

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HOUSING
PROJECTS FOR THE NEEDY FAMILIES OF UBUDEHE PROGRAM IN GICUMBI
DISTRICT, RWANDA**

BY

JOSEPHINE MUTAMBA

1161-06216-04019

**A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN PROJECT
PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF KAMPALA
INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY**

MAY, 2018

DECLARATION

I, Josephine Mutamba, do declare that the work presented in this report was personally done by me under the supervision of Dr. Charles Kiiza and that it has never been presented to any academic Institution for an academic award.

.....

Signed

.....

Date

APPROVAL

This research report was carried out by the candidate under my guidance as the university supervisor. It is ready for final submission to the university.

.....

Dr. Charles Kiiza

.....

Date

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to Gerfried and Karin, Sheila Janet Kajuga, my family and close friends who were there to support me financially and emotionally.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My profound gratitude goes to the Almighty God for the gift of life and wisdom that He gave me throughout my studies. I would also like to acknowledge and extend my sincere and heartfelt gratitude to my supportive supervisor Dr. Kiiza Charles for his critical reviews, expert advice, and for his availability throughout the course of my research work.

My warm appreciation goes to Gerfried, Karin and Sheila Janet Kajuga who supported me throughout my life, most importantly, academic life, May God reward them abundantly. I cannot forget my exemplary lecturers at the College of Humanities and social science, especially for their great assistance and excellent academic advice. I owe a special debt of gratitude to all of them.

I acknowledge the authors whose works have been cited in this study. I also acknowledge with gratitude the contributions and co-operation of the respondents from Gicumbi District for their willingness to provide necessary information during the process of conducting interviews. Without their cooperation, this study would have been impossible to accomplish.

Finally, my great appreciation goes to my classmates and friends for their unconditional support. It is because of them that I successfully completed this work.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CDF	Community Development Fund
EDPRS	Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
MINALOC	Ministry of Local Government
PHDP	Participatory Human Development Paradigm
PPA	Participatory Poverty Assessment
RLDSF	Rwanda Local Development Support Fund
VUP	Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme
WHO	World Health Organization

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
APPROVAL	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	vi
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.1.1 Historical Perspective	1
1.1.2 Theoretical Perspective	2
1.1.4 Contextual Perspective	4
1.2 Statement of the Problem	5
1.3 Purpose of the Study	5
1.4 Objectives of the study	6
1.5 Scope of the Study	6
1.5.1 Geographical Scope	6
1.5.2 Theoretical Scope	6
1.5.4 Time Scope	7
1.6 Significance of the Study	7
1.7 Definition of Key Terms and Concepts	8
CHAPTER TWO	9
LITERATURE REVIEW	9

2.0 Introduction.....	9
2.1 Theoretical Review	9
2.1.1 Collective Action Theory.....	9
2.1.2 Participatory Human Development Paradigm	10
2.2 Conceptual Framework.....	13
2.3 Review of Related Literature	14
2.3.1 Community Participation	14
2.3.1.1 Citizen Control.....	16
2.3.1.2 Delegated Power	17
2.3.1.3 Partnership	18
2.3.2 Ubudehe Program	18
2.4 Empirical Studies	20
2.4 Gaps in the Literature Review	26
CHAPTER THREE	27
METHODOLOGY	27
3.0 Introduction.....	27
3.1 Research Design.....	27
3.2 Study Population.....	27
3.3 Sample Size.....	28
3.4 Sampling Procedure	28
3.5 Data Collection Procedure	29
3.6 Data Sources	29
The study collected primary data using interviews and focus group discussions.....	29
3.7 Data Collection Instruments	29
3.7.1 Interview	29

3.7.2 Focus Group Discussion	29
3.8 Validity	30
3.8.1 Validity	30
3.9 Data Collection Procedure	31
3.10 Data Analysis	31
3.11 Ethical Considerations	31
3.12 Limitation of the Study	32
CHAPTER FOUR.....	33
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	33
4.0 Introduction.....	33
4.1 Response Rate.....	33
4.2 Informants' Profile.....	33
4.3 The Level of Citizens' Control in the Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District.....	38
4.4 Power Delegation to the Community Members and their Contribution towards Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District.....	41
4.5 Partnership of the Community Members with other Project Stakeholders.....	48
CHAPTER FIVE	55
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
5.0 Introduction.....	55
5.1 Discussions	55
5.1.1 The Level of Citizens' Control in the Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District.....	55
5.1.2 The Power of Delegation to the Community Members and their Contribution towards Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District	56
5.1.3 Partnership of the Community Members with other Project Stakeholders	57

5.2 A Synthesis of the Major Findings	58
5.2 Conclusion	59
5.3 Recommendations	60
5.3.1 The Level of Citizens’ Control in the Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District.....	60
5.3.2 Delegation of Power to the Community Members and their Contribution towards Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District.....	60
5.3.3 Partnership of the Community Members with other Project Stakeholders	61
5.4 Contribution to the existing body of Knowledge.....	61
5.5 Suggestions for Future Research	61
References	62
APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW GUIDE.....	66
APPENDIX II: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION	67
APPENDIX III: KREJCIE AND MORGAN TABLE	68

ABSTRACT

This study set out to examine the role of community participation in housing projects for the needy in Gicumbi District, Rwanda. The study was guided by the following objectives: i) to examine whether the target community has power to negotiate the terms and conditions of housing project for the needy families in Gicumbi District; ii) to establish how power is delegated to the community members to contribute towards housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District; and iii) to investigate whether community members have partnership with other stakeholders in housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District. The study adopted a case study design. The target population was 2,100 participants who included project leaders, local leaders and project beneficiaries. The sample size was 327 respondents, though, 248 participated giving a response rate of 76%. Research instruments used were interview guide and focus group discussions. Qualitative data was analyzed by editing transcripts to identify the significant statements across individual and group interviews. The study found out that the citizens had control in the following project activities, democratically elected their representatives at the village level, negotiated project terms and conditions of work, selected potential project beneficiaries, distributed project deliverables to the beneficiaries, monitored and evaluated several project activities, participated in decision making and held their leaders accountable. Furthermore, the study found out that power which was delegated to the community members included, among others, decision making in meetings, forums, and seminars; involvement in budgeting and planning of financial resources, and holding their representatives accountable and sometimes take legal action where need be. The following recommendations were made: the project team should ensure that citizens participate and have a degree of control in all the project activities that directly affect them; the government and the project leaders should always involve the community members in decision making in all matters of the project that would directly or indirectly affect them to avoid conflict of interest at a later stage of the project; and the government and the project officials should provide grounds for flexible partnership with the local communities so that they willingly participate in the projects.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Housing construction for the needy families is a government aided project whose intention is to help the poorest people in the rural areas who either do not own houses or have decent housing. The following section covers the historical perspective, theoretical perspective, conceptual perspective and contextual perspective.

1.1 Background of the Study

1.1.1 Historical Perspective

Globally, the concept of community participation took shape in the 1950s in the cities of the United States of America, the cities included: Massachusetts; Dayton, Columbus, Ohio, and Minneapolis. The members of the community advocated for their involvement in decision making on projects that directly affected them. The projects included: sanitation, schools, hospitals, road construction, crime watch etc (Cooke, & Kothari, 2011). In Asia and specifically Bangladesh, the concept of community participation was first evidenced in 1976 under Grameen Bank. Grameen gave authority to five member groups of the local people called *Kendro* (center) to plan at the local level. This *Kendro* discussed concerns related to group and emergency funding with administrative units. The assumption was that if individual borrowers are given access to credit, they would be able to identify and engage in viable income generating activities. The borrowers planned their loans by themselves and then discussed them with others. The viability of their scheme, how the marketing would be conducted, was also sorted out by the borrowers. Grameen officials believed participation was a process of growth (Mohan & Stokke, 2010).

In Sub-Saharan Africa, specifically, Tanzania, the discourse of community participation is rooted in African socialism and Nyerere's concept of self-reliance (*kujitegemea*), in which citizens are obliged to contribute their labour and resources in a community effort to "build the nation" (*kujengataifa*) (Marsland, 2012). These two conceptualizations of "participation" are divergent and yet, because the language of participation remains the same, and since generally expatriates and Tanzanians do not spend too much time working together in the field, all actors

are able to imagine that they understand each other and are working towards the same agenda (Marsland, 2012). In Uganda, the concept of community participation was first used in primary schools development after independence in 1962. In order to ensure that the communities were effectively involved in school development, the government established Parents-Teachers Association (PTAs). The government assisted the primary schools through Capital Development Grants (GDG) to cover the costs of erecting buildings, payment of teacher's salaries, buying furniture and equipment, while the people involved in the provision of labour and cash to build schools all over the country (Njunwa, 2010).

In Rwanda, Ubudehe is a long-standing Rwandan practice and culture of collective action and mutual support to solve problems within a community which was in existence until 1980s (Mujawase, 2015). The Ubudehe Program was again officially launched in 2001 as part of the partnership between the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and the Ministry of Local Government in an attempt to draft the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). As part of efforts to reconstruct Rwanda and nurture a shared national identity, the Government of Rwanda drew on aspects of Rwandan culture and traditional practices to enrich and adapt its development programs to the country's needs and context. In the recent past, the programme was first piloted in Butare Prefecture in early 2001. It was officially rolled out at the national level with the support from the European Union in 2004. As such, it had the potential to reach most of the poor Rwandan population (Mupenzi, 2015).

1.1.2 Theoretical Perspective

This study was guided by two theories; Collective Action Theory of Olson (1965) and Participatory Human Development Paradigm (PHDP) by Jones and Kardan (2013). The Collective Action Theory assumes that, human beings are rational creatures; they can voluntarily participate in social development activities and share resources in order to achieve a common goal. This study is centered on Housing Projects for the Needy Families under Ubudehe Program and it is premised on community involvement. Collective Action Theory is applicable to this study because of its Ubudehe nature (i.e. people working together to achieve a common goal). The theory recognizes the need for effective provision of public goods (i.e. iron sheets, bags of cement and nails) by the local government through organized collective efforts undertaken by

community members and local leaders at the village, cell, sector and district level; conjointly sharing common-pool resource or common-property groups.

Participatory Human Development Paradigm (PHDP) by Jones and Kardan (2013) encourages collective action by community members toward equitable redistribution of valued resources through political/decision-making power, economic and purchasing power, information and more. This theory is related to this study because it is premised on community participation in all the phases of the project. In other words, the members of the community are involved in the project from its initiation to implementation and sustainance. This participatory approach is the backbone of Ubudehe program which emphasizes working together to achieve a common goal. Housing Projects for the Needy Families only can succeed if the local community is involved in the identification of the needy families such as the genocide victims, the homeless, orphans, and the vulnerable. On the other hand, the projects cannot succeed if they are left to project officials, sector and district leaders.

1.1.3 Conceptual Perspective

Community participation is defined by Goodlad (2002) as the involvement by individuals or representatives of community or voluntary organizations in public policy ‘both in designing what is to be done and in implementing it. Community participation according to Wilcox (1994) may refer to the participation of people in a variety of voluntary and community organizations, for their own or others’ benefit. This sort of community participation can ‘have the triple benefit of getting things done, fostering community links and building the skills, self-esteem and networks of those who give their time. Community participation on the other hand, is defined by Dufour, Grünewald & Karla (2003) as the involvement of people with similar needs and goals in decisions affecting their lives. In this study, community participation will be operationalized as citizen control, delegated power, and partnership.

Ubudehe is defined by Mujawase (2015) as a long standing Rwandan practice and culture of collective action and mutual support to solve problems within a community. It is a method of addressing rural poverty through community collective action. Ubudehe is a mechanism by which the Government of Rwanda aimed at helping local people to create social capital, nurture

citizenship and build a strong civil society. This process helps citizens to engage in local problem-solving using their own locally designed institution in voluntary association.

1.1.4 Contextual Perspective

The word Ubudehe refers to the long-standing Rwandan practice and culture of collective action and mutual support to solve problems within a community. Ubudehe has been conceptualized as a home grown development programme whereby citizens are placed into different categories depending on their income levels. These categories inform the level of support families receive through government social protection programmes. In 2014, the Local Administrative Entities Development Agency created new Ubudehe categories. Under the programme, households were put in categories based on their social-economic status and property ownership – in terms of land and other belongings – and what the families' bread winners do to earn a living. The categories were as follows: Category 1: Families which do not own a house and can hardly afford basic needs; Category 2: Those who have a dwelling of their own or are able to rent one but rarely get full time jobs; Category 3: Those who have a job and farmers who go beyond subsistence farming to produce a surplus which can be sold. The latter also includes those with small and medium enterprises who can provide employment to dozens of people; and Category 4: Those who own large-scale business, individuals working with international organizations and industries as well as public servants (Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC), 2015).

The new Ubudehe categorization process involved local leaders and communities as beneficiaries. The Ubudehe program works in this way: the community gathers and a representative from each household gives details on the families' social and economic status. The details are provided through a questionnaire designed by the Ministry of Local Government. After each household has filled in the questionnaire, the community comes together at the cell level to crosscheck the accuracy of the information. When the community approves the information as accurate, the categorization process begins. The data collected is sent to the district level, which in turn sends it to the Ministry of Local Government for validation (MINALOC, 2015).

In 2010, the Office of the Ombudsman was mandated by the Ministry of Local Government to set up a project that would help in supporting needy families (i.e. survivors of the 1994 Genocide

against the Tutsi; vulnerable people; orphans and widows who are homeless; and those whose houses were destroyed by earthquake) by granting them shelters. In some districts, houses were constructed according to the village community settlement program, and with dimensions of 8 per 6 meters. Many of the houses were constructed with support of the citizen, in community works (Umuganda). In implementing ‘construction of houses for the needed families’ project, MINALOC purchased iron sheets, cement and nails for constructing houses for the vulnerable people in all districts of the country. These materials were distributed to the districts by the Ministry. According to the investigation that was carried out by the Office of the Ombudsman, the funds were mismanaged and embezzled (Office of the Ombudsman, 2015).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The people of Gicumbi District live in poor housing conditions. Gicumbi is one of the poorest districts in Rwanda with 76% of the poor people living in poor housing conditions (Rwanda Demographic and Health Survey, 2015). A report by WHO (2015) revealed that poor housing conditions is one of the major causes of communicable diseases such as flu, tuberculosis, measles, rabies etc. The government of Rwanda has over the years fought poor housing conditions in the country through different methods, initiatives and projects, among which included, construction of houses for the needy families. The construction of houses for the needy families was done with the intention of helping the poorest people in the rural areas who either did not own houses or had decent housing. However, the project in question has since then been marred by corruption and embezzlement of funds, iron sheets, and bags of cement by the local leaders (Ombudsman, 2015). Therefore, the study intended to assess the level at which the communities were involved in the housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District with the purpose of ensuring accountability and transparency in their implementation.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

To investigate community participation in the implementation of Housing Project for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District, Rwanda.

1.4 Objectives of the study

- i. To examine whether the target community has power to negotiate the terms and conditions of housing project for the needy families in Gicumbi District.
- ii. To examine how power is delegated to the community members in order to contribute towards housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District.
- iii. To investigate whether community members have partnership with other stakeholders in under taking housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District.

1.4 Research Questions

- i. How much power do the communities have to negotiate the terms and conditions of housing project for the needy families in Gicumbi District?
- ii. How is power delegated to the community members in order for them to contribute towards housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?
- iii. What partnerships do the community members have with other stakeholders in under taking housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?

1.5 Scope of the Study

1.5.1 Geographical Scope

This study was conducted in Gicumbi District which is located in the Northern Province of Rwanda. The District is mainly engaged in subsistence farming and it was selected by the researcher because it is the largest beneficiary of the housing projects for the needy families in Rwanda. The study population comprised of local leaders, project officials and community members from randomly selected sectors which are involved in the housing projects. According to the National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (2015), Gicumbi District has a population of 395,606.

1.5.2 Theoretical Scope

This study was guided by two theories; Collective Action Theory of Olson (1965) and Participatory Human Development Paradigm (PHDP) by Jones and Kardan (2013). The Collective Action Theory assumes that, human beings are rational creatures; they can voluntarily participate in social development activities and share resources in order to achieve a common

goal; while PHDP encourages collective action by community members toward equitable redistribution of valued resources through political/decision-making power, economic and purchasing power, information and more.

1.5.3 Content Scope

The content of the current study was confined to citizens' participation in the housing projects for the needy families; delegated power to the community members in order to participate in housing projects for the needy families; and community members' participation with various stakeholders in under taking housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District.

1.5.4 Time Scope

It was important that the current research focuses on 2011-2016 period of the project cycle because this is the time that the government of Rwanda obtained foreign aid to support rural social development projects, including Gicumbi district.

1.6 Significance of the Study

It is believed that the findings of this study provide the government specifically the Ministry of Local Government with information related to the success and loopholes in the Housing Project for the needy Families so that they may come up with better measures that ensure that projects serve their intended purposes.

Furthermore, policymakers could find the results of this study resourceful in designing policies that could encourage community participation in projects that affect them both directly and indirectly.

In addition, the findings of this study will provide insight to non-governmental organizations, civil society groups, community based organizations and financiers in ensuring that they provide capacity building platforms and monitor projects so as to promote community accountability and transparency.

The findings of the study also will contribute to the existing knowledge on poverty reduction strategies and improve on the perception of communities on participatory development

approaches and the challenges and consequences of not involving communities in planning and implementation of community projects.

Last but not least, it is hoped that the findings of the study will provide important literature for academic and practitioners' use especially in the area of community growth and development. The literature will also provide insight into how to increase the level of community participation in projects that concern them.

1.7 Definition of Key Terms and Concepts

Community participation: refers to the process of “giving people more opportunities to participate effectively in development activities, empowering people to mobilize their own capacities, be social actors rather than passive subjects, manage the resources, make decisions and control the activities that affect their lives”.

Partnership: this is when power is redistributed through negotiation between citizens and power holders; they agree to share planning and decision-making responsibilities through such structures as joint policy boards, planning committees and mechanisms for resolving impasses.

Delegated Power: refers to when citizens are given more substantial authority over a particular plan or program.

Citizen Control: this is when citizens have a degree of power or control which makes them have influence in the activities and affairs that concern them.

Ubudehe: refers to the long standing Rwandan practice and culture of collective action and mutual support to solve problems within a community.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter review related literature in line with the research problem and objectives of the study. The chapter is subdivided into theoretical review, conceptual perspective and review of related literature. The literature was reviewed starting with community participation, followed by Ubudehe program and lastly empirical studies.

2.1 Theoretical Review

2.1.1 Collective Action Theory

This study was guided by Collective Action Theory of Olson (1965). This theory assumes that human beings are rational creatures who can voluntarily participate in social development activities and share resources in order to achieve a common goal (Olson, 1965 in Kyessi, 2002). In reality, people's willingness to cooperate in provision and maintenance of a collective good is not necessarily the same. Human beings are rational; they can cooperate for a common interest or behave indifferently. It depends on multiple factors debatable between "cooperation optimists" and "cooperation pessimists" (Botes & Van Rensburg).

The word "cooperation" is synonymous to "collective action." Collective action optimists refer to social scientists who assume that wherever cooperation is required for the mutual benefit of a group of people, it will naturally occur. Participation optimism originates from orthodox group theories that prevailed in political science in the 1950s. They postulated that the existence of a collective interest was a sufficient motive for people to take joint action or decisions that affect their lives.

By "collective action", Olson refers to group efforts aiming at promoting common interests. In essence, the collective action aims at achieving tangible or intangible goals shared by a group of people, which may benefit everyone, once achieved, regardless whether one contributed or not to its provision.

In Economics and Geography, such goods or services which bear characteristics of jointness of supply and impossibility of exclusion are termed "public goods". In this case, the theory

recognizes the link between collective action and public goods and that all group goals and group interests are subject to the same dilemma. Further, Olson theory asserts that, group size, age and other group characteristics and coercion have attitudinal influence based on rationality in deciding, whether one should cooperate or not in collective action project.

This study is centred on community participation in Housing Projects for the Needy Families under Ubudehe Program. Collective Action Theory is applicable to this study because of its Ubudehe nature (i.e. people working together to achieve a common goal). The theory recognizes the need for effective provision of public goods (i.e. iron sheets, bags of cement and nails) by the local government through organized collective efforts undertaken by community members and local leaders at the village, cell, sector and district level; cojointly sharing common-pool resource or common-property groups.

2.1.2 Participatory Human Development Paradigm

Participatory Human Development Paradigm (PHDP) is defined as a participatory experiential, non-violent and evolutionary approach with problem-solving, consciousness-raising and empowerment (organizing) of the poor within a particular community or area (Jones & Kardan, 2013). Aspects of this paradigm include a process sometimes referred to as community organizing. PHDP encourages collective action by community members toward equitable redistribution of valued resources through political/decision-making power, economic and purchasing power, information and more. This is accomplished in order to establish just, humane, and meaningful social relationships (Labayen & Delfin, 2016).

Cornwall (2008) opines that Participatory Human Development Process is formulated in response to a specific situation in the world: specific to Rwanda, Ubudehe is a participatory approach. This is because there is massive chronic poverty at community level yet chronic poverty is not naturally caused, it is caused by oppressive and exploitative social structures and relationships. The poor are caught in a culture of silence and dependence. The poor are marginalized from participating in the systems that govern and impact their lives. Privileged persons will rarely voluntarily share their power with the marginalized and many development efforts fail to address the basic underlying problems of poverty.

According to Jones and Kardan (2013), PHDP approach is premised on allowing the local people to participate in decision making in the different project phases. The argument here is that, rather than imposing solutions or manipulating decision-making, the role of the Human Development Facilitator (HDF) is to support people in making a well-informed and intelligent decisions based on thorough investigation, discussion and reflection.

The current salience in the research literature on conceptual and empirical interest in understanding participation and development is illustrated by some recent studies that attempt to summarize large bodies of evidence about the effects of participation. Gaventa and Barrett (2012) state that: understanding what difference citizen participation and engagement make to development and to more accountable and responsive governance has become a key preoccupation in the development field. It has been over a decade since participation moved towards the mainstream in development debates and a strategy for achieving good governance and human rights. Despite this, a large gap still exists between normative positions promoting citizen engagement and the empirical evidence and understanding of what difference citizen engagement makes (or not) to achieving the stated goals.

Speer (2012) reviews experiences of participatory governance mechanisms as a strategy for increasing government responsiveness and improving public services. She characterizes these mechanisms as follows: they involve citizens in decision-making over the distribution of public funds between communities and the design of public policies, as well as in monitoring and evaluating government spending. However, this differs from community-based development schemes in which community members participate in the planning, implementation and monitoring of a particular development project within their community.

Participation often tends to be driven by project-related incentives: people get together to derive benefits from project funds. It is very difficult to know whether these effects will last beyond the tenure of the project and the limited evidence indicates that it usually does not (Norad 2013). There is some heartening evidence, though, that participation may have intrinsic value. Communities tend to express greater satisfaction with decisions in which they participate, even when participation does not change the outcome or when outcomes are not consistent with their expressed preferences (Mansuri & Rao, 2012).

This theory is related to this study because it is premised on community participation in all the phases of the project. In other words, the members of the community are involved in the project from its initiation to implementation and sustenance. This participatory approach is the backbone of Ubudehe program which emphasizes working together to achieve a common goal. This is to say, Housing Projects for the Needy Families is only a success story if the local community participated in the identification of the needy families such as the genocide victims, the homeless, orphans, and the vulnerable; however, this is impossible if it is left to facilitators, sector and district leaders.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

Independent Variable

Community Participation

- Citizen control
 - Power to negotiate project terms and conditions
- Delegated Power
 - Authorization to be involved in the project
- Partnership
 - Planning and decision making

Dependent Variable

Implementation of Housing Project for the Needy Families

- Allocation of construction materials (i.e. iron sheets, bags of cement, and nails)
- Construction of houses

Intervening Variables

- Government policy on rural housing for the poor
- Sensitization
- Availability of funds
- Monitoring and evaluation

Source: Arnstein (1969) and Mujawase (2015)

Figure 2.1: *Conceptual Framework Showing the Relationship between Community participation and Housing Project for the Needy Families under Ubudehe program in Gicumbi District, Rwanda*

The figure above shows community participation as the independent variable measured using citizen control, delegated power, and partnership, while the dependent variable is Housing Project for the Needy Families under Ubudehe program. The dependent variable is measured

using: - allocation of construction materials and constructed houses. The relationship between the two variables is that, when communities are involved in the allocation of these construction materials, they will be able to receive sufficient materials for their housing projects. For instance, giving the community members some control over the project gives them a sense of motivation and makes the project to serve better the people it is intended to. This is because, the community members themselves know well the people who are in need of the housing support compared to facilitators from the Ministry of Local Government or District. Furthermore, delegating power and partnering with the communities ensures that the project focuses on the most vulnerable individuals.

2.3 Review of Related Literature

2.3.1 Community Participation

Community participation is a very important aspect of housing construction projects for any community, no matter what size (Weiss et al. 2010). Without community buy-in, a project may never get off the ground or will not be accepted once it is completed. According to Abelson et al. (2014), community participation should be used to generate not only ideas for housing construction projects and their implementation, but also ideas to further improve existing project features. Housing construction projects can be facilitated and enhanced by finding out what the community needs, what will benefit the community, what has been tried in the past, and what could be done to improve past ideas (Abelson et al. 2014). Community members when given an opportunity to be informed and involved in the project process are or can be a critical factor to a project's success. Aigner et al. (2013) argue that community members may have special issues or concerns that if incorporated into a project at the outset, may help to reduce the likelihood of challenges to risk assessment results, and potential remediation or housing construction plans.

Arai (2014) posits that successful community participation is based upon information and dialogue. Only an informed community can be part of the decision-making process, which then will lead to a sustainable project. Community members who contribute to the project planning process will better understand the process and will be more likely to support a project they had input in. Arai (2014) confirms that effective community participation leads to better decisions and better implementation. Area consultation and decision making arrangements have a valuable

role to play in helping to involve citizens in decisions which affect them, particularly on neighborhood issues (Burton, 2013).

According to Asiyambola (2012), there are several reasons why community participation is important: community members may have useful information about the site's history, past land uses and associated contaminants; community members may have special issues or concerns that, if incorporated into a project at the outset, may help to reduce the likelihood of challenges to risk assessment results, and potential remediation or house construction plans; and community members who contribute to the house construction planning process will better understand the process and will be more likely to support a project they had input in, thus creating a sustainable project.

Furthermore, MacFarlane (2013) asserts that meaningful community involvement is beneficial in several ways: improves information flow; improves community understanding of local government; allows for community advocacy; fosters collaboration; minimizes conflicts, and may promote environmental justice.

According to McArthur (2011), members of the community should be seen as equal partners in the dialogue that takes place during project initiation. Community members need to understand the details of a project to evaluate its importance, costs, and benefits. Failure to adequately inform and involve the public can cause significant delays as a result of public reluctance or outright opposition to the project. McArthur (2011) advises that the communication process should include site-specific technical information about the project before it is implemented and should continue throughout the duration of the project. To make progress, a high level of patience and willingness to listen with an open mind are important to all stakeholders and participants in the process.

Yorkshire (2010) argues that communication and outreach to stakeholders is critical to sharing project's technical aspects and priorities, and to gaining community buy-in or acceptance of a project. Well-informed residents and stakeholders who understand the project's goals are more likely to support it than those who are kept in the dark or given only small amounts of information out of context. According to Yorkshire (2010), project details such as design images, upcoming projects, and relevant information about contamination and remediation should be

shared with communities. This can be done via public meetings, workshops and seminars, local media announcements, open houses, the city's website (if present), informative project display in publicly accessible places (library, post office, bank, etc.), fact sheets and flyers, or the respective state's environmental department web site.

Blake (2015) explains that specific projects may also have their own individual websites and, if so, providing links to local web resources is prudent. It is important to note that smaller and rural communities' access to the web is not always a given priority. Here local media play an important role in communicating with the public. Communication is a two-way street and, as such, the direct exchange with the public is one of the most important communication aspects of a housing construction project. Only through direct exchange can concerns and misconceptions be addressed, questions answered and ideas be developed most effectively. While passive communication, like websites and media announcements, is important as well, they are no substitute for the direct exchange. Good community participation will use passive and active communication means in a well weighted manner, as an informed and engaged public can be a vast asset to a house construction project (Botes & Van Rensburg, 2012).

2.3.1.1 Citizen Control

The Citizen Control is the final eighth rung of Citizen Power on the ladder of Citizen Participation for achieving full empowerment in community participation in sustainability of water projects. According to Earnhart & Lízal (2007) an ownership structure is effective in transitory economies that alleviate pressure in community needs. Levina (2005) says that inadequate community participation and tight project schedule timeframes without involving the community affects the quality of projects in the same line of thought, Sultana (2009) argues that communities should be fully empowered to participate effectively in development projects. Martin (2009) further explains that citizen participation should be guided by the community's own terms to increase collective local participation.

Participants or residents can govern a program or be in full charge of policy and managerial aspects, and be able to negotiate the conditions under which 'outsiders' may change them. Here, Arnstein imagines several models especially those where neighborhood corporations have direct control over funds. Arnstein example is a "bitter struggle" between community groups and teachers' unions in New York City in 1968 (Goldstein, 2014).

Demands for community controlled schools, black control, and neighborhood control are on the increase. Though no one in the nation has absolute control, it is very important that the rhetoric is not confused with intent. People are simply demanding that degree of power (or control) which guarantees that participants or residents can govern a program or an institution, be in full charge of policy and managerial aspects, and be able to negotiate the conditions under which “outsiders” may change them (Collins & Ison, 2011).

According to Cornwall (2008), a neighborhood corporation with no intermediaries between it and the source of funds is the model most frequently advocated. A small number of such experimental corporations are already producing goods and/or social services. Several others are reportedly in the development stage, and new models for control will undoubtedly emerge as the have-nots continue to press for greater degrees of power over their lives.

2.3.1.2 Delegated Power

Delegated Power, is exercising of power bestowed by a Constitution or the community concerned for representation in development projects matters (Davie, 2013). Delegated power is delegated for the purpose of representation since it is impossible for everyone to be included. This way community leaders are selected to act on behalf of the community. Delegated Power concerns leadership in Housing for the Needy projects.

Negotiations between citizens and public officials can also result in citizens achieving dominant decision making authority over a particular plan or program (Mansuri&Rao, 2012). At this level, the ladder has been scaled to the point where citizens hold the significant cards to assure accountability of the program to them. To resolve differences, power holders need to start the bargaining process rather than respond to pressure from the other end. Such a dominant decision-making role has been attained by residents in a handful of Model Cities including Cambridge, Massachusetts; Dayton, and Columbus, Ohio; Minneapolis, Minnesota; St. Louis, Missouri; Hartford and New Haven, Connecticut; and Oakland, California.

According to Tritter and McCallum (2016), another model of delegated power is separate and parallel groups of citizens and power holders, with provision for citizen veto if differences of opinion cannot be resolved through negotiation. This is a particularly interesting coexistence

model for hostile citizen groups too embittered toward city hall-as a result of past “collaborative efforts”-to engage in joint planning.

2.3.1.3 Partnership

Partnership in development processes allows stakeholders to work, talk, and solve problems with individuals who are often perceived as the masters. Instead of demonstrating the relationship as a worker- client tie, the parties involved should agree on working in partnerships. An expression used by the Latin American activists to describe their relationship with the people (communities, groups) with whom they are working is “accompanying the process” (Wilson & Whitmore, 2011). Wilson and Whitmore identified a set of principles for collaboration in a variety of settings and situations. These include nonintrusive collaboration, mutual trust and respect, a common analysis of what the problem is, a commitment to solidarity, equality in the relationship, an explicit focus on process, and the importance of language.

Partnership implies that power is in fact redistributed through negotiation between citizens and power holders (Swidler & Watkins, 2013). They agree to share planning and decision-making responsibilities through such structures as joint policy boards, planning committees and mechanisms for resolving impasses. After the ground rules have been established through some form of give-and-take, they are not subject to unilateral change. Speer (2012) argues that partnership can work most effectively when there is an organized power-base in the community to which the citizen leaders are accountable; when the citizens group has the financial resources to pay its leaders reasonable honoraria for their time-consuming efforts; and when the group has the resources to hire (and fire) its own technicians, lawyers, and community organizers. With these ingredients, citizens have some genuine bargaining influence over the outcome of the plan (as long as both parties find it useful to maintain the partnership).

2.3.2 Ubudehe Program

The Ubudehe process in Rwanda is a unique policy of nurturing citizens ‘collective action in partnership with a government committed to decentralization. This policy has its roots in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP 2002-2006) and the Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA). It is a policy designed to increase the level of institutional problem-solving capacity at the local level by citizens and local government. It seeks to put into operation the principles of citizens’ participation through local collective action (Ministry of Local Government, 2009).

According to Mujawase (2015), the word Ubudehe was selected to present a quick mental image of people working in collective action; action to solve problems affecting local people, by local people, for local people; with support from local government, NGOs, local resource people and donors. It sets out to strengthen democratic processes and governance starting from the people's aspirations, ability and traditions. Mujawase (2015) argues that the Ubudehe process seeks to create deliberate opportunities for people at the cell level to interact with one another, to share worldviews, and to create institutions of their own which assign duties, benefits, responsibility and authority. According to Rwanda Local Development Support Fund (RLDSF) (2012), it is through such processes of local interaction for mutual benefit that trust between individuals will increase, as will reciprocal relationships. The assumption is made that strong social capital creates high trust and communication within a group and opportunity for economic co-operative formation. If such a group faces a conflict situation they will attempt to resolve the conflict through local institutional means without resorting to violence. Consequently, the Ubudehe process, through encouraging local collective action is also building a foundation for reducing vulnerability and the potential for divisionism and conflict (RLDSF, 2012).

According to Mupenzi (2015), Ubudehe was set up as part of the Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA). The overarching goal of the PPA was "To help community groups and some poor households to create their own problem-solving experience". As such, information gathered at the cell level, by the population, helped to understand people's experience of poverty and was incorporated into the final PRSP. Mupenzi (2015) posits that the following principles were to guide the PPA and through that the Poverty Reduction Strategy: enhance local problem solving experience; attempt participation of all actors; those affected should be able to participate; the "action-experience-knowledge-new action" cycle of all nationals should be protected; and the poor should not lose livelihoods for the days that they engage in the PPA.

According to the Ministry of the Finance and Economic Planning (2011), Ubudehe is made up of two distinct processes, one at the community level and one at the household level. Both processes use in essence the same methodology. At community level, Ubudehe follows the following steps: determine the poverty profile as perceived by the people themselves; determine the causes and consequences of poverty; draw up the social map of the cell, which includes the names of household heads, their social category (different categories are again decided by the

people themselves), development infrastructure, material of each house's roof; identify and analyse the problems facing their community and determine a priority problem to be addressed; plan the activities and relative means needed for addressing the prioritised problem through a collective action plan (Ubudehe); put in place a system to manage the identified collective action (soft system check list); submit the action plan to a pertinence test for all stakeholders to see if the retained strategies are the best to solve the identified problem; Check if collective action principles are respected through the Co-operation, Operational, Maintenance, Information and co-ordination (COMIC) tool; and the management committee, elected by the community, local technicians, local authorities and other stakeholders approve the execution of the collective action and engage to safeguard and respect the principles of collective action (Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, 2011).

Mujawase (2015) points out that at household level, Ubudehe methodology consists of analysing and identifying the household's survival (coping) strategies. The members of the household, together with the facilitators/trainers follow the following steps: determine their coping strategies throughout the year (seasonality); analyse these strategies in order to come up with a strategy favorable to the promotion and improvement of the living conditions within the household (preference scoring); plan activities and budget the necessary means to execute the retained strategy; a pertinence test is then carried out by wise men in the cell (Inyangamugayo) to make sure that the retained strategy is appropriate and will be of good use to the household; and the household members finally accept and sign for the funds that are accorded to them. They agree that the funds supporting the execution of their strategy will have a rotating character. After this process, funds are made available to support the identified household strategy.

2.4 Empirical Studies

A study by Mupenzi (2015) on the role of Ubudehe in poverty reduction in Rwanda using a descriptive survey design revealed that despite the desire to meaningfully involve people in community development projects, Ubudehe had faced numerous challenges because of inadequate resources and therefore poverty reduction was still a question among people in Rwanda. It appears in the papers that at global level, Ubudehe scooped a United Nations trophy as the best managed and implemented development programme. Particularly in Gicumbi district, it was found out that in the last two financial years of 2005/2006 and 2007/2008, they had one

village (Umudugudu) that emerged best in the district and second at national level as a result of fighting poverty and with clear poverty reduction indicators. Research findings revealed that Ubudehe approach is very politically acclaimed both at National and International levels as the best approach to poverty reduction, but it is also working amidst limited funding and therefore one wonders how poverty can be reduced within limited funding. It is therefore clear that with limited funding such approach cannot succeed. In a nutshell, the interventions against poverty in Rwanda are contextualized and applicable but the challenge remains differentiating poverty reduction tools from political tools intended to address trust among the citizenry. The above study looked at poverty reduction in Gicumbi district; however, the current study will look at improving housing condition of the needy families in Gicumbi district.

Mujawase (2015) in her study examined the factors that contributed to the successful implementation of ubudehe program of social protection intra-community cooperation based on collective and individual actions and its impact on the lives of Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP) beneficiaries in Ngororero District in Rwanda. Results showed that the Ubudehe program became successful as a result of the decentralization policy of the Rwandan government that activated collective action at the community level by developing bottom-up budgeting and planning systems to address communities' needs as well as resource mobilization that facilitated programme implementation and building the capacity of the population and entities which implement programmes. The role of government in the process is providing an environment for socio-cultural rights and obligations of citizens towards one another. Its impact on the lives of the beneficiaries is traced on their evolving increase in per capital expenditure on a monthly basis and changes on their socio-economic aspects. The above study looked at the factors that contribute to successful implementation of ubudehe program; however, the current study will look at the extent of community participation in implementing a project that directly affects them.

Mansuri and Rao (2012) in their study examined over 500 examples of interventions (government- and donor-supported) which have sought to induce participation, including the World Bank's substantial effort to support participatory development. Their focus was on "induced" participation, not the "organic" form. They found that over the past decade, the World Bank had allocated almost \$85 billion to local participatory development. Driving this massive

injection of funding had been the underlying belief that involving communities in at least some aspects of project design and implementation creates a closer connection between development aid and its intended beneficiaries. Indeed, local participation was proposed as a method to achieve a variety of goals, including sharpening poverty targeting, improving service delivery, expanding livelihood opportunities, and strengthening demand for good governance. From their review of the evidence, they are generally modestly positive about the results of participatory approaches, but emphasize that the main beneficiaries tend to be the most literate, the least geographically isolated, and the most politically well-connected. They found little evidence that induced participation builds long-lasting cohesion, even at the community level and that group formation tends to be both parochial and unequal. The above study looks at community participation by funding the community livelihood changing projects with cash, however, the current study will look at community participation without cash enhancement, only construction material enhancement.

Njunwa (2010) in his study investigated community participation in development of primary education in Tanzania. The study investigated general understanding of the people on community participation, the extent of community participation, reasons for their participation and the limitations to effective community participation in development. The finding revealed that the community participates in development of their school through building classrooms, teacher's houses, toilets, furniture in school administration. The study also found out that the local people participated through paying money and providing labour. Furthermore, the study found a number of factors that limited effective community participation which included poverty, illiteracy and ignorance, political interferences, poor performance of the pupils, mistrust and misuse of money and lack of transparency. Although the above study looked at community participation, it did not use the dimensions of delegated power and partnership; the current study will close this gap by using the dimensions of community participation.

Asiyanbola (2012) conducted a study local perspective, aspiration and women empowerment in housing development in Africa: Nigeria. The first aim of the study was to make an examination of the local perspective about women's involvement in housing development. The second aim was an examination of the influence of local perspective on housing development involvement aspiration of women as indicated by the actual housing development involvement of women,

women's level of knowledge about the development of their household, and women's intention to be involved in housing delivery. Correlation statistical technique was used to test the hypotheses. The study found significant negative relationship between local perspective and (i) actual housing development involvement of women, (ii) women's level of knowledge about the development of their household house, and, (iii) women's intention to be involved in housing delivery. This result suggests that women empowerment could be greatly enhanced through a reorientation of the mindset of the society about some of the local perspective that hinders women's involvement in development activities. However, this study only looked at women's level of participation in the housing projects and did not specify whether these women were needy or was not. The current study will look at the involvement of both women and men in promoting housing projects for the needy families.

The study by Speer (2013) documents the consolidation efforts of households who invaded land near to the city of Pietermaritzburg after being driven out of a more rural area by political violence in 1990. 90% of households had been in the area for five years and more. Despite local authority attempts to relocate them, the community was eventually recognized and grew rapidly. The settlement was upgraded, and 23 households who were relocated to allow road construction take part in a mutual aid construction project sponsored by Oxfam Canada and supported by a local NGO. An amount left over from the State housing subsidy after services were installed was made available to each household to purchase building materials. Just more than half the households in the sample built two room core houses using concrete blocks, and another 20% used wattle and daub. 27% of the sample had undertaken minor improvements. The motivations of households for improving their housing are examined. Because of the time in which the data was collected, the above study is more about the initial impact of the government housing subsidy on the building activities of poor households than it is about longer term consolidation which the current study intends to investigate.

Edwin (2013), in his study investigated the challenges of housing development for the low income population in Kenya. Housing development situation in Kenya has been skewed in favour of high income earners as most developers and housing financiers always target high income population because of the perception that they can rent houses or take up mortgages and repay comfortably. The result is the isolation of low income population who form the majority.

Challenges faced by government in provision of housing Key areas of challenge in Kenya relate to developing country initiatives which include rapid urban population growth, the misuse of dwelling funds, the adverse effects of increasing rents for low income groups, the deficiency of the housing loan system and the increase in luxury houses rather than social houses. However, the real challenge for the Government is to create an enabling environment for investment and to remove the impediments that hamper private sector development. These range from functioning labour, capital, and input markets through to an efficient and effective administration process, with an emphasis on showing real progress, building on key successes in market where the private sector already has incentives to invest. This study focused more on how to help provide housing projects to the poor/low income earners since most housing projects in Kenya are meant for the middle and high income earners who are able to pay for the mortgage. This research is related to the current study as they both focus on building housing projects for the needy/poor families in Rwanda.

In a study conducted by Cross (2006) in Johannesburg, questions were raised about possible links between the breakdown of South African black households and government provision of low-cost housing. The study revealed that young single women living in subsidised housing with their families in Johannesburg rejected strategies to study further in the hope of formal employment. Instead, they believed in living on their own resources through transactional sex and other income sources. These formally unemployed young women would delay marriage and forego the establishment of their own households without having a guaranteed source of income (Cross, 2006). This undermined the formation of marriage-based nuclear-family households. Further, if they were to leave their household, they would decide not to pursue acquiring of subsidised housing even if they qualified for such housing. They would instead prefer to move to a shack community. In doing so, they would be leaving behind their household's support system and social networks focusing on their household of origin. The study established how housing projects were costly in South Africa hence discouraging women to occupy them and hence create a racial segregation in the community. The current study looks at how housing projects could be developed with the community hence eliminating the challenges of racial segregation, and high costs on the occupants of the housing, this shows a relationship between the current study and the findings of this study.

A study conducted by Mukorombindo (2012) focuses on social networks and developed human settlements in black Grahams town. It attempts to provide an indication of the importance of social networks as part of building sustainable communities and social cohesion. In doing so, it explored the opportunities and challenges of ‘deploying’ social capital and social networks among low-income urban communities in alleviating poverty and developing sustainable human settlements. Significant social security networks amongst neighbours existed. Local residents ‘expressed strong family-like connections with fellow members and neighbours and acknowledged receiving some assistance from these local networks when in need’ (Mukorombindo 2012). Community networks were present in the form of stokvels (or savings-clubs), burial societies and churches which could be said to facilitate the building of social capital. Social networks in Grahams town made positive contributions to poor households. The burdens of rising unemployment and poverty over-shadowed and dented the effects of social networks. This study investigated how social networks, social development and other social initiatives can be integrated into developing housing projects such as the current study also focuses on how housing projects can be built in Rwanda with the elimination of both expected and unexpected challenges. This study will further establish how power is delegated in housing projects unlike the study that was conducted by Mukorombindo (2012).

In another study conducted by Nkambule (2012), also on Grahamstown, housing is clearly shown to be marked by overcrowding, in which seven people on average occupy one house which is approximately forty square metres. Overcrowding sometimes leads to invasion of privacy and heightened anxiety, though the notion of crowding may be locally and culturally specific (Graydon, 2010). Residents, in specifically Extension 9 (in Grahamstown), though with big families in small houses, felt in fact that the shortage of physical space within the houses facilitated interaction and connectivity. The cramped space enhanced collective participation in conversation and entertainment activities. One of the female participants noted that “it is not good for the house to be small but its advantage is that it makes us very close”. In this sense the size of houses creates and maintains bonding social capital between RDP beneficiaries (internal to households) but the implications of this for cohesion between households is unclear. In large part, though, urban housing literature in South Africa does not incorporate in-depth discussions about sustainable human settlements and social capital formation, although it does often raise questions about the scarcity of community participation in housing projects (Mafukidze and

Hoosen 2009). Crucially, then, the social dimension of housing sustainability is the least researched in South Africa and is normally over-looked. This study looked at house space and overcrowding, which can be an issue among housing projects hence highlighting the necessity for privacy among the occupants of the housing projects. This is a challenge that has to be considered when constructing a housing project even in Rwanda. Overcrowding in housing projects needs to be solved hence the current study established how this crisis can be averted so that the same doesn't happen in Rwanda.

2.4 Gaps in the Literature Review

Mupenzi (2015), Mujawase (2015), Mansuri and Rao (2012), and Njunwa (2010) have covered the concept of community participation in community development projects such as schools and poverty eradication, however, none of the preceding studies conceptualized community participation in terms of citizen involvement, delegated powers and partnership, this study closed this content gap through information that was collected from focus group discussions and interviews with the project leaders, local leaders and project beneficiaries.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with the practical procedures which were used in carrying out the current study. The chapter includes the research design that was adopted, population of the study, sample size, sampling procedure, data collection instruments, data analysis and field data collection procedures. The chapter also underlines the framework within which data was collected, analyzed and presented.

3.1 Research Design

This study adopted a case study research design taking a single case (i.e. Housing Project for the Needy Families). A single case is often used where it represents a critical case or, alternatively, an extreme or unique case. The researcher selected a single case because it provides one with an opportunity to observe and analyse a phenomenon that few have considered before (Creswell, 2011). In addition, the case study strategy was of particular interest to the researcher because of the need to clearly understand the impact of community participation on Housing Project for the Needy Families in Gicumbi district. This helped the researcher answer the ‘why’, ‘what’, and ‘how’ questions. Furthermore, since the study used case study design, the researcher preferred to use only qualitative approach because of its ability to provide detailed textual descriptions of how people experience a given research issue (i.e. Housing Projects for the Needy Families vis-à-vis community participation).

3.2 Study Population

There are 395,606 people in Gicumbi District (National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda, 2015). Among the population, the beneficiaries of Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District are 1,680 families (Office of the Ombudsman, 2015). The target population was 2,100 participants who included district local leaders (236), district project officials (184) and, project beneficiaries (1,680) in Gicumbi District (Department of Social Affairs, Gicumbi District).

3.3 Sample Size

This study used Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table to determine the sample size of the respondents. According to Morgan table (1970) that is attached on the Appendix III, a population size of 2,100 is estimated at 327 respondents.

Table 3.1 gives the summary of the target population and sample size

Table 3.1: Target Population and Sample Size

Sector	Target Population			Sample Size		
Category of informants	Local leaders	Project leaders	Beneficiaries	Local leaders	Project leaders	Beneficiaries
Sector A	58	43	420	9	7	65
Sector B	57	47	419	9	7	65
Sector C	60	48	417	9	7	65
Sector D	61	46	424	9	7	66
Sub Total	236	184	1,680	36	28	261
Overall Total	2,100			327		

3.4 Sampling Procedure

Gicumbi District is made up of 21 sectors. The researcher divided the district into three strata with each stratum containing 7 sectors. The researcher used stratified random sampling to divide the large district into smaller sectors. Furthermore, the researcher used purposive sampling to select the stratum (containing 7 sectors) with the highest activities regarding Housing Project for the Needy Families. The researcher preferred this method because it adds credibility to a sample when the potential purposeful sample is larger than one can handle. In addition, from the seven sectors in the selected stratum, the researcher used simple random sampling to select 4 sectors. This was achieved by the researcher writing the names of the seven sectors on a piece of paper and placing them in a bowl and shaking them so that they can randomize. The researcher then selected 4 sectors from among the 7 sectors. In order to select project beneficiaries from the four selected sectors, the researcher consulted the District Office to establish the names of the

beneficiaries from each sector plus their addresses. The researcher then wrote the names of the beneficiaries on pieces of papers and placed them in a bowl and shook them so that they could randomize. The researcher selected the names of the participants randomly until the required number was established. Similarly, simple random sampling was used to select the local community leaders and the project leaders in the same manner as described above in the case of the beneficiaries. The researcher preferred to use this method because it gives equal opportunity of participation to every participant without bias.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

An introductory letter was obtained from the College of Humanities and Social Sciences of Kampala International University after the approval of the validity of the research instruments. Before collecting data, the researcher obtained the permission from the mayor allowing me to undertake research in the District. The researcher briefed the key interview informants (KIIs) about her intentions to carry out a research in their area. The researcher then asked the KIIs to sign a consent form that they were informed of participating in the study. The researcher requested the KIIs to respond to all the questions and thereafter planed for data collection.

3.6 Data Sources

The study collected primary data using interviews and focus group discussions.

3.7 Data Collection Instruments

3.7.1 Interview

The study employed face to face interviews with the project officials on themes regarding project control by the citizens, delegation of power to the citizens and partnership of the citizens with other stakeholders in the project. The study preferred face to face interview because of its extensive knowledge of the current research issues. This allowed more detailed questions to be asked which greatly enriched field findings. The key informants' own words were recorded, and ambiguities were clarified.

3.7.2 Focus Group Discussion

The study used one (1) focus group of nine (9) local leaders from each of the four (4) sectors to discuss themes such as project control, delegation of power, and partnership with other stakeholders in project, with the local leaders of each selected sector. The leaders were involved

in the study because they are the ones mandated with the distribution of iron sheets, bags of cement and nails by the Ministry of Local Government.

Furthermore, the study used eight (8) focus groups with the project beneficiaries, each with a minimum of eight (8) members and maximum of (9) members. The themes of the focus group discussions with beneficiaries included: project control, delegation of power and partnership with other stakeholders in the project. According to Onen (2012), FGD are useful if the researcher wishes to explore group perceptions, experiences and understanding with regard to a particular issue. It involves having a discussion with a specific group of key informants on a particular topic or subject. A small group of about 8-10 participants are recommended for the focus group discussion. The focus group discussions were carried out with the help of a research assistant recording the discussions while the researcher engaged the key informants on various issues related to the purpose and objectives of the current research. The study preferred focus group discussions because they produce data and insights that would be inaccessible without interaction in a group setting, and group members can discover a common language to describe similar experiences (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

3.8 Validity

3.8.1 Validity

Validity in qualitative research means “appropriateness” of the tools, processes, and data (Rolf, 2006). Validity in this study was used to establish whether the research question was valid for the desired outcome, the choice of methodology was appropriate for answering the research question, the design was valid for the methodology, the sampling and data analysis was appropriate, and if the results and conclusions were valid for the sample and context. The researcher established the validity of this study by accounting for personal biases which may have influenced findings; meticulous record keeping, demonstrating a clear decision trail and ensuring interpretations of data were consistent and transparent; establishing a comparison case/seeking out similarities and differences across views to ensure different perspectives were represented; including rich and thick verbatim descriptions of participants’ views to support findings; and demonstrating clarity in terms of thought processes during data analysis and subsequent interpretations (Kuper, Lingard & Levinson, 2008).

3.9 Data Collection Procedure

An introductory letter was obtained from the College of Humanities and Social Sciences of Kampala International University after the approval of the validity of the research instruments. Before collecting data, the researcher obtained the permission from the mayor allowing me to undertake research in the District.

The researcher briefed the key interview informants (KIIs) about her intentions to carry out a research in their area. The researcher then asked the KIIs to sign a consent form that they were informed of participating in the study. The researcher requested the KIIs to respond to all the questions and thereafter planed for data collection.

3.10 Data Analysis

Data was analysed using editing on the transcripts to identify the significant statements across individual and group interviews. Subsequent reviews of the significant statements helped in identifying sub-themes emerging within the patterns. For presentation of thematic findings, both *textural* and *structural* descriptions were used in the results section. Textural descriptions are significant statements used to write what the participants experienced while Structural descriptions are the interpretation of the context or setting that influenced participants' experiences. For textural descriptions, the quotes of participants were given in italics with the respondent to whom that quote belonged and in accordance to one's gender. The structural descriptions as interpreted by the researcher were provided in plain text.

3.11 Ethical Considerations

The following strategies were adopted to ensure the moral justification of the investigation.

Authorization: This involved getting consent of the informants as highlighted above.

Anonymity and Confidentiality: The names or identifications of the informants were treated anonymous and information collected from them was treated with utmost confidentiality.

Integrity: The researcher acted honestly, fairly and respectfully to all the informants who participated in this study.

Ascriptions of authorship: The researcher accurately recorded the sources of information in an effort to acknowledge the works of past scholars or researchers. This ensured that no plagiarism was practiced.

Scientific adjudication: The researcher worked according to generally acceptable norms of research.

3.12 Limitation of the Study

- Uncooperative behavior of some informants, un-approachable informants and those who were reluctant to give information limited the researcher in this study. However the researcher convinced the informants that the work was for academic purposes only.
- The researcher was as well limited by extraneous variables such as honesty, especially from project leaders where some of them chose not to say the truth. However, this was mitigated by asking the project beneficiaries and the local leaders probing questions so as to eliminate any lies that were made by some informants.
- Instrumentation: Questions in the interview guide and focus group were not standard but were researcher-developed. It is likely that the validity of the results could have been affected on the ground of none standardization of the instruments. The researcher mitigated this by recording and keeping field notes to track the responses in different themes by different informants and by establishing similarities and differences across submitted views or responses to ensure a reasonable degree of validity of the current research.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the data collected from the field, analysis and interpretation of the data. It follows the major themes and objectives of the study. After a description of each of the finding, an interpretation is given in the context of the study objective.

4.1 Response Rate

The study sampled 327 informants but only 248 persons participated, giving a response rate of 76%. Amin (2004) believes that if the response rate is more than 70%, it signifies that the turn up of participants was good; hence, the data can be used in the final analysis of the study. Table 4.1 gives the summary of the responses from the different categories of informants.

Table 4.1: Response Rate

Anticipated participants				Actual participants (key informants)		
Sector	Local leaders	Project officials	Beneficiaries	Local leaders	Project leaders	Beneficiaries
Sector A	9	7	65	4	3	53
Sector B	9	7	65	6	2	59
Sector C	9	7	65	5	4	55
Sector D	9	7	66	4	5	48
Sub total	36	28	261	19	14	215
Overall total	327					

Source: primary data, 2017/2018

4.2 Informants' Profile

This section provides the findings on the profile of the informants. The informants were put into three categories, namely; project officials (gender, age, educational level and work experience);

and local leaders and project beneficiaries (gender, age and educational level). Table 4.2 and 4.3 give the summary of the findings as regard profile of the informants.

Table 4.2: Profile of the Project Officials

Profile of project officials	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	9	64
Female	5	36
Total	14	100
Age		
20-29 years	2	14
30-39 years	4	29
40-49 years	5	36
50 and above	3	21
Total	14	100
Education Level		
Certificate	0	0
Diploma	3	21
Bachelor Degree	11	79
Master's Degree	0	0
Total	14	100
Work Experience		
Less than 1 year	0	0
1-5 years	2	14
6-10 years	4	29
More than 10 years	8	57
Total	14	100

Source: primary data, 2017/2018

The results in Table 4.2 indicate that majority, 64% of the informants were male while their female counterparts were represented by 36%. The dominance of the male informants is

attributed to the fact that men were preferred as project managers in the Housing project for the needy Families because it involved construction of houses and dealing with procurement and purchase of building materials which the women had little knowledge about.

Furthermore, table 4.2 revealed that majority, 36% of the informants were within the age group of 40-49 years, followed by 29% who were within the age group of 30-39 years, while those within the age group of 20-29 years and 50 and above were represented by 14% and 21% respectively. The dominance of the informants within the age group of 40-49 years implies that majority of the project officials were mature and understand well what they do.

In addition, table 4.2 revealed that majority, 79% of the informants were Bachelor holders, followed by Diploma holders, however, none of them had Certificate or Master's Qualification. The dominance of Bachelor holders as project official was because the government wanted the project to be successful and eliminate any failures that would arise from incompetence and low qualification for the task.

Lastly, table 4.2 revealed that majority, 57% of the informants had more than 10 years of working experience, followed by 29% who had 6-10 years of working experience and 14% who had work experience of 1-5 years. None of the informants had work experience of less than 1 year. The dominance of the informants with a working experience of more than 10 years is attributed to the fact that the district leaders recruited only project officials with the knowledge, expertise, and competence for the task so as to eliminate any mishaps in any phase of the project.

Table 4.3: Profile of the Local Leaders

Profile of local leaders	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	13	68
Female	6	32
Total	19	100
Age		
20-29 years	0	0
30-39 years	11	58
40-49 years	8	42
50 and above	0	0
Total	19	100
Education Level		
Certificate	1	5
Diploma	3	16
Bachelor Degree	15	79
Master's Degree	0	0
Total	19	100

Source: primary data, 2018

The results presented in Table 4.3 revealed that majority, 68% of the informants were male, while 32% were female.

Furthermore, Table 4.3 revealed that majority, 58% of the informants were within the age group of 30-39 years, followed by 42% who were within the age group of 40-49 years.

In addition, Table 4.3 Revealed that majority, 79% of the informants were Bachelor holders, followed by 16% of the informants were Diploma holders, followed by 5% of the respondents who were certificate holder.

Table 4.4: Profile of the Project Beneficiaries

Profile of project beneficiaries	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	89	41
Female	126	59
Total	215	100
Age		
20-29 years	6	3
30-39 years	15	7
40-49 years	24	11
50 and above	170	79
Total	215	100
Education Level		
None	78	36
Primary	103	48
Secondary	32	15
University	2	1
Total	215	100

Source: primary data, 2018

The results presented in Table 4.4 revealed that majority, 59% of the informants were female, while 41% were male. The dominance of the informants who were female was attributed to the fact that the project was intended to serve the orphans, widows and vulnerable who were victims of genocide, hence the majority of them happen to be women.

Furthermore, Table 4.4 revealed that majority, 79% of the informants were of the age of 50 years and above, followed by 11% who were 40-49 years of age and 7% who were 30-39 years of age and 3% who were 20-29 years of age. The dominance of the informants who were above 50 years of age was attributed to the fact that the project targeted the vulnerable and elderly women who had no hope of having decent housing.

Lastly, Table 4.4 revealed that majority, 48% of the elderly and vulnerable women had only primary education, followed by 36% who had no education at all, while other informants with secondary education and university education were represented by 15% and 1% respectively.

4.3 The Level of Citizens' Control in the Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District

The first objective of this study was to examine how citizens have control in the projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District. In order to achieve this objective, the researcher conducted face to face interviews with the project officials, and focus group discussions with the local leaders and the project beneficiaries. The researcher asked the project officials the question: "In which ways are the citizens given opportunities to have some control in the projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?" The responses are summarized below:

A project official was quoted saying, "often times we give them the opportunities to organize themselves in committees/groups and advise them to come up with a group leader who will represent them and update them in any matters that may arise in the project. we have given their leaders the opportunity to always give their views and come up with good or even better plans that can ensure that the project is successful. For example, we have mandated the power to the village committee leaders to select the most vulnerable and the most likely beneficiaries to this project so as to avoid any biasness and favoritism, so far their contribution has been good, so to say...."

Some of the project officials said, "during project initiation, we have involved the participation of the local leaders within the different villages to give us information regarding genocide victims, they were the ones who gave us a list of names and took us to see the residences of each of the victims and some orphans that were helpless in the villages. We gave them full control of this stage of the project, our work was only to confirm the report they give us".

On the other hand, some project officials argued "well, we have been able to include some of the leaders that the people selected from among themselves to participate in the distribution of iron sheets, cement and nails to the families that were selected. They reported to us which families have not yet received the items and which ones had received less than half of the items, their reports were very helpful in making the project progress smoothly and successfully".

The above results imply that the citizens were given control in the project right from the start of the project. This responds to the research question of whether the citizens were given some control over project activities. This is because the citizens were given control in the selection of their own representatives, selection of the beneficiaries and implementation of the project by distributing iron sheets, nails and bags of cement.

In order to confirm the above views that were submitted by the project officials, the researcher organized a focus group discussion with the local leaders and the project beneficiaries. The question asked as regards the matter was: “In what ways are you given opportunity to have any control in the projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?” Their responses are summarized below:

The local leader said, “as a leader in this village, I was given the role of identifying the most vulnerable genocide victims that would be the target beneficiaries of the project, I took them on a tour to every family so that they can see for themselves the housing conditions where some of the beneficiaries reside.....we were able to come up with a list of names and the number of family members...not all families had the same number of family members, some had few, others had even more than ten members with this information, the number of rooms for each needy family was established”.

The above statement is a summary of what most of the local leaders from the sectors were able to say. There was no need to repeat what each of them said since all of them described the same roles that they rendered to the project officials in their sectors.

However, the project beneficiaries had this to say:

The project beneficiary argued that, “they came here and asked me how many rooms I want for my house, and I said three rooms because I leave with two grown up grandchildren, i told them I need the house to have a kitchen also since I’m tired of cooking from outside I’m disturbed a lot during rainy season, they had no problem.....after two month, they came back and started to build the house...they constructed exactly three rooms and a kitchen just the way I wanted “.

The project beneficiary said “i had already started to build a house of four rooms, I was just at the foundation level, but due to problems of money, I stopped the process for close to two years

until this program came to our village and I was also included in the project. at first they wanted to build for me three rooms since that was the design for every family but I requested them to continue with my foundation of four rooms and they did not refuse at all, i was very lucky to have such a rare opportunity”.

Other project beneficiaries argued that, “When the local leaders came with the project team to my village, they were looking for people who were willing to participate in the distribution of iron sheets, and cement. I agreed to participate and we went from village to village distributing these items and those who participated in the distribution work were given daily allowances and improved my standards of living”.

The above extract signifies that the project officials and their team gave the citizens a percentage of control regarding the project. Their suggestions were respected and adhered to and their expectations were met. The citizens had control of what the project was supposed to do for them and the project team was compliant enough.

Furthermore, the researcher asked the project officials who project activities they gave the local communities and their leaders control in. The responses were the same for all the project leaders. They were summarized as below:

The project official said, “The members of the communities were mostly involved in the distribution of iron sheets, cement, nails, selection of the beneficiaries, monitoring and evaluation project activities, planning and budgeting of some of the financial resources we gave them and selection of subcontractors, though there was heavy corruption among the local leaders where some funds were mismanaged and the other materials were not all given to the beneficiaries”.

On the other hand, the researcher asked the beneficiaries of how they hold their leaders accountable in some of their project activities. The question asked was: “How do you hold the project leaders accountable in the projects for the needy families?” Their responses were summarized as below:

The beneficiary said, “we normally ask them questions regarding what the objectives of the projects are, the purpose of the project, who are the eligible beneficiaries, how are they going to

benefit, what are they supposed to do in the meantime, what planning do they have in place regarding the project, and how is the local community supposed to be involved in the project? Such and several other questions helps to get to understand exactly what the project entails”.

The project beneficiary said, “sometimes those who have been selected from among us to be our leaders in the project must account to us on how they have used the money allocated to them with evidences of receipts, this is how we have been putting a stop on misappropriation cases and there have been penalties in that regard”.

Some of the beneficiaries argued that, “indeed holding this people accountable sometimes is very difficult because there are certain things they do that we don’t know about, however, occasionally we are entitled to project reports after every phase has been completed....when we are not given we try our best to ask for it just for the sake of ensuring that we understand what is going on and what is challenging the project team....we can also give our input in terms of man power in case the challenges or problems the project team is facing can be solved by us”.

The beneficiary urged that, “on our own, we have a team of three members whom we elected to make sure they do regular follow ups on matters of the project....they follow up on who has missed to receive the deliverables, when will they receive it and where will they receive it.....they are like informers to us on tracking the outcome of the project through the information they give us, we can use it to hold the responsible leaders accountable if they swindle what rightfully belongs to us”.

The above responses indicate that the members of the local community have a good way of having control on the project outcome. This is because ensuring that they hold their leaders accountable is evidence that they have some degree of control in the project and therefore such engagement makes them to fully benefit in the project.

4.4 Power Delegation to the Community Members and their Contribution towards Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District

The second objective of this study was to establish how power is delegated to the community members to contribute towards housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District. The researcher asked the key interview informants (i.e. project managers) this question: “how power

is sometimes delegated to the community members to contribute towards housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?” Their responses were summarized as below:

The project official said, “we ensure that we involve them in decision making during community group meetings so that they give us what they know and what they think is the most appropriate way of handling any matter that pertains the project, their contributions have been generally very helpful, they are very knowledgeable of their members and they give the most vivid decision regarding how such members may best be part of the project and they would be served”.

The project official argued that, “in several of our forums, we have allowed the citizens to hold some of our members accountable for their activities even their own local leaders who are part of the project, the citizens have been able to hold them accountable on several occasions, mostly on areas of budget planning and resource distribution, the delegation of this kind of power has been able to act as check and balances for our project activities”.

The project official said, “the local community share some bit of power where they have the right to stop our activities if we are not doing what we had earlier agreed on in the different forums we held with them, they have the power to withdraw, sue and at the same time arrest us for any misappropriation of the resources that were allocated as deliverables in the project....they do this because they have been well educated of what they are supposed to benefit from, how and when they are supposed to have such provisions availed to them”.

The project official said, “actually in this project, the citizens have the power to negotiate with the district officials and we the project team on matters of the project that directly affect them for instance, in my sector, the local community members were able to negotiate that even the HIV victims be included since they were also vulnerable members of the community, a criteria was arrived at on who of the HIV/AIDs victims would be included and several of such people were able to be included in the project just like that, so I can say, there is power when the citizens are able to negotiate some terms on the project”.

The project official argued, “The locals and their leaders also negotiated that they would be the sole suppliers of cheap materials such as sand, timber, stones and gravel, and water. Initially, the project team had intended to have outside contractors to provide such materials and

services, however after the communities complained that they want to be the ones to benefit from such activities, a report was written to the district office and their request was okayed”.

The project official said, “in this sector, the communities gave us a list of subcontractors that would be most eligible to be included in the project to provide materials such as cement, iron bars, and paint and we saw no problem with that so far these contractors have been good in what they do and we have no complaints against them as regard quality, quantity, cost and time of delivery seems the locals know their people that is why they recommended them to us and it has made our work very simple”.

The above extract is an indication that power delegation in the project was of great relevance to its success. That is, giving the citizens the power to make decision, hold leaders accountable and negotiate their position in the project indeed was a better idea that led to successful completion of the project. However, without power delegation, there would have been several conflicts of interests that would have stampede the project and brought it to a halt.

Furthermore, the researcher in different sets of focus group discussions asked the local leaders and the project beneficiaries this question: “What powers are delegated to the community members in the housing project for the needy families?” Their responses were summarized as below:

The beneficiary said, “they have given us the authority to make decisions about the project activities that directly affect us, they have involved some of our members in meetings, forums, and seminars so as to get our collective view concerning the project our leaders have been so representative in such matters since they first consult with us and then take the views of the members to the district officials and the project official”.

The local argued that, “yes, we have the power to decide who benefits from the project since we know most of the people whom the government has described in the report of who should be included in the project. This people are always with us and we have stayed with them over the years so there are no other better people who can identify them except us so far I believe we have done our best to avail the project team and government officials from the district the best information possible”.

The local leader said, “during the project implementation, we were granted the power to give our evaluation as regard the outcome of the project by the district officials hey gave us the opportunity to look around some of the completed houses to see if they were well constructed, our report was taken into consideration by the project leaders and the district officials. Somehow, some two houses were not well painted and three houses had their floors poorly done so when we showed the project leaders and the district officials the flaw, they considered it immediately and both the walls and the floors of the said houses were redone”.

The project leader said, “it is true that they gave us some powers in the ongoing project for instance we were able to successfully negotiate benefit sharing in the project we were able to negotiate through our leaders the provision of services such as cooking for the construction men, and the supply of local materials like sand, stones, and gravel our negotiation was heeded to by the district officials and the project leader”.

The beneficiary argued that, “when the project first came, we were invited to several meetings within the village and some of the members were democratically elected as village committee leaders based on trust to spear head in some of the project activities such as selection of the beneficiaries, distribution of project deliverables, and management of financial resources, however, we were told to always hold them accountable in all their activities pertaining the project on several occasions we forced most of them to resign since they were not able to properly account while others sadly ended up in police cells because they misused the resources that was put in their care, yes we were given that power by the project team themselves”.

The beneficiary said, “the power delegated to the village committee leaders which were democratically elected by the members was to plan, budget and procure resources from local suppliers they were to bargain and negotiate for the best quality of the building materials, however, we the remaining people also had the power to check most of their activities and hold them responsible for any misguided spending”.

The above extract has demonstrated that power delegation in the project of providing housing for the needy families in Gicumbi district was put into good practice and positive results were recorded.

Furthermore the researcher asked the project leaders of the impact of power delegation to the local leaders and the community members, specifically the question asked was: “What has been the impact of power delegation to the local communities on this project?” Their responses were summarized as below:

The project official argued that, “delegating some of the project activities helped in getting the right information, specifically at the stage of selecting the right beneficiaries and distributing the items to the beneficiaries, the local leaders and the communities were so involved and they managed to help us access some of the most remote places in the areas without their efforts, it would be so challenging to accomplish some of the project tasks”.

The project official said that, “at some stage, the politicians used the media to confuse the people that the project was their own efforts and it was somehow difficult for us since some of the beneficiaries were asking for more than what the government had given us their participation in some phases in the project made us to halt on several occasions because of the misinformation from the politician and the district leaders however came and clarified the matter and that is how the relationship between us and the local leaders with the beneficiaries came to calm”.

The project official argued that, “the project somehow delayed because of involving the community members in some of the most vital management responsibilities such as financial management, actually most of the money got lost in that process. Some local leaders embezzled the money and ran away so it made procurement of some building materials impossible and we had to wait for the government to send in more financial resources but that happened in the next quarter of government planning”.

The project official said, “it was interesting to work with them since they knew most of the things concerning the geography of their place better than us, they were able to help us identify homes that badly needed to benefit from the project they did their best to ensure that no eligible person was left out and they even made follow up in case some people had not received the project deliverables their leaders kept on reminding us on several occasions and the work went on smoothly”.

The project official said that, “it was challenging to work with some of the local leaders and the members of the community since we had to spend resources on capacity building such as

training them to be equipped with the knowledge that we wanted them to have. It took us a lot of time which should have been used to progress with the project, nonetheless, the training was worth it because we later discovered that accomplishing the project without the representation of the locals in some decisions would have caused in it to end prematurely”.

The project official said, “delegating power to the locals also gave them trust in us and we also developed trust in them in fact they helped in choosing some of the subcontractors to supply some of the most needed materials for the project because of power delegation, they worked so hard since they knew that they were the ones fully in charge of some project activities and that later they would be held accountable for any flaw and it made the results to have very minimal mistakes”.

The project official said, “Power delegation to the local leaders and the beneficiaries was useful in the project because it ensured that no shoddy work was done. The communities were able to do monitoring and evaluation of the project activities and give independent report to the district officials to a greater extent it helped to force us to give the project our very best though sometimes the reports were also wrong because they didn’t know very well how to write good reports as experts in monitoring and evaluation”.

The above extract shows that power delegation to the local community was positively impaction on the project to a greater extent. The project recorded a high level of success because the communities and their leadership were highly involved. They participated in almost all the phases of the project such as planning, execution, control and implementation.

In the same vein, the researcher asked the local leaders and the project beneficiaries this question: “How did you benefit from power delegation in the housing project for the needy families?” Their responses are summarized below:

The local leader said that, “the power delegation effort helped us to have strong bargaining power during several decision makings, our team of community leaders assisted a great deal to ensure that our voices were well represented and heard. We negotiated a number of services and changes to the project that were very important to us a community”.

The beneficiary said that, “the power delegation to our project representatives helped to bring about efficiency in the project they were able to monitor the progress of the project and make the project leaders accountable to the members of the community they were able to check the quality of the work of the project team and advise where necessary...their efforts made us able to get the best out of the project”.

The local leader argued that, “well, it is good to know that this project was delegated to us at some point because they could not go all through with it without involving us in what they were doing. We benefited from the power delegation because we were responsible in overseeing some of the project activities like the selection of the project beneficiaries, the planning of the community meetings and forums, and the validation of the outcome of the work of the project team”.

The beneficiary said that, “indeed this power delegation thing was very helpful, otherwise we would have been completely left out, for instance they didn’t want us to know what the government had apportioned for us as deliverables they tried to sideline us on several occasions mostly at the district level actually some beneficiaries at some point got few iron sheets and bags of cement than they were supposed to get but due to the instituted project team at the village level, they were able to make a follow up and some of the district officials who abused their duties by misappropriation were apprehended and forced to face the long arm of the law”.

The beneficiary said, “power delegation to the local community is what made us get the benefit from this project, otherwise, it would be in vain actually due to power delegation, we were able to get into some form of agreements as regard supply of certain materials and some small services to the construction team...no body was cheated or manipulated due to the terms and conditions of work that we had laid down as principle guideline”.

The beneficiary said that, “yes, we benefited a lot from this power delegation move most of our representatives actually got some form of capacity building training which enhanced their skills to work effectively in the project some of our young people were trained in digging the foundation, mixing cement, sand and gravel, plastering the walls and cementing the floors, fixing doors and windows, painting walls and roofing the house tops and i believe that even after the

project is completed they will use such skills to look for jobs within the villages so to earn a living”.

The above responses from the local leaders and the members of the community signify that indeed it was necessary to have a power delegation in the project so as to make it possible for the project team and the members of the communities to work together in harmony and share ideas and knowledge where necessary. The communities and their leadership surely exploited the delegation strategy to their benefit and were able to get the fullness of its relevance to them as a community and also to the project as well.

4.5 Partnership of the Community Members with other Project Stakeholders

The third objective of this study was to investigate whether community members have any partnership with other stakeholders in housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District. In order to achieve this objective, the researcher conducted a face to face interview with the project leaders, and focus group discussions with the local leaders and the project beneficiaries. The researcher asked the project leaders this question: “How did you ensure an effective partnership with the members of the community in housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?” The responses were summarized as below:

The project official argued that, “we successfully partnered with the local leaders and some beneficiaries by training them at the initial stages of the project such as how to distribute the items that would later be given to them, how to solve complaints and cases of misappropriation the training indeed helped in streamlining a number of things that would have been catastrophic to handle and we were also lucky that several local leaders were willing to get involved in the different training establishments that our team had set”.

The project official said that, “in our partnership with the local communities and their leaders, we developed the project vision and action plan together with the communities and their leaders we had terms and conditions which were laid down that each party was supposed to follow and not go overboard for example, in one of our action plans, we made it clear that it would be the local communities and the local leaders to supply all the needed raw materials for building and the financial aspect would be handled by the project team that was well settled and no one was in objection”.

The project official said that “Yes it’s good to have partnership always in any project when dealing with the local community or even any other project well, I and my team came up with a strategy and designed a partnership structure that works for the local communities for instance, we ensured that most of the resources were readily available for the construction work we signed agreements with the suppliers of the building materials who were mostly the local people as long as they supplied in time, we ensured that they would get some financial incentives as motivation and so far they have been doing their best to give us bricks, sand, gravel, and timber in time”.

The project official said, “it is true that involving the community in a partnership needs time, resources and sensitivity, that is why we had to lay down structures and made sure that our relationship with them was clear before the project work started we also ensured that it was crucial to achieve early clarity about when the community is being consulted and when it has the power to share decisions or to veto them. Such strategies were so instrumental in the project that we recorded a high success rate in this sector”.

The project official argued that, “in our partnership with the local communities and their leaders, we made meetings community-friendly at all levels of the partnership structure, it was very important that meetings be conducted in a style that community partners are comfortable with. for instance, attention was paid to: the time of day set for meetings; the language used in meetings; the level of formality to be adopted at meetings; the possibility of larger meetings being broken down at certain points into smaller groups, to facilitate participation; and the most appropriate venues, where transport; childcare arrangements; and any translation services may be needed”.

The project official said, “In our sector, we partnered with the communities in the monitoring and evaluation of the project activities and this is because evaluation can provide ways of checking that the community participation strategy is going according to plan and that money invested in this has been well spent. In most cases the community, with fewer resources, is the weaker partner. Without a monitoring of progress, there is a danger that community priorities could be sidelined or that token community involvement could take the place of real participation by local residents.therefore we ensured that throughout the monitoring process, full account was taken of the community’s views”.

The above extract imply that the project leaders indeed involved the local leaders and the local communities in a partnership in some of the aspects of the projects that directly needed their involvement in decision making and expert local area views that would help in laying a firm foundation for the success of the project.

On the other hand, the researcher asked the local leaders and project beneficiaries of how they partnered with other stakeholders in the project, specifically, the question asked was: “how did the community members partner with other stake holders in housing projects for the community members?” their responses were summarized as below:

The beneficiary said that, “i think what I might view as partnership was the periodic consultation the project team made at the initial stages of the project.....sure the consultations made us to be on the know on what type of project was been done around as and how we were supposed to be part of it, or rather benefit from it. It is true, they have tried to consult some people, though they did not reach everybody, may be people were so many for them but at least I know that periodic consultation was made most of us gave our opinions regarding the project.”

The local leader argued that, “the issue of partnership is very important since it involves us the members of the community we have been able throughout the course of the project to partner with them by providing labour our young boys and girls provided manual labour in areas such as fetching water, cooking for the builders, while the boys were involved in mixing mortar and wheeling sand and cement but of course the labour that was provided by our young children were paid for and we are grateful that”.

The local leaders said that, “yes there was some sought of partnership with the local leaders of this sector we were mostly involved in information exchange, specifically when it was time to select the beneficiaries.... we gave them the information they needed and they also gave the information regarding the specific type of people they wanted to be included in the project ome of the people we thought would be eligible were deleted from our list because they did not meet the qualities that the project team required all in all, i think information exchange helped a lot to ensure that the real people for the project were selected”.

The beneficiary argued that, “the community should have really partnered with the project team through active management of some of the project activities but there was limited space for that

the members of the local community were mostly involved in initial project phases, however in other phases such as procurement and purchases and financial spending and budget allocation, it was far from it”).

The beneficiary said that, “indeed we did partner with them by contributing some small amount of money it was not much but we needed money to buy water from the nearby tap water given the fact that it was dry season since most of the wells already dry, the local community participated with all their energy.....some of even used our own Jerricans to fetch water to help the builders continue with the construction activity.....it was the least we could do since we needed to do something that would make us proud to have been part of the project”.

The above extract signifies that there was some sought of partnership between the project stakeholders and the local communities. The partnership to a great extent helped in the acceleration of some of the project activities, though the communities were not involved in vital areas of active project management.

Furthermore, the researcher asked the project leaders of why they chose to partner with the community members, specifically the question posed was: “What were the reasons for partnering with the local communities in this project?” Their reasons were summarized as below:

The project official argued that, “well, the partnership was basically because we needed to have their decisions since they were the ones who were directly affected by the project.....their input in regard to opinion was necessary to us besides, every project involving humans must often have a step of consultation otherwise, the whole thing would flop in other words, community participation is a vital part of many projects and the benefits of it are well documented, such as better outcomes for all stakeholders, community ownership and lower project costs so you must know that effective community participation through a partnership is about recognizing that involving the public in a project is no longer about information dissemination and telling the people what is being done, but is a two-way information sharing tool. Regardless of your qualifications, everyone knows what they like and dislike, has an opinion about what needs to be done and where priorities should lay”.

The project official said, “it was necessary for us to partner with the local communities and their leaders so as to improve the project and make it completely a success story through partnership,

we were able to find out what the community needs, what would benefit them, what had been tried in the past, and what could be done to improve past ideas.....indeed, when we gave the community members the opportunity to partner with us, they gave us very important information that was a backbone for the project's implementation.....the community members had special issues and concerns that we decided to incorporate into the project at the outset and it helped to reduce the likelihood of challenges to risk assessment results, and potential remediation plans”.

The project official said, “we chose to partner with them because we needed new information about the area that the project was supposed to be implemented in and we had earlier done our own survey, but we needed to have direct contact with the locals so as to get better results this is because we believed that the communities had an intimate and unique relationship with the area that we ourselves did not have because of this knowledge, we knew that the community members would provide new information on a project that was yet to be considered. This is because partnership with the public brings more information to the decision, including technical knowledge, therefore more information was needed to make the difference between a good and poor decision”.

The project official said that, “the partnership was just for the communities also to get the feel of the project sometimes when the community is involved in a project, they have ownership of it and the decision making process, which is key to a successful project outcome, even if not all individuals necessarily agree with the outcome. When a project is finalized and you can see the fruits of your labour, it feels good knowing that you were involved in something that benefits the community”.

The project official continues, “partnership with the communities was also good for purposes of accountability, the central government and the local government at the district level from onset wanted the local people to participate in the project, there was no way ever we would work without them. It would cause us problems from our district superiors and even the Ministry would not agree with the outcome of our job”.

The project official said, “it was necessary that members of the community be seen as equal partners in the dialogue that takes place during project initiation, planning, implementation and maintenance...this is so because community members need to understand the details of a project

to evaluate its importance, costs, and benefits that means failure to adequately inform and involve the public can cause significant delays as a result of public reluctance or outright opposition to the project, we therefore ensured that the communication process included site-specific technical information about the project before it was implemented and we continued throughout the duration of the project in order to make progress, we instituted a high level of patience and willingness to listen with an open mind to all stakeholders and participants in the process”.

The results from the above extract signify that the project in question would not be possible had it not been for the partnership with the local communities. This shows that project partnership is very important for the success of any project that would involve the local communities. They would have the chance to have their say and make decisions accordingly, some of which would be of great value to the project leaders and their team.

In same vein, the researcher asked the project beneficiaries this question: “how were the members of the local community actively involved in decision making in aspects of the project that directly affected them?” Their responses were summarized as below:

The beneficiary said that, “I participated in making some decisions regarding how we would be of relevance to the project team during one of the project meetings particularly they told us to bring 5 Jerrycans of 20 litres of water every day and that they would give us some money hat is how I manage to participate in this project through the agreement we arrived at during the meetings”.

The beneficiary said, “sometimes they asked from among us the beneficiaries if we knew other people who could also be potential beneficiaries of the project this was so because some of the local leaders who were entrusted with the job of selecting potential beneficiaries became biased and selected only members of their families and close clan relatives. however, in one of the meetings, we brought this issue to the district officials and the project team.... the matter was followed up and remedies were made”.

The beneficiary said that, “yes, often times our decisions were sought during the village meetings but of course since most of us new absolutely nothing about how projects were run, our contributions were very limited in fact sometimes when we were asked certain things we have no

idea of, most of us just kept quite.....and sometimes we only talked on matters we know such as reporting the leaders who were not doing things ethically and providing complaints regarding flaws in the houses constructed”.

The above responses shows that the beneficiaries where to a greater extent actively involved in the decision making in the project on matters that had direct effect on them. They were able to give their opinion regarding some of the project activities and it was not taken lightly. Their opinions served as guiding road maps to the project team and the district officials in scrutinizing project outcomes and largely led to the promotion of quality work.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research findings and draws conclusions and recommendations. The conclusions are made based on the research findings and the challenges revealed by the study, while recommendations include suggested solutions to the revealed challenges.

5.1 Discussions

5.1.1 The Level of Citizens' Control in the Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District

The first objective of this study was to examine how citizens have control in the projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District. The responses were given by the project officials, the local leaders and the project beneficiaries. From the different views that were given, the following opinions were summarized as citizens' control in the housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi district. The citizens had control in the following project activities; democratic election of their representatives at the village level, selection of potential project beneficiaries, distribution of project deliverables to the beneficiaries, monitoring and evaluation of several project activities, participation in decision making and holding their leaders accountable.

This, therefore, implies that giving the citizens control over some of the project activities is very important in ensuring that the project registers success. In other words, this kind of approach helps the project to be sustainable as communities themselves learn how to adopt and correct changes resulting from the project. This also shows that giving citizens' control in some of the project activities helps to protect interest of the people concerned, enhance self-respect and self-reliance among people, that is, they are empowered to determine the success of projects, communities become aware of the project implementation, which in the end equips them with experience and skills. They understand their local needs and the nature of new project which they acquire. They can easily spread the new knowledge acquired to other communities; participation promotes a sense of ownership among the community of equipment used in the project. For example, they will protect and maintain the projects through their own means like protecting the store houses where the cement, iron sheets and nails are kept.

Several studies were found to be in agreement with the findings of this study (Cornwall 2008; Sultana 2009; Collins & Ison 2011; Goldstein 2014). The studies demonstrated that citizen control of projects brings about a greater chance that resources available to development projects will be more efficiently used. The authors further noted that allowing citizens control reduces misunderstanding or possible disagreements and thus the time and energy that would be spent by professional staff explaining to the people matters of the project.

It can, therefore, be argued that allowing citizens some degree of control in the housing project for needy families in Gicumbi district was a step in the right direction and was able to serve its purpose accordingly. Therefore, giving the citizen control can rightfully be said to make projects more effective as instruments of development. That is to say, citizen control allows the people to have a voice in determining project objectives, support project administration and make their local knowledge, skills and resources available for a more effective project. The major reason why many projects have often failed is because the citizens had no control of 10% of the project activities.

5.1.2 The Power of Delegation to the Community Members and their Contribution towards Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District

The second objective of this study was to assess whether power is sometimes delegated to the community members to contribute towards housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District. The informants with whom information was sought included the project officials, local leaders, and the beneficiaries. Power which was delegated to the community members included among others, decision making in meetings, forums, and seminars; involvement in budgeting and planning of financial resources; negotiation of the best deal without being manipulated; validating project outcome and subjecting their representatives to account and sometimes take legal action where need be.

Power delegation is a very important aspect of the project that helps in ensuring that everyone involved is at least accountable to a certain extent. In fact the local communities will feel that they are part of the project because of their participation in the project activities rendered in their care. The community members can, therefore, do their best to ensure that they do not spoil the golden opportunity given to them to take part in the project. When power is delegated to the local communities, they will do a good job because the final output of the project is their own and,

therefore, having shoddy performance will not be in their interest. This implies that arming them with the power to make decisions on critical matters, hold irresponsible leaders to account, power to negotiate project terms and validate project output, is as important as subjecting the project to a road of perfection and success.

A study by Mansuri and Rao (2012) is consistent with the findings of this study when they reported that negotiations between citizens and public officials results in citizens achieving dominant decision making authority over a particular plan or program and having the power to assure accountability of the program to them. Similarly, in agreement to this study, Tritter and McCallum (2016) found out that delegated power provides the citizens an upper hand to negotiate equal terms with other power holders or veto if differences of opinion cannot be resolved through negotiation.

The issue of power delegation most often comes from better representation of the project beneficiaries. Therefore, the citizens can only benefit from such strategies if they have educated and knowledgeable representatives. As for the case of housing for the needy families, the leaders in whose hands power was delegated were found to be good representatives since they made follow up on most project deliverables and gave accurate evaluation reports that on several occasions changed the course of action of the project officials and their team.

The power of delegation requires that residents have been given more power in the decision-making process than the power holders. This gives citizens a sense of ownership over the state of their community. This often looks like majority presence in decision-making committees and involvement from the beginning of a project. Outsiders are included on committees as well, but ultimately, community members are given relatively more power.

5.1.3 Partnership of the Community Members with other Project Stakeholders

The third objective of this study was to assess whether community members had any partnership with other stakeholders in housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District. The study found out that the community members indeed had partnership with other project stakeholders. The following were some of the areas in which that the community members partnered with other project stakeholders: capacity building, development of project objectives and visions,

planning of project activities, procurement of project raw materials, and selection of project subcontractors.

Partnership in every project is important in providing clear and agreed purpose and objectives; commitment and ownership; trust between partners, create clear and robust partnership arrangements; good communication with all partners; mutual benefits for all partners; conflict resolution and mediation; systems to monitor, measure and learn; and outcomes that live on beyond the life of the partnership.

A study by Swidler and Watkins (2013) found out that partnership provides ground for redistribution of power through negotiation between citizens and power holders. The authors argued that power sharing is possible when the partners agree to share planning and decision-making responsibilities through such structures as joint policy boards, planning committees and mechanisms for resolving impasses. Similarly, Speer (2012) in his study found that partnership works effectively when there is an organized power-base in the community to which the citizen leaders are accountable; when the citizens group has the financial resources to pay its leaders reasonable honoraria for their time-consuming efforts; and when the group has the resources to hire (and fire) its own technicians, lawyers, and community organizers. With these ingredients, citizens have some genuine bargaining influence over the outcome of the plan (as long as both parties find it useful to maintain the partnership).

5.2 A Synthesis of the Major Findings

The Collective Action Theory assumes that human beings are rational creatures who can participate in social development activities and share resources in order to achieve common goals. Human beings can cooperate for common interest and use group efforts to gain common goals.

The findings of this study revealed that the local communities through their democratically elected leaders are able to collectively participate in the decision making of different project activities. This implies that they have the power to negotiate the terms and conditions of project outcomes and their deliverables. Furthermore, based on the argument of delegated power,

through collective action theory, the citizens are able to participate in the different project activities and stages.

The theory of participatory human development paradigm is premised on equitable redistribution of valued resources through decision making, economic and purchasing power. The findings of this study revealed that this theory was appropriate for this study because the study found out that throughout the various project phases, the citizens were allowed to participate in decision making and delivering construction materials such as iron sheets, bags of cement, and nails which were equitably distributed to the project beneficiaries.

5.2 Conclusion

The citizens were found to have control in the following project activities, democratic election of their own leaders, negotiation of project terms and conditions of work, selection of potential project beneficiaries and distribution of project deliverables to the beneficiaries, monitoring and evaluation of several project activities, participation in decision making and holding their leaders accountable.

However, some challenges were identified where some funds were mismanaged and other materials were not all given to the beneficiaries by the local leaders.

As regards delegation of power to the community members, the delegated power included but was not limited to the following; decision making in meetings, forums, and seminars; involvement in budgeting and planning of financial resources; negotiating the best deal without being manipulated; validating project outcome and subjecting their representatives to account and sometimes take legal action where need be.

As regard partnership, the community members partnered with other stakeholders in the following project activities: capacity building, development of project objectives and visions, planning of project activities, procurement of project raw materials, and selection of project subcontractors.

In conclusion, therefore, community participation in housing project for the needy families is very instrumental in ensuring project success if citizen control, power delegation and partnership are exercised meaningfully practiced in a more detailed manner.

5.3 Recommendations

5.3.1 The Level of Citizens' Control in the Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District

The project team should ensure that citizens are involved and have a degree of control in all the project activities that directly affect them. This would avoid a lot of unnecessary misunderstandings that would accrue from the different phases and activities of the project.

The communities should be involved in the allocation of construction materials which will help them receive sufficient materials for their housing projects. Giving the community members control (for example, in democratic election of their representatives at the village level, selection of potential project beneficiaries, distribution of project deliverables to the beneficiaries etc) over the project gives them a sense of motivation and makes the project to serve better the people it is intended to.

The ministry in charge of distributing construction materials should put strict measures over the corrupt local leaders who mismanage and embezzle construction materials. Strict measures, among others, could be imprisonment and dismissal from ever working in public service.

Similarly, the government and the project team should do more training to capacitate the local communities in areas of financial management, law and monitoring and evaluation. This kind of knowledge would help in providing a better accountability, better provision of monitoring and evaluation report and better understanding of the law so as to apprehend those who misappropriate project resources.

5.3.2 Delegation of Power to the Community Members and their Contribution towards Housing Projects for the Needy Families in Gicumbi District

The government and the project leaders should always involve the community members in decision making in all matters of the project that would directly or indirectly affect them to avoid conflict of interest at a later stage of the project. This can be achieved by organizing regular meetings with the communities in their very own villages and educate the people about the value of meetings so that they do not abscond so important meetings.

Furthermore, the project team should train the local communities on how to negotiate for good project deals so that they do not get manipulated or used as stepping stones by the rich district officials who would want to provide all the raw materials for the project because of their ‘connections’ and financial resources. Good negotiation skills would yield ground for better benefit-sharing in the project.

5.3.3 Partnership of the Community Members with other Project Stakeholders

The government and the project leadership should provide grounds for flexible partnership with the local communities so that they willingly participate in the projects. They should be allowed to provide local services within their capacity and raw materials for the project within their level of supply. This would help promote development and good relationship with the communities. They will have no incentive to frustrate project initiatives since they directly participated and benefit in the project activities.

5.4 Contribution to the existing body of Knowledge

The research findings of the current study have contributed to the existing body of knowledge on housing projects for the needy families particularly in Rwanda and elsewhere. The findings explored the extent of community participation through power delegation, advocacy for more funds through stated stakeholders and the challenges facing the housing projects administration and management by the community, hence, the research is reach in information concerning the involvement of the community in housing projects.

5.5 Suggestions for Future Research

Future study should include all the districts in Northern Province of Rwanda so as to provide generalization of the study. The current study only looked at one district in Northern Province whose findings may not be used for generalization due to limited geographical coverage. This is because Northern Province has up to five districts.

Furthermore, there is need for future study to be conducted using both quantitative and qualitative approaches so as to provide the statistical and descriptive explanations of the findings in order to give comprehensive reporting. The current study only used qualitative approach.

References

- Abelson, J., Lomas, J., Eyles, J., Birch, S., & Veenstra, G. (2014). Does The Community Want Devolved Authority? Results of deliberative polling in Ontario', *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 153, (4), 403-412.
- Aigner, S., Flora, C., Tirmizi, S., & Wilcox, C. (2013). Dynamics to Sustain Community Development in Persistently Poor Rural Areas Development in the United States', *Community Development Journal*, 34, (1), 13-27.
- Arai, S. (2014). Benefits of Citizen Participation in a Healthy Communities Initiative: Linking community development and empowerment, *Report of Canadian Congress On Leisure Research, University of Ottawa*, 1-3.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *JAIP*, 35 (4), 216-224.
- Asiyanbola, R.A. (2012). Local perspective, aspiration and women empowerment in housing development in Africa: Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science (JHSS)*, 5 (4), 15-22.
- Assi, E. (2012). Community Involvement in a Housing Renewal Project in the Old City of Jerusalem', *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 8, (1), 74-85.
- Blake, G. (2015). *Getting Set for Citizenship: Using participative approaches in regeneration*, Paper produced for the Kings Fund Participatory Approaches Network. Retrieved on 18th Sept, 2017 from: <http://www.participatory-london.org.uk/news.htm>.
- Botes, L., & Van Rensburg, D. (2012). Community Participation in Development: Nine plagues and twelve commandments, *Community Development Journal*, 35, (1), 41-58.
- Burton, P (2013). Community involvement in neighbourhood regeneration: Stairway to heaven or road to nowhere? ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research
- Carcary, M. (2009). The research audit trail – Enhancing trustworthiness in qualitative inquiry. *Electron J Bus Res Methods*. 7:11–24.

- Centre for African Family Studies, (2011). *Empowering Communities: Participatory Techniques for Community-Based Programme Development*. Retrieved on 18th Sept, 2017 from: <http://pcs.aed.org/documents.htm>
- Collins, K., & Ison, R. (2011). Dare We Jump Off Arnstein's Ladder? Social Learning as a New Policy Paradigm, Proceedings of PATH (*Participatory Approaches in Science & Technology*) Conference, Edinburgh, June, 2011.
- Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (2011). *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London and New York: Zed Books.
- Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking "Participation": Models, Meanings and Practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43 (3), 269–283.
- Dixon-Woods, M., Shaw, R.L., Agarwal, S., & Smith, J.A. (2004). The problem of appraising qualitative research. *QualSaf Health Care*. 13:223–5.
- Dufour, C., Grünewald, F., & Karla, L. (2003). *Participation by Crisis-affected Populations in Humanitarian Action. Practitioners' Handbook (Draft)*. Retrieved on 18th Sept, 2017 from: www.odi.org.uk/alnap/publications/gs_handbook/gs_handbook.pdf
- Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G. (2012). Mapping the Outcomes of Citizen Engagement. *World Development*, 40 (12), 2399–2410.
- Jones, S., & Kardan, A. (2013). *A Framework for Analyzing Participation in Development*. Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation.
- Kuper, A., Lingard, L., & Levinson, W. (2008). Critically appraising qualitative research. *BMJ*, 337:a1035.
- MacFarlane, R (2013). Community involvement in City Challenge: A policy report, London: NCVO.
- Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2012). Localizing Development: Does Participation Work?, A World Bank Policy Research Report, World Bank, Washington DC.

- Marsland, R. (2012). Community Participation the Tanzanian Way: Conceptual Contiguity or Power Struggle? *Oxford Development Studies*, 34 (1), 67-79.
- McArthur, T. (2011). *Less than equal? Community organisations and estate regeneration partnerships*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (2011). EDPRS Poverty Analysis of Ubudehe, Republic of Rwanda, Kigali.
- Ministry of Local Government (2009). Ubudehe Concept note. Republic of Rwanda
- Mohan, G., & Stokke, K. (2010). Participatory development and empowerment. *Third World Quarterly*, 21: 266–280.
- Mujawase, F. (2015). Assessment of Policy Implementation of Ubudehe Program and its Impact on the Lives of VUP Beneficiaries in Ngororero District, Rwanda. African Renaissance Center, Kigali-Rwanda.
- Mupenzi, A. (2015). *Interventions Against Poverty In Rwanda: A Case Study Of Ubudehe In Gicumbi District, Eastern Province, Rwanda*. A Masters thesis of Makerere University.
- Njunwa, K. M. (2010). *Community participation as a tool for development: local community's participation in primary education development in Morogoro, Tanzania*. Master's thesis University of Agder.
- Norad (2013). Local Perceptions, Participation and Accountability in Malawi's Health Sector, Report 2/2013.
- Office of the Ombudsman (2015). Report on Girinka and Housing Projects For the Needy Families in Rwanda.
- Rolfe, G. (2006). Validity, trustworthiness and rigour: quality and the idea of qualitative research. *J Adv Nurs*; 304–10.
- Rwanda Local Development Support Fund (RLDSF) (2012). Vision 2020 Umurenge Programme (VUP) Intermediate Impact Assessment 2008-2011. Republic of Rwanda.

- Speer, J. (2012). Participatory Governance Reform: A Good Strategy for Increasing Government Responsiveness and Improving Public Services? *World Development*, 40 (12), 2379–2398.
- Swidler, A., & Watkins, S. C. (2013). Teach a Man to Fish: The Sustainability Doctrine and Its Social Consequences. *World Development*, 37 (7), 1182–1196.
- Tritter, J.Q., & McCallum, A. (2016). The Snakes and Ladders of User Involvement: Moving beyond Arnstein, *Health Policy*, 76: 156–168.
- Weiss, H. B., Lopez, M. E., & Rosenberg, H. (2010). *Beyond random acts: Family, school, and community engagement as an integral part of education reform*. Retrieved on 18th Sept 2017 from http://www.nationalpirc.org/engagement_forum/beyond_random_acts.pdf
- Wilcox, D. (1994). *Community Participation and Empowerment: Putting Theory into Practice*. Retrieved on 18th Sept, 2017 from: www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/h4.asp
- Yorkshire, F. (2010). *Active Partners – benchmarking community participation in regeneration*, Leeds: Yorkshire Forward.

APPENDIX I: INTERVIEW GUIDE

For project leaders

Profile of the key informants

1. Mention your gender
2. What is your age?
3. What is your level of education?
4. How many years of work experience do you have?
5. How are the citizens given opportunity to have any control in the projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?
6. What project activities have you given the citizens control in?
7. How is power sometimes delegated to the community members to contribute towards housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?
8. What has been the impact of power delegation to the local communities on this project?
9. How did you ensure an effective partnership with the members of the community in housing projects for the needy families in Gicumbi District?
10. What were the reasons for partnering with the local communities in this project?

APPENDIX II: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

For the local leaders and project beneficiaries

1. Mention your gender
2. What is your age?
3. What is your level of education?
4. In what ways are you given opportunity to have any control in the projects for the needy families in Gicumbi district?
5. How do you hold the project leaders accountable in the projects for the needy families?
6. What powers are delegated to the community members in the housing project for the needy families?
7. How did you benefit from power delegation in the housing project for the needy families?
8. How did the community members partner with other stake holders in housing projects for the community members?
9. How were members of the local community actively involved in decision making in aspects of the project that directly affected them?

APPENDIX III: KREJCIE AND MORGAN TABLE

TABLE 1
Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population

<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>
10	10	220	140	1200	291
15	14	230	144	1300	297
20	19	240	148	1400	302
25	24	250	152	1500	306
30	28	260	155	1600	310
35	32	270	159	1700	313
40	36	280	162	1800	317
45	40	290	165	1900	320
50	44	300	169	2000	322
55	48	320	175	2200	327
60	52	340	181	2400	331
65	56	360	186	2600	335
70	59	380	191	2800	338
75	63	400	196	3000	341
80	66	420	201	3500	346
85	70	440	205	4000	351
90	73	460	210	4500	354
95	76	480	214	5000	357
100	80	500	217	6000	361
110	86	550	226	7000	364
120	92	600	234	8000	367
130	97	650	242	9000	368
140	103	700	248	10000	370
150	108	750	254	15000	375
160	113	800	260	20000	377
170	118	850	265	30000	379
180	123	900	269	40000	380
190	127	950	274	50000	381
200	132	1000	278	75000	382
210	136	1100	285	1000000	384

Note.—*N* is population size.
S is sample size.