Asian Journal of Management Entrepreneurship and Social Science
ISSN: 2808 7399
https://ajmesc.com/index.php/ajmesc Volume 03 Issue 04

Communıty Partıcıpatıon And Sustaınabılıty Of Donor-Funded Agrıcultural Projects In Uganda (The Case Of Potato Projects In Kabale Dıstrıct)

Turyasingura john Bosco[1] ,Agaba Moses[2] ,Tamwesigire Caleb[3]

[1,2,3]Kabale University, Faculty of economics and management sciences, Deportment of management sciences, Uganda

Corresponding author: agabamosez@yahoo.com

Abstract

*This study examined the effect of community involvement on the sustainability of donor-funded agricultural projects in Uganda, specifically the potato projects in Kabale District. The study used a mixed methods research technique using a cross-sectional survey design based on questionnaires, interviews and documentary review. Using basic random and purposeful selection methods, 196 respondents were chosen as a sample from a total of 400. Using descriptive statistical methods like mean and standard deviation, quantitative data were examined. The impact of community participation on sustainability of donor funded potato projects was determined using regression analysis. The findings indicated that, project design, (R Square =.180, P .01). project resourcing (R Square = 925, P .01) and project monitoring and evaluation (R Square =.147**, P.01) affects sustainability of donor funded agricultural projects by roughly 90%. In conclusion, it has been established that, community participation has provided knowledge & information only to a limited extent that has not had any substantial impact on sustainability of donor funded potato projects. The study recommends that donors should all include potato project stakeholders in project design and implementation, project resourcing, and project monitoring and evaluation if potato projects are to be sustainable world overs globally, particularly in those involving potato projects.*

Key Terms: Community Participation, Sustainability of Donor Funded Projects

1. INTRODUCTION

Through the years, a lot of money has been dispersed in communities all over the world to support their efforts to raise their level of living through potato projects (Bartlett et al., 2019). Europeans began their first potato-related endeavors in the seventeenth century. The first people to make potatoes the main component of their diet in the eighteenth century were the Europeans, who were helped at the time by NGOs (Muriungi, et al., 2015). Irish potato programs were successful because they remarkably well matched the country's soil, climate, and way of life. They failed, nevertheless, as soon as the donor left (Bartlett et al., 2019). . In China and Norway, potatoes are a vital crop, according to Bhatnagar and Williams (2019). In contrast to China's 1.4 billion inhabitants, Norway has a population of about five million. Despite this, considering the populations of the two nations, the combined production of potatoes is still insufficient. One of the reasons why there is still insufficient potato output, according to Brown & Moore (2019),cited in Turyasingura et al 2022) is that all sponsored potato ventures failed once donors withdrew their support.

Around 250,000 people in Kabale District rely mostly on potatoes as a staple traditional meal, and the crop is also the region's top source of revenue (Aheisibwe et al, 2015). Because of this, numerous donors expressed interest in sponsoring potato initiatives in the Kabale District and donated cash to increase potato output and sustainability. (Africa, & Ngos,2017). Potato growers have received instruction on how to set up seed plots, create seed potato multiplication plots with a minimum of 0.25 acres each, and ensure that clusters are present. They were informed about seasonal strategies as well. Following training in various roles, project participants—including 240 potato farmer groups—conducted crop rotation trials (Turyasingura et, 2022). Potato growers have received instruction on how to set up seed plots, create multiplication plots for seed potatoes that are at least 0.25 acres each, verify that clusters are there, and be aware of season-related techniques. 240 potato farmer groups participated in crop rotation experiments with project beneficiaries while receiving training on a variety of topics related to their roles in ensuring the success of potato initiatives (Aheisibwe et al 2016). The Kabale District Department of Production and Marketing Report, published in 2017, specifically questioned the viability of potato projects beyond donor support, noting that, despite donor efforts to expand the District's potato production systems, the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects is still lacking. Potato producers do not see the utility in maintaining up with potato production when up to 90% of people are still undernourished in terms of food security (Airey,2019). The UNSPPA and IFDC reports (Stephen, 2018) make it very evident that despite numerous training initiatives

and other extended services, farmers' ongoing use of crude management techniques is to blame for the poor yields of potatoes. These circumstances raise serious questions about whether community involvement is the only factor that will ensure the sustainability of potato programs in Kabale. Only 40% of potato farmers maintained in potato projects (Joseph et al 2019). Several potato projects initiated by donors failed after donor exit (Schwartz, et al, 2019). Donors stopping 10 projects and they closed between 2 to 5 years later after donor exit. Potato farmers confessing lack of knowledge of potato management were as many as 78% (Suhairom,2020). Projects whose productivity reduced were as many as 26 (Nyambura, 2017) 80% of the potato farmers had limited knowledge of project design, implementation, resourcing, and monitoring and evaluation (Personal, & Archive, 2019). The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of community participation on sustainability of donor funded agricultural potato projects in Kabale District, and to develop a framework to ensure the sustainability of project activities after the expiry of donor assistance. Objectives of the study were:

1.1 Objectives of the study

1) To assess the effect of potato project design and implementation in the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district.
2) To establish the effect of potato project resourcing in the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District.
3) To explore the effect of potato project monitoring in the evaluation on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district

2. RELATED LITERATURE

Community participation affects project design, execution, and evaluation of donor-funded initiatives, claim Haldane et al. (2019). A detailed examination of the empowerment, health, community, and outcome processes reveals this. The study discovered that community involvement in projects supported by donors is crucial for sustainability after the funders go. The report recommends that community members always participate in civic efforts. There is a gap, though, because the study did not outline how or when community members ought to get involved in project design and implementation. What has been discussed has been precisely outlined in this study.

According to Henderson and Vercseg (2019), community involvement has an impact on the planning, execution, and evaluation of donor-funded agricultural initiatives. This is evident

from a thorough analysis of the empowerment, health, community, and outcome processes. The study concludes that community participation in donor-funded projects is essential to ensuring their survival after the donors have left. The study asserts that community members should always take part in civic activities (Hu, et al., 2019). However, there is a gap since the researcher did not specify how or when members of the community should take part in the project's conception and execution. This study has provided a detailed explanation of what has been said. The significance of local community participation in project feasibility studies throughout project design and implementation, which this study has found as having an impact on project sustainability following donor withdrawal, is still not adequately explained in the paper.

Bezyak et al. (2020) examined how community involvement affects the viability of rural projects. According to the study, community participation has an impact on privately held rural programs. Stakeholder training has been addressed in this study to guarantee that project beneficiaries are an integral part of the project, particularly after donor withdrawal, but it was not covered in the earlier study. Bishoge et al (2020). conducted research on the effects of community involvement on the sustainability of renewable energy projects in Tanzania. The study's objective was to ascertain how community participation impacted the commercial feasibility of renewable energy projects. The report recommends that community members be included in the project at every stage. However, there is a gap in the researcher's explanation of the proper role of community members in decision-making. This study closed that same gap. Such projects should be supported by community members who voluntarily provide their time and land. Since it wasn't covered in this study, there was still a research deficit in that area. A study was done with the goal of empowering residents of a rural southern community in Nigeria to plan and carry out donor-funded potato projects after donors leave. This study did not address project continuity following donor departure, which is crucial for project sustainability. There is a resulting gap, which this research intended to fill.

Pashby et al. (2021) carried out a study on project resourcing and moral global issues in order to ascertain the sustainability of donor-funded agricultural initiatives in Northern Europe. However, there is still a vacuum in the study because it did not address how farmers' groups should continue to function after donors leave. This study sought to close that wide gap. In Katebire (2017) conducted research on the effect of management practices on the sustainability of youth income-generating projects in Kenya's Murang'a County and Kangema District.The findings indicated that young income-generating initiatives might be

maintained by applying BMA best management practices. The study found that management strategies like planning, controlling, and collaboration are crucial for project sustainability. The relevance of youth participation in project design, implementation, cost sharing, and labor provision for successful project sustainability was disregarded by the researcher. In the year 2101 Karanja did research on the elements affecting the viability of donor-funded potato initiatives in Kenya.

The Samburux County Eliud Ombui Keura case was the main subject. The study did not address the objective of community activities, which is to enhance societal livelihoods and their economic standing as well. This gap has been found by this study. Lenjo and Moronge (2018) conducted a study on the factors that influence the sustainability of youth empowerment initiatives in Taitax Tavetax County, Kenya. The study did not address youth involvement in monitoring and evaluation, data collection methods, report writing, or dissemination of findings related to participatory development. a study of the elements that make resource provision a successful tactic for eradicating poverty (Sutter et al. 2022). The findings indicated that everyone in the community who was interested in the project should donate money so they can continue to own it after the donor departs. However, there is a gap because the study did not outline the specific project resources that the local community should provide, such as project beneficiaries contributing labor, organic fertilizer, and land for demonstration sites in addition to cost-sharing. These holes have been effectively filled by our study. In a study (Mbabaali et al., 2015), the capability for monitoring and assessing the sustainability of donor-funded agricultural initiatives in Uganda was strengthened. The results demonstrated that the durability of donor-funded agricultural projects in Uganda is a result of community members' acquisition of knowledge and skills. The study suggests that all project beneficiaries participate in project monitoring and assessment to ensure the viability of agricultural projects. The current study bridges the gap left by the previous one by addressing the development of data collection methods, data collection, report writing, and dissemination of findings, as well as how and when the project's beneficiaries should participate. The results demonstrated that the durability of donor-funded agricultural projects in Uganda is a result of community members' acquisition of knowledge and skills. The study suggests that all project beneficiaries participate in project monitoring and assessment to ensure the viability of agricultural projects. The current study bridges the gap left by the previous one by addressing the development of data collection methods, data collection, report writing, and dissemination of findings, as well as how and when the project's beneficiaries should participate. However, nowhere in the literature is it stated that

those who gain from potato projects should actively participate in project planning and execution (including stakeholder engagement, feasibility studies, decision-making, and reporting), project funding (including providing land, splitting costs, organic fertilizer, and labor to the project), project monitoring and evaluation (development of data collection tools, data collection, and report), or project resourcing.

3. METHODS

3.1 Research design

A planned framework for collecting and interpreting data is known as a research design (Hu, at el 2019). It serves as a master plan that specifies the steps and techniques for collecting and analyzing data (Mando, et al. 2017). This study used descriptive survey research, which concentrates on the what, where, when, and how the problem happened. The primary characteristics, if any, of a phenomenon as well as the details of the problem were thoroughly understood by the researcher (Mayer et al., 2018). The design made it easier to see why the potato initiatives in Kabale District financed by donors are unsustainable and why the issue has persisted even after the funders withdrew. By using this research methodology, the researcher was able to present data that might be used to describe or develop a profile of the subject under investigation. While the quantitative method attempted to quantify and establish the relationships, the qualitative strategy let the researcher gather in-depth explanations on community engagement and sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District.

3.2 Sample Size

Any group of institutions, individuals, or objects that share similar traits is referred to as a population. According to Heyvaert et al. (2019), a sample is a compendium of a few constituents of a population. An individual sample participant is referred to as a subject. According to Mugambi et al. (2016), the term "population" refers to the total group of individuals, occasions, or objects of interest that the researcher desires to study. 142 individual potato farmers, 24 groups of potato farmers, 10 district marketing and production departments, 10 community development officers, and 10 sub-county chiefs made up the study's samples. The intended number of responses was 196 in total. 142 + 24 + 10 + 10 + 10 equals 196. Four hundred people make up the target population as a whole.

Table 1:Showing the Study population, Sample Size and Sampling Frame

Population category	Target Population	Sample Size	Sampling Techniques
Potato individual farmer	338	142	Simple random sampling
Potato farmer groups	26	24	Simple random sampling
District marketing and production department	10	10	Purposive
Community Development officers	13	10	Purposive
Sub County Chiefs	13	10	Purposive
Total	400	196	

Source: Delivered from Kabale District Registry 2021; Primary data 2019.

3.3. Validity

Validity is the degree to which a test captures what it is meant to capture (Amin et al., 2005) and Agaba and Emenike (2018). The researcher ensured the validity of the instruments for efficiency and efficacy of the tools in order to provide the trustworthy findings, conclusions, and suggestions required by the study's objectives and problem. The instruments were created and discussed with experts in the field to see if they are comprehensive, clear, simple, and relevant to the study objectives. The CVI's formula was used to perform the Content Validity Test.

$$\text{CVI} = \frac{\text{Number of relevant items}}{\text{Total number of items}} \times 100 = \frac{100}{110} \times 100 = 99.9$$

Summary of the reliability statistics

Judge 1. = 190/196=0.969

Judge 2. =192/196= 0.979

Judge 3. = 189/196 0.964

Judge 4. = 185/196=0.944

Therefore 0.969+0.979+0.964+0.944=3.856. 3.856/4=0.964

These results indicated the potential use of research methods to learn more about community involvement and the long-term sustainability of donor-funded potato programs

in Kabale District. Amin et al. (2005) state that for instruments to be accepted as valid, the average content validity index (CVI) number of items certified valid divided by the total number of items must be at least 0.7. The instruments were legitimate because the CVI value was greater than 90% (Agaba &Turyasingura 2022)).

3.4 Reliability of the questionnaire

The consistency or reliability of results over time, or the degree to which a questionnaire consistently produces the same response on repeated attempts, is referred to as the questionnaire's dependability as asserted in Mbabazi and Agaba, (2021). The reliability of the questionnaire was ensured through pretesting, training of research assistants before the study, and calculation of Cronbach's alpha (a), a metric for reliability, or how well a test measures what it is intended to measure, developed by Lee Cronbach in 1952. Because the questionnaire responses consist of a variety of options and succinct responses,

Table 1: The Demission of the Independent Variables

Variable	**Reliability statistics**
Project design and implementation	0.890
Project resourcing	0.904
Project monitoring and evaluation	0.941
Sustainability	0.866
Total	3.601
Average	3.601/4=0.900

Source: Field data 2023.

0.900 was Cronbach's Alpha. Reliability coefficients (alpha) in the 0.7 to 0.9 range are regarded as satisfactory, and values over 0.9 as good. 2014 (Bekele, et al 2020). The survey's dependability was high as a result.

3.5 Quantitative Data Analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in the quantitative data analysis. The initial phase in the data analysis was to create frequencies, which consisted of means and percentages, to determine how respondents saw the relationship between community involvement and the long-term viability of donor-funded potato initiatives. The correlation technique, which analysed significance at 99% and 95% confidence levels based on two

specific correlations and significantly more than or equal to 0.05, was based on the Pearson's coefficient. A negative correlation indicates an inverse relationship between the two variables, whilst a positive correlation suggests a direct positive association between the variables. Using the corrected R2 values from the regression analysis, the magnitude of the independent factors' impact on the dependent variable was determined.

3.6 Qualitative Data Analysis

The researcher organized all of the qualitative data from key informant interviews. To better understand the phenomenon being studied, it was then coded, analyzed, and key themes were created..

4 RESULTS

Table 3: Summary of the findings on project design and implementation on sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District

Statement	Disagreed		Undecided		Agreed	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
I have been participating in project design and implementation of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district	105	53.5	19	9.7	72	36.8
I have participated in the project design of donor-funded potato projects	135	67.9	13	6.7	48	24.5
I have participated in the project idea generation	135	68.9	14	7.1	47	24
I have been involved in potato project feasibility studies of donor-funded potato projects.	133	67.9	20	10.2	43	21.9
I have been involved in stakeholders' training of donor-funded potato projects	136	69.4	17	8.7	43	21.9
I have been able to participate in stakeholder's meetings throughout the potato projects	140	71.5	13	6.6	43	21.9
I have participated in donor-funded potato project decision making during project planning and implementation.	139	70.9	12	6.1	45	23

I have participated in resource utilization	138	70.4	13	6.6	45	23
I have not observed corruption during project planning and implementation of donor-funded potato projects.	48	24.5	37	18.9	111	56.6
I am convinced that donor funded potato projects will be sustainable	137	68.9	13	6.6	46	23.6
I have been involved in potato project feasibility studies of donor-funded potato projects.	160	81.6	00	00	36	18.4
Kabale district have been involved in potato project feasibility studies of donor-funded potato projects	156	79.6	00	00	40	20.4
Potato farmer groups have been involved in potato project feasibility studies of donor-funded potato projects	150	76.5	10	5.1	36	18.4
I have been involved in stakeholders' training of donor-funded potato projects	171	87.2	00	00	25	12.8
Kabale district production department has participated in stakeholders training of donor-funded potato projects	182	92.9	00	00	14	7.1
Potato farmer groups have been involved in stakeholders training of donor-funded potato projects	168	85.7	00	00	28	14.3
I have been able to participate in decision making of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district	157	80.1	10	5.1	29	14.8
As Kabale district, we have been able to participate in decision making for donor-funded potato projects in the district	159	81.1	00	00	37	18.9
As potato farmers, we have participated in decision making for donor-funded potato projects during project planning and implementation.	168	85.7	00	00	28	14.3
We have participated in report making of donor funded potato projects	182	92.9	00	00	14	7.1
As Kabale district we have participated in report making for donor-funded potato projects.	196	100	00	00	00	00

As potato farmers we have participate in report making for donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	190	96.9	00	00	6	3.1

Source: field data 2021

Analysis of sixteen (16) statements given to respondents and intended to gauge project conception, execution, and sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District is shown in Table 5.8 above. The following explanations are provided for the descriptive statistics in the above table: When asked if they have been involved in the planning and execution of donor-funded potato initiatives in the Kabale District, respondents overwhelmingly agreed—53.5% of the (105) agreed, compared to 36.8% of the (72) disagreed, and 19 respondents with 9.7% undecided. 67.9% of respondents disagreed with the statement that they had participated in the project design of donor-funded potato programs, while 24.5% agreed and 6.7% were unsure.

When asked if they had received adequate orientation to take part in the donor-funded potato initiatives, 68.9% of respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 24% who agreed and 7.1% who were unsure. Only 21.9% of respondents who were asked if they had participated in potato project feasibility studies of donor-funded potato projects agreed, compared to 67.9% of respondents who disagreed, leaving 10.2% of respondents unclear. 69.4% of respondents disagreed with the assertion that donors' financed potato project recipients had been included in stakeholders' training, while 21.9% agreed and 8.7% were undecided. When asked if they had attended stakeholder meetings over the duration of the potato projects, 71.4% of respondents disagreed, while 23% indicated that they would exit the survey, leaving 6.6% of respondents. When asked whether potato project beneficiaries had taken part in decision-making funded by donors, 70.9% of respondents disagreed, compared to 23% of respondents who agreed to leave 6.1% of respondent's undecided. When asked whether potato project beneficiaries had taken part in resource utilization, 70.4% of respondents disagreed, as opposed to 23% of respondents who agreed to leave 6.6% of respondent's undecided. sustainable. When the beneficiaries of the potato project were asked if they had seen corruption during the project's conception and execution, 56.6% of them agreed with the assertion, compared to 24.5% who did, leaving 18.9% of the respondents unsure. 68.9% of respondents who were polled disagreed, stating that they were unsure about the viability of the donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District. When asked if they have participated in potato project feasibility studies for donor-

funded potato projects, 81.6% of respondents disagreed with the assertion, while only 18% agreed. When asked if the Kabale district had participated in feasibility studies for donor-funded potato projects, 79.6% of respondents disagreed, leaving 20.4% of respondents in favor of the claim. In response to a follow-up question about whether potato farmer groups have participated in feasibility studies for donor-funded potato projects, 76.5% of respondents disagreed with the claim, while 18.4% did. Furthermore, when asked if they have participated in stakeholder education for donor-funded potato initiatives, 87.2% of respondents said no, leaving 12.8% who said yes. When asked again whether the Kabale District Production Department had taken part in stakeholder training for donor-funded potato initiatives, 91.9% of respondents disagreed, while only 7.1% of respondents agreed. When asked if potato farmer groups had participated in stakeholders' training for donor-funded potato initiatives, 65.7% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 14.3% agreed. When asked if they had been able to participate in the decision-making for donor-funded potato projects in the Kabale area, 80.1% of respondents disagreed, compared to 14.8% who disagreed (for reasons that are not apparent), and 5.1% who were unsure. 81.1% of respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 18.9% of respondents who agreed, when respondents were further questioned whether Kabale district has been able to participate (not clear) in decision-making for donor-funded potato projects in the district. Respondents were then questioned if potato farmers, we have participated in decision making for donor-funded potato initiatives during project design and implementation, 85.7% of the respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 14.3% of the respondents who agreed with the statement. When asked if they had contributed to the reporting of donor-funded potato projects, 92.9% of respondents disagreed with the assertion, compared to 7.1% of respondents who did. When asked if the Kabale district had taken part in the report-writing for donor-funded potato projects, all of the respondents said no. Last but not least, respondents were asked if they had taken part in reporting for potato initiatives in Kabale District that had been supported by donors. In contrast to the 3.1% of respondents who agreed with the statement, 96.9% of respondents disagreed with it. According to the results, respondents played a significant role in the development and implementation of potato initiatives in Kabale District that were supported by donors.

4.1 Hypothesis testing

Correlation **analysis on project design and implementation**

Table 4 showing Correlations analysis on project design and implementation

		Sustainability of donor-funded potato projects	Project design and implementation
Sustainability of donor-funded potato projects	Pearson Correlation	1	.424**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	196	196
Project design and implementation	Pearson Correlation	.424**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	196	196

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

Table 4 above reveals a correlation coefficient of r = 0.424, which implies that project design and implementation have a modest, positive, linear link with the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects. A regression analysis was consequently, undertaken to discover how changes in the independent variable (project design and implementation) are connected with changes in the dependent variable (sustainability of donor-funded potato programs) (sustainability of donor-funded potato projects).

Table 5:Model summary of project design and implementation.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.424[a]	.180	.176	1.03204

a. Predictors: (Constant), project design and implementation
Source: Field data 2023

According to the coefficient of determination R2 = 0.180, only 18% of donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District are sustainable due to project design and implementation. The sustainability of donor-funded potato projects is thus significantly positively correlated with project design and implementation. This implies that the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District will be greater the more community participation there is in project design and execution. Therefore, the planning

and execution of programs contribute 18% to the long-term viability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District. Thus, only 18% of variation can be attributed to or explained by project design and implementation. 82% must be caused by other factors.

Table 7: Summary of the findings on project resourcing on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District.

Statement	Disagreed		Undecided		Agreed	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
I have been involved in providing project resources to donor funded potato projects in Kabale District	101	51.6	3	1.5	92	46.9
As Kabale District, through the production and marketing department, we have been involved in supporting potato farmers	180	91.8	00	00	16	8.2
We potato farmer groups, we have been participating in project resourcing of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District.	176	89.8	00	00	20	10.2
I have provided land for donor-funded potato projects	170	86.7	00	00	26	13.3
Potato farmer groups have been providing land for donor-funded potato projects as demonstration sites	165	84.2	5	2.5	26	13.3
I have participated in setting donor-funded potato demonstrations on the land provided to the project.	123	62.8	21	10.7	52	26.5
We have participated in setting donor-funded potato demonstrations on the land provided to the project.	190	96.9	00	00	6	3.1
For donor-funded potato project sustainability, I have been cost-sharing on the progress of the project.	124	63.3	13	6.6	59	30.1
We have been cost-sharing on the progress of the project as potato farmers.	187	95.4	00	00	9	4.6
My contribution on donor-funded potato project has been 10%.	126	64.3	10	5.1	60	30.6
Cost sharing has increased my participation in donor funded potato project.	170	86.7	00	00	26	13.3

I have been trained on how to make organic manure as a fertilizer.	160	81.6	00	00	36	18.4
We have been trained on how to make organic manure as a fertilizer.	180	91.8	00	00	16	8.2
I have contributed organic fertilizer to donor funded potato plantations in our area.	134	68.3	5	2.6	57	29.1
We have contributed organic fertilizer to donor-funded potato plantations in our area.	193	98.5	00	00	3	1.5
We have benefited from donor-funded potato projects	132	67.3	6	3.1	58	29.6
With my knowledge, donor funded potato projects will be sustainable.	137	69.9	3	1.5	56	28.6

Source: Field data 2021

Analysis of the seventeen (17) statements that were given to respondents and were meant to gauge the sustainability and project resourcing of donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District is shown in Table 6.1 above. The following explanations are given for the descriptive statistics in the above table:

When asked if they had participated in supplying project resources to donor-funded potato initiatives in the Kabale District, 51.6% of respondents disagreed, compared to 46.9% who agreed, leaving 1.5% of respondents unclear. 91.8% of respondents disagreed with the assertion that Kabale District has supported potato growers through the production and marketing department, while 8.2% of respondents agreed with the statement. This is in contrast to the other question that asked respondents if they had any other opinions. In addition, when asked if potato farmer associations had contributed to donor-funded potato initiatives in the Kabale District, 89.8% of respondents disagreed, 10.2% agreed, and 2.5% were unsure. Also addressed was if respondents had donated land for donor-funded potato projects. 10.7% of respondents were undecided, while 13.3% of respondents disagreed with the statement. When asked whether potato farmer associations had provided land for donor-funded potato projects as demonstration grounds, respondents were split 84.2% to 26.5% in favor and 6.6% in favor of the assertion. Once more, respondents were asked if they had taken part in establishing potato demonstrations on the project's given acreage that were supported by donations. In contrast to the 26.5% of respondents who agreed, 62.8% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. When asked whether they had taken part in building up potato demonstrations supported by donors on the project's supplied land,

96.9% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 3.1% did. When asked again whether the donor-funded potato experiment had been sustainable, 98.4% of the respondents disagreed with the claim, compared to 4.6% of the respondents who did. 63.3% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 4.6% of respondents agreed, when the question of whether there had been cost-sharing on the project's development was also posed. Further, when asked whether their 10% donation to a donor-funded potato project was appropriate, 64.3% of respondents disagreed with the claim, compared to 30.6% of respondents who agreed, and 5.1% of respondents were unsure. 81.6% of respondents disagreed with the statement when asked if cost sharing had enhanced their participation in donor-funded potato projects, leaving 18.4% of respondents who agreed with the responses. When asked whether they have received training on how to make organic dung into fertilizer, 91.8% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 8.2% of respondents agreed. When asked if they have given organic fertilizer to projects growing potatoes with donor funding, answers were divided, with 68.3% disagreeing with the assertion and only 1.5% agreeing. Respondents were questioned once more. The majority of us donated organic fertilizer to potato initiatives financed by donors; nevertheless, 98.5% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 1.5% agreed. When asked if the majority of respondents had profited from donor-funded potato programs, the response rate was 3.1%, with 67.9% disagreeing with the statement and 29.6% agreeing. Finally, respondents were asked if they believed that donor-funded potato projects would be sustainable. Of those surveyed, 69.9% disagreed with the statement, compared to 28.6% of those who agreed and 1.5% of those who were unsure. This suggests that the majority of respondents—90%—did not take part in the potato project's funding. This suggests that if things stay as they are, there won't be any project ownership, which will make donor-funded potato projects unsustainable.

Table 8 .Summary of project resourcing on sustainability donor-funded potato project.

Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.

Asian Journal of Management Entrepreneurship and Social Science
ISSN: 2808 7399
https://ajmesc.com/index.php/ajmesc Volume 03 Issue 04

		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.000	.000		.	.
	Project Resourcing	962**	.000	1.000	.	.

a. Dependent Variable: Sustainability of donor-funded potato projects

Once more, the outcome showed a regression coefficient of. 962 at a significance level of 0.01 indicates a positive trend. With a Beta value of 0, the findings further demonstrate that project resourcing affects the viability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District. 962 at a 95% confidence level. The alternate hypothesis put forth by the researcher is that "project resourcing favorably influences the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District. So, with 92.5%, project resourcing helps keep donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District going. Summary of the findings on project monitoring and evaluation on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District

Key: Strongly Agree (SA) +, (Agree (A)=All respondents agreed, Undecided, disagree (D) + Strongly Disagree (SD)= All respondents disagreed which make a three larked scale

Statement	**Disagreed**		**UD**		**Agreed**	
	F	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**
I have been always participating in project monitoring and evaluation of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district	140	76	6	3.1	41	20.9
As potato farmers in our group, we have been part of the monitoring and evaluation of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district	180	91.8	00	00	16	8.2
I have participated in the development of data collection of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	193	98.5	00	00	3	1.5
We have been involved in the development of data collection of potato project sports visits with the donors	137	69.9	3	1.5	56	28.6

As potato farmer groups, we have participated in data collection of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District.	187	95.4	00	00	9	4.6
As the district, we have participated in the midterm evaluation of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	154	78.5	7	3.7	35	17.8
I have been involved in data analysis of donor-funded potato projects	170	86.7	00	00	16	18.4
We have participated in data analysis of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	180	91.8	00	00	16	8.2
As a Kabale district staff, we have participated in data analysis of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	176	89.8	00	00	20	10.2
I have been involved in report writing of donor-funded potato projects.	170	86.7	00	00	26	13.3
As potato farmer groups, we have been involved in report writing of donor-funded potato projects.	165	84.2	5	2.5	26	13.3
As Kabale district staff, we have been participating in report writing of donor-funded potato projects.	123	62.8	21	10.7	52	26.5
I have been involved in the utilization of report findings from donor-funded potato projects	190	96.9	00	00	6	3.1
As a potato farmer groups, we have been participating in the disseminating of report findings from donor funded potato projects.	170	86.7	00	00	26	13.3
As Kabale district, we have participated in the utilization of report findings of donor-funded potato projects.	165	84.2	5	2.5	26	13.3
I have been participating in the dissemination of monitoring and evaluation findings of donor-funded potato findings.	123	62.8	21	10.7	52	26.5
I am sure there will be sustainability of donor-funded potato projects due to participatory monitoring and evaluation in Kabale District.	190	96.9	00	00	6	3.1

Source: Field Data 2022.

Table Analyses of the seventeen (17) statements that respondents were asked to respond to in order to assess project monitoring, assessment, and sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District are shown above. The following explanations are provided for the descriptive statistics in the above table:

When asked if they had always been involved in the project monitoring and assessment of donor-funded potato initiatives in the Kabale region, 76% of the respondents disagreed, compared to 20.9% of the respondents who agreed, and 3.1% of the respondents were unsure. Conversely, respondents were questioned regarding whether or not potato growers in their groups had taken part in the supervision and assessment of donor-funded potato initiatives in the Kabale district. In contrast to the 8.2% of respondents who agreed with the statement, 91.8% of the respondents disagreed. When asked whether they had taken part in the development of data collecting for donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District, 98.5% of respondents disagreed with the assertion, while 1.5% of respondents agreed. 69.9% of respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 28.6% of respondents who agreed with the statement, leaving 1.5% of respondents unclear when asked if potato farmers had been involved in the development of data collecting of potato project sports visits with the funders. In response to the question of whether potato farmer groups had taken part in the data collecting for donor-funded initiatives in the Kabale District, 95.4% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 4.6% of respondents agreed. Additionally, respondents were asked if the district had taken part in the midterm evaluation of donor-funded potato projects in the Kabale District. Of the respondents, 78.5% disagreed with the statement, while 17.8% did. This left 3.7% of the respondents indecisive. When asked if they had participated in data analysis for donor-funded potato projects, the respondents' responses revealed that 86.7% of them disagreed with the assertion and 18.4% of them agreed. 91.8% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 8.2% agreed, when it was asked again whether potato farmer groups had taken part in data analysis of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District. When asked whether Kabale district staff members had been involved in data analysis for donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District, 89.8% of respondents disagreed with the claim, while 8.2% of respondents agreed. When asked if they had participated in drafting reports for donor-funded potato initiatives, individual potato farmers disagreed with the assertion 86.7% more often than those who agreed with it, 13.3%. When asked if there are any potato farmer groups that write reports on donor-funded projects, the respondents' responses revealed that 84.2% of them agreed with the statement, compared to 13.3% who disagreed and 2.5% who were unsure. When

asked if Kabale district personnel had been involved in drafting reports for donor-funded potato projects, 62.8% of respondents disagreed with the claim, compared to 26.5% who were unsure and 10.7% who were not sure. When asked if they had used report findings from programs supported by donors to grow potatoes, 96.9% of respondents disagreed with the assertion, while 3.1% of respondents agreed. 86.7% of respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 13.3% of respondents who agreed, when asked whether potato farmer groups have been using report findings from donor-funded potato initiatives. When asked once more if the Kabale district has utilized the report findings from donor-funded potato projects, 84.2% of respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 13.3% of respondents who agreed and 2.5% of respondents who were unsure. When asked if they had been involved in the distribution of the monitoring and evaluation findings of the donor-funded potato findings, 62.8% of the respondents disagreed, while 6.5% of the respondents agreed, leaving 10.7% of the respondents unsure. The last question questioned respondents if they were confident that donor-funded potato programs would continue owing to participatory monitoring and evaluation in Kabale District. 3.1% of respondents did not agree with the statement, compared to 96.9% of respondents who did. This suggests that over 85% of the respondents did not take part in the monitoring and evaluation of the potato projects supported by donors in Kabale District.

Table 9. Correlation analysis on project monitoring and evaluation

Correlation

		Sustainability of Donor-Funded Potato Projects	Project Monitoring and Evaluation
Sustainability of Donor Funded Potato Projects	Pearson Correlation	1	.383**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	196	196
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	.383**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	196	196

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

Source: Field Data 2023

The sustainability of donor-funded potato programs is strongly positively and linearly correlated with project monitoring and assessment, as shown in Table 7.2 above, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of r = 0.383. In Table 7.3, a regression analysis was performed to determine the relationship between variations in the independent variable (project monitoring and assessment) and variations in the dependent variable (sustainability of donor-funded potato projects).

Table 10. Model summary of project monitoring and evaluation

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.383[a]	.147	.143	1.05243

a. Predictors: (Constant), Project monitoring and Evaluation

The sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District is thought to be influenced by project monitoring and assessment, according to the coefficient of determination R2 =.147. This indicates that the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District will be stronger the more the community is involved in project monitoring and assessment. Therefore, the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District is increased by 14.7% as a result of project monitoring and assessment.

Table 11. Summary of parameter estimates of project monitoring and evaluation.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.870	.141		13.227	.000
	Project monitoring and Evaluation	.355	.061	.383	5.783	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Sustainability of donor of funded potato projects

Source: Field Data 2023

Table 11's outcome again showed that the regression coefficient was. 333 at a significance level of 0.01 indicates a positive trend. Additional findings support the notion that project resourcing affects the viability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District with a Beta value of 0. At a 95% confidence level, 333. In light of this, the researcher has a different hypothesis, according to which "project resourcing favorably improves the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District. Consequently, project resourcing helps, to the tune of 14.7%, to the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District.

4.2 Empirical findings on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district

Using the set of questions to gather data from the respondents, this section gives the findings on the dependent variable which is sustainability of donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District. The key sources used to gather the data for this were individual and collective potato growers, the Kabale district production and marketing department, community development officers, and sub-county chiefs (reports, articles and documented work). The table below provides a summary of the replies.

Table 12 A summary of the findings on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District.

Statement	**Disagreed**		**Undecided**		**Agreed**		**Mean**	
	F	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**		
I have realized potato projects continuity in Kabale District	76	38.8	66	33.7	54	27.6	2.8010	1.75593
I have seen potato farmer groups Functioning	113	57.6	38	19.4	45	23	2.4388	1.19027
My savings have increased as a potato farmer	44	22.5	50	25.5	102	52	2.4847	1.15238
The quality of our life as potato farmers has improved.	113	57.6	38	19.4	45	23	2.4388	1.19027

We have enough knowledge of potato production	104	53.1	45	23	45	24	2.5255	1.18727

Source: Field data 2021.

According to the statement in table 12 above, respondents were given four (4) statements about the viability of donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District. When the study's participants were asked whether they had realized the sustainability of potato production in Kabale District, 38.8% disagreed, compared to 27.6% who agreed, leaving 33.7% of the participants unclear.

Respondents were also asked whether their savings have increased for potato farmers; 52% of the respondents disagreed compared to 22.5% of the respondents leaving 25.5% of the respondents who were undecided during data collection. Respondents were also asked whether their income value has increased; 57.6% of the respondents disagreed with the statement compared to 23% of the respondents who agreed to leave 19.4% of the respondent's undecided. When asked if their quality of life as potato farmers had increased, respondents responded with a mixed response: 57.6% disagreed with the statement, 23% agreed, and 19.4% were unsure.

Finally, respondents were asked if they knew enough about the production of potatoes. While 24% of respondents agreed to leave 23% of the respondents unsure during data collection, 53.1% of respondents disagreed. However, community participation has been accepted as the solution to embrace the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District based on the findings of the analysis above on the dependent variable, which is the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District, Uganda.

Table 13. Summary of the findings on project monitoring and evaluation on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District

Statement	**Disagreed**		**UD**		**Agreed**	
	F	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**
I have been always participating in project monitoring and evaluation of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district	140	76	6	3.1	41	20.9

As potato farmers in our group, we have been part of the monitoring and evaluation of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district	180	91.8	00	00	16	8.2
I have participated in the development of data collection of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	193	98.5	00	00	3	1.5
We have been involved in the development of data collection of potato project sports visits with the donors	137	69.9	3	1.5	56	28.6
As potato farmer groups, we have participated in data collection of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District.	187	95.4	00	00	9	4.6
As the district, we have participated in the midterm evaluation of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	154	78.5	7	3.7	35	17.8
I have been involved in data analysis of donor-funded potato projects	170	86.7	00	00	16	18.4
We have participated in data analysis of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	180	91.8	00	00	16	8.2
As a Kabale district staff, we have participated in data analysis of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District	176	89.8	00	00	20	10.2
I have been involved in report writing of donor-funded potato projects.	170	86.7	00	00	26	13.3
As potato farmer groups, we have been involved in report writing of donor-funded potato projects.	165	84.2	5	2.5	26	13.3
As Kabale district staff, we have been participating in report writing of donor-funded potato projects.	123	62.8	21	10.7	52	26.5
I have been involved in the utilization of report findings from donor-funded potato projects	190	96.9	00	00	6	3.1
As a potato farmer groups, we have been participating in the disseminating of report findings from donor funded potato projects.	170	86.7	00	00	26	13.3
As Kabale district, we have participated in the utilization of report findings of donor-funded potato projects.	165	84.2	5	2.5	26	13.3

I have been participating in the dissemination of monitoring and evaluation findings of donor-funded potato findings.	123	62.8	21	10.7	52	26.5
I am sure there will be sustainability of donor-funded potato projects due to participatory monitoring and evaluation in Kabale District.	190	96.9	00	00	6	3.1

Source: Field Data 2021.

Table 13. Analyses of the seventeen (17) statements that respondents were asked to respond to in order to assess project monitoring, assessment, and sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District are shown above. The following explanations are provided for the descriptive statistics in the above table:

When asked if they had always been involved in the project monitoring and assessment of donor-funded potato initiatives in the Kabale region, 76% of the respondents disagreed, compared to 20.9% of the respondents who agreed, and 3.1% of the respondents were unsure. Conversely, respondents were questioned regarding whether or not potato growers in their groups had taken part in the supervision and assessment of donor-funded potato initiatives in the Kabale district. In contrast to the 8.2% of respondents who agreed with the statement, 91.8% of the respondents disagreed. When asked whether they had taken part in the development of data collecting for donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District, 98.5% of respondents disagreed with the assertion, while 1.5% of respondents agreed. 69.9% of respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 28.6% of respondents who agreed with the statement, leaving 1.5% of respondents unclear when asked if potato farmers had been involved in the development of data collecting of potato project sports visits with the funders. In response to the question of whether potato farmer groups had taken part in the data collecting for donor-funded initiatives in the Kabale District, 95.4% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 4.6% of respondents agreed. Additionally, respondents were asked if the district had taken part in the midterm evaluation of donor-funded potato projects in the Kabale District. Of the respondents, 78.5% disagreed with the statement, while 17.8% did. This left 3.7% of the respondents indecisive. When asked if they had participated in data analysis for donor-funded potato projects, the respondents' responses revealed that 86.7% of them disagreed with the assertion and 18.4% of them agreed. 91.8% of respondents disagreed with the statement, while 8.2% agreed, when it was asked again whether potato farmer groups had taken part in data analysis of

donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District. When asked whether Kabale district staff members had been involved in data analysis for donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District, 89.8% of respondents disagreed with the claim, while 8.2% of respondents agreed. When asked if they had participated in drafting reports for donor-funded potato initiatives, individual potato farmers disagreed with the assertion 86.7% more often than those who agreed with it, 13.3%. When asked if there are any potato farmer groups that write reports on donor-funded projects, the respondents' responses revealed that 84.2% of them agreed with the statement, compared to 13.3% who disagreed and 2.5% who were unsure. When asked if Kabale district personnel had been involved in drafting reports for donor-funded potato projects, 62.8% of respondents disagreed with the claim, compared to 26.5% who were unsure and 10.7% who were not sure. When asked if they had used report findings from programs supported by donors to grow potatoes, 96.9% of respondents disagreed with the assertion, while 3.1% of respondents agreed. 86.7% of respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 13.3% of respondents who agreed, when asked whether potato farmer groups have been using report findings from donor-funded potato initiatives. When asked once more if the Kabale district has utilized the report findings from donor-funded potato projects, 84.2% of respondents disagreed with the statement, compared to 13.3% of respondents who agreed and 2.5% of respondents who were unsure. When asked if they had been involved in the distribution of the monitoring and evaluation findings of the donor-funded potato findings, 62.8% of the respondents disagreed, while 6.5% of the respondents agreed, leaving 10.7% of the respondents unsure. The last question questioned respondents if they were confident that donor-funded potato programs would continue owing to participatory monitoring and evaluation in Kabale District. 3.1% of respondents did not agree with the statement, compared to 96.9% of respondents who did. This suggests that over 85% of the respondents did not take part in the monitoring and evaluation of the potato projects supported by donors in Kabale District.

4.3 Hypothesis testing

Table 14. C**orrelation analysis on project monitoring and evaluation**

Correlations

	Sustainability of Donor-Funded Potato Projects	Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Sustainability of Donor Funded Potato Projects	Pearson Correlation	1	.383**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	196	196
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	.383**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	196	196

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

Source: Field Data 2023

The sustainability of donor-funded potato programs is strongly positively and linearly correlated with project monitoring and assessment, as shown in Table 14 above, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of r = 0.383. In Table 7.3, a regression analysis was performed to determine the relationship between variations in the independent variable (project monitoring and assessment) and variations in the dependent variable (sustainability of donor-funded potato projects).

Table 15. Model summary of project monitoring and evaluation

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.383[a]	.147	.143	1.05243

a. Predictors: (Constant), Project monitoring and Evaluation

The sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District is thought to be influenced by project monitoring and assessment, according to the coefficient of determination R2 =.147. This indicates that the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District will be stronger the more the community is involved in project monitoring and assessment. Therefore, the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District is increased by 14.7% as a result of project monitoring and assessment.

Asian Journal of Management Entrepreneurship and Social Science
ISSN: 2808 7399
https://ajmesc.com/index.php/ajmesc Volume 03 Issue 04

Tabel 16. Summary of parameter estimates of project monitoring and evaluation.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.870	.141		13.227	.000
	Project monitoring and Evaluation	.355	.061	.383	5.783	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Sustainability of donor of funded potato projects
Source: Field Data 2023

Outcome again showed that the regression coefficient was. 333 at a significance level of 0.01 indicates a positive trend. Additional findings support the notion that project resourcing affects the viability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District with a Beta value of 0. At a 95% confidence level, 333. In light of this, the researcher has a different hypothesis, according to which "project resourcing favorably improves the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District. Consequently, project resourcing helps, to the tune of 14.7%, to the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District.

4.4 Empirical findings on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale district

Using the set of questions to gather data from the respondents, this section gives the findings on the dependent variable which is sustainability of donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District. The key sources used to gather the data for this were individual and collective potato growers, the Kabale district production and marketing department, community development officers, and sub-county chiefs (reports, articles and documented work). The table below provides a summary of the replies.

Table 17. A summary of the findings on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District.

Statement	Disagreed		Undecided		Agreed		Mean	
	F	%	F	%	F	%		

I have realized potato projects continuity in Kabale District	76	38.8	66	33.7	54	27.6	2.8010	1.75593
I have seen potato farmer groups Functioning	113	57.6	38	19.4	45	23	2.4388	1.19027
My savings have increased as a potato farmer	44	22.5	50	25.5	102	52	2.4847	1.15238
The quality of our life as potato farmers has improved.	113	57.6	38	19.4	45	23	2.4388	1.19027
We have enough knowledge of potato production	104	53.1	45	23	45	24	2.5255	1.18727

Source: Field data 2021.

According to the statement in table 16 above, respondents were given four (4) statements about the viability of donor-funded potato initiatives in Kabale District. When the study's participants were asked whether they had realized the sustainability of potato production in Kabale District, 38.8% disagreed, compared to 27.6% who agreed, leaving 33.7% of the participants unclear. Respondents were also asked whether their savings have increased for potato farmers; 52% of the respondents disagreed compared to 22.5% of the respondents leaving 25.5% of the respondents who were undecided during data collection. Respondents were also asked whether their income value has increased; 57.6% of the respondents disagreed with the statement compared to 23% of the respondents who agreed to leave 19.4% of the respondent's undecided. When asked if their quality of life as potato farmers had increased, respondents responded with a mixed response: 57.6% disagreed with the statement, 23% agreed, and 19.4% were unsure. Finally, respondents were asked if they knew enough about the production of potatoes. While 24% of respondents agreed to leave 23% of the respondents unsure during data collection, 53.1% of respondents disagreed. However, community participation has been accepted as the solution to embrace the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District based on the findings of the analysis above on the dependent variable, which is the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District, Uganda.

Moderating variables between community participation and sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District based on government policies, donor policies and potato markets

4.5 Project design and implementation in the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District

The results of the study are consistent with those of Mugo, N. J. (2017). According to Mugo, community involvement in donor-funded project design and execution requires the presence of three key elements worldwide. Stakeholder training, decision-making, empowering project beneficiaries to take charge of the projects, co-opting project beneficiaries to participate in an already-existing project, and eventually, as a front for public relations, defending a donor project that has already been specified. Donors, however, neglected to account for the aforementioned crucial elements, which contributed to the potato project's failure.This demonstrates how essential it is for project beneficiaries to be involved in project design and implementation if donor-funded potato initiatives are to be sustainable. According to ILO (2018), community involvement refers to a mechanism that enables communities, people, or groups of farmers to take part in a project's lifecycle. Donors, however, are less interested in community involvement and more interested in research on the best potato agronomy practices. Community members have been unable to participate in donation-funded potato initiatives as a result of this. When participants in potato initiatives are actively involved, they experience a strong sense of ownership and are ready to participate in decision-making.

4.6 Project resourcing on the sustainability of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District

The results of the study show a significant link between project resourcing and the long-term sustainability of donor-funded potato programs in Kabale District (r=.962**, p0.01). This calls for an improvement in project funding, including the provision of land, cost-sharing, labor, and organic fertilizer. This is in line with a study by Bartlett (2016), which explains that donor-funded potato project beneficiaries have made little contribution to project resources, such as providing land, providing both organic and inorganic manure, and splitting the costs of the project's activities. Actually, they don't add anything to the project's activities, which ought to give land priority. But because there is a lack of project ownership, the gap closes.

Land is required for the feasibility of donor-funded potato projects, claim Mudege et al. (2017). The farm is used as a demonstration facility where potato producers may learn from, unlike potato initiatives funded by donors. Everyone is in agreement that efficient farmers must produce more food per unit of land. The gap, however, is that the project's

beneficiaries lack the means of supplying land. In order for agricultural projects like potato initiatives to be sustainable, project stakeholders must contribute their resources, according to Mugambi et al. (2016). They feel more pride in their work as a result. This is not true. Donors have neglected the concept of ensuring that these donor-funded potato programs will continue to be viable once the donors have left.

4.7 Project monitoring and evaluation in the implementation of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District

The results of the analysis show a substantial positive correlation (r=.383**, p0.01) between project monitoring and assessment and the longevity of donor-funded potato projects in Kabale District. This is consistent with the claim made by Jamaal et al. (2018) that monitoring and evaluation is a strategic function of communities that gives potato initiative beneficiaries a sense of ownership over the project. Although some funding from donors has gone toward the communities' monitoring and evaluation efforts. Due to this, it has become more difficult to successfully finish programs funded by donors. According to Mutonga et al. (2015b), monitoring and evaluation refers to the collaborative study and calculation of the project by the project beneficiaries for the aim of owning it. This definition applies to donor-funded potato initiatives. Omari, et al. (2015) note that there is limited global beneficiary participation in monitoring and evaluating donor-funded initiatives. According to Omari (2015), Donor-funded potato projects haven't been successful, according to Mutonga (2015b), since beneficiaries haven't participated as much in monitoring and evaluation, which is essential to the programs' sustainability. According to Hodgkin et al. (2016), when monitoring and evaluation are done with the help of the potato project's beneficiaries, the donors do not see them as a way to remedy the project's problems. Hodgkin, et al. (2016) claim that receivers of potato

5 CONCLUSIONS

Considering the following major findings: Potato producers do not practice inclusive planning, Among potato farmers, there is a lack of integrated project design and implementation. Donor restrictions prevent potato producers from contributing to project resources minimal involvement of potato producers in project evaluation and monitoring, Insufficient decision-making in potato projects started by donors, Potato producers don't have a lot of policy about community involvement. Prior to the implementation of initiatives, donors adopt top-bottom strategies that do not take into account the worries of potato

producers. Therefore, it can be concluded that community involvement has only slightly increased knowledge and information sharing, which has not significantly affected the sustainability of donor-funded potato programs..

6 Recommendation

According to the study, donors should always encourage potato farmers to participate in the planning and execution of projects. According to the findings, donors ought to constantly urge potato producers to take part in feasibility studies. The study recommends that funders should motivate farmers to donate funds to potato initiatives so that farmers may easily take ownership of their projects after donors leave. The study recommends that donors should permit potato farmers to share in project costs. The study suggests that potato producers hire workers for their project The study suggests that producers of potatoes participate in data collecting during project M&E. The study suggests that potato farmers be urged to take full part in the reporting for the potato project.

REFERENCES

Agaba M, & JB Turyasingura (2022) Participatory Project Implementation and Sustainability of Government Funded Projects a Case study of Parish Development Model in Kabale District, Uganda, *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review* Volume 06 Issue 01 January 2023

Agaba. M. and Emenike K. (2018). Product Innovation, Price Level And Competitive Advantage: A Perception Assessment Of Beer Products*; Journal of management and enterpreneuriship; vol.6, 2018*

Africa, S., & Ngos, T. (2017). Uganda Seed Sector Assessment. (September), 1–7.*African Journal of Plant*. (2017). *11*(2).

AGRA-SSTP. (2016). Mozambique early generation seed study. Early generation seed systems study, AGRA–SSTP. *Rutgers University*. Retrieved from https://agrilinks.org/.../mozambique_early_generation_seed_report. pp34-9

Aheisibwe, A. R., Barekye, A., Namugga, P., & Byarugaba, A. A. (2015). Challenges and opportunities for quality seed potato availability and production in Uganda. *Uganda Journal of Agricultural Sciences by the National Agricultural Research Organisation Is Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Based on a Work at Www.Ajol.Info*, *16*(2), 149–159.

Aheisibwe, A. R., Barekye, A., Namugga, P., & Byarugaba, A. A. (2016). Challenges and opportunities for quality seed potato availability and production in Uganda. *Uganda Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, *16*(2), pp 149. https://doi.org/10.4314/ujas.v16i2.1

Airey, A. (2019). *Good Policies and Practices on Rural Transport in Africa: Monitoring & Evaluation*. (99). pp15-18 *Banana (RTB), Lima: RTB Working Paper N° 2016-3.ISSN2309-6586.244P.*, 244. https://doi.org/10.4160/23096586RTBWP20163.

Amin, M.E. (2005) Social Science Research: Conception, Methodology and Analysis. Makerere University Press, Kampala.

Andrew, P.S., Pedersen, P.M., and McEvoy, C.D. (2011). Research Methods and Designs in Sport Management. Human Kinetics.

Bartlett, A. G. (2019). Evaluating the relative success of donor-funded collaborative research projects.*ResearchEvaluation*,Vol.25,pp.405–415. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvw009

Bekele, D., Abera, G., & Gobena, A. (2020). *Effects of chemical fertilizer types and rates on tuber yield and quality of potato (Solanum tuberosum L .) at*. *14*(April), pp 155–164. https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPS2019.1930

Bezyak, JL, Sabella, S, Hammel, J,(2020). Community participation and public transportation barriers experienced by people with disabilities. *Disability and …*, Taylor & Francis

Bhatnagar, B. & Williams, A. (2019) 'Participatory development and the World Bank: potential directions for change', World Bank Discussion Paper 183; pp 453-9 (Washington, DC: World Bank).

Bishoge, OK, Kombe, GG, & Mvile, BN (2020). Community participation in the renewable energy sector in Tanzania: Community participation in the renewable energy sector. *International Journal of …*, 130.225.53.24

Brown, T. A., & Moore, M. T. (2019). Confirmatory factor analysis. *Handbook of structural equation modelling*, 361-379.

Haldane, V, Chuah, FLH, Srivastava, A, Singh, SR, &(2019). Community participation in health services development, implementation, and evaluation: A systematic review of empowerment, health, community, and *PloS one*, journals.plos.org

Harahagazwe, D., Condori, B., Barreda, C., Bararyenya, A., Byarugaba, A., Kude, D. A., … Quiroz, R. (2018). *How big is the potato (Solanum tuberosum L .) yield gap in Sub-Saharan Africa and why ? A participatory approach* pp180–189.

Hassenforder, E., Ducrot, R., Ferrand, N., Barreteau, O., Anne Daniell, K., & Pittock, J. (2016). Four challenges in selecting and implementing methods to monitor and evaluate

participatory processes: Example from the Rwenzori region, Uganda. *Journal of EnvironmentalManagement*,Vol.180,pp.504–516. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.05.019

Henderson, P., &Vercseg, I. (2019). Community development and civil society: making connections in the European context. Bristol: The Policy Press pp5-9

Heyvaert, M., Hannes, K., Maes, B., & Onghena, P. (2019). *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689813479449 pp234-238

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (2019). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, *6*(1), pp1-55.

Jamaal, N. (2018). Effects of participatory monitoring and evaluation on project performance at Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute. *International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management*, *3*(1),pp1–15. Retrieved from http://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajispm_v3_i1_1_15

Joseph, E., Mwesige, R., Kyarisiima, S., Aheisibwe, A., Muhereze, R., Kutesa, R. A., & Barekye, A. (2019). *Seed Potato Production Business through a Gender Lens Keywords*. *2*(2), 1–11.

Maffei, R., Burciago, D., & Dunn, K. (2019). Determining business models for financial sustainability in regional health information organizations (RHIOs): a review. *PopulationHealthManagement*,*12*(5),273–278. https://doi.org/10.1089/pop.2008.0045

Matu, J., Kyalo, D., Mbugua, J., & Mulwa, A. (2020). Stakeholder Participation in Project Planning: Prerequisite to Effective Completion of Urban Road Transport Infrastructure Projects in Kenya. *Journal of Building Construction and Planning Research*, *08*(01),pp 73–91. https://doi.org/10.4236/jbcpr.2020.81006

Mbabazi M, and Agaba M. (2021), The Practice of Accounting Standards And Performance Of Commercial Banks In Kabale Municipality, South Western Uganda. *Special Journal of Banking, Finance, and Management. ISSN-2710-2025, 2021, 1 (2): 1-15*

Mbugua, P., Nyiva, F., & Gathano, C. W. (2017). Sustainability of Community-Based Projects in Archdiocese of Nairobi - Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, *7*(10), pp622–646.

Mugambi, M. D. (2016). *Donor Funding Practices and Financial Sustainability of Donor a Research Project Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Award of the Degree of Master of Business Administration. UMI Uganda pp76-9*

Mugo, N. J. (2017). *Monitoring and Evaluation Practices, Ethics and Sustainability of Agricultural Food Crop Projects in Nyeri County, Kenya*.pp67-9

Muriungi, T. M. (2015). the role of participatory monitoring and evaluation programs among government corporations : a case of ewaso ngi ' ro north Development Authority. *International Academic Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, *1*(4), 53–76.

Mutonga, B. K. (2015b). *Factors Influencing sustainability of donor-funded community water projects: A case of Kitui Central Constituency, Kitui County, Kenya*.pp18-19

Omari, M. Z. (2015). *Analysis of Production and Marketing of Irish Potato in Mbulu and Babati Districts in Tanzania*. pp124.

Pashby, K, Costa, M Da, Sund, L, (2021). Resourcing an ethical global issues pedagogy with secondary teachers in Northern Europe. *Teaching and learning …*, igi-global.com

Schwartz, N., Deruyttere, A., Huntley, S., Stonich, S., & Kottak, C. (2019). *Community Consultation, Sustainable Development and the Inter-American Development Bank* https://doi.org/10.4172/2329-8863.1000250 pp245-9

Suhairom, (2020). Community participation in water management-experiences from Zimbabwe.D+C Development and cooperation. pp24

Turyasingura JB, Agaba M, Orach-Meza FI, Zombire R, Kyabarongo B.(2022). Resourcing and the sustainability of Donor funded Potatoes Projects in Kabale District, Southwestern Uganda. *Special Journal of Politics and Economic Sustainability* 2022, 2(2): 1-17