability of DSP**

From the findings it can be noted that stakeholder participation in planning enhances project sustainability of DSP by 58.4%. The results provided a justification that if stakeholder involvement through stakeholder participation in planning is improved, this would enhance optimum level of project sustainability in DSP of Save the Children in South Sudan. Stakeholder participation plays a vital role in the overall success and sustainability of a project. Given the fact that respondents are in influential position in the project, it was important to know their understanding of this concept.

## **9.1.2. Stakeholder participation in implementation and Project sustainability of DSP**

The results indicated that effective stakeholder participation in implementation improved project sustainability in DSP by 65.1%. The correlation results provided a justification that if stakeholder involvement was effective through stakeholder participation in implementation, then there is a high probability of improving project sustainability of DSP of Save the Children in Juba South Sudan. However, stakeholders need to be chosen according to knowledge and experience in a given subject or project. This means that they come in with a body of knowledge which if shared would lead to sustainability of the project.

## **9.1.3. Stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation and Project sustainability of DSP**

Results also indicated that effective stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation enhanced project sustainability of DSP by 62.2%. The result also provides a justification that if stakeholder involvement were effective through stakeholder participation in monitoring, then there is a high probability of improving project sustainability of DSP of Save the Children International in Juba South Sudan by 62.2%.Providing stakeholders the chance to participate in M&E becomes an opportunity for development organisations to focus better on their ultimate goal of improving poor people’s lives and broadening involvement in identifying change of which a clearer picture can be gained of what is really happening on the ground.Hence, any project management’s obligation to ensure that stakeholders get fully involved in monitoring and evaluation matters not only as a means of improving development effectiveness but also as the key to long-term sustainability and leverage of the project.

## **9.2. Conclusions**

From the above summary of findings, the following conclusions were made. The study conclusions and recommendations were to examine how stakeholder participation in form of stakeholder participation in planning, stakeholder participation in implementation and stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation influences project sustainability of DSP in Save the Children, Juba South Sudan. These are detailed as follows;

## **9.2.1. Stakeholder participation in planning and Project sustainability of DSP**

From the analysis given in the discussion of findings, it is noted that the respondents confirmed that stakeholder participation in planning enhanced project sustainability of DSP as evidenced by the positive significant correlation value of 0.58.4 and this shows that effective stakeholder participation in planning enhanced project sustainability of DSP by 58.4%.

## **9.2.2. Stakeholder participation in implementation and Project sustainability of DSP**

And from the analysis given in the discussion of findings, it is noted that the respondents agreed that stakeholder participation in implementation enhanced project sustainability of DSP as evidenced by the positive significant correlation value of 0.651 and this shows that effective stakeholder participation in implementation enhanced project sustainability of DSP by 65.1%, which was the highest among the factors.

## **9.2.3. Stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation and Project sustainability of DSP**

In general, the findings showed that stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation led to improved project sustainability of DSP since most of the respondents had positive views on the importance of stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation as shown by the positive correlation value of 0.622, an indication that effective stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation enhanced project sustainability of DSP by 62.2%,

## **9.3. Recommendations**

Basing on the findings of the study, the researcher found it prudent to make a few recommendations which are deemed important to guide the readers and policy makers as they use this research work and in order that DSP may use it to achieve potential project sustainability through improved stakeholder participation practices.

1. The research recommends that before any project starts operating, there is need to carry out a feasibility study in order to establish the actual problem on the ground. The NGO bureau needs to ensure that they follow up on NGOs operating in the country to ensure that projects are started the right way.
2. As the research has established, DSP has been implementing projects basing on ideas, and not from the reality on the ground. This therefore means the type of planning that the beneficiaries engage in is informative and not one where they give their own suggestions basing on what is being faced on the ground and in most cases the stakeholders do not actively contribute because the project is irrelevant to their pressing needs.
3. The project managers need to ensure that engage all stakeholders who can impact the project both positively and negatively from the beginning of the project. The study findings have revealed that some stakeholders are only brought on board in the middle of the implementation process of the project, most times when there is a problem, which makes it difficult to solve because they were not engaged from the beginning.
4. It is important to project managers to incorporate the aspect on sustainability during the planning process and make ensure that all stakeholders are aware about what they have to contribute to ensure sustainability is achieved
5. There is need for empowerment of the stakeholders; the study findings have revealed that most of the stakeholders of DSP lack understanding of the project do not understand the objective and overall goal of the project and their roles. So the study suggests programs like adult literacy and financial literacy since majority of the beneficiaries are illiterate.
6. The study recommends that the Monitoring and Evaluation team come up with the right tools that will help to identify some of the loopholes in the implementation process like stakeholders lack of understanding of their role and the overall aim of the project.

## **9.4 Suggested Areas for further research**

Although this study was done successfully, there is need for more studies in the field give a better understanding of the challenges observed.

The researcher recommends further studies in the following areas

1. The level of participation of stakeholders in a project.
2. Incorporation of sustainability in the project lifecycle
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**APPENDENCES**

**APPENDIX I: TABLE FOR DETERMINING SAMPLE SIZE FROM A GIVEN POPULATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N  | S  | N  | S  | N  | S  | N  | S  | N  | S  |
| 10  | 10  | 100  | 80  | 280  | 162  | 800  | 260  | 2800  | 338  |
| 15  | 14  | 110  | 86  | 290  | 165  | 850  | 265  | 3000  | 341  |
| 20  | 19  | 120  | 92  | 300  | 169  | 900  | 269  | 3500  | 346  |
| 25  | 24  | 130  | 97  | 320  | 175  | 950  | 274  | 4000  | 351  |
| 30  | 28  | 140  | 103  | 340  | 181  | 1000  | 278  | 4500  | 354  |
| 35  | 32  | 150  | 108  | 360  | 186  | 1100  | 285  | 5000  | 357  |
| 40  | 36  | 160  | 113  | 380  | 191  | 1200  | 291  | 6000  | 361  |
| 45  | 40  | 170  | 118  | 400  | 196  | 1300  | 297  | 7000  | 364  |
| 50  | 44  | 180  | 123  | 420  | 201  | 1400  | 302  | 8000  | 367  |
| 55  | 48  | 190  | 127  | 440  | 205  | 1500  | 306  | 9000  | 368  |
| 60  | 52  | 200  | 132  | 460  | 210  | 1600  | 310  | 10000  | 370  |
| 65  | 56  | 210  | 136  | 480  | 214  | 1700  | 313  | 15000  | 375  |
| 70  | 59  | 220  | 140  | 500  | 217  | 1800  | 317  | 20000  | 377  |
| 75  | 63  | 230  | 144  | 550  | 226  | 1900  | 320  | 30000  | 379  |
| 80  | 66  | 240  | 148  | 600  | 234  | 2000  | 322  | 40000  | 380  |
| 85  | 70  | 250  | 152  | 650  | 242  | 2200  | 327  | 50000  | 381  |
| 90  | 73  | 260  | 155  | 700  | 248  | 2400  | 331  | 75000  | 382  |
| 95  | 76  | 270  | 159  | 750  | 254  | 2600  | 335  | 100000  | 384  |

Note: “N” is population size; “S” is sample size.

**Source:** Krejcie, Robert V., and Morgan, Daryle W., (1970): “Determining Sample Size for Research Activities”: Educational and Psychological Measurement:

# **APPENDENCES**

## **APPENDIX II: CONSENT FORM**

Dear Participant,

My names are **Sebit Edimon Marino**, a student of Masters in Business Administration of Nkumba University, Uganda. I am conducting academic enquiry on Stakeholder participation and Project sustainability in the Distance Support Program (DSP) of Save the Children in Juba, South Sudan. You are among the stakeholders of the DSP and you have been chosen to take part in the study because of your understanding of the topic and your status in the community. The study’s aim and conclusions will be strictly academic. The research would only take about 30 minutes. All details you provide will be handled and treated with the highest discretion.

Respondents signature ………………………………. Date…………………

## **APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BENEFICIARIES/STAKEHOLDERS**

Dear Respondent:

Dear Participant, the questionnaire below appeals to get your response concerning Stakeholder Participation and Project Sustainability. A Case of Distance Support Program (DSP) of Save the Children in Juba, South Sudan. Please be as truthful as possible when answering the following questions. The data provided will be used and treated with utmost care.

Thank you so much for your cooperation.

**Section A: Background Information**

BIO DATA (Please do provide the following information. Indicate appropriate code in box)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01 | Sex | Male …………………………1Female ………………………2 | Enter the correct code |
| 02 | Age | Below 26 years…….. ………126---35 years……...…………236----45 years………………..346----55 years……………..…4Above 55 years….…….……..8 | Enter the correct code |
| 03 | Marital Status | Married………………..….......1 Single…….…..…….….…..…2Separated ……………..…......3Divorced…...………..;……....4Widowed……….………..…..5 | Enter the correct code |
| 04 | Highest Level of Education | Post Graduate Courses.….......1Bachelors ………………......3Diploma ……………….…....4Certificate ……….….…..…..5Primary to Secondary ………6Never Studied …………………7  | Enter the correct code |
| 05 | Your period of working or benefiting withthe Organisation | 0-4 years ……………..……....15-9 years ….……………...…..210-14years………………...….315 and above years….………..4 | Enter the correct code |

**For sections B, C and D use the scale/ranking below to tick in the box that corresponds with number that best indicates your opinion on the statement or question.**

1. Strongly Disagree; **2-**Disagree; **3-**Neutral; **4-**Agree; and **5-**Strongly Agree

**SECTION B: The impact of stakeholder participation in planning on project sustainability of DSP.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Item** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. | I understand what stakeholder participation in the project planning stage means |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | I have ever participated in the planning process of the DSP project. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | I know how stakeholder participation is practiced of DSP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. | The project objectives are set according to the needs of the beneficiaries. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | I was informed or consulted about the outcome of the planning process before it was taken for implementation. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | Participant Involvement in Formation process influences sustainability of projects. |  |  |  |  |  |

**SECTION C: The effect of Stakeholder participation in implementation on Project sustainability of DSP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Item** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. | I understand what stakeholder participation in project implementation means. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | I feel that I am part of the project through my participation in the implementation process. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | I know my roles and responsibility in ensuring the success of the DSP Program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. | The Organization carries out capacity building to ensure that I play my roles well during project implementation. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | Does the group work together to identify issues and needs that can be addressed through the project mechanism? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | Stakeholder Participation throughout the execution phase of project influences overall sustainability of project. |  |  |  |  |  |

**SECTION D: Effect of stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation on project sustainability of DSP.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Item** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. | I understand what Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) means |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | I have Participated in the M&E process of DSP |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | DSP has the right tools for monitoring and evaluating its project. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. | DSP implements projects according to the planned objectives. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | The project activities meet my needs and expectation. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. |  Participation of Stakeholders in M&E has effect on project sustainability. |  |  |  |  |  |

**SECTION E: The Level ofProject Sustainability of DSP.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Item** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. | I understand what project sustainability means. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | I know how the sustainability as a concept might possibly be assimilated and implemented into a project life-cycle |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | I have other suggestions about measures that would lead to the sustainability of the DSP project. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  I will be able to lead the project if external donor funding is no longer available. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | I received empowerment and training to carry on project activities once funding has been terminated. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | The project has a solid exit plan that includes all stakeholders. |  |  |  |  |  |

***Thanks for your participation.***

## **APPENDIX IV: INTERVIEW GUIDE**

**Dear Sir/Madam,**

Dear respondent, the questionnaire below desires to get your reaction concerning Stakeholder Participation and Project Sustainability of Distance Support Program (DSP) in Save the Children, Juba South Sudan. Please respond to the questions as honestly as possible. The information you provide will be handled confidently. Thank you!

1. What is your understanding of the term stakeholder participation?
2. What is your understanding of the term Project Sustainability?
3. According to your understanding, how does stakeholder participation influence project sustainability?
4. How can the idea of project sustainability be incorporated into the project life cycle?
5. What are the approaches that can be adopted in coordinating stakeholder participation in a project?
6. Will you and the other beneficiaries be able to lead the project even if external donor funding is no longer available?

***Thank you for cooperating!***