

It enables the government to select beneficiaries who are in need of those cows	176	4.5227	.68414
Need assessment helped the government to know the resources that will be needed during project implementation.	176	4.6364	.53840
Need assessment helps to know people who will be responsible for implementing the project	176	4.4489	.70727
Need assessment helps the government to predict the results of the project	176	4.4830	.70892
Valid N (listwise)	176	4.482967	.710878

Source: Researcher (2021)

Table 5 indicates the effect of need assessment on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district. The results have revealed that majority of respondents with a mean (4.6364) and SD of .53840 have agreed that need assessment helped the government to know the resources that will be needed during implementation. On the other hand, need assessment helped the government know the budgets to be used in Girinka Munyarwanda project with a mean of 4.5909 and SD of .60731. In other words, all the statement fall under the average mean of 4.482967 and SD of 0.710878 which indicates that respondents have all agreed with the statements. Based on the finding of this study, it can be concluded that there are significant effects of need assessment on implementation of government livelihood projects.

Effect of planning on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda Project in Kamonyi District.

With respect to the second objective of the study, which was intended to determine the effect of Planning on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district, a Likart scale of Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly agree were also used. The results were presented in table 4.6 as follows;

Table 3: Effect of planning on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi District.

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Planning gives the government a clear direction of the project	176	4.0909	.92750
It facilitates proper coordination of project activities and personnel.	176	4.4545	.70766
Planning helped in organizing of project resources	176	4.3750	.86603
Planning helps in the schedule arrangements of Girinka Munyarwanda projects	176	4.1761	1.12005
Planning motivates members of the community to participate in Girinka Munyarwanda project	176	4.0114	1.13131
Planning helps in decision making concerning Girinka Munyarwanda project	176	4.1932	1.01821
Valid N (listwise)	176	4.21685	.961793

Source: Researcher (2021)

Table 6 the effect of need planning on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district. The results have revealed that majority of respondents with a mean (4.4545) and SD of (.70766) have agreed that planning facilitated in proper coordination of project activities and personnel. On the other hand, planning helped the government in organizing of project resources with a mean of 4.3750 and SD of .86603. In other words, all the statement falls under the average mean of 4.21685 and SD of 0.961793 which indicates that respondents have all agreed with the statements.

Effect of Community Mobilization on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda Project in Kamonyi District.

With respect to third objective of the study, which was intended to determine the effect of community mobilization on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district, a Likart scale of Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly agree were also used. The results were presented in table 4.7 as follows;

Table 4: Effect of community mobilization on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda Project in Kamonyi District.

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Community mobilization enables community members to understand the reason and benefits of Girinka Munyarwanda project	176	4.7333	.63968

Community mobilization helps community leaders skills and knowledge of how to handle problems of Girinka Munyarwanda projects.	176	4.6667	.66089
Beneficiaries also gain skills from mobilization on how to take care of the cow and provide a calf to new beneficiary	176	4.5667	.67891
Community mobilization helps project leaders to gain a good number of participants from the community	176	3.8667	.68145
Community members are mobilized on how to manage the project resources	176	3.6772	.5678
Beneficiaries gain knowledge of how to utilize the product of the cow including (milk, manure and so on) for a better life	176	3.6123	.4537
Valid N (listwise)	176	4.18715	.613738

Source: Researcher (2021)

Table 7 indicates the effect of community mobilization on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district. The results have revealed that majority of respondents with a mean (4.7333) and SD of (.63968) have agreed that community mobilization enables community members to understand the reason and benefits of Girinka Munyarwanda project. On the other hand, mobilization helps community leaders to gain skills and knowledge of how to handle problems of Girinka Munyarwanda projects with a mean of 4.6667 and SD of .66089. In other words, all the statement falls under the average mean of 4.18715 and SD of 0.613738, which indicates that respondents have all agreed with the statements.

Table 5 Respondent participation on indicators of implementation of government livelihood Projects

Indicators dependent Variable	Frequency	Percent (%)
Valid Operations	125	71.0
Maintenance	11	6.3
Payment of services	40	22.7
Total	176	100.0

Source: Researcher, 2021

Table 4.8 shows the indicators of implementation of government livelihood projects and the results have indicated majority of respondents at 71.0% have argued that for the project to be implemented operations should take place. In addition to that respondents at 22.7% have also argued that for the project to be successful, payment of required services by the government should be done as early as possible. Finally, few respondents at 6.3% have indicated that maintenance is another important part in project implementation.

ix. Regression Analysis

In order to determine the relationship that exists between need assessments, planning, Community mobilization and government livelihood projects, the regression analysis was carried out. The outputs of the model summary were presented in the table 4.9 below;

Table 6: Correlation Output

		Correlations			
		Government livelihood projects	Need assessment	Planning	Community mobilization
Pearson Correlation	Government livelihood projects	1.000	.603	.787	.852
	Need assessment	.603	1.000	.545	.554
	Planning helps in	.787	.545	1.000	.901
	Community mobilization	.852	.554	.901	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Government livelihood projects	.	.000	.000	.000
	Need assessment	.000	.	.000	.000
	Planning	.000	.000	.	.000
	Community mobilization	.000	.000	.000	.
N	Government livelihood projects	176	176	176	176
	Need assessment	176	176	176	176
	Planning	176	176	176	176
	Community mobilization	176	176	176	176

Source: Researcher (2021)

Regarding correlation coefficient, Table 9 shows the magnitude of the relationship between variables implies that there is a high correlation between need assessment, planning, Community mobilization Government livelihood projects given by their correlation confident of .603, .787 and .852. These correlations are significant at 0.000. This implies that all variables indicated a positive and strong correlation with Government livelihood projects.

Table 7: Model Summary

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.867 ^a	.751	.747	.70584

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Need assessment, Planning and Community mobilization
b. Dependent Variable: Implementation of Government livelihood projects

Source: Researcher (2021)

In Table 10, the adjusted R² of 0.747 implies that 74.7% of the variations in Government livelihood projects can be described by the variations in need assessment, planning and Community mobilization. This implies that only 25.3% of the disparities in Government livelihood projects can be described by variations in other variables not enclosed within the current study.

The R² of 0.751 further explains that the model explains 75.1% of the variability of the response data around its average while R of 0.867, which is 86.7%, shows that the relationship between Need assessment, Planning and Community mobilization and Government livelihood projects is positive and strong. Finally, the standard estimate of the error given at 0.70584 depicts that the typical distance of the data points from the best-fit line is about 0.7%. The ANOVA results were presented in Table 4.11 as follows;

Table 8: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	258.945	3	86.315	173.253	.000 ^b
	Residual	85.691	172	.498		
	Total	344.636	175			

- a. Dependent Variable: Implementation of Government livelihood projects
c. Predictors: (Constant), Community mobilization, Need assessment, Planning

Source: Researcher (2021)

In the ANOVA, Table 11 shows F-value 173.253 at 0.000 implying that the model is statistically significant. The 0.000 p-value shows that Need assessment, Planning, Community mobilization predicts Government livelihood projects. The Table 4.10 further shows that the variance in total has N-1 degrees of freedom given by N-1 (76-1) the residual degrees of freedom on the other hand are 85.6.

Thus, the overall regression model is statistically significant in predicting the relationship Need assessment, Planning, Community mobilization predicts Government livelihood projects. Concerning the coefficient, the results were presented in Table 12 bellow;

Table 9: Regression Coefficient

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.810	.158		-5.142	.000
	Need assessment	.302	.075	.186	4.045	.000
	Planning	.085	.133	.057	.642	.522
	Community mobilization	1.113	.142	.698	7.850	.000

- a. Dependent Variable: Government livelihood projects

Source: Researcher (2021)

The regression equation obtained is;

$$Y = -.810 + .302X_1 + .085X_2 + 1.113X_3 + e$$

Where Y is Government livelihood projects; X₁ is need assessment; X₂ is planning; X₃ is Community mobilization, and e is the significance level. The significance levels of the independent variables were; need assessment (p= .000); planning (p= .522); and Community mobilizations (p= .000). This means that need assessment and Community

mobilization would lead to high level of Government livelihood projects. Given the p values of 0.05 and 0.01, this relationship is significant with a p-value of 0.000. The regression model served as a statistical control for the study, allowing it to determine the impact of each predictor variable. The coefficients for each independent variable were also non-zero, according to the results. This means that all of the independent factors impacted the government's livelihood programs.

x. Discussion of Findings

The above findings were linked to the available literature related to community participation and government livelihood projects. With respect to the first objective, which was to find out the effect of need assessment on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda, project in Kamonyi district. The findings provided an average mean of 4.4829 and SD of .710878 meaning that all the statements were strongly agreed that need assessment helps the government to know the resources that are needed and the budgets during implementation. The findings therefore indicated that need assessment contributes to the effective implementation of the projects.

The findings of James (2014), who conducted research on the effect of needs assessment on the sustainability of food security programs in central Kenya, with a case study of Gatanga Sub-county, backed up these findings. In this study, a cross-section survey was used. The study discovered that a factor determining the viability of food security projects in the area was the depth of the needs assessment within communities. He further discovered that the requirement assessment for food security projects in Gatanga sub-county had not been completed sufficiently. According to the report, all interested groups, including farmers and interested individuals, should be invited and encouraged to participate in the needs assessment study. It has been determined that a comprehensive presentation by all participants will improve the process' credibility, project support, and outcome success.

On the other hand, the second objective of the study was intended to determine the effect of Planning on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district, planning has been found to play a significant role in proper implementation of government livelihood projects. This was also supported by other scholars like Hassan *et al* (2021) on Role of Project Planning and Project Manager Competencies on Public Sector Project Success. He further found that the evidence for planning as a predictor of project success appears to be strong. On the other hand Dvir recently wrote about the advantages of project planning. He feels that keeping consistency between different stages of planning makes it easier to manage and control the project, reduce project risks and vulnerabilities, and improve the project manager's expertise. Similarly, according to Ref, excellent planning not only allows project managers to make better use of their infrastructure, such as land and buildings, but also creates economic benefits for the stakeholders (Hassan *et al*, 2021).

Similarly, a research was recently done in Oman to analyze project managers' perspectives on planning and scheduling techniques in building projects. According to the conclusions of their research, project managers should use knowledge-based planning and scheduling ideas to ensure project success (Hassan *et al*, 2021). Therefore prior with respect to the findings of the above researchers, planning shows a significant effect on project success and hence can also contribute effectively to Government livelihood projects.

With respect to third objective of the study, which was intended to determine the effect of community mobilization on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district, the findings revealed that community mobilization contributes to better understanding of the project by the community members. In order to determine the relationship that exists between need assessments, planning, Community mobilization and government livelihood projects, the regression analysis was carried out and a positive strong relationship was identified between Need assessment, Planning Community mobilization and Government livelihood projects is positive and strong.

The relationship findings add to that of Eunice (2014) who determined the relationship between training and employee performance. His findings revealed a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.76, indicating a strong relationship between employee training and performance, which is similar to our findings at a probability of $p < 0.001$, indicating that the coefficient is significantly different from zero, and thus it can be concluded that training and performance have a direct relationship with employee performance. Therefore, Eunice findings support our findings that training has a strong relationship with implementation of government livelihood projects.

xi. Summary of major Findings

The results of this study were obtained in accordance to the specific objectives. The first objective was to find out the effect of need assessment on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi District, a Likart scale of Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly agree were used. The results have revealed that majority of respondents with a mean (4.6364) and SD of .53840 have agreed that need assessment helped the government to know the resources that will be needed during implementation. On the other hand, need assessment

helped the government know the budgets to be used in Girinka Munyarwanda project with a mean of 4.5909 and SD of .60731.

With respect to the second objective of the study, which was intended to determine the effect of Planning on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district, a Likart scale of Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly agree were also used. The results have revealed that majority of respondents with a mean (4.4545) and SD of (.70766) have agreed that planning facilitated in proper coordination of project activities and personnel. On the other hand, planning helped the government in organizing of project resources with a mean of 4.3750 and SD of .86603.

With respect to third objective of the study, which was intended to determine the effect of community mobilization on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district, a Likart scale of Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree and Strongly agree were also used. The results have revealed that majority of respondents with a mean (4.7333) and SD of (.63968) have agreed that Community mobilization enables community members to understand the reason and benefits of Girinka Munyarwanda project. On the other hand, Community mobilization helps community leaders to gain skills and knowledge of how to handle problems of Girinka Munyarwanda projects with a mean of 4.6667 and SD of .66089.

The researcher also considered determining the indicators of government livelihood project implementation as a dependent variable, and the results revealed that the majority of respondents (71.0%) believe that operations must take place in order for the project to be implemented. Furthermore, (22.7%) of respondents believe that payment of essential services by the government should be made as soon as feasible for the project to be successful. Finally, maintenance is an important aspect of project implementation, according to (6.3%) of respondents.

In order to determine the relationship that exists between need assessments, planning, Community mobilization and government livelihood projects, the regression analysis was carried out. The model summary shows that the adjusted R^2 of 0.747 implies that 74.7% of the variations in Government livelihood projects can be described by the variations in need assessment, planning and Community mobilization. This implies that only 25.3% of the disparities in Government livelihood projects can be described by variations in other variables not enclosed within the current study. R of 0.867, which is 86.7%, shows that the relationship between Need assessment, Planning and Community mobilization and Government livelihood projects is positive and strong.

In the ANOVA, table 4.9 shows F-value 173.253 at 0.000 implying that the model is statistically significant. The 0.000 p-value shows that Need assessment, Planning, Community mobilization predicts Government livelihood projects. Regarding correlation coefficient, table 4.4 shows the magnitude of the relationship between variables implies that there is a high correlation between need assessment, planning, Community mobilization Government livelihood projects given by their correlation confident of .603, .787 and .852. These correlations are significant at 0.000. This implies that all variables indicated a positive and strong correlation with Government livelihood projects

xii. Conclusions

In conclusion, the research concluded that need assessment has a significant effect on implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district, by helping the government to know the resources that will be needed during implementation and also be able to know the budgets to be used in Girinka Munyarwanda project. On the other hand, the research concluded that planning also contributes a lot to the implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district, where it has been revealed that it facilitates in proper coordination of the project activities and personnel.

Furthermore, the research also concluded that Community mobilization is another important aspect in Implementation of Girinka Munyarwanda project in Kamonyi district where it was revealed that Community mobilization enables community members to understand the reason and benefits of Girinka Munyarwanda project and also helps leaders and beneficiaries to gain skills and knowledge of how to handle problems of Girinka Munyarwanda projects. Finally, the research concluded that there is a significant strong relationship between need assessments, planning, Community mobilization and implementation of government livelihood projects, therefore the variables should be put at the forefront before implementing the project.

REFERENCES

- Ababio, E. P. (2014). Enhancing community participation in developmental local government for improved service delivery. *Journal of Public administration*, 39(2), 272-289.
- Ashley, C., & Mitchell, J. (2009). *Tourism and poverty reduction: Pathways to prosperity*.

- Bugingo, I., & Interayamahanga, R. (2010). A study on the development and use of governance indicators in Rwanda. *Irdp, October*, 1–85.
- Chauya, I.V. (2015). *The effectiveness of community development groups in poverty reduction with regards to individual community members: The case of Likasi Area Development Programme in Mchinji District, Malawi* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa).
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2010). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Darlington, S. (2011) *The role of community participation in development initiatives*, University of western cape, Zimbabwe
- DeFilippis, J., Fisher, R., & Shragge, E. (2010). *Contesting community: The limits and potential of local organizing*. Rutgers University Press.
- Futhi, E., & Mazibuko, A. (2017). The Participation of Women from Rural Areas in Development Projects for Sustainable Livelihoods: A Case of Community Groups in Maqongqo Area, KwaZulu-Natal Province. *Focus Groups, March*.
- Jain, S., & Mansuri, G. (2016). A little at a time: the use of regularly scheduled repayments in microfinance programs. *Journal of development Economics*, 72(1), 253-279.
- Journal, I., Science, S., Iv, V., Vii, I., Marcel, R. Z., & Nuwatuhaire, B. (2020). *Success of Community Participation in Development Planning for Socio-Economic Transformation in. IV(Vii)*, 198–203.
- Khwaja, A (2013). Is increasing community participation always a good thing? *Journal of the European Economic Association* 2(2-3): 427-436.
- Korten, D. (2010). Social learning and the nature of planning. In Korten, D. C. and Klauss, R. (eds.). *People-centered development: contributions toward theory and planning frameworks*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- Kothari, C.R. (2014). *Research methodology, Methods and techniques, 2nd revised edition*, New Delhi: New age international publishers.
- Local Development agency (LODA), (2017). Planning and budgeting documents is a participatory planning process in Rwanda.
- Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2010). Community-based and driven development: A critical review. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 19(1), 1-39.
- Ministry of Local Government (MINALOC). (2013). *The Republic of Rwanda National Strategy for Community Development and Local Economic Development*. 78.
- Mugenda, O.M., & Mugenda, A. G., (2013). *Research Methods – Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: Acts Press
- Narayan, D. (2013). The Contribution of People's participation. Evidence from 121 Rural Water Supply Projects. *ESD. Occasional Paper Series No. 1*. World Bank.
- Never Again Rwanda (2016). *Governing with and for Citizens, Lessons from a Post-Genocide Rwanda*, Kigali: NAR
- Never Again Rwanda (2018). *Local Government Imihigo Process: understanding the factors contributing to low citizen participation*, Kigali: NAR
- Oakley, P. (1991). *Projects with people: the practice of participation in rural development*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Oakley, P. and Marsden, D. (2014). *Approaches to participation in rural development*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- OECD, D. (2015). *Paris declaration on aid effectiveness*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

- Okech, T. C., & Lelegwe, L. S. (2016). Community participation in donor funded projects among pastoral community of Northern Kenya.
- Perkins, P. E. E. (2011). Public participation in watershed management: International practices for inclusiveness. *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C*, 36(5-6), 204-212.
- Saxby, J. (2018). Local ownership and development co-operation—the role of Northern civil society. *Canadian Council for International Co-operation Resource Document, Ontario*.
- Sewpaul, V., & Jones, D. (2014). Global standards for social work education and training. *Social Work Education*, 23(5), 493-513.
- SNV (2009). *Joint Action Development Forum in Rwanda, Experiences and lessons learned*, Kigali: SNV
- Umhlaba Development Services, (2017) Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation Using the Logical Framework Approach. Noswal Hall, Braamfontein, Johannesburg.
- World Bank (2010). World Development Indicators 2010. Washington DC: World Bank Publications
- World Bank (2011) *Conflict, Security and Development: World Development Report 2011*, Washington: World Bank.
- World Bank (2013). *World Development Report 2004, Making Services Work for poor People*, Oxford University Press.

