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Abstract:
The study was motivated by the fact that there are numerous efforts in the recent past of phasing out the community based projects but there is failure on the part of the communities in managing or sustaining the projects. The study was conducted in an attempt to establish the factors that influence sustainability of donor funded youth projects in Kakamega County, Kenya. The study specifically examined how Leadership Capabilities, Training, Youth Participation and Monitoring and Evaluation influence sustainability of Donor funded youth Agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya. It was informed by the Theory of change (ToC), Sustainability Theory and Positive Youth Development Approach (PYDA). The research design used was descriptive research design with the target population being the youth agri-business projects funded under the USAID/YYC program. The identified target population is unique in a special way since they were involved as direct beneficiaries of the Program in Kakamega County. The total numbers of projects were 233 in the entire county. 30% of the projects were sampled where the chairperson of the projects were purposively sampled as the respondents. The research focused on primary data that was collected from questionnaires. The researcher used the Cronbach’s Alpha to assess internal consistency reliability for the five-point Likert scale items with 0.7 and above being the cut-off point or acceptable range. The study used descriptive and inferential statistics to analyse the quantitative data. From the findings, majority of the respondents agreed that Leadership Capabilities, Training, Youth Participation and Monitoring and Evaluation affects sustainability of donor funded youth Agri-business projects, it is eminent that the youth play a significant role in project management and sustainability. In conclusion therefore, if organizations wants to develop, there is great need to meaningfully involve the youth in the development of every facet of the project. The recommendations from the study are; project practitioners should involve youth as partners and diversify in their project approaches, develop and implement sound policies and establish effective partnership for sustainability. It is therefore important that young people be given opportunities in organizational management and participation for sustainability of projects. Thus, it is recommended that youth in Kakamega County be involved and included in work as a collective in project sustainability. The aim of this study was to fill the gap in the incomplete literature on youth participation in project sustainability. The study sought to contribute to the progress study on Youth and project sustainability, add to the scanty empirical literature and to subsequently fill the knowledge gap.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study
Sustainable development is where the current generation needs are met but also taking in to account the future generations’ expectations over the usage of the same resource or source of livelihood (Bossel, 1999; ILO, 2012; CEC, 2001). The brain child of such a concept was Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) and David Ricardo (1772-1823) who indicated the sense that there is finite of resources within the environment in existence (WCED, 1997). It is thus in the conservation of environment that even the concept of development and sustainability was anchored. It was in 1970 when sustainability issues and concept is traced and initiated and eventually commission on the development of the environment in the world (WCED) which is a United Nations branch. The sustainability of projects is a concern especially for agencies of internal image and even national and at the grassroots levels. Peter, Geoffrey and Kirui (2015) argue that money and any other resources in huge amounts have been given to communities within and outside the expected reach with the focus of enhancing their livelihoods which can be by well-wishers or donors. In Kenya, the development aid was at $770m in 2005 to support to development projects assistance. It has been established and brought forward that success has been registered to some but also no much or little evidence established on how the impact has been felt by the poor (Ababa, 2013).
Project sustainability is dissected into various dimensions which include continuous flow and equitable distribution and sharing of project benefits, active community participation, institutional stability, continued operation and maintenance of environment (Kariuki, 2014). There have also been shifts including mode of projects, approaches on wide sector, measures on adjustment on structures, papers concerning reduction in poverty, approaches on programmes, support of budgets directly, frameworks on expenditures concerning medium term since have been enacted to reduce fragmentation of systems of development and also act as a change in aiding balance of power (Adhiambo, 2012).

The concept especially relating to projects of youths being sustained entails enabling certain projects for the current use to be used later by other generation through systems and processes being endured (James, 2002) this is aimed at providing measurable indicators which can guide the generation of solutions through enabling decision making and to meet practical challenges (IFAD, 2012)

This can be boosted by empowering the youth in project identification and design, positive involvement in leadership, exit strategies inbuilt in project design and project relying on resources that are locally available (Kariuki, 2014). This lays a foundation upon which development especially their effectiveness is based and thus engaging them fully gives an ability to deal with challenges such as: putting families together, health risks being minimized giving rise to sustainable projects and livelihoods realized for the future (DFID, 1995).

1.1.1. Global Perspective

Globally, 18% of the population comprises persons between the ages of 15-24 estimated at 1.06 billion with a majority 85% living in developing countries. These youths have been afflicted by many socio-economic issues but unemployment and poverty remain the greatest challenge of this century (Ledwith & Margaret, 2005). According to Manpower group study, the International Labour Organization estimates that nearly 75 million youths are unemployed in the world today. The 2007 report regarding youth development stipulates the sense that about 1.3 billion of those considered young take cognitive of the generation of social and economic actors. Thus opportunities must be gotten right or risk the permanent situation since it may not be reversed easily. The goals also related to Millennium Development talks much on goals related to youths with an estimation of seven in every eight goals in order to improve on outcome livelihood.

In India, factors identified and documented as affecting sustainability and success of projects included, interference of politics along beneficiary selection, timing issues, credit inadequacy and also orientations in youth schemes whilst in South Africa they included lack of well-developed management systems and unclear vision and mission statements to guide their decision making with many of the youth groups developing the constitutions only for the purpose of Registration and also citing challenges in the registration process with the government departments, (Khan, S, 1998). Many Sub-Saharan countries in Africa have made positive steps to address youth unemployment but regardless of the approach applied, inadequate funding coupled with poorly designed and executed programs, have consistently remained the biggest barrier to sustainability of these well intentioned projects (ILO, 2012).

1.1.2. Kenyan Perspective

Kenya has generally youthful population which constitute 35.4% of the total population in 2009 up from 30.4% in 1969. The high proportion of the youth population signifies that Kenya is facing a youth bulge which offers opportunities for economic, social and political development while at the same time poses challenges of risk and threat to the country’s social cohesion and stability (NYES, 2015 - 2017). These challenges include unemployment and poverty which results from underemployment of the necessary skills and competencies since youths as compared to adults are underemployed.

In an effort to enhance youth empowerment the government is implementing a transformative youth empowerment program through the 5 point vision under the National Youth Service (NYS) which seeks to promote transformative youth empowerment through skills and talent development and exploitation of the entrepreneurial potential of the youth with the main goal being to promote youth savings, community service, peace building and leadership skills. The National Youth Empowerment Strategy (NYES) thus provides strategic direction and consolidates stakeholders’ efforts towards scale up of youth empowerment in the country (GOK, 2010).

Studies have found out that, those myriad challenges which majority of youths are likely to face includes skills which are inappropriate, policies which are unclear, constraints in resources and also unfamiliar policies. From records in department of Social Services active groups not exceeding 50% involving in initiatives of empowerment with majority disintegrating or rather may be dormant which raises major interrogations concerning how youth groups are able to be sustained over time to achieve both long as well as short term goals (Peter et al., 2015).

1.1.3. Organization in Focus

USAID/Yes Youth Can Western is mostly involved by youths in social and also status of their economy in the Kenyan setups. It involves empowerment in terms of prosperity economically, development as a whole in community, building required peace and also social service involvement. This has also in partnership with Winrock International (WI) and also Village Bunge Networks in Western Kenya being taken as implementing partners and works across the constituencies surmounting to 33 in total and four counties of Kakamega, Bungoma, Vihiga and Busia where youths act as organizers and also mobilizing legitimately within county up to village levels.

This also gives leverage on public and private partnerships for new livelihood opportunities arising for the sake of youths. This also entails application more so on gender focused approach to monitor and even evaluate benefits for both male and females. There is clear support for the representation of youths at all levels of elections for representation. It has
also emerged Village Youth Bunges at the representation of elected leaders and establishment of networks for youth forums to link other networks of youth nationally.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

According to the Kenya National Census 2009, youths (15-35) years form 35% of the total population. This is a significant portion of Kenya’s population expected to play a vital role in the socio-economic aspirations and therefore the need to be involved in shaping the country’s present and future development agendas as per Vision 2030. Due to issues associated with youth unemployment, governments globally have attempted to find ways to address this issue (Dillard, 2008; Peter et al., 2015). The NGO projects sustainability levels have been rated at 43% where high sustainability levels has been described as enhanced sustainability and low sustainability levels as impended sustainability with Kenyan NGO’s projects being at evolving sustainability level (Peter et al., 2015; Kariuki, 2014).

While the trend with implementation of such projects is showing significant improvement, the trend with post-implementation is disappointing as fewer projects are being sustained (Dillard, 2008, Shikuku. M., 2012). Empirical evidence has shown that projects initiated by such funds normally experience certain challenges. It is therefore important that young people be given opportunities and their participation incorporated in project development. Thus, it is recommended that youth in Kakamega County be involved, and work collectively in enhancing project sustainability. The study sought to contribute to the progress study on substantive dispersion between the implemented youth projects and the sustainable or active ones, add to the scanty empirical literature and to subsequently fill the knowledge gap.

1.3. Research Objectives

1.3.1. General Objective

The objective of the study was to examine the factors that influence sustainability of Donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The study was guided by the following objectives;

- To establish the effect of leadership capabilities on sustainability of Donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.
- To examine the effects of training on sustainability of Donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.
- To establish the effect of youth participation on sustainability of Donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.
- To examine the effect of Monitoring and Evaluation on sustainability of Donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.

1.4. Research Hypothesis

- H1: There is no significant relationship between leadership and sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.
- H2: There is no significant relationship between training and sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.
- H3: There is no significant relationship between youth participation and sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.
- H4: There is no significant relationship between monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya.

1.5. Significance of the Study

Evaluation of factors that influence sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects can contribute to existing knowledge on project sustainability. The findings of the study provides insight on the importance of promoting meaningful youth participation in project sustainability and serves as a project policy document for partners and organizations that operate in this area in order to address the concerns raised. Partners can use the information to facilitate the change theory. The information generated guides interventions that are greatly needed to address youth participation in development. The government, scholars and academicians can use this report as a study model for areas that emerged wanting in order to facilitate effective policy development and contribute to new insights that can help achieve sustainable development goals.

1.6. Scope of the Study

The study was carried out in Kakamega County, Kenya with focus on Youth groups that had started and benefitted from donor funding more especially from the USAID/Yes Youth Can Initiative. The study was carried out to evaluate how the youth were being involved in sustainability measures of their groups’ projects with special attention on agri-business projects. The research was carried out from the month of January 2019 to May 2019.
1.7. Limitation of the Study
The major challenge was unwillingness of respondents to participate in the survey resulting to the researcher not achieving data collection from all targeted respondents. Attributed to youth being accustomed to receiving handouts, it made information dissemination very difficult negatively impacting the probability sampling technique. To address the challenge, the researcher adopted non-probability sampling to meet the study objectives.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Introduction
This chapter presents literature on related theories, well thought conceptual framework, and examined empirical review and the interaction between the variables and further critique of existing relevant literature related to the study and the research gaps.

2.2. Theoretical Review
This study borrowed from three theories: Theory of Change (Andrea. A.A, 2010), Sustainability Theory (CEC, 2001), and Positive Youth Development Theory (Lerner et. al, 2006) to explain the factors that influence sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects. The theories effectively highlighted important relationship between the dependent and independent variables which was presumed to have a relationship.

2.2.1. Theory of Change (TOC)
Theory of Change is where participation, evaluation and even planning are done methodologically for the government, NGOs or philanthropic issues to promote change socially. It also shows how necessary conditions can be put in mix to bring about goals which are long term. The change process is explained through causal links in terms of long, intermediate and short-term outcomes then mapped in a relationship key to each other for a flow in a chronological manner (Andrea. A.A, 2010).

The youth need an intrinsic motivation for planning; participation in evaluation and that can help define their long-term goals. Motivation creates need for achievement as they become more ambitious and their behavior is dedicated to developing and demonstrating higher abilities given in detail through the blocks considered for building goals that are long term. Built around the pathway of change, Theory of change plays a significant role in our research study as key for long term goals to be enacted and achieved with building blocks that work interchangeably represented graphically to bring about results.

2.2.2. Sustainability Theory
The theory argues that a particular development should not just be about the present generation but, also how the future interested parties can benefit from its proceeds without being compromised in the process which is key especially to environmental conservation (ILO, 2012; CEC, 2001; World Bank, 2005).

It also talks about development in management form that keeps the process of change active resulting to continuous goals other than fixed goals with communities in question being handled in a given manner to bring concepts together geared towards enhancing livelihoods and creating opportunities resulting to positive development that give the community a decent living (White, 1996; WCED,1997). The concepts required by the management include behavioral skills which are technical and behavioral competencies and contextual skills mainly concerned with focus on a certain goal (Dillard, 2008; Beata, 2014).

The Sustainability Theory plays a key role in the research study as inclusion of all parties interested especially the communities concerned in planning so as to be accepted and sustained for long is important to catch up with generations to come (Nyaguthii and Oyugi, (2013). The involvement of youth as stakeholders and their participation in the projects regarding youth matters is therefore key in determining the preferences as far as the goals are concerned before coming up with priorities and competing interests in place.

2.2.3. Positive Youth Development Approach (PYDA)
The theoretical approach (PYD) outlines and discusses young people as key resources and perceived assets for development. Initially, the deficit models looked at characteristics of youths in negative ways including problematic, risky characters and dangerousness (Lerner, 2005). It was later discovered that youth can be used positively to engage actively in projects and sustain the intended projects.

The Positive Youth Development Approach (PYD) looks at the youths as having characteristics that can be used to avoid their bad comportments and engage them productively in a course well intended to make a key difference to the community like managing a project that will sustain the current and future generation (Benson et.al., 2006; Judd B. 2006). This theory plays a significant role in the study as it outlines the importance of the youth who form the largest population yet with highest levels of unemployment. The strengths that exist within and beyond the youth are useful resources to be tapped for a meaningful development (Lerner et. al., 2006). The approach is positivity geared on the notion of accepting that the youths require some assets and resources to thrive including positive supportive relationships (Enfield & Owens, 2009).
2.3. Review of Variables

2.3.1. Leadership Capabilities and Project Sustainability

The idea behind leadership is to bring efforts together in a certain organization in achieving the intended purpose through placing skills and competencies in their right occupation (Bolden, 2010). It is key to tie such skills and competencies on missions and systems in an integrated developmental manner with functions including managing, planning, jobs selection, mistake identification, rewards and even recognition with great emphasis placed on equipping leaders with necessary skills estimated at around $50 billion with companies in Europe spending about £3,336 on each head (Burgoyne, Hirsch & William, 2004).

Leadership encompasses traits of self-esteem, self-confidence, emotional stability, self-assurance and even assertiveness (Beata, 2014). Building effective leadership capacity involves training, mentoring and sanctioning emerging leaders through public speaking trainings (Bolden, 2010). Those with self-esteem do not doubt themselves, their decisions and ability are well reserved in their minds, can project their decisions to others without any fear and in turn be well trusted with members committed to their suggestions (Raelin, 2004). These leaders also have high competencies and are able to interpret what members require for the acceptance of the said project to be met and subsequently sustainability. Youth group leadership, have typical competencies commonly associated with them. These include; the ability of a leader to communicate the vision, motivate individuals, inspire members, identify opportunities and initiate transformation (Karanja, 2014). Good leaders possess special skills and capacity that can be developed at every level of the organization to provide lasting positive change and those endeavored with such skills are required to give an acumen to steer the goals set since they are able to understand what is needed and the initiated challenges controlled for the objectives not to be compromised (Dillard, Dujon & King, 2008). In essence, failure or even success of any project is about the competencies of team leaders and even top management contribution. Many effective leaders demonstrate high levels of self and social awareness, self-management, and are able to manage a diverse range of relationships in group set up.

2.3.2. Training and Project Sustainability

Training is a systematic modification of behavior through learning which occurs as result of education and instruction. It encompasses three main activities: training, education and development with most organizations encompassing these three separate although interrelated activities (Kiboi, 2013). It is also defined as an activity that focuses upon and evaluates against the job that an individual currently holds, whilst education focuses on the job that an individual may potentially hold in the future and is evaluated against those jobs (Michael, 2016).

Training is an important element in entrepreneurship and enterprise development (Financial Times, 2003) with studies on unemployment in Kenya establishing that the entrepreneurial culture is an important ingredient in youth employment. It promotes individual and community development which solves issues such as community partaking in a project which leads to the concept of local solution to local problem and draws economically important and statistically significant changes in the probability that individuals open new business and expand on existing one (Kiboi, 2013). Stakeholder trainings are categorized into several classes with entrepreneurship and leadership trainings giving room for leaders to understand how strategy is formalized and responded to, in order to acquire one's self positively to growth and performance (Financial Times, 2003). The Hayton’s report for BIS gives a definition of skills relating to entrepreneurship as a way of knowing the necessities, market prospects and even methodological form of how to achieve the opportunities identified.

Studies by various scholars have revealed that the youth cannot fully gain from the youth enterprise development fund (YEDF) if they lack essential entrepreneurial skills for doing such business (Michael, 2016). An entrepreneurial inclination by the youths who benefitted from the youth fund program in Nairobi was found to be low with 48% youth surveyed having less than 50% likelihood of trade success hence impacting on repayment rate. Study findings by (Kiboi, 2013) identified training of Project teams have had an influence on the sustainability of tree programmes in primary schools in Kinangop Constituency Nyandarua county, Kenya which concurs with a study by (Bukhala, 2013) which looked at training and its influence on programme sustainability of organizations for persons with disability in Kenya and a research made on Training and development influence on project sustainability of youth group projects funded by youth enterprise development fund in Bomet county, Kenya (Michael, 2016).

An entrepreneur's individual capabilities such as training, motivation, prior experience in business and entrepreneurial skills have been identified as having significant effect in the progression of business ventures hence scaled up efforts, means identification and strategies development for improving youth access to entrepreneurship established. The youth need more awareness and expertise to conjoin and assist in setting priorities that can deal with the project sustainability. Hence an encouragement by the Kenyan Government to develop a training capacity in entrepreneurship that could lead to the establishment of an enterprise value in the country.

2.3.3. Youth Participation and Project Sustainability

Participation describes to active involvement in civic and developmental organizations, local government and political parties by people, with the purpose of influencing decisions that affect their lives (IEA, 2012). Youth participation is characterized by young people having a certain level of responsibility, empowerment, decision-making powers and existence of youth-adults partnerships which entails integration of realistic perspective and youth skills with the wisdom and experience of adults offering each party the opportunity to make suggestions and take decisions recognizing the values and contribution of both the youth and adults (Dunn, 2002:6).
The significance of understanding youth participation comes from two corresponding angles: youth as strategic actors in the development process and youth as targeted consumers for a range of public services intended to enhance social inclusion and vulnerability (NYES, 2015 - 2017). It assumes that the youth everywhere have hopes and want to fully take part in the lives of their communities to seek to be incorporated in the existing society or serve as a force to transform it (Lemer et al, 2006).

Chapter 25 of Agenda 21 of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil calls for involvement of youth in all decisions affecting their lives today and in the future whilst having the capability to mobilize popular support and bring unique perspectives that have potential to enrich each action. In 2002, the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) held in Johannesburg approved the World Programme of Action on Youth (WPAY) which recommended among others training programs as well as protection, improvement and preservation of the environment.

Youth have often been perceived as leaders of tomorrow or the future and as such continue to face exclusion from social, economic and political leadership (Nyaguthii & Oyugi, 2013). In Kenya, the government has made increased citizen participation a priority with several policies directly addressing citizen sensitization, education and involvement as part of the many development programmes (GOK, 2010). From a study on youth participation in household enterprise (HHEs), the analysis showed that HHEs significantly contribute to employment with the youth significantly involved in running them. The peak of HHEs is just before 30 years in urban and after 35 years in rural areas. In 2004/5 1.7 million HHEs owned at least one HHE, 25% of all families had HHE which provided 5 million jobs (IFAD, 2002).

The Kenya National Youth Policy 2006 recognizes environmental challenges affecting the youth and underscores youth involvement in environmental protection and conservation, such as awareness creation, tree planting initiative, environmental cleanup campaigns and advocacy for biodiversity conservation. These deliberate efforts consist of youth identification of solutions to environmental problems.

Community participation levels and their outcome may manifest differently at different stages of project cycle management depending on capacity (Darlington, 2011; WHO, 2010; IFAD, 2012) in a study on factors that influence project sustainability: A case of saint franciscans sister Programme in Otieno Sub-county in Nairobi county, community participation was observed as a sustainability measure indicated by positive correlations between the number of respondent indicating having clear knowledge on their roles and responsibility in resource mobilization and personal contribution of resources to community development projects (Baariu, 2015).

Effective participation and involvement of the youth is necessary for realization of vision 2030 aspirations. Experience has shown that too many decisions regarding projects have been taken without adequate consultation with stakeholders and beneficiaries and without the necessary information hence unsustainability of projects (Nyaguthii & Oyugi, 2013; Menokabal, 2013) Therefore, the governments in partnership with key stakeholders like the children, adolescents and community have an obligation to provide a conducive environment where youth participation can be employed, ideals of community service and voluntarism upheld and national values entrenched among the youth (Hart, 1997; DFID, 1997; Khan S, 1998; IIED, 2010).

2.3.4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Project Sustainability.

Project monitoring refers to the continuous and periodic oversight of projects to ensure the set targets are achieved against project input deliveries (Were V. L., 2014). This makes it possible for the management to spot potential challenges and achievements of a project providing the basis for taking corrective actions, both operational and substantive to ensure that the project design is improved and implemented well by adhering to quality standards (Karanja, 2014; Emmanuel Z., 2015).

On the hand, evaluation is the methodical assessment of a project that is completed or ongoing including design, results and implementation with the aim to assess the fulfillment and relevance of project objectives effectiveness, development and sustainability (Joshua, 2013). Evaluation may be midterm (Interim), terminal or ex-post (Cabrera, 2008). It attempts to determine the significance of an intervention, strategy or policy and for it to be objective, it needs to achieve a balanced analysis, recognize bias and reconcile perspectives of different stakeholders through the use of different sources and methods (Cartland et al., 2008; Rist et al., 2001) Monitoring and evaluation planning is an essential component of the M&E System involving a practical plan for the project to monitor and evaluate the log frame’s objectives and indicators (Francis et al., 2014). The plan assists in managing the process of assessing and reporting progress towards achieving project outputs and outcomes, and to identify what evaluation questions will be addressed through evaluation (Charles and Humam,2015; Joshua, 2013). Monitoring and Evaluation also plays a crucial part in the project management cycle including planning and design of projects with focus on effectiveness, efficiency and project impact (Biwott et al., 2017; Wachamba, 2013).

As an essential element in project performance, it has remained deserted by many Non-Governmental Organizations programmes with the management staff offering minimal support (Emmanuel Z., 2015; Lahey, 2015). Program and project managers do not take it seriously, lowly regarded during inception taking it as unnecessary expense that should be done away with hence projects may not yield the required results by underperforming (Kirsch, 2013, Nalianya & Luketero, 2017). A concern still remains on the effectiveness of projects by donors and development agencies to NGOs who have not responded quite well to the demand by the public who have continuously advocated for accountability on how the assistance is utilized, the results obtained and how effective the results are in achieving the required effect to the community (Adhiambo, 2012; Karani, Bichanga, & Kamau, 2014).
Because ‘Youth’ is not a homogeneous group, monitoring and evaluation systems should disaggregate and analyze all program data and information by sex, age and relevant socio-economic factors (Sammy & Daniel, 2015). This is essential for tracking the goal of Youth unemployment with any meaningful accuracy and when carried out correctly and at the right time and place are two of the most important aspects of ensuring the success of many projects as it can enhance the chances of success of youth funded projects enabling youth to enjoy economic transformation.

2.3.5. Project Sustainability

Project Sustainability is a concept on how projects can continuously exist for a given intended period with the future generation benefitting in the same way as the current generations with the aim of providing measurable indicators which can enable decision making and guide towards generation of solution to meet the practical challenges (CEC, 2001). Project Sustainability is dissected into various sustainability dimensions which include: continuous flow of benefits, institutional stability, active community participation, equitable distribution and sharing of projects benefits, continued operation and maintenance of project structures and the environment (Dillard & King, 2008).

In the study on New approaches to the sustainable development in agriculture (Haag, 2007), Building and sustaining community based youth development collaboratives (Enfield & Owens, 2009) Considering sustainability factors in the development project life cycle (Ostrom, 2010), the role of community participation in the development initiative a case of the Danga ecological sanitation project in Zvishavane district in Zimbabwe (Darlington S., 2011), Community related variables influencing sustainability of water projects (Shikuku. M, 2012), Factors affecting sustainability of community based projects in mutomo district, kitui county (Charles, 2013) Factors influencing sustainability of NGO funded community projects in Kenya (Kariuki, 2010) and The dilemma in sustainability of community based projects in Kenya (Peter at al., 2015) factors found to affect sustainability of the project included: interference of politics along beneficiary selection, timing issues, credit inadequacy, orientations in youth schemes, lack of well-developed management systems, unclear vision and mission statements and also challenges in the registration process with the government departments.

It can be argued that project sustainability can be boosted through resources mobilization strategy and community systems strengthening framework by empowering the benefitting community through positive involvement of the project beneficiaries and community opinion leaders in project identification, design, project reliance on locally available resources and the exit strategies. (ILO, 2012; IFAD, 2012; Menoka et al., 2013; WHO, 2010) Through the use of young people, governments can be able to enhance the livelihoods of the entire population (DFID, 2010).

2.4. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework is an illustration of factors influencing sustainability of donor funded youth agricultural business project in Kakamega county presented in a diagrammatic form conceptualized regarding the independent and dependent variable with indicators captured as indicated in the diagram below.

![Conceptual Framework](image)

2.5. Empirical Reviews of Literature

The empirical literature on evaluating the factors that influence sustainability of donor funded youth agricultural business projects is limited across the globe. The literature critically analyzes the extent to which different organizations are using the variables as applied by the study in promoting project sustainability. The review of this literature aimed at seeing its applicability to the topic under study and find out the uniqueness of the present study considering the available reviewed literatures.

Nalianya & Luketero, (2015) researched on Monitoring and Evaluation systems and performance of Non-Governmental based maternity health projects in Bungoma South Sub-County, Kenya. It adopted the mixed approach methods in addition to correlational and descriptive survey design with the target population including the M&E officers, project managers, field officers, interns and volunteers. Aspects such as Plans, Human Resource Capacity, Information system and stakeholder participation were shown to influence performance of maternity health projects. On conclusion it was determined that stakeholder involvement slows down performance therefore should be carefully managed to enrich data quality, improve project delivery and ensure project management process is applied to achieve better results.
Baariu, (2015) studied the factors that influence project sustainability: A case of Saint Franciscan Sister's Programme in Otiende Sub-County in Nairobi County had a sample of 90 Respondents. Three Theories formed the basis for the study: Asset based development model, System theory and Sustainability theory. The study confined itself on project management indicators predicted by selected project management capacity, development structures and community participation. Three theories formed the basis of this research which were; Asset based development model, system theory and sustainability theory. The study finding was that community participation to some extent influence on community development sustainability.

2.6. Critique of Existing Literature
Preceding studies have focused more on Non - governmental organizations and community projects than sustainability in youth group projects of youth agri-business projects. With various studies acknowledging the importance of participation and representation in project management, limited data exist to analytically assess the levels of engagement of the youth in project sustainability. This shows that little has been done in terms of evaluating the quality of participation. In addition, Reviews of literature have proven with doubt that various practices of M&E such as planning tools have significant effect on project performance. However, there was no conclusive evidence on how other factor such as data use, research and surveillance of M&E affects youth group performances. Except for a few studies, who assessed monitoring and evaluation in communities, government and companies, none have attempted to directly link monitoring and evaluation on youth group performances.

2.7. Summary of Reviewed Literature
In this chapter we have discussed relevant theoretical literature, empirical and the conceptual framework. Theory of change brings out the need for motivation by the youth in planning, participation and evaluation that can help define their long term goals. Positive youth development approach has been used to effectively highlight the aptitudes, capacities and rising prosperous behaviors of youth in development. Sustainability Theory effectively highlights the road picture view of global thinking and local actions of communities while critically thinking about fine-tuning the small intricacies of this relationship that ultimately shapes these communities. Four independent variables: leadership capabilities, training, youth participation and monitoring and evaluation have been addressed and it is evident that youth participation on project management is a force to reckon. Empirical literature clearly indicates youth participation plays a vital part in project management and subsequently sustainability of a project. The conceptual model shows the linkage between leadership capabilities, training, youth participation and monitoring and evaluation on project sustainability.

2.8. Research Gaps
Many literatures focused on community capacity and community development projects sustainability have indicated attention on extent and how to improve community participation. Review of literature revealed that there is limited work done towards understanding role played by NGOs in developing donations dependency in target communities. It can be noted that usually, entry of NGOs into a community eventually creates some level of dependency on donor help. Recent debate about effectiveness of M&E in relation to factors such as data use, planning, research and surveillance means that there is a high probability that these factors affect the process and the system. Recent studies in Kenya have concentrated on particular projects or particular areas making generalization of the results almost impossible which creates a research gap that this study seeks to fill.
3.4. Sampling Size and Sampling Technique

Purposive sampling was used as it is dependent on common sense and accurate judgment of the researcher concerning the participants answering the questions in the research instrument. From a target population of 233, 30% was sampled giving a sample size of 70 being considered enough for the study as recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (2013).

| Agribusiness Projects | Population |
|-----------------------|------------|
| Poultry farming       | 60         |
| Pig farming           | 36         |
| Dairy farming         | 33         |
| Tree farming          | 41         |
| Crop production       | 63         |
| **Total**             | **233**    |

*Table 1: Target Population
Source: Field Data (2019)*

3.5. Data Collection Instruments

The data was drawn from both primary and secondary data with respondents being assured of confidentiality in dealing with their responses as provided by code of ethics in research procedures. The Secondary data was obtained from past studies to shed more light on the issue under current study. The Primary data was collected with the aid of structured questionnaires with open and closed ended questions capturing both dependent and independent variables which provided a guide on how to answer questions to avoid ambiguity and for easier data analysis. The Drop and pick later method was also employed in carrying out the study where the respondents remained with the questionnaires so as to fill at a time convenient to them. Sufficient time was given with the researcher collecting the questionnaires thereafter.

3.6. Pilot Study

The researcher carried out pilot testing to help develop and test the adequacy of research instruments as well as assess the feasibility of the study. A small representation of the sample was used in the pilot testing. This was ten to twenty (10-20) respondents from agribusiness youth groups in Kakamega. Pilot testing is important for correcting unanticipated errors in the final questionnaire before being administered to the respondents.

3.6.1. Validity of Research Instruments

Validity essentially implies that data analyzed represents the exact phenomenon under research (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2013). To test the validity of the instruments, the researcher used the Content Validity Index (CVI). The research objectives of the study were met when the research tool was given to an expert (the supervisor) to give his expert opinion. The number of items ticked relevant by the supervisor in each instrument was summed up and divided by the total number of items in each instrument. The researcher then computed the Content Validity Index using the formula below:

\[ CVI = \frac{\text{Number of items regarded relevant in the questionnaire}}{\text{Total Number of items in the questionnaire}} \]

This should be > 0.5

The researcher considered proceeding to collect data using the same instruments if the CVI is 0.7 and above. If the CVI is below 0.796 the instrument was to be revised accordingly before proceeding to collect data.

3.6.2. Reliability of Research Instruments

Reliability is essentially the degree to which designed research instruments measures in the same manner each and every time under the same condition with the same subjects. A measure is deemed to be reliable if it provides consistent results with each repetition. Same research respondents using the same instrument should generate the same results under identical conditions (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2013). To ensure reliability of the instruments, the internal consistency method using Cronbach’s alpha co-efficient (α) was used (excluding background information).

\[ \alpha = \frac{k}{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma^2}{\sigma^2} \right) \]

\[ \alpha = \text{Reliability, Alpha Co-efficient (Cronbach)} \]

K = Number of items in the instrument
A Cronbach coefficient was used because the instrument used multiple rating scale questions which were 5-point Likert scale. Many scholars recommend a minimum cut off of 0.7 as appropriate for data analysis and this study adopted the same cut off in assessing the questionnaire items. The pretesting stage involved only 5 respondents who then did not participate in the main study. The Cronbach’s alpha co-efficient was computed section by section as per the research variables using the Statistical Package for Social Science research (SPSS) programme to collect data.

3.7 Data Processing and Analysis

Data analysis is the processing of data to obtain answers to research questions (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2013). This study collected both qualitative and quantitative data. Which were then edited and coded in readiness for analysis. Qualitative data analysis methods specifically content analysis was used to analyze responses from interviewees whereas, quantitative data that involve the use of numeric measures was analyzed by use of descriptive and inferential statistics. The SPSS software was utilized to perform correlation and regression analysis on the collected data as it is possible to relate the dependent variable with multiple variables.

The following regression analysis model on the research study topic was adopted and analyzed using the SPSS software:

\[
y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \beta_4 x_4 + \varepsilon
\]

Where,
- \( y \) = sustainability of Youth agribusiness projects
- \( \alpha \) = constant.
- \( \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4 \) = the slope which represents the degree in which sustainability changes as the independent variable change by one unit variable.
- \( x_1 \) = Leadership capabilities
- \( x_2 \) = Training
- \( x_3 \) = Youth participation
- \( x_4 \) = Monitoring & Evaluation

4. Research Findings and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research findings on factors that influence sustainability of donor funded youth agribusiness projects in Kakamega County, Kenya. It precisely looked at leadership capabilities, training, youth participation and monitoring and evaluation. The chapter is categorized into, response rate, respondents’ demographic information, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The data from the study was analyzed and the results interpreted based on the overall objectives of the study.

4.2 Response Rate

The researcher targeted 5 projects under the agri-business category: poultry farming, pig farming, dairy farming, tree farming and crop production. For a more comprehensive analysis a total of 70 questionnaires were administered with 58 questionnaires satisfactorily filled and returned. This was 83% response rate which was excellent. This conforms to Mugenda and Mugenda (2013) stipulation that a response rate of 50% is adequate, 60% is good and 70% and over is excellent for analysis and reporting. To achieve a good response rate included establishing a rapport with targeted respondents and meeting them at their point of choice to ensure adherence to safety measures. With the researcher working with this groups for the past five years gave the advantage since it was easier dealing with respondents from the diverse backgrounds due to experienced life skills.

| Agri-Business Projects | Questionnaires Distributed | Questionnaires Filled And Returned | Percentage |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Poultry farming         | 18                          | 15                                | 83.33       |
| Pig farming             | 11                          | 8                                 | 72.72       |
| Dairy farming           | 10                          | 8                                 | 80          |
| Tree farming            | 12                          | 10                                | 83.33       |
| Crop production         | 19                          | 17                                | 89.47       |
| Total                   | 70                          | 58                                | 82.86       |

Table 3: Response Rate
Source: Field Data, (2019)

4.3 Respondents’ Demographic Profiles

The general information that the study sought from the respondents include; position held in the group, years as a member of a group, gender, highest level of education, number of years in operation and how the group benefits from donor aid program.
4.3.1. Position Held in the Group

The study sought to find out the position held by respondents in the group where it was established that majority (24.14%) were treasurers, 22.41% members, 20.69% vice chairperson, 17.24% secretaries and 15.52% were holding the position of chairperson.

![Figure 2: Position Held in the Group](source: Field Data, (2019))

4.3.2. Years as a Member of the Group

The findings established the durations of group membership as follows, 43% were members of their groups for a period of 1-2 years, 36% for a period of 2-3 years, 17% for 3-4 years while only 4% had been members of the groups for over 5 years.

![Figure 3: Years as a Member of the Group](source: Field Data, (2019))

4.3.3. Gender of the Respondents

The findings of the study which is a representative of both genders in Figure 4 below indicated that out of the total responses received from the respondents, 58.62% were male while 41.38% female. This indicates that male are more recognized and willing to engage themselves than female in in youth development initiatives. This explains the fact that socio-cultural factors plays a key role in females’ reluctance to participate in such activities.

![Figure 4: Gender](source: Field Data, (2019))

4.3.4. Level of Education of the Respondents

Education whether formal, non-formal or informal is a key aspect that drive development of a community. Respondents who had reached had primary level registered the highest frequency at 36%, followed by those in secondary level 35%, tertiary and technical level at 21% while only 9% had university level of education. These statistics demonstrate that regardless of education levels, there is willingness by all to engage in development initiatives that
improves their quality of life. Nevertheless, information from interviews with key informants revealed that most of the youth in Kakamega County are school dropouts hardly completing primary and secondary education with major key factors leading to incompleteness of education being poverty, early marriages and pregnancies among the females, lack of exposure to different environment, among others. This invited transitions to adulthood which almost marked the end of road for majority.

### 4.3.5. Number of Years the Group has been Operational

The findings in Figure 6 indicate that for a period of 2-3 years 51.72% of the groups had been operational. 24.14% of the groups had been operational for 1-2 years, 15.52% had been operational for 3-4 years and only 8.62% had been operational for over 5 years.

### 4.3.6. How the Groups Benefit from Donor Aid Program

The study sought to find out how the groups benefited from donor aid programs. It was established that 32.76% benefited through agribusiness development while 20.69% benefited through trainings. It was also established that 15.52% had benefited through employment opportunities and partnerships and networks. Further findings indicated that 8.62% had benefited through business opportunities while 6.89% had benefited through market for products.

### 4.4. Descriptive Analysis of Study Variables

This study was based on Descriptive statistics and Normality tests. Descriptive statistics is a summation of responses based on independent variables (leadership capabilities, training, youth participation and monitoring and evaluation) on the dependent variable (project sustainability). It therefore shows the outcomes of responses to each of the statements on the study variables using Likert scale of values ranging from 5 to 1 where; 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3= Neutral, 2=Disagree and 1= Strongly Disagree. The findings are summarized as agree and disagree leaving out the neutral
responses to enable the researcher to meaningfully describe a distribution of scores using statistics to provide simple summaries about the sample and the measures. In this study frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were used to summarize the study variables. Normality tests was carried out using the mean and standard deviation.

4.4.1. Leadership Capabilities

This section analyzes the responses received about leadership capabilities in project sustainability. It evaluated objective one which was to analyze how leadership capabilities relates with project sustainability in Kakamega County, Kenya. Leadership capabilities in this case involved enhancing the capacity of the group and members within to better achieve their purpose through sharing ideas and accessing decision making avenues and platforms in order to meaningfully participate in the development agendas for project sustainability (Bolden.R, 2010). The research therefore strived to understand the level of youth representation in group leadership, youth recognition in decision making and frequency of attendance in meetings.

Descriptive analysis using frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation as summarized revealed that a majority of the respondents 77.59% agreed and 22.41% disagreed that leadership capabilities affect projects sustainability.

| Leadership capabilities                                                                 | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------|
| Our group has good management and effective leadership                                 | 3.59 | 1.01           |
| Group members are frequently trained on leadership and management skills                | 3.65 | 1.01           |
| Group leaders inspire and motivate members for achievement of objectives                | 3.64 | 1.04           |
| Leaders are able to effectively handle challenges in the group.                        | 3.78 | 1.11           |
| Leaders allow members input in decision making                                        | 3.71 | 1.12           |
| Our group has mechanisms for problem solving in your group                             | 3.69 | 1.06           |
| Our group ensures timely reports and feedback                                            | 3.71 | 1.11           |
| Our group stress on efficiency in business operations                                  | 3.75 | 1.01           |
| Group leaders are democratically elected by members                                     | 3.72 | 1.06           |

Table 4: Descriptive Analysis; Leadership Capabilities and Project Sustainability
Source: Field Data, (2019)

Good leadership skills are necessary requirement for a good leader which propels an organization to superior performance hence ensuring sustainability of projects (Michael et al., 1998). Youth group leadership, have typical competencies commonly associated with them. These competencies are necessary for the groups to achieve its objectives and survive. These competencies include; leader’s capability to relay information regarding organization mission and vision, inspires team, motivating employees, and identifying business opportunities and leading transformation agenda. The findings concur with (Karanja, 2014) who indicated that Good leaders possess special skills and capacity that can provide lasting positive change.

4.4.2. Training

This section analyzes the responses received about training in project sustainability. It evaluated objective two which examine how training relates with project sustainability in Kakamega County, Kenya. Training in this case involved learning whether formal or informal directed towards acquisition of specific knowledge and skills (Kiboi, 2013; Michael, 2016) and designed to meet the goals of the organization while simultaneously meeting the goals of individuals (Bukhala, 2013). The research therefore strived to understand the economic importance and statistical significance in probability that the groups and individuals grow on projects through donor funds.
Descriptive analysis using frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation as summarized revealed that a majority of the respondents 91.38% agreed and 8.62% disagreed that training affects sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects.

| Statement                                                                 | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------|
| Formal training on funds management, budgeting and accounting by donor funding is done. | 3.57 | 0.49           |
| We have been adequately trained on project management skills.             | 2.09 | 0.94           |
| Project stakeholders are satisfied with management skills.               | 3.47 | 1.14           |
| Through training, we have acquired planning, communication and technical skills. | 3.50 | 1.11           |
| Training has ensured project resources are managed properly.             | 3.66 | 1.21           |
| Skills acquired through training has ensured efficiency in projects management. | 3.59 | 1.14           |
| Training programs as offered to youth groups help ensure project sustainability. | 3.59 | 1.16           |
| There is enough Funds meant for training and related activities.         | 3.66 | 1.15           |
| Group members are involved in preparing the training material.           | 3.64 | 1.21           |
| Members involved in training program preparation collaborate with other service providers. | 3.57 | 1.10           |

Training of project teams have been identified to have an influence on the sustainability of projects and groups. This is in agreement with study findings by (Michael,2016) which also concurs with the research made on Training and development influence on project sustainability in the organization by (Bukhala,2013) and a study of tree programs in the Constituency by (Kiboi, 2013).

4.4.3. Youth Participation

This section analyzes the responses received about youth participation in project sustainability. It evaluated objective three which was to establish how youth participation relates with project sustainability in Kakamega County, Kenya. Youth participation in this case entailed involvement of the youth in responsible, challenging actions that meet genuine needs, with opportunities for planning and decision making affecting others in an activity whose impact is extended to others beyond the youth participants themselves (IIED, 2010). The research therefore strived to understand the Donor and member involvement, project ownership and collaboration and the roles and responsibilities played by each member.
Descriptive analysis using frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation as summarized revealed that a majority of the respondents 89.66% agreed and 10.34% disagreed that youth participation affects sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects.

| Statement                                                                 | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------|
| Group members get involved and participate in the formation, planning,    | 3.72 | 1.09           |
| organizing and development programs of the group.                         |      |                |
| Youth participation promotes project ownership and collaboration          | 3.84 | 1.11           |
| The group members have clear roles and responsibilities                  | 3.83 | 1.13           |
| Donors /Partners are currently involved in the project                   | 3.78 | 1.19           |
| The group members are involved in the outreach programs                   | 3.79 | 1.07           |
| We have undertaken training of leadership skills                          | 3.69 | 1.11           |
| Members have been trained on financial management                        | 3.59 | 1.03           |
| Members have been trained on the use of ICT                              | 3.79 | 1.06           |
| The group undertakes creation of awareness of the individual rights       | 3.88 | 1.14           |

Youth involvement encourages resilience by enabling the youths to participate in activities that generate income and contribute to society, community and family prosperity (NYES, 2015-2017). It plays an important role in inspiring the youths involved to develop confidence, acquire useful resources, increase their skills level, develop positive attitude and improve their relationships with their adult colleagues.

4.4.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

This section analyzes the responses received about Monitoring and Evaluation in project sustainability. It evaluated objective four which was to examine how Monitoring and Evaluation relates with project sustainability of youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County, Kenya. Monitoring and Evaluation in this case involved a focus on efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the project on the project beneficiaries enabling them to enjoy economic transformation (Francis et al., 2014; Sammy and Daniel, 2015). The research therefore strived to understand the process of assessing and reporting progress towards achieving project outputs and outcomes, and to identify what evaluation questions would be addressed through evaluation.
Descriptive analysis using frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation as summarized revealed that a majority of the respondents 77.59% agreed and 22.41% disagreed that Monitoring and Evaluation affects sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects.

| Statement on Monitoring and Evaluation                              | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------------|
| There is continuous review of group activities progress             | 3.54 | 1.39           |
| There is monitoring and evaluation of project activities            | 3.71 | 1.04           |
| Members meet frequently to evaluate whether objectives are being met| 3.67 | 1.10           |
| Lessons learnt in projects are properly documented and improvements made | 3.71 | 1.08           |
| Deviations in project activities are well corrected                 | 3.40 | 1.20           |
| Monitoring and evaluation enables problem identification and solution generation in the project by stakeholders. | 3.38 | 1.25           |
| After project completion beneficiaries and stakeholders continue conducting monitoring and evaluation. | 3.64 | 1.05           |
| There is constant feedback on projects progress from monitoring and evaluation | 3.62 | 1.06           |

**Table 7: Descriptive Analysis; Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Sustainability**

Monitoring and evaluation makes it possible for management to spot problems and assess the success in a project. It also grants the foundation for taking corrective actions, both operational and substantive. This findings concurs with (Lahey, 2015) who indicated that by adhering to quality standards project design is improved and well implemented.

### 4.4.5. Sustainability

The study sought to find out the extent of sustainability addressed in their project plan. From the respondents the findings indicate that financial sustainability had been addressed by a mean of 3.74 and a standard deviation of 1.21. Further findings indicated that Socio-cultural sustainability, Technological sustainability and Environmental sustainability was being addressed to a great extent as shown by a mean of 3.79, 3.83 and 3.76 respectively. Table 8 shows the summary of the findings.

| Statement                              | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------------------------------------|------|----------------|
| Financial sustainability               | 3.74 | 1.21           |
| Socio-cultural sustainability          | 3.79 | 1.23           |
| Technological sustainability           | 3.83 | 1.10           |
| Environmental sustainability           | 3.76 | 1.11           |

**Table 8: Sustainability of Donor Funded Youth Agri-Business Projects**

*Source: Field Data, (2019)*

The findings is supported by Kariuki (2014) who indicated that project sustainability is dissected into various sustainability dimensions which include institutional stability, continuous flow of benefits, equitable distribution and sharing of projects benefits, active community participation, continued operation and maintenance of project structures and environment.

### 4.5. Inferential Analysis of Study Variables

Inferential analysis for this study was based on linear and multiple regressions taking into consideration assumptions of multiple regression analysis. Linear regression was used to compute the relation of independent variables (Leadership, training, youth participation and monitoring and evaluation) on the dependent variable (project sustainability). Linearity was tested to check the actual strength of all relationships in order to identify any partings bound to affect correlation. Researchers posit that correlation coefficient (r) value that ranges from 0.10 to 0.29 is considered weak, 0.30 to 0.49 is considered medium and from 0.5 to 1.0 is considered strong (Babbie E, 2011).

Multicollinearity is a statistical phenomenon in which two or more independent variables in a multiple regression model are highly correlated meaning that one can be linearly predicted from the others with a non-trivial degree of accuracy. Multicollinearity was checked by computing correlations between all pairs of predictors. If correlation coefficient, r is close to 1 or -1, then there is multicollinearity but if r is not above 0.8, then there is no multicollinearity (Hair et al, 2010).

Hypotheses formed on the basis of the research objectives were tested using simple regression analysis for direct relationship in hypotheses H1, H2, H3 and H4. The choice of analytical tools was guided by study objectives, measurement scales and the data type with findings being presented along corresponding hypotheses and study objectives. The hypotheses were tested at 95% confidence level (α=0.05) and Interpretation of results and subsequent discussions also considered Correlation (R), Coefficient of determination (R²), F-Statistic values (F) and Beta value (β)

- p-Value (p) – Represents the decision points to reject or fail to reject a hypothesis, where (p < 0.05), the study failed to reject the hypotheses and where the (p > 0.05) the study rejected the hypotheses.
4.5.1. Relation between Leadership Capabilities and Project Sustainability

The hypothesis as tested through the simple linear regression analysis was that:

- **H₁**: There is a relationship between leadership capabilities and sustainability of donor funded youth agribusiness projects in Kakamega County.

| Model Summary |
|----------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|---|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .671  | .451     | .441              | .5817                     |

| ANOVA² |
|--------|
| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|---|------|
| 1     | Regression     | 1  | 15.888      | 45.928 | .000  |
|       | Residual       | 56 | .346        |    |      |
| Total | 35.261         | 57 |             |    |      |

| Coefficients³ |
|----------------|
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|
|       | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta |      |
|       | (Constant)                  | .524                      | .399 | 1.311 | .195 |
|       | Leadership Capabilities     | .780                      | .115 | .671  | 6.777 | .000 |

Table 9: Inferential analysis; Leadership Capabilities and Project Sustainability

Source: Field Data, (2019)

The study found a relatively moderate relationship between leadership and sustainability of donor funded youth agribusiness projects (R= .671). The Coefficient of determination (R²) indicates that leadership capabilities explains (.451 = 45.1%) variation in sustainability and although moderate, the relationship is significant at (F=45.93, p<0.05). This relationship is further manifested by the t-value in the coefficient table (β = .780, t= 6.777, p<0.05) which depicts that leadership capabilities is key and thus the hypothesis that there is significant influence of leadership on sustainability of donor funded youth agribusiness projects was supported.

4.5.2. Relation between Training and Project Sustainability

The hypothesis as tested through the simple linear regression analysis was that:

- **H₂**: There is an association between training and sustainability of donor funded youth agribusiness projects in Kakamega County.

| Model Summary |
|----------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|---|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .437  | .191     | .176              | .71387                     |

| ANOVA² |
|--------|
| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|---|------|
| 1     | Regression     | 1  | 6.723       | 13.192 | .001  |
|       | Residual       | 56 | .510        |    |      |
| Total | 35.261         | 57 |             |    |      |

| Coefficients³ |
|----------------|
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|
|       | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta |      |
|       | (Constant)                  | 1.843                     | .380 | 4.856 | .000 |
|       | Training                    | .420                      | .116 | .437  | 3.632 | .001 |

Table 10: Inferential analysis; Training and Project Sustainability

Source: Field Data, (2019)

The results in the model summary show that R=.437 suggesting that there exists a moderate relationship between the constructs of training and sustainability and the Coefficient of determination R²=.191 which implies that the constructs
influence donor funded youth agribusiness projects by 19.1%. This is significant since p-value < 0.05 at 95% confidence level with the overall model significant at (F=13.192, p<0.05) and a coefficient of (β=.420, t=3.632, p<0.05). This implies therefore that training significantly influence donor funded youth agribusiness projects and thus the hypothesis is supported.

4.5.3. Relation between Youth Participation and Project Sustainability

The hypothesis as tested through the simple linear regression analysis was that:

- H₃: There is relationship between youth participation and sustainability of donor funded youth agribusiness projects in Kakamega County.

| Model | R   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-----|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .586 | .343     | .331              | .64322                    |

ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F        | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|----------|------|
| 1     | Regression     | 1  | 12.092      | 29.228   | .000 |
|       | Residual       | 56 | .414        |          |      |
| Total |                | 57 |             |          |      |

Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t    | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|
| 1     | (Constant)                  |                           |      |      |
|       | .108                        | .586                      | 2.514| .015 |
| Participation | .583 | .366 | 5.406 | .000 |

Table 11: Inferential Analysis; Youth Participation and Project Sustainability
Source: Field Data, (2019)

The results in the model summary show that R=.586 suggesting that there exists a moderate relationship between the constructs of youth participation and sustainability and the Coefficient of determination R²=.343 which implies that the constructs influence donor funded youth agribusiness projects by 34.3%. This is significant since p-value < 0.05 at 95% confidence level with the overall model significant at (F=29.228, p<0.05) and a coefficient of (β=0.583, t=5.406, p<0.05) which shows the youth participation levels. This supports the hypothesis that youth participation significantly influence sustainability of donor funded youth agribusiness projects and thus the hypothesis is supported.

4.5.4. Relation between Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Sustainability

The hypothesis as tested through the simple linear regression analysis was that:

- H₄: There is relationship between monitoring and evaluation and sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamega County.

| Model | R   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-----|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .366 | .134     | .188              | .73855                    |

ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F        | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|----------|------|
| 1     | Regression     | 1  | 4.716       | 8.645    | .005 |
|       | Residual       | 56 | .545        |          |      |
| Total |                | 57 |             |          |      |

Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t    | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|
| 1     | (Constant)                  |                           |      |      |
|       | .631                        | .366                      | 2.136| .037 |
| Participation | .533 | .366 | 2.940 | .005 |

Table 12: Inferential analysis; Monitoring and Evaluation and Project Sustainability
Source: Field Data, (2019)

The results in the model summary show that R=.366 suggesting that there exists a moderate relationship between the constructs of monitoring and evaluation and sustainability and the Coefficient of determination R²=.134.
implies that the constructs influence donor funded youth agribusiness projects by 13.4%. This is significant since p-value < 0.05 at 95% confidence level with the overall model significant at (F=8.47, p<0.05) and a coefficient of (β=0.53, t=2.94, p>0.05). This implies therefore that monitoring and evaluation significantly influence donor funded youth agribusiness projects and thus the hypothesis is supported.

5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Introduction

This chapter includes summary of key findings, conclusions and provides recommendations for further study using the findings and results of data analysis of the variables and techniques mentioned. Mixed approach method was used for data collection and statistical analysis with reference to the study objectives.

5.2. Summary of Key Findings

The study sought to evaluate the factors that influence sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects in Kakamenga County, Kenya. The study specifically looked at leadership capabilities, training, youth participation and monitoring and evaluation in Kakamenga County.

5.2.1. Relationship of Leadership Capabilities on Project Sustainability

From the findings, majority of the respondents agreed that leadership affect sustainability. And when presented with statements to rate on the effects, it was agreed that the groups have good management and effective leadership and the members are frequently trained on leadership and management skills. Further findings indicated that the group leaders inspire and motivate members for achievement of objectives, allowing members input in decision making. The respondents also agreed that their groups have mechanisms for problem solving, provide timely reports and feedback and stress on efficiency in business operations with group leaders being democratically elected by members.

5.2.2. Relationship of Training on Project Sustainability

Training and capacity building is a requirement by the community for them to participate in their development agenda (Baariu, 2015 & Adhiambo, 2012). From the findings, it was established that training as offered to the youth groups helps ensure project sustainability. The respondents agreed that formal training on funds management, budgeting and accounting by donor funding was done, the group members had acquired planning, communication and technical skills which has ensured project resources are managed properly. The respondents also expressed their dissatisfaction in the lack of support to some extent by the government as a majority of respondents viewed government structure support as poor. This is indicative as evidenced by a low mean on the project personnel’s management skills and the adequacy of training on project management skills. In this case, capacity building and empowerment may be critical (IEA, 2012; Adhiambo, 2012).

5.2.3. Relationship of Youth Participation on Project Sustainability

Fundamental to community participation is getting involved not only in doing project work but also taking responsibility in resource mobilization for common good which involve collaboration, partnership and networking. From studies on Kibera and Langata it was revealed that low level of awareness on community development agenda could be a reason for youth not participating in their development projects hence the reason as to why other youth groups had not achieved a given level of sustainability (Adhiambo, 2012; IEA, 2012). Participation of beneficiaries who are a subset of community members is one of the fundamental factors for a sustainable project. Communities that participate in their development agenda are more likely to ensure project sustainability as opposed to that which is passive (ILO, 2012). Following the research findings it was established that members of the youth group got involved and participated in the formation, planning and organization of the development programs. The members also had clear roles and responsibilities in development of projects and the group undertook outreach programs with creation of awareness of individual rights.

5.2.4. Sustainability of Donor Funded Youth Agri-Business Projects

Project sustainability is a dependent variable in this study and it is predicted by independent variables; Leadership, Training, Participation and Monitoring and Evaluation. The main finding on sustainability is that majority indicated that they had some kind of training by either government or other development agencies. They indicated that they had benefited from the projects for 1-2 years and participated in their sustainability planning. They also indicated that they had participated in contributing to some resources for the project, viewed their group leadership as capable in sustaining their projects having knowledge in resource management and playing a direct role and responsibilities in their group projects.

Based on the findings, the study found out the extent of sustainability as addressed in the groups project plans. The respondents indicated that financial sustainability, socio-cultural sustainability, technological sustainability and environmental sustainability were being addressed to a great extent. However, majority indicated that they had not replicated any project by their own and rated their community project management team as fair.
5.3. Conclusions

The data analysis for selected indicators on leadership, Training Participation and Monitoring and Evaluation of donor funded youth agri-business projects reveals relationships hence the following conclusion: Leadership has influence on sustainability of donor funded youth agribusiness projects indicated by positive correlations between number of respondents indicating having direct responsibility on projects and rating on their leadership against number of respondents indicating having contributed their resources on youth development projects. Training influences the groups' project sustainability through development of structure factors which include endurance of groups, training to youth on agri-business development, experience and knowledge in youth development plan. Participation is considered as the community's capability to spot their needs and challenges and participate in finding solutions. It can also be defined as people’s empowerment to utilize their own capacities, be active participants in managing their resources and making decisions about their lives. The participation of the youth in their projects played a key role in their sustainability indicated by positive correlations between the number of respondent indicating having clear knowledge on their roles and responsibility and personal contribution of resources to group development projects. On Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), the youth leadership was seen as not taking it seriously, as it was considered an unnecessary expense that should be done away with. It was lowly regarded during inception of the project because all focus was on project induction.

5.4. Recommendations

Recommendations that would enhance sustainability of donor funded youth projects include: Responsiveness of group leadership to challenges affecting the youth groups so as to reduce the number of complaints in the projects which leads to greater accountability and transparency hence improving service delivery. A reach out program to female youth and adolescents to form or join youth groups so that they can be able to participate in productive community activities. Adequate training of leaders and members to enhance competency in management, decision making and conflict resolution for sustainability of the projects. And also an adequate Monitoring and Evaluation plan for continuous monitoring of project activities to enhance continuity.

5.5. Recommendation For future Research

The researcher acknowledges that in this preliminary study, the results of the enquiry may have been influenced by the unique challenges facing donor funded youth groups in Kakamenga County and for that reason, the results presented may have limited generalizations hence a similar study can be conducted in other organizations and regions for comparison and confirmation of validity. Further investigation may also be conducted to inferentially establish or determine the influence of the feedback mechanism on the sustainability of youth agri-business projects.
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Letter of Transmittal
Cynthia Ayoti Masinde,
P.O Box 7 - 50306,
Kakamega.
Phone: 0707668697
Email: cynthiamasinde@gmail.com

The County Director Youth Development,
Kakamega County,
P.O Box 71-20400,
Kakamega.
10th January, 2019

Dear Sir /Madam,

Re: Request for Research Data Collection
I am a student at Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, pursing Master of Science course in Project Planning and Management. As part of the course assessment I am required to undertake a research project which focuses on 'Factors influencing the sustainability of donor funded youth projects in Kakamega County.'

I am seeking your authority for data collection using a designed questionnaire. The information obtained is for academic purpose and the findings from the study shall be made available upon request. Your assistance and cooperation is highly appreciated.

Thank you in advance.
Yours sincerely,
Cynthia Ayoti Masinde.

Letter to the Respondents
Cynthia Ayoti Masinde,
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT),
College of Human Resource and Entrepreneurship Development
Kakamega Town Campus.
Phone: 0707668697
Email: cynthiamasinde@gmail.com

Dear Respondent,

My name is Cynthia Ayoti Masinde, a student at Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT), Kakamega town Campus, pursing a Master of Science degree in Project Planning and Management. I am undertaking a research on the 'Factors influencing the sustainability of Donor Funded youth projects in Kakamega County, Kenya. You have been identified as one of the respondents in this research. Kindly provide information by honestly completing this questionnaire. Whatever information you give will be treated with absolute confidentiality. Your co-operation is highly appreciated.

Thank you in advance.
Yours sincerely,
Cynthia Ayoti Masinde.

Respondents' Questionnaire (Youth Groups Members)

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is meant to find information on factors influencing sustainability of donor funded youth projects in Kakamega County Kenya. The information will be used for academic purposes only. Your responses will be totally anonymous and accorded the highest degree of confidentiality. I therefore request you to openly respond to the following questions.

SECTION A: General Information
1. Member's Name (Optional): ............................................................
2. What is your Group name? ............................................................
3. What position do you hold in the group? 
Chairperson [ ]  Vice chairperson [ ]  Secretary [ ]  Treasurer [ ]  Member [ ]
4. How many years have you been a member of your group? 
   a) 1-2 years [ ]  b) 2-3 years [ ]  c) 3-4 years [ ]  d) Over 5 years [ ]
5. What is your gender? 
   a) Male [ ]  b) Female [ ]
6. What is your age bracket? 
   a) 18 – 25 [ ]  b) 26 – 30 [ ]  c) 31 – 35 [ ]  d) Over 35 years [ ]
7. What is your highest level of education? 
   a) Primary [ ]  b) Secondary [ ]  c) Tertiary/Technical [ ]  d) University [ ]
8. Number of years the group has been operational? 
   a) 1-2 years [ ]  b) 2-3 years [ ]  c) 3-4 years [ ]  d) Over 5 years [ ]
9. What type of enterprises is your group involved in? 
   a) Farming [ ]  b) Manufacturing [ ]  c) Commercial retail [ ]  d) ICT [ ]
   c) Others (specify) ……………………………………………………………
10. As a group, how did you benefit from donor aid Program? 
   a) Employment opportunities [ ]  b) Business Opportunities [ ]  c) Trainings [ ]
   d) Agri-business development [ ]  e) Market for products [ ]  f) Sacco [ ]
   g) Partnership and networks [ ]
   b) Others (specify) …………………………………………………………………..

SECTION A: Leadership Capabilities and Sustainability of Donor Funded Youth Agri-Business Projects

11. In your own opinion, do you think leadership capabilities affects sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects? 
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

12. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning the influence of leadership capabilities on sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects. 

| Statements                                                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Our group has good management and effective leadership                     |   |   |   |   |   |
| Group members are frequently trained on leadership and management skills   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Group leaders inspire and motivate members for achievement of objectives  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Leaders are able to effectively handle challenges in the group.            |   |   |   |   |   |
| Leaders allow members input in decision making                            |   |   |   |   |   |
| Our group has mechanisms for problem solving in your group                |   |   |   |   |   |
| Our group ensures timely reports and feedback                              |   |   |   |   |   |
| Our group stress on efficiency in business operations                     |   |   |   |   |   |
| Group leaders are democratically elected by members                        |   |   |   |   |   |

SECTION B: Training and Sustainability of Donor Funded Youth Agri-Business Projects

13. In your own opinion, do you think training affects sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects? 
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

14. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning the influence of training on sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects. 

| Statements                                                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Formal training on funds management, budgeting and accounting by donor    |   |   |   |   |   |
| funding is done                                                            |   |   |   |   |   |
| We have been adequately trained on project management skills to enhance    |   |   |   |   |   |
| sustainability of the projects                                             |   |   |   |   |   |
| Project stakeholders are satisfied with management skills of the project   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Personnel                                                                  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Through training, we have acquired planning, communication and technical   |   |   |   |   |   |
| skills                                                                    |   |   |   |   |   |
| Training has ensured project resources are managed properly to enhance     |   |   |   |   |   |
| sustainability of the projects                                             |   |   |   |   |   |
| Skills acquired through training has ensured efficiency in the management |   |   |   |   |   |
| of the projects                                                            |   |   |   |   |   |
| Training and capacity building programs as offered to the youth groups     |   |   |   |   |   |
| helps ensure project sustainability                                         |   |   |   |   |   |
| Funds meant for training and related activities are enough                  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Group members are involved in the preparation of training material         |   |   |   |   |   |
| Members involved in preparing training program collaborate with other service providers |   |   |   |   |   |
SECTION C: Youth Participation and Sustainability of Donor Funded Youth Agri-Business Projects

15. In your own opinion, do you think youth participation affects sustainability of donor funded youth projects? 
Yes [ ]   No [ ]

16. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning the influence of youth participation on sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects.

1- Strongly Disagree (SD), 2-Disagree (D), 3-Not Sure (NS), 4-Agree (A), 5- Strongly Agree (SA)

| Statements                                                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group members get involved and participate in the formation, planning,     |   |   |   |   |   |
| organizing and development programs of the group.                         |   |   |   |   |   |
| Youth participation promotes project ownership and collaboration to boost  |   |   |   |   |   |
| sustainability                                                            |   |   |   |   |   |
| The group members have clear roles and responsibilities in development of |   |   |   |   |   |
| projects                                                                  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Donors /Partners are currently involved in the project                    |   |   |   |   |   |
| The group members are involved in the outreach programs                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| We have undertaken training of leadership skills                          |   |   |   |   |   |
| Members have been trained on financial management                         |   |   |   |   |   |
| Members have been trained on the use of ICT                               |   |   |   |   |   |
| The group undertakes creation of awareness of the individual rights of the |   |   |   |   |   |
| youth                                                                     |   |   |   |   |   |

SECTION D: Monitoring and Evaluation and Sustainability of Donor Funded Youth Agri-Business Projects

17. In your own opinion, do you think monitoring and evaluation affects sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects? 
Yes [ ]   No [ ]

18. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements concerning the influence of monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of donor funded youth agri-business projects.

1- Strongly Disagree (SD), 2-Disagree (D), 3-Not Sure (NS), 4-Agree (A), 5- Strongly Agree (SA)

| Statements                                                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| There is continuous review of progress of group activities                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| There is monitoring and evaluation of project activities                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Members meet frequently to evaluate whether objectives are being met      |   |   |   |   |   |
| Lessons learnt in projects are properly documented and improvements made  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Deviations in project activities are well corrected                       |   |   |   |   |   |
| Monitoring and evaluation enables the project and stakeholders to identify |   |   |   |   |   |
| problems and generate solutions                                            |   |   |   |   |   |
| Beneficiaries and stakeholders continue conducting monitoring and evaluation|   |   |   |   |   |
| after project completion                                                   |   |   |   |   |   |
| There is constant feedback and information from monitoring and evaluation  |   |   |   |   |   |
| on progress of projects                                                   |   |   |   |   |   |

SECTION E: Sustainability Donor Funded Youth Agri-Business Projects

19. To what extent are the below listed areas of sustainability addressed in your project plan according to the scale given (Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = least extent, 3 = little extent, 4 = Great extent, 5 = very great extent).

| Statement                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Financial sustainability      |   |   |   |   |   |
| Socio-cultural sustainability |   |   |   |   |   |
| Technological sustainability  |   |   |   |   |   |
| Environmental sustainability  |   |   |   |   |   |

20. Indicate the amount of money received from donors to finance this project. Ksh ..................

21. How many projects have been financed by donors and completed? ..................

22. How many projects have been financed by donors and not completed? ...................