

# Community Participation and Sustainability of Youth Livelihood Projects in Uganda: A Case of Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Project (NUYEP)

<sup>1</sup>Tumuhairwe Phionah., <sup>2</sup>Mubiru Pontious., <sup>\*3</sup>Dr. James Kizza

<sup>1</sup>University of Kisubi, Uganda

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business Administration and Management, University of Kisubi

<sup>3</sup>Lecturer, faculty of Business and ICT, University of Kisubi, Uganda

\*Corresponding Author

DOI : <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.807083>

Received: 13 June 2024; Revised: 25 June 2024; Accepted: 29 June 2024; Published: 05 August 2024

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** This study examined the effect of community participation on sustainability of youth livelihood projects in Uganda, using a case of Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Project (NUYEP). The specific objectives of the study were to determine the effect of community participation in planning, implementation and monitoring on sustainability of NUYEP.

**Methodology:** The study adopted a cross-sectional design with both qualitative and quantitative research approaches. Data was collected from a sample of 152 project beneficiaries and 10 local leaders using a self-administered questionnaire and interview guide. The data was analyzed using Spearman's rank correlation and regression analysis with the help of SPSS v25.

**Findings:** The study found a significant positive relationship between community participation in planning ( $r_s = 0.406^{**}$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ); participation in implementation ( $r_s = 0.655^{**}$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ); and participation in monitoring ( $r_s = 0.365^{**}$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) and project sustainability. Collectively, the predictor variables explain 52.1% of the variation in project sustainability.

**Conclusion:** It is concluded that community participation improves the sustainability of Youth Livelihood projects.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that future projects do prioritize community participation in project definition, implementation and monitoring. This should be a key aspect of project programming.

**Contribution:** This study contributes to the understanding of how community participation is aiding the sustainability of the NUYEP project. In addition, most studies do explore the aspect of project performance with very few handling the aspect of project sustainability especially involving the youth programmes.

**Key Words:** Community Participation, Planning, Implementation, Monitoring, Sustainability.

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of stakeholder participation in project sustainability dates back to the 1960's when researchers at the Stanford Research Institute first brought the idea, though; it gained prominence in the mid-1980s as a strategy

for promoting citizenry interests (Scoones, 2007). Since then, it has come to be seen as a crucial element that could increase the likelihood that development programs will be sustained through the development of community capacity and empowerment (Brett, 2003). Today, stakeholder participation is an essential component of project sustainability. The stakeholders of a project are varied among which include the community. By involving the community in the development and implementation of the project, the relevance and prospects of project sustainability increase. Sustainability are deemed incomplete without a stakeholder engagement strategy (Bal et al., 2013). Community engagement is a fundamental aspect of rural development programs where many of the youths live and sustain their livelihoods (Chifamba, 2013). By community participation, is meant the deliberate efforts of involving the project beneficiaries in the project development cycle. The community participation provides the project with the needed credibility as the community provide social support for the project. Community participation improves the prospects of project sustainability through the involvement of the beneficiaries in actively contributing to solving their own problems.

When local groups participate in the planning and execution of projects, there is a greater assurance of sustainability than when the initiative is top bottom (Ayuso et al., 2012). Participation creates ownership and a sense of identity for the initiated projects, which improves their chances of success and sustainability. The community ought to be involved in the project's conceptualization, planning, implementation, all through to the cleanup phase (Mwobobia, 2013), as a means to ensure project acceptance and sustainability. Community participation is defined in this study as a process in which beneficiaries take active participation in the design and execution of the project with a view of improving their well – being through increased incomes, individual growth, self-reliance and any other aspect they consider important to them (Gaventa, 2011). Project sustainability is defined as the capacity of a development project or program to continue to provide the necessary level of benefits when the donor stops providing significant financial, managerial, and technical assistance (Cracknell, 2010). A project is deemed sustainable when the beneficiary community is capable of continuing to reap benefits and find solutions to problems on their own without the aid of outside development partners (Luvenga et al., 2015). Sustainability encompasses the maintenance of the benefits received from the project into the future.

Some studies have linked stakeholder participation and project performance, but not sustainability (Atwijukire, 2015; Sloman, 2011). Masika (2020) who studied the relationship between stakeholder participation and project sustainability had a methodological gap since his study was only quantitative. This study sets to study the effect of community participation on project sustainability using Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Project (NUYEP) as a case study. NUYEP was implemented in the War – affected areas of Northern Uganda. The NUYEP objectives included: creating and expanding 6,000 sustainable youth and family-owned enterprises in Northern Uganda; empowering and equipping youth with practical business skills; changing the mindsets and attitudes of youth towards income generating activities; and improving the livelihoods of over 10,500 youth (aged 18 - 35) and their households in Northern Uganda (NUYEP External Evaluation Report, 2016).

The current study was guided by the following objectives: (1) to investigate the effect of community participation in planning on project sustainability; (2) to assess the effect of community participation in implementation on project sustainability; and (3) to establish the effect of community participation in monitoring on project sustainability. There is no known study to the best of our knowledge that has handled the aspect of project sustainability of NUYEP. The current study aims to contribute towards the filling of this gap.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Community Participation in Planning and Project Sustainability

Participation in development projects increases the program successes and long-term sustainability (Widianingsih & Morrel, 2017). Stakeholder participation in projects builds their capacities to manage the projects when donor funding stops or is halted. Community participation in projects empowers the community to take charge of their problems, which as well reduces the potential threat of dependency syndrome associated with topdown projects. Through participation, the community gains a clear understanding of the project objectives, expected deliverables, and help contribute towards their attainment. During this process, the

community capacities in form of competencies and skills to run the project after donor funding is halted are gained which help to support the sustainability of projects.

According to Turyasingura et al., (2021), participation of project beneficiaries in planning provides them with a broad perspective of what the project intends to achieve. This suggests that the community as part of the project stakeholders should actively participate in the project development cycle. The planning, implementation, execution, and evaluation processes for a project should be guided by the project management objectives (Wani et al., 2022). Stakeholder participation was found to be positively associated with the sustainability of community health programmes (Masika, 2020). In the same line, Atwijukire (2015) found a significant positive association between stakeholder involvement in planning, monitoring and feedback with performance of public institutions. This underscores the key role played by stakeholder participation in project sustainability that the current study explores in relation with the NUYEP project.

According to Turyasingura and Agaba (2022), sharing goals with project beneficiaries at the planning phase might enhance a project team's attention to tasks. Involving stakeholders in the process of developing project goals is essential for every type of project since it improves operational procedures. Project success and sustainability may be adversely impacted when project end users are not involved in defining project results. This is because the lack of stakeholder participation increases project ambiguity. The lack of clarity at project definition often leads to project failure. Experienced community builders understand how crucial it is to involve stakeholders, the people who are directly involved with and impacted by their projects in their work (Fifield, 2020). It provides them with the knowledge they require to plan their activities and to modify them as necessary to best meet the requirements of the neighborhood and of the specific people that an intervention or program is intended to assist. This is especially true when it comes to defining project results in a participatory manner.

Participatory planning allows for an interactive process as stakeholders share their thoughts and feelings regarding a desired situation. Participation in planning helps in clarity of defining the project objectives, the desired state and how to attain the desired state (Chikati, 2009). Details like the budget, how resources will be mobilized, work plan and evaluation and phase out plans are discussed (Mulwa, 2018). Effective development is realized when the community, being the major project beneficiary, is involved in planning, procurement and resource allocation. Stakeholder participation in project implementation is often executed through project committees (Mulwa, 2018). The active participation of stakeholders in planning is credited with implementable plans contrary to the use of experts in planning in total disregard of the project beneficiaries. The experts more often than not produce technically sound projects that may not be implementable by the communities (Rahman, 2015).

Sloman (2011) opines that involving the community in participation when designing their own development interventions aids in executing a community development initiative. Participation of a community in project development leads to building capacity that equips the community for efficiency and effectiveness on the journey to identify, implement, monitor and evaluate the projects for development (Davids et al., 2009). The people in any given locality should be allowed to determine for themselves, on their own initiative, what are the things that they feel they need most. This is based on what is already known that the community understands better what they want, how they want it and when they want it. The people to be affected by the project should be involved in the process of project identification (formulation) and all the phases of project life cycle. Projects initiated out of wide consultations have a higher likelihood of success (Cornwall, 2008). Maina (2013) found that stakeholder involvement in the project discovery and selection, project planning, project implementation, and project monitoring and assessment was favorably connected with the effectiveness of the Economic Stimulus Programs.

## **2.2 Community Participation in Implementation and Project Sustainability**

Community participation ensures that stakeholders are actively involved in the execution of project activities. This enables planned project activities to be carried out in an effective and efficient way while ensuring that measurements against project plans, specifications, and the original feasibility concept continue to be collected, analyzed and acted on throughout the project lifecycle. When stakeholders are involved in project planning, they can influence the design of projects, programs to more effectively appeal to what the community needs most.

The community active participation in project activities' execution and monitoring make the project more relevant and meaningful to the beneficiaries (Save the Children, 2010). The more the stakeholders know about a project, the more they create a greater sense of ownership and engagement in its implementation.

The need to build the capacities of the beneficiaries should be an integral aspect of project programming Gikonyo (2010). This view is supported by Bierele (2002) who acknowledges the lack of competences among the population. However, some researchers have challenged the idea of community involvement arguing that it can alter the current power structure and cause unforeseen disputes as opposed to the consensus that was hoped for (Sultana & Abeyasekera, 2007). This may include a scenario that reinforces the interests of the privileged and suppression of the minority viewpoints. The participatory approach to project implementation is also prone to the lengthy periods required to generate consensus, which may delay project implementation (Vedwan et al., 2008).

The World Bank (2011) report on strengthening capacity for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in Uganda acknowledges that stakeholder's involvement in project implementation is vital for the success of development programs in the country. Opportunities and partnerships in development can be explored in community development projects when stakeholders are empowered. The effective stakeholder participation should allow parties with stake to freely express their views, opinions, thoughts, ideas on the most sustainable project decisions (Ratnayake et al., 2017).

Participatory approaches have differing contribution to project sustainability. For instance, stakeholders' diversity in terms of personality, demographic and functional diversity has differing effects on project responsiveness and sustainability (Stokes et al., 2019). The neglect of stakeholder interests may limit project sustainability (Hugue, 2020). It is therefore imperative that the interests of the stakeholders in a given project is known and integrated during project programming. Project ownership is perceived significantly contribute to project sustainability (Kalu & Rugami, 2021). Uzochukwu et al. (2020) claim that actors' capacities like experiences, skills, resources and expertise are critical determinants of project sustainability. Thus, investing in stakeholders' capacities eases implementation challenges leading to better chances of project sustainability. Socio-cultural dynamics of stakeholders are also important predictors of project sustainability (Ali et al., 2020). In this study, we argue that stakeholder participation in project implementation improves the chances of project sustainability.

### **2.3 Community Participation in Monitoring and Project Sustainability**

Monitoring refers to activities intended to track the project to ensure what is planned moves as scheduled. Eversole (2010) stresses the role of participation in effective monitoring. Project monitoring is intended to provide feedback about how well the project is progressing. Constructive feedback about the project is best obtained by involving the community in the project monitoring activities. This involves seeking their opinion and feedback about the project (Murray, 2011). According to Tomaselli (2006), monitoring helps to find out whether project objectives have been met, whether outcomes are satisfactory relative to the target and resources well expended. Project monitoring provides information on how best to keep the project on track as well as correct identified deficiencies.

Stakeholder involvement in monitoring and supervision has significant influence on the outcomes of the program/project. The impacts of stakeholder involvement are equally reflected on the performance of projects (Coulter, 2010). One way to help satisfy stakeholder concerns and promote transparency is to involve program-affected stakeholders in monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures or other environmental and social programs (David, 2003). Participatory monitoring tends to strengthen relationships between the project and its stakeholders (Flanagan & Norman, 2003).

Singh (2018) argues that community involvement in project management is a key tool in developing self-governing and authorized communities, inspiring community members to monitor, take action and make decisions as a group. Training of stakeholders encourages the sustainability of projects and empowers them to take charge of the projects when the donors exit (Saragi et al., 2020). The project becomes more efficient, effective, and relevant to the recipients as a result of including stakeholders in mutual inspection and monitoring.



The longevity of donor-funded initiatives depends on developing local people's capacity.

## METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a cross-sectional research design, with a mixed research approach employing both qualitative and quantitative research approaches. This was done for purposes of triangulation and improving the validity of our research findings. Data was collected from a sample of 152 NUYEP beneficiaries using self-administered questionnaire and 10 local leaders using guided interviews. The self-administered questionnaire followed a five-type Likert scale ranging from 5 for strongly agree to 1 for strongly disagree. The questionnaire had two sections: section A for demographic information that included questions on gender, age, education level and main occupation; and section B with items on each of the variables under observation. Project beneficiaries were selected using simple random sampling and local leaders were selected using purposive sampling. Before data collection, the tools were checked for content validity and reliability. The reliability of the study instrument was obtained using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient which yielded a value of 0.838 that was above the minimum acceptable cut off of 0.7 (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Data was analysed descriptively using frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation while inferential statistics were obtained using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient and linear regression analysis, with the help of SPSS v25. The theoretical model that guided this study is given by: Project sustainability ( $Y$ ) =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 \dots \dots + \varepsilon$  where,  $\beta_0$  is the intercept,  $X_1$  is community participation in planning,  $X_2$  is participation in implementation,  $X_3$  is participation in monitoring,  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$  are coefficient of the predictor variables, and  $\varepsilon$  is the error term. Multi collinearity, was tested using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) which yielded values than 10. Vatcheva et al., (2016) suggest that a VIF less than 10 shows absence of multi collinearity exists in the data set.

## RESULTS

### 4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Out of the 152 respondents that participated in the study, 61.8% were males and 38.2% were females. 46.1% of the respondents were between the ages of 20 – 29, followed by 40.1% that were between 20- 39, 10.5% were below the age of 20 and only 3.3% were between the ages of 40 – 49. Majority of the respondents 40.1% had secondary education, 30.3% had primary education, 10.5% had tertiary, 3.3% had university degree and that 15.8% of the respondents had no education. Farming was main occupation for the majority of the respondents 38.8%, followed closely by 33.6% engaged in trade, 16.4% engaged in tailoring, 6.6% in carpentry and 4.6% who responded as being in salaried employment. This occupation of the respondents is expected with having few in salaried employment given the high levels of youth unemployment experienced in the country.

The overall means for community participation in planning was 3.873 and standard deviation of 0.752. The overall mean for community participation in implementation had an overall mean of 4.185 and standard deviation of 0.669 while community participation monitoring had an overall mean score of 4.283 and standard deviation of 0.666. The construct for project sustainability posted an overall mean score of 3.927 and standard deviation of 0.775. The overall means of all the study constructs were high with low standard deviations, revealing that respondents agreed with the various items under each construct.

The findings indicated that the community participation in planning was manifest in identifying the need for project before implementation ( $M=4.41, SD=0.624$ ) and participated in the identification and selection of project activities ( $M=4.05, SD=0.549$ ). The essential aspects of these components is supported by findings of earlier researchers like Atwijukire (2015) that relate positive performance in public institutions to stakeholder participation in planning. The need to involve the community in project selection is echoed in the findings of Maina (2013) and Sloman (2011). Similarly, there was community participation in decision making before implementation ( $M=4.13, SD=0.479$ ) where the community was involved through baseline surveys ( $M=4.54, SD=0.585$ ) and the findings shared with the community ( $M=3.99, SD=0.719$ ). The baseline surveys formed a basis for the NUYEP project activities ( $M=3.22, SD=1.146$ ).

The project deliverables were shared with the community ( $M=3.82, SD=0.758$ ). The decision concerning community involvement in the choice of project location posted a neutral response but with wide variation in

the responses ( $M=2.82$ ,  $SD=1.153$ ). The limit to the community participation in project activities was expressed in the qualitative results from one of the respondents thus

*“Community participation in NUYEP was only limited to consultation and agreeing with decisions already taken. As local leaders we would just be told to do this and that, not knowing where the decision came from.”*

Another key informant supported this view

*“Some community leaders were given the opportunity to participate in decision making, however, their participation was of less importance as their views were never considered. The communities were not able to make decisions or if they did, it was not taken seriously.”*

On the aspect of community participation in project implementation, the findings revealed the involvement of the community during the decision making process ( $M=4.64$ ,  $SD=0.480$ ) and community mobilization activities ( $M=4.55$ ,  $SD=0.512$ ). Gikonyo (2010) who argues that nobody understands the community problems as the local population supports this. The good practices of soliciting views from the beneficiaries before project implementation were confirmed ( $M=4.27$ ,  $SD=0.586$ ). There was agreement that project beneficiaries were selected by community members ( $M=3.67$ ,  $SD=0.867$ ) and the community participated in the development of work plans. The limitation in this aspect may be the level of project complexity that may be beyond the competencies available in the community (Bierele, 2002).

Where training was an aspect of the project implementation, the community was involved in the identification of the training needs ( $M=4.03$ ,  $SD=0.927$ ), the trainings were participatory ( $M=4.27$ ,  $SD=0.586$ ) where some of the trainers were sourced from the community ( $M=4.19$ ,  $SD=0.844$ ). One of the respondents verified this

*“During training sessions, some of the trainers were successful business people in the area who were selected from the community members because they were familiar with the business dynamics of the areas.”*

Regarding the aspect of community participation in monitoring, the findings revealed the involvement of the community in project monitoring ( $M=4.36$ ,  $SD=0.480$ ). The community was involved in project supervision ( $M=4.22$ ,  $SD=0.837$ ) through field visits ( $M=4.39$ ,  $SD=0.641$ ) and the consequent sharing of ideas on project implementation ( $M=4.66$ ,  $SD=0.514$ ). This not only helped in the efficient utilization of project resources ( $M=4.30$ ,  $SD=0.669$ ) but also guided the prioritization of the project activities in relation to the community needs ( $M=4.34$ ,  $SD=0.672$ ). There was agreement that getting feedback from the community was a key aspect of the NUYEP project ( $M=4.01$ ,  $SD=0.540$ ) that helped to monitor the continued relevance of the project to the community ( $M=3.98$ ,  $SD=0.973$ ). These findings are supported by Tomaselli (2006) who attributes monitoring to aiding the tracking of the project progress, identification of variations and timely correction of the deficiencies. The role of the community participation in monitoring is best represented in the words of one respondent thus

*“Local people used to give feedback which project teams would use during implementation. Where technocrats would want to divert project resources, they would fear community members because they knew they would be caught.”*

The findings on project sustainability indicators revealed the continuation of establishing income-generating activities among the project beneficiaries ( $M=4.66$ ,  $SD=0.514$ ) including the young women ( $M=4.36$ ,  $SD=0.480$ ). The youth continue to maintain income generating activities ( $M=4.01$ ,  $SD=0.540$ ) and an increase in the growth of income generating has increased since the end of the NUYEP project ( $M=3.49$ ,  $SD=1.197$ ). The respondents reported the continued growth of their businesses despite the wide variations in opinion ( $M=3.84$ ,  $SD=1.004$ ). Through these income generating activities employment opportunities have been generated ( $M=4.19$ ,  $SD=0.844$ ). The ability of the businesses to create more employment opportunities may be attributed to the good practices of record keeping ( $M=4.03$ ,  $SD=0.927$ ), saving culture ( $M=4.55$ ,  $SD=0.512$ ) enabled by the increasing cash flows ( $M=4.27$ ,  $SD=0.586$ ). The availability of the market ( $M=4.64$ ,  $SD=0.480$ ) has ensured the improvements in incomes, part of which has been saved in the village savings groups ( $M=3.83$ ,  $SD=1.008$ ) and reinvested ( $M=4.29$ ,  $SD=0.594$ ). The main challenge remaining in the process of community participation in project monitoring is in the area of environmental protection ( $M=2.34$ ,  $SD=1.185$ ). This pauses

a challenge to the triple bottom line approach to project sustainability.

### 4.2 Inferential Statistics

Normality of the data was tested using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests, which gave significance values less than 0.05, indicating that the data significantly deviates from a normal distribution. This informed the use of Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient test to test the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The results are presented in table 1

Table 1 Correlation matrix

	Planning	Implementation	Monitoring	Project sustainability
Participation in planning	1			
Participation in implementation	.209**	1		
Participation in monitoring	.357**	.281**	1	
Project sustainability	.406**	.655**	.365**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 1 reveals the existence of a significant positive relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The relationship between community participation in planning and project sustainability is moderate ( $r_s = 0.406^{**}$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ); the relationship between community participation in implementation and project sustainability is strong ( $r_s = 0.655^{**}$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) while the relationship between community participation in monitoring and project sustainability is fair ( $r_s = 0.365^{**}$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). The positive and significant relationship between community participation in planning and project sustainability confirm the findings of earlier researchers (Masika, 2020; Atwijukire, 2015; Maina, 2013). The limitation to community participation is cited in the delayed decision making process Vedwan et al. (2008) that needs to be managed. The findings revealed that the participation of the community in project implementation increases the chances of project sustainability. The reasons for this is provided by researchers such as Gikonyo (2010) who credits the local community with a clear understanding of the community problems. The prospects of project sustainability will thus be enhanced by clear project definition between the project beneficiaries and the project promoters. By allowing the community to play an active role in project monitoring enables the building of community capacities and identification with the project, which increases the chances of project sustainability (Tomaselli, 2006)

In order to determine the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable, we performed a multiple regression test. The results are presented in table 4.2.

Table 2 Multiple regression analysis

Model	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.	R2	Adj.R2	F
	Coefficients		Coefficients					
	B	Std. Error	Beta					
(Constant)	0.789	0.28		2.82	0.005	0.53	0.521	55.68
Participation in planning	0.178	0.051	0.214	3.473	0.001			

Participation in implementation	0.504	0.052	0.583	9.762	0			
Participation in monitoring	0.12	0.058	0.129	2.056	0.041			

Table 2 shows that 52.1% of the variation in project sustainability could be explained by the predictor variables. The major contributor to project sustainability among the variables studied is the community participation in project implementation (50.4%).

## CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

This study investigated the effect of community participation on project sustainability of Youth Livelihood projects in Uganda with reference to the NUYEP project. The overall conclusion is that community participation improves the sustainability of Youth Livelihood projects. The involvement of the community during the planning phase is positively correlated to youth livelihoods project sustainability and improves project sustainability. It is recommended that all planned projects for a given project actively involve the intended beneficiaries for the clear identification of the required project, the expected deliverables and the role expected of the various players to ensure project success and sustainability.

The community participation in project implementation improves the sustainability of youth livelihoods in Uganda. When the beneficiaries actively participate in the implementation of the project, a feeling of ownership of the project activities is created (Gikonyo, 2010). It is recommended that during project implementation, the engagement of local leaders is prioritized given the key role they play in supporting community projects.

The community participation in youth project monitoring is vital to ensure projects keep on track. By involving the community in youths project monitoring, the likelihood of project sustainability improves by 12%. The feedback from the community improves project relevance (Tomaselli, 2006). It is recommended that communities are actively involved during the monitoring phase to improve project relevance and strengthen the potential of the youth livelihoods project sustainability.

### Suggestions for Future Research

This study investigated the effects of community participation on project sustainability using Northern Uganda Youth Entrepreneurship Project (NUYEP) as a case study. We recommend future research to explore other projects, other than NUYEP. Further studies involving moderating variables such as the education level of the beneficiaries could be undertaken. This study was more inclined to the quantitative approach with its associated limitations, we suggest a study that is more qualitative in nature especially with the project beneficiaries to capture the success stories that can help in the improvement of future projects.

## REFERENCES

1. Ali, T. S., Karmaliani, R., Khuwaja, H. M. A., Shah, N. Z., Wadani, Z. H., Aijaz, S., & Kulane, A (2020). Community stakeholders' views on reducing violence against women in Pakistan. *BMC Womens Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-020-00961-3>.
2. Atwijukire, D. (2015). Stakeholder Involvement and Performance of Public Institutions in Uganda: The Case of National Medical Stores. Uganda Management Institute.
3. Ayuso, S., Rodriguez, M.A., Castro, R.G., & Arino, M.A. (2012). Does stakeholder engagement promote sustainable innovation orientation? *Ind. Manag. Data. Syst.*, 111, 1399–1417.
4. Bal, M., Bryde, D., Fearon, D. & Ochieng E. (2013). Stakeholder Engagement: Achieving Sustainability in the Construction Sector. *Sustainability* 2013, 6, 695-710.
5. Bierele, T. C (2002). The quality of stakeholder-based decisions. *Risk Analysis*: 22 739–49 Brundtland Report (1987), Our Common Future, The World Commission on Environment and Development, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
6. Brett, E.A. (2003) Participation and accountability in development management. *The Journal of*



- Development Studies, 40(2), 1-29
7. Chifamba, E. (2013) Confronting the Challenges and Barriers to Community Participation in Rural Development Initiatives in Duhera District, ward 12 Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review*, 1(2): pp 01-19.
  8. Chikati, J. (2009). *Participatory Project Identification and Planning, A Regional Partnership for Resource Development* publication, Signal Press Ltd, IFDM Gardens off Ngong Road Nairobi
  9. Cornwall, A. (2010). Beneficiary, consumer, citizen: perspectives on participation for poverty reduction. *Sidastudies*, 2, 1–98.
  10. Cracknell, E.B. (2010). *Evaluating Development Aid. Issues, Problems and Solutions. M-32 Market, Greater Kailash, Part 1 New Delhi*
  11. David, L. (2003). *Organizational Culture and Institutional Sustainability: Department of Social*
  12. Davids, I. T. (2009). *Participatory development in South Africa: A Development Management Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
  13. Eversole, R. (2010). *Remaking participation: challenges for community development practice. Community Development Journal* 44 (2), Oxford University Press.
  14. Fifield, S. (2020). *The urban politics of greenspace: exploring community empowerment for greenspace aspirations, justice and resiliences. A participatory action research project in Glasgow (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow)*.
  15. Flanagan, G. & Norman, U. (2003). *Assessment and Control of project Risks*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
  16. Gaventá, J., & Barrett, G. (2010). So what difference does it make? Mapping the outcomes of citizen engagement. IDS Working Paper 347. Retrieved from <<http://www.ids.ac.uk/files/dmfile/Wp347.pdf>>.
  17. Gikonyo, W. (2010). *The CDF social audit guide: A handbook for communities*. Open 84 Society Initiative for East Africa, Nairobi.
  18. Hugue, A. S. (2020). *Infrastructure, Political Conflict, and Stakeholder Interests: The Case of a Public–Private Partnership in Bangladesh. Case Report*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087724X19895281>.
  19. Kalu, C., & Rugami, J. (2021). *Stakeholder Involvement and Infrastructure Projects implementation at Kenya Ports Authority*. *International Journal of Business Management, Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 3(1), 78-90. <https://doi.org/10.35942/jbmed.v3i1.166>.
  20. Luvega, C., Kirui, K., Oino, P., and Towett, G. (2015). *The dilemma in sustainability of Community based projects in Kenya*. *Global Journal of advanced research* Vol-2, Issue-4 PP. 757-768
  21. Maina, B. M. (2013) *Influence of stakeholders' participation on the success of the economic Stimulus programme: A case of education projects in Nakuru County, Kenya*. Unpublished project. University of Nairobi.
  22. Masika, N. (2020). *Stakeholder Participation and Project Sustainability: A Case Study of Integrated Community Based Initiative's Community Health Plan for All Jinja, Uganda*. Kampala International University
  23. Mulwa, F. (2018). *Participatory MONITORING AND EVALUATION of Community projects*, Paulines Publications Africa, Nairobi, Kenya p. 13
  24. Murray, K. M. (2011). *Regulating activism: an institutional ethnography of public participation*. *Community Development Journal* 46 (2), Oxford University Press.
  25. Mwobobia, N. (2013). *Influence of Local Community Involvement in Project Planning*. University of Nairobi, Unpublished Thesis.
  26. NUYEP External Evaluation Report (2016). *External Evaluation of YDP and NUYEP Programmes: Montrose*. Available at: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/607549/Evaluation-of-Youth-Development-and-Northern-Uganda-Youth-Entrepreneurship-Programme.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/607549/Evaluation-of-Youth-Development-and-Northern-Uganda-Youth-Entrepreneurship-Programme.pdf) Policy, London School of Economics.
  27. Rahman, A. (2015). *People's budgeting at the local government level in Bangladesh*, New York: United Nations
  28. Ratnayake., R., Wickramaarachchi., N., & Wattege., P. (2017). *Urban water body recreational development and revitalizing program in Sri Lanka: public perception and willingness to pay*. *Bhumi. The Planning Research Journal*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.4038/bhumi.v5i2.30>
  29. Saragi, S., Sinaga, K., & Purba, B. (2020). *The role of the government in community empowerment through waste bank management*. Dharmawangsa: *International Journal of the Social Sciences*,

- Education and Humanitis 1(2):130-143.
30. Save the Children (2013). Putting Stakeholders at the Centre. London. International Save the Stakeholders Alliance 2013
  31. Scoones, I. (2007). Sustainability. *Development in Practice* 17(4) 589-596.
  32. Singh, C. (2018). Is participatory watershed development building local adaptive capacity? Findings from a case study in Rajasthan, India. *Environmental Development* 25:43-58.
  33. Sloman, A. (2011) Using participatory theatre in international community development. *Community Development Journal*, Oxford University Press.
  34. Stokes, K., Kneale, D., & Sutcliffe, K. (2019). Title: Diversity in reviewers: diverse researcher perspectives in systematic reviews may help to reduce potential researcher bias and improve reporting. The Department of Health and Social Care Policy Reviews Facility- a collaboration between three centers of excellence.
  35. Sultana, P., & Abeyasekera, S. (2007). Effectiveness of participatory planning for community Management of fisheries in Bangladesh. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 86 201– 13.
  36. Tomaselli, K. G. (2006). ‘Action Research, Participatory Communication: Why Governments Don’t Listen’, University of Natal, Durban, South Africa.
  37. Turyasingura, J.B, Agaba, M. (2022). Socio-Economic Factors and Project Implementation in G Government Aided Secondary Schools in Kabale District.
  38. Turyasingura, J.B, Agaba, M., Orach-Meza, F.L., Zombeire, R (2021). Project Design Implementation and Sustainability of Donor Funded Potato Projects in Kabale District South Western Uganda. *Special Journal of Politics and Economic Sustainability* 2(1):1-13.
  39. Uzochukwu, B. S. C., Okeke, C., O’Brien, N., Ruiz, F., Sombie, I., & Hollingwo, S. (2020). Health technology assessment and priority setting for universal health coverage: a qualitative study of stakeholders’ capacity, needs, policy areas of demand and perspectives in Nigeria. *Globalization and Health*, 16-58. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-020-00583-2>
  40. Vatcheva K. P., Lee M., McCormick J. B., Rahbar M. H. (2016). Multicollinearity in regression analysis conducted in epidemiologic studies. *Epidemiology*, 6, 227-247.
  41. Vedwan, N., Ahmad, S., Miralles-Wilhelm, F., Broad, K., Letson, D., & Podesta, G. (2008). Institutional evolution in Lake Okeechobee management in Florida: Characteristics, impacts, and limitations. *Water Resources Management*, 22, 699-718.
  42. Wani, M.D., Dada, Z.A., & Shah, S.A. (2022). The impact of community empowerment on sustainable tourism development and the mediation effect of local support: a structural equation Modeling approach. *Community Development* 2022:1-17.
  43. Widianingsig, E. & Morrel, I. (2017). Participatory planning in Indonesia, seeking a path to democracy. *Policy Studies*, 28(1): 1–15.)
  44. World Bank. (2011). Strengthening Capacity for M&E in Uganda: Results Based Management Perspective. World Bank.