



**PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY-BASED PROJECTS IN SIAYA COUNTY,  
KENYA**

<sup>1\*</sup>Siwa, D. O., & <sup>2</sup>Ngugi, L.

---

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY-BASED PROJECTS IN SIAAYA COUNTY, KENYA**

<sup>1\*</sup>Siwa, D. O., & <sup>2</sup>Ngugi, L.

<sup>1\*</sup>Postgraduate Student, Kenyatta University [KU], Kenya

<sup>2</sup>Doctor, Lecturer, Department of Management Science, Kenyatta University [KU], Kenya

**Accepted: June 1, 2021**

---

**ABSTRACT**

*This study sought to evaluate the effect of Project Management factors on the implementation of community projects in Siaya County, Kenya. The specific objectives were to evaluate the effect of project design on the implementation of community-based projects, to evaluate the effect of management support on the implementation of community-based projects, to evaluate the effect of resource allocation on the implementation of community-based projects and to evaluate the effect of community participation on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. In order to achieve the set objectives, the study adopted a descriptive research design. The research targeted 356 ongoing community projects in Siaya County. Using stratified random sampling 72 of the projects were selected. Structured questionnaires were used to collect data from the study respondents who included five most informed project management officials selected from each project. Data collected was analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation. Additionally, inferential analysis was performed using the linear multiple regression model. The study findings highlighted that project management factors are key to effective implementation of community-based projects. Based on the findings, the study concluded that project management factors provide an effective management system that ensures projects are completed on time, using the allocated resources and attaining high quality standards. The study recommended that the project teams should target improving the management of risk on different phases of the project cycle through adaptation of existing risk management approaches and development of new approaches. This study should assist project managers identify opportunities, follow the allocated budget, meet set timelines, and attain the established quality standards when implementing projects.*

**Key Words:** *Project Implementation, Community based Projects, Project Management, Community Involvement, Resource Allocation.*

---

**CITATION:** Siwa, D. O., & Ngugi, L. (2021). Project management and implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, 8 (2), 408 – 420.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Community-based projects have led to a remarkable positive influence on development around the globe. For example, in developing economies, community projects enabled many local populations to improve their living standards through agendas such as the construction of schools, sustainable agriculture, provision of sustainable safe water, construction of churches, among other programs. Approximately five million people in Kenya are being influenced positively by efforts made from community-based projects (Amadi, 2017). The emphasis of community-based projects mostly has comprised interventions in water, education, health care, sanitation, spiritual nurture, agriculture, micro-finance development, and public capacity building (Ocheni, Atakpa & Nwankwo, 2013). Moreover, community-based program projects are established by NGOs and government organs in collaboration with local communities (Amadi, 2017).

Some project implementation factors have been highlighted to contribute to the trend of community projects failing. Iddi (2018) proposed that while economic reasons, structural rigidities, and internal policies might partly explain the failure of community-based projects and, subsequently, the development plans. Nevertheless, it is hypothesized that successful implementation or lack of it, might be affected by project management factors such as design, management support, risk management, and resource allocation (Amadi, 2017). Thus, it was important to evaluate the effect of project management factors on the implementation of community projects.

### Statement of the Problem

The effectiveness of implementing projects is an emerging concern for donors in developing countries. In Kenya, the key challenge faced by project officials is the failure to stick to the allocated budget, meeting timelines, or even attaining the established quality standards. Hence, measuring project performance is essential when managing projects because it allows the project

team to identify the challenges related to time, budget or quality. Conversely, it allows the development of proper mechanisms that address the emerging challenges (Aneesha & Haridharan, 2017). Nonetheless, Ochunga and Awiti (2017) noted that those in charge of projects often fail to develop mechanisms that mitigate the challenges. Consequently, this leads to exceeding budgets, project delays, and poor-quality work because of the tendency to overlook possible risks. Poor planning and management of community projects resulted in to overrun of project cost, stalling, poor quality work, or even termination before closure (Oino, Towett, Kirui & Luvega, 2015).

The study by Gitamo (2018) examined the effect of project management factors when implementing health projects in the County Government of Nairobi. The study established that new criteria including project team's competency, project design, and resource allocation were essential in monitoring as well as evaluating project implementation, which led to orientation and organizational learning. Nevertheless, the study focused only on projects implemented in the health industry. Odoyo (2019) examined factors leading to cost escalation, implementation delays, and negative attitudes towards community projects in Homa Bay, Kenya. It was established that poor resource allocation, especially for resettlement and compensation, as well as failure to mitigate project risks, contributed to the failure of community projects. However, the study focused only on small agricultural projects. This study sought to fill these gaps by providing a theoretical foundation on the effect of project management factors in the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, in Kenya. The gaps were filled by focusing on five sectors and a huge sample of projects.

### Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study was to investigate the effect of project management factors on the implementation of community-based

projects in Siaya County, Kenya. The study specifically sought to;

- To evaluate the effect of project design on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya
- To evaluate the effect of management support on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya
- To evaluate the effect of risk management on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya
- To evaluate the effect of resource allocation on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya
- To evaluate the effect of community participation on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Project Design and Implementation of Community-based Projects**

According to a study by Amadi (2017), the initial brainstorming stage of project design is known as the initiation stage. Amadi examined the influence of project design and planning on community-based project performance in Kakamega, in Kenya. The author sought to highlight the need during the project design stage of involving all the stakeholders in planning, sharing views on the best strategies to run and execute the project. Moreover, Amadi included 14 studies in the conceptual framework and performed thematic analysis. It was established that project design involvement is essential in bringing confidence between donors, project managers, and the community. The study established that project design involvement is essential in bringing confidence between donors, project managers, and the community. Amadi concluded that project success and performance were highly influenced by project design, initiation, and involvement of the community in the initial stages.

Another study by Miki, Kagiri, and Nganga (2017) focused on the factors that influence the sustainability of livestock technology projects supported by ILRI in Kisumu County. The study analyzed the impact of project design including funding, stakeholders, information, and technology with a theoretical foundation built around Stakeholder Participation Theory, Resource-Dependence Theory, and Technology Acceptance Model. About 45 respondents were added to the study's sample, while data was collected using questionnaires and analysis tests such as descriptive statistics performed. For the analysis, the design aspects of project information and technology were found the most influential aspects of project sustainability.

### **Management Support and Implementation of Community-based projects**

A study by (Nyandika & Ngugi, 2014) examined the impact of management support, user involvement, resources, and technology on road projects in Kenya. Using qualitative and quantitative methods of collecting data, the sample included 75 participants representing contractors, prequalified consultants, and top Kenya National Highway Authority managers. The stratified random technique of sampling was used to include a 30% sample from the study population. The analysis was done using regression to determine the association between the examined variables. The findings established that management support influenced significantly overseeing goodwill or commitment, funding approvals, approval, and participation of projects. Moreover, the study found human resource availability as critical in influencing positively the performance and management of road projects.

Sang et al. (2017) examined the management factors influential to the sustainability of programs funded by the World Bank in Kenya. The focus was on determining the technical, institutional, economic, and political factors, with both explanatory and cross-sectional research designs adopted. This is because, despite various feasibility

studies being carried out before the onset of programs, the sustainability of the projects is never guaranteed. A sample of 51 participants including project managers and officials involved in monitoring as well as evaluation were involved in responding to the questionnaires. Both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were applied to determine the relationships. The findings proposed that the coefficients of management support like technical and institutional factors influenced project sustainability. The researchers concluded that it was vital to incorporate capacity building in project design.

### **Risk Management and Implementation of Community-based projects**

In their study, Carvalho et al. (2014) aimed to analyze the link between project success and risk management skills. The study was a methodological approach involving an empirical survey based on 263 projects, which were distributed across eight industries. Data was collected through interviews from risk managers, project managers, and evaluating internal company reports on the performance of projects. The structural modeling correlated the soft and hard skill of managing risks to enable successful project implementation, with project complexity considered to have a moderating effect. The soft side was defined as the project stakeholder's relationships such as judgment and intuition, expectations, power conflicts, biases, learning, and trust. The hard side included a focus on administrative activities using project management strategies such as risk planning, identification, analysis, monitoring, control, and response. The researchers identified the soft skills of managing risk as the most prominent and had an influential 10.7% impact on the successful implementation of a project. Furthermore, the soft risk management skills supported the hard risk management skills, since the correlation explained 25.3% influence on the hard risk management skills.

### **Resource allocation and implementation of community-based projects**

A study by Odoyo (2013) examined factors influencing the implementation of community projects in Kenyas' Homa Bay County. The researcher's objective included assessing factors influencing implementation delay, cost escalation, community attitude, and community leadership using a sample of 3,000 households. The findings suggested the most influential factors to include natural occurrences like floods, lacking funds for resettlement and compensation, and lacking resources for flood mitigation.

Dinnie and Holstead (2018) examined the opportunities and challenges presented by public funding for community-based groups. The researchers collected data using interviews with community-based groups and public funding institutions. It was established that community-based groups experienced challenges when negotiating procedural and technical, goals and implementation of projects, which hindered their aspirations and identity. The researchers argued that while public funding was vital for community-based projects, it introduced various technical and managerial procedures, which enroll community groups in governmental accountability mechanisms. Besides monitoring the process, the projects require resource accountability and transparency, as well as a great performance of projects.

### **Community involvement and implementing community-based projects**

Musau and Kirui (2018) highlighted that all Kenyan County governments had shown significant management gaps concerning the successful implementation of their planned projects. The researchers examined the effect of project management strategies on the implementation of projects by the County government of Machakos. The aim was to evaluate the impact of project planning, evaluation and monitoring, and stakeholders' involvement in managing as well as implementing government projects. The sample targeted 90 employees directly involved in the execution of the projects. The study established the involvement of key stakeholders such as parents,

teachers, community members, donors, and government officials, was positively associated with the successful implementation of projects.

Moreover, Achieno and Mwangangi (2018) carried a study to establish the influential factors affecting the success of water projects implemented in Narok County. A survey was designed and a sample of 85 participants was included from 15 community-based water projects. Both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were applied to analyze the collected data. The study results established that project management approaches and community participation had a positive association with the success of rural community-based water facilities. Interestingly, post-implementation management support and the use of technology were insignificantly associated with the sustainability of projects. The researchers recommended that community members should be involved adequately in identifying, designing, implementing, and closing out projects.

## METHODOLOGY

The study was quantitative and used a descriptive survey approach to provide a precise as well as an effective measure of the studied variables. Saunders et al. (2016) describe quantitative research as a scientific design, which measures attitude, behavior, opinion, or knowledge accurately. According to Johannesson and Perjons (2014), a population is an overall group from which a sample is drawn, whether it involves humans, events, animals, or objects. The study's targeted population included 356 community-based projects

which were initiated in Siaya County. The projects were grouped into five strata's; the Health sector, Agriculture & food security sector, social development sector, social services sector, and enterprise development sector.

As recommended by Mugenda and Mugenda (2013), when the overall population is less than 10,000 cases, then a sample size of between 10 percent and 30 percent is considered a good representation of the targeted population. Therefore, 20 percent of the population was considered sufficient for analysis. Thus, 72 projects representing 20.2% of the population were considered.

Questionnaires were used as a tool for collecting data. The rationale of using questionnaires is they allowed the collecting of data from the large sample economically and easily. Furthermore, the questionnaire provided quantifiable answers that were easy to analyze. The obtained quantitative data was entered into the IBM SPSS software version 24.0 for statistical analysis. Data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

The study collected data using an likert scale of Strongly disagree =1, Disagree =2, Neutral =3, Agree =4 and Strongly agree =5

The first objective was to evaluate effects of project design on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. The results were represented in table 1.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics of project design factors**

Factor	Percentages		Mean	Std. Dev
	Agreed	Disagreed		
The order of key activities are identified at the project initiation stage	25.3	39.2	3.15	.829
The needed resources are determined at the project initiation stage	31.6	37.1	3.06	.901
Clear objectives and goals are established at the project initiation stage	32.3	35.8	3.04	.886

Establishing major milestones and deliverables is done at the project initiation stage	37.5	27.0	2.90	.850
The required time to complete the project is determined at the project initiation stage	34.0	25.0	2.90	.822
The significance of the project is determined at the project initiation stage	44.1	20.8	2.76	.843
The expected quality standards is determined at the project initiation stage	42.0	18.4	2.76	.775

**Source: Survey Data (2020)**

Based on the results, the participants were neutral that during the project initiation stage, the order of key activities were identified (Mean=3.15, SD=.829), there is determination of needed resources (Mean=3.06, SD=.901), and clear objectives and goals are established (Mean=3.04, SD=.886). The study participants were neutral on all the project design factors. The study findings highlighted a major knowledge gap during the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County as far as

project design is concerned. Previous findings posted that it is essential to follow a project cycle to determine the intended project’s key significance, objectives, goals, focus, the needed resources, the required technical knowledge, and skills (Amadi, 2017; Mkutano & Sang, 2018).

The study’s second objective sought to evaluate the effect of management support on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya.

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics of management support factors**

Factor	Percentage		Mean	Std. Dev
	Agreed	Disagreed		
Leadership helps in managing of emerging technical and institutional factors	92.8	1.7	4.10	.546
Leadership helps in building strong relationships and trust between stakeholders	87.5	2.8	3.99	.590
Leadership helps in designing and use of appropriate standards in management of the project	80.9	3.5	3.92	.657
Leadership helps the managing of knowledge	78.8	3.1	3.89	.615
Leadership helps design contingency plans for managing emergent project risks	67.7	7.2	3.71	.768
Leadership monitors the project cycle and the use of resources	48.9	22.6	3.29	.890
Directing, managing, and motivating the project team	22.9	49.2	2.69	.929

**Source: Survey Data (2020)**

The study findings established that management support had the largest effect ( $\beta=.362, p<.001$ ) on project implementation. The study examined the capacity of project leadership to manage new systems, structures, funds, and ideas. Based on the findings, it was evident that leadership was involved when making decisions related to goals, and had strong relationships as well as trust with other stakeholders such as the community members

when implementing projects. Research suggests that project leaders have distinct roles in managing projects, which demand good relationships and trust with the local community as well as other professionals (Sang et al., 2017).

The third objective was to evaluate the effect of risk management on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya.

**Table 3: Descriptive statistics of risk management design factors**

Factor	Percentages		Mean	Std. Dev
	Agreed	Disagreed		
Identification of emerging issues and problems is done before they happen	51.7	26.4	2.70	.984
Preparations are made in advance enables for potential issues and problems	54.9	18.4	2.58	.938
Potential issues that could negatively impact the project are analyzed	68.4	16.0	2.44	.858
The emerging issues that could negatively impact the project are monitored	68.1	15.6	2.39	.880
A contingency plan is always in place to allow exploration and preparation for any project eventuality	72.9	10.1	2.30	.761
Decisions are made on how to deal with each emerging risk	72.6	12.2	2.28	.819
Precautionary steps to reduce the negative impact of potential risks is done	76.4	6.9	2.22	.693

**Source: Survey Data (2020)**

The low standard deviation of <1.0 for each factor indicated the individual responses were closer to the mean. There was also the elaboration of new strategies for identifying, assessing, and monitoring risks, which supports previous findings by Batkovskiy et al. (2015) and Shi et al. (2015). Hence,

there is a knowledge gap on risk management during the implementation of community projects in Siaya County, Kenya.

The fourth objective was to evaluate the effect of resource allocation on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya.

**Table 4: Descriptive statistics of resource allocation factors**

Factor	Percentages		Mean	Std. Dev
	Agreed	Disagreed		
There is periodic monitoring of budget against the expenditures	84.0	0.7	4.07	.643
Project equipment is assigned to the project staff for use during implementation	84.4	2.1	4.04	.655
The right materials are provided on time for project implementation	86.8	3.1	4.04	.669
Available resources are properly utilized	86.1	3.8	4.03	.680
The project is implemented based on the approved budget	81.9	2.8	3.98	.677
The project staff are accountable for allocated resources	84.3	3.1	3.98	.650
There is proper management of available funds	81.6	2.4	3.96	.651

**Source: Survey Data (2020)**

The study results as highlighted in table 4 below established that resource allocation had a significant effect ( $\beta=.258$ ,  $p<.001$ ) on the implementation of community-based projects. The low standard deviation suggests that the responses were closer to the mean. The study findings established that “the project staff is accountable for

allocated resources”, supporting the findings by Dinnie and Holstead (2018) who highlighted that projects required resource accountability and transparency.

The fifth objective evaluated the effect of community participation on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya.

**Table 5: Descriptive statistics of community participation factors**

Factor	Percentages		Mean	Std. Dev
	Agreed	Disagreed		
Community involvement enhances support for the project	72.9	7.2	3.74	.730
Community involvement allows identification of deviation from the project	69.8	8.3	3.74	.792
The community makes their requirements known	64.2	10.4	3.63	.791
The community is involved in the making of key decisions	58.3	11.1	3.54	.821
There is formation of important partnerships with the local community	54.5	14.6	3.48	.863
There is effective sharing of information with the community	52.1	19.9	3.45	.850
The community is informed on any project impact to the environment	47.9	18.0	3.37	.893

**Source: Survey Data (2020)**

The study established that community participation had a significant 18.4% ( $\beta=.184$ ,  $p=.001$ ) effect on project implementation. All the factors had a low standard deviation, which indicated the individual responses were closer to the mean. Based on these findings, community participation is a critical factor

for both the design and implementation of community projects. The finding was supported by previous research that a project cannot succeed without the participation of the community (Oino et al., 2015).

**Table 6: Descriptive statistics of project implementation factors**

Factor	Percentages		Mean	Std. Dev
	Agreed	Disagreed		
Tasks have to be redone during the project implementation process	5.2	77.0	3.92	.763
Community-based projects are completed by a given deadline.	76.4	2.8	3.87	.667
Adjustments to the completion date of the project as a whole are rarely made	79.2	3.8	3.87	.653
The communal objectives of the project were successfully attained	71.2	3.5	3.81	.696
The baseline amount of project expenses is always close to the expected value	71.9	4.8	3.78	.716
The actual project cost exceeds the project budget	4.5	69.8	3.75	.685
The time spent working on the project rarely differs from the amount of time anticipated	70.1	6.3	3.74	.751

**Source: Survey Data (2020)**

The study participants disagreed that tasks have to be redone during the project implementation process (Mean=3.92, SD=.763). The participants agreed that community-based projects are completed by a given deadline (Mean=3.87, SD=.667) and that adjustments to the completion date are rarely made (Mean=3.87, SD=.653).

Additionally, the communal objectives of the project were successfully attained (Mean=3.81, SD=.696) and the baseline amount of project expenses is always close to the expected value (Mean=3.78, SD=.716). The participants agreed that the actual project cost rarely exceeds the project budget (Mean=3.75, SD=.685) and the time spent

working on the project rarely differs from the expected timelines (Mean=3.74, SD=.751) as highlighted in table 6.

### Inferential Analysis

It was necessary to test the linear multiple regression model assumptions. It was assumed that the data were normally distributed, and there was no multicollinearity. The normal probability plot (P-P) was used to test homoscedasticity and the Smirnov and Shapiro Wilk Tests were used to test normality. Multicollinearity was tested using the tolerance tests and variance inflation factor (VIF) test.

The regression equation used was represented as;

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_5X_5 + \epsilon$$

Where Y= Implementation of community-based projects

$\beta_1$ ....  $\beta_5$ = coefficients of determination

$X_1$  = Project design

$X_2$ = Management support

$X_3$ = Risk management

$X_4$ = Resource allocation

$X_5$ = Community participation

$\epsilon$  = Error term

**Table 7: Normality test**

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		Shapiro-Wilk	
	Statistic	Sig.	Statistic	Sig.
Project Design	.143	.075*	.924	.049
Management Support	.129	.073*	.934	.079
Risk Management	.157	.200*	.915	.083
Resource Allocation	.145	.060*	.927	.059
Community Participation	.144	.200*	.937	.063
Project Implementation	.159	.181*	.967	.067

**Source: Survey data (2020)**

All variables the based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test had p-values >.05 implying that the data was normally distributed.

**Table 8: Testing multicollinearity**

Variable	Tolerance	Variance Inflation Factor
Project Design	.618	1.617
Management Support	.588	1.702
Risk Management	.743	1.345
Resource Allocation	.654	1.529
Community Participation	.627	.594

**Source: Survey data (2020)**

Table 8, showed the multicollinearity tests aimed to establish the correlations of the independent variables. As VIF results indicated, all the covariates had values between  $\geq 1.0$  and  $\leq 10.0$ .

Furthermore, all the covariates had tolerance scores of  $>0.10$ . Both the VIF and tolerance results indicated that there were linearity and no multicollinearity.

**Table 9: The Summary of the Multiple Linear Regression Model**

Model	R	R- Square	Adjusted R- Square	Standard Error
1	.689	.474	.465	2.80

- \* Model 1= the effect of covariates (community participation, management support, risk management, resource allocation, and project design) on the outcome (project implementation).
- \* R = Correlation between the predicted values of Y and the observed values
- \* df = degree of freedom

**Source: Survey data (2020)**

The R-Square value indicated that 47.4% ( $R^2=.474$ ) of the variance in project implementation scores could be explained by the variables: community participation, management support, risk management, resource allocation, and project design.

**Table 10: ANOVA for the multiple regression model**

Model		Sum of Squares	Degree of freedom	Mean Square	F-value	P-value
1	Regression	1994.764	5	398.953	50.848	<.001
	Residual	2212.566	282	7.846		
	Total	4207.330	287			

- \* Model 1= the effect of covariates (community participation, management support, risk management, resource allocation, and project design) on the outcome (project implementation).

**Source: Survey data (2020)**

Based on the results of the model, community participation, management support, risk management, resource allocation, and project design jointly affected project implementation.

**Table 11: The Parameter Estimates for the Regression Models**

Model	Term	Beta	B	T-value	P-value
1	(Constant)	4.291		2.980	.003
	Project Design	.033	.041	.743	.458
	Management Support	.424	.362	6.427	.000
	Risk Management	.015	.016	.324	.746
	Resource Allocation	.250	.258	4.826	.000
	Community Participation	.146	.184	3.376	.001

- \* Model 1= the effect of covariates (community participation, management support, risk management, resource allocation, and project design) on the outcome (project implementation).

- \*  $\beta$  = Standardized Beta

**Source: Survey data (2020)**

Table 11 above illustrated the parameter estimates results for the model. The constant, represents the Y-intercept, which is the predicted value of project implementation when all other covariates equal to zero (0). The "Beta" column presents the values of the regression coefficients for project implementation (outcome variable) from the covariates (community participation, management

support, risk management, resource allocation, and project design). Based on the beta results, the regression equation was illustrated as:

$$\text{Project implementation Predicted} = 4.291 + .033*\text{Project Design} + .424*\text{Management Support} + .015*\text{Risk Management} + .250*\text{Resource Allocation} + .146*\text{Community Participation}$$

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The general conclusion of the study was based on the study objectives. The study sought to investigate the effect of project management factors on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. The first objective was to evaluate the effect of project design on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. The study established that project design had insignificant effect on the implementation of community-based projects. The study concluded that it was essential for project managers to follow the project cycle to determine the project's key significance, objectives, goals, and focus.

The second objective was to evaluate the effect of management support on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. The study findings established that among project management factors, management support had the largest effect on the implementation of community-based projects. *The study* concluded that project leaders have critical roles in managing projects, which demand having good leadership skills, strong relationships, and trust with the local community, their team, as well as other professionals. The third objective was to evaluate the effect of risk management on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. Based on the findings, the study concluded that each project is unique and hence may face distinct unknown variables.

The fourth objective was to evaluate the effect of resource allocation on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. It was determined that resource allocation had a significant effect on the implementation of community-based projects. The study concluded that sufficient resource allocation and fund management increased the likelihood of project

completion. The fifth objective was to evaluate the effect of community participation on the implementation of community-based projects in Siaya County, Kenya. The study findings established that community participation had a significant effect on the implementation of community-based projects. Based on the findings, the study concluded that community participation in non-technical resolutions is likely to boost the project implementation outcomes.

Overall, the study findings and reviewed literature highlight that project management factors are key to the effective implementation of community-based projects.

The researcher believes that the study successfully identified the effect of project management factors on the implementation of community-based projects in the context of Siaya County, Kenya. This study narrowed down the project management factors to five factors: project design, management support, risk management, resource allocation, and community participation. As a way forward, this researcher recommends that future studies should explore in-depth, one project management factor from the five identified. This would establish whether the effect is mediated or moderated by other factors that would complement the major findings of this study. Similarly, another possible research area would be examining how project design is affected by the project's industry. Additionally, the study further recommended that future studies should examine the critical project management obstacles to the implementation of community-based projects. Finally, a possible future research area could concentrate on a specific project using a mixture of qualitative and quantitative measures to determine whether project management factors are influential for individual projects.

## REFERENCES

- Abdi, A., & Mbugua, J. (2019). Project design factors influencing the implementation of infrastructural development projects in devolved governments. *International Academic Journal Of Information Sciences And Project Management*, 3(4), 429-457.
- Achieno, G., & Mwangangi, P. (2018). Determinants of Sustainability of Rural Community Based Water Projects in Narok County, Kenya. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management*, 3(1), 41-57.
- Ali, A., & Kiarie, M. (2017). Factors Affecting Effective Implementation of Wind Power Projects in Kenya. *International Journal Of Entrepreneurship And Project Management*, 2(1), 1-21.
- Amadi, J. (2017). The Role of Planning on Performance of Community Projects in Kenya. *Developing Country Studies*, 7(1), 1-7.
- Batkovskiy, A., Konovalova, A., Semenova, E., Trofimets, V., & Fomina, A. (2015). Risks of Development and Implementation of Innovative Projects. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. doi: 10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n4s4p243
- Carvalho, M., & Rabechini Junior, R. (2014). Impact of risk management on project performance: the importance of soft skills. *International Journal Of Production Research*, 53(2), 321-340. doi: 10.1080/00207543.2014.919423
- Dinnie, E., & Holstead, K. (2018). The influence of public funding on community-based sustainability projects in Scotland. *Environmental Innovation And Societal Transitions*, 29, 25-33. doi: 10.1016/j.eist.2017.08.003
- Gitamo, M. (2018). *Project Management Implementation Practices in Provision of Reproductive Health Services in Selected Health Facilities in Nairobi County* (Masters). Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.
- Miki, A., Kagiri, A., & Nganga, K. (2017). Factors influencing sustainability of international livestock research institute technology supported livestock projects in Kisumu County. *International Academic Journal Of Information Sciences And Project Management*, 2(1), 66-85.
- Mkutano, S. M. & Sang, P. (2018). Project management practices and performance of non-governmental organizations projects in Nairobi City County, Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management*, 3(3), 1-22
- Musau, P. M. & Kirui, C. (2018). Project management practices and implementation of government projects in Kenya, case of Machakos County government. *International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management*, 3(2), 58-79
- Muthaura, M., & Omwenga, J. (2017). Factors Influencing Implementation Of Projects In Community Based Organizations In Kenya. A Case of Child Regional Education Support Services. *International Journal Of Scientific And Research Publications*, 7(6), 575-587.
- Nyandika, O. F & Ngugi, K. (2014). Influence of Stakeholders' Participation on Performance of Road Projects at Kenya National Highways Authority. *European Journal of Business Management*, 1(11), 384-404.

- Ocheni, S., Atakpa, M., & Nwankwo, B. (2013). A Review of the Project Cycle and Project Implementation at the Third Tier Level of Government in Nigeria: A Theoretical Reflection. *Mediterranean Journal Of Social Sciences*. doi: 10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n2p595
- Odoyo, C. (2019). Factors Affecting Implementation of Community Projects: Case of Kimira – Oluch Smallholder Farm Improvement Project in Homa Bay County, Kenya. *Journal Of Economics And Sustainable Development*, 1(2), 111-118. doi: 10.13189/ujm.2013.010211
- Ogolla, F., & Moronge, M. (2016). Determinants of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Funded Water Projects in Kenya: A Case of Nairobi County. *The Strategic Journals Of Business & Change Management*, 3(1), 328-358.
- Oino, P., Towett, G., Kirui, K., & Luvega, C. (2015). The Dilemma In Sustainability Of Community based Projects In Kenya. *Agriculture & Food Security*, 2(4), 757-768.
- Oino, P., Towett, J., Kirui, K., & Luvega, C. (2015). The dilemma in sustainability of community-based projects in Kenya. *Global Journal Of Advanced Research*, 2(4), 757-768.
- Sang, P. et al (2017) Institutional Influence on Sustainability of World Bank Funded Projects in Kenya', *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*, 6(11), 7725-7730. doi: 10.24327/ijcar.2017.7730.1213
- Shi, Q., Liu, Y., Zuo, J., Pan, N., & Ma, G. (2015). On the management of social risks of hydraulic infrastructure projects in China: A case study. *International Journal Of Project Management*, 33(3), 483-496. doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.06.003
- World Bank Group. (2019). World Bank Group - International Development, Poverty, & Sustainability. Retrieved 6 October 2019, from <https://www.worldbank.org/>