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ABSTRACT

The study sought to establish the determinants of sustainability of charity educational NGOs in post war situation; a case of Gulu District. It was prompted by the drastic number of educational NGOs that were either closing their shops or eliminating the education component from their activities. The researcher adopted a cross sectional survey design, used structured questionnaires, interview guide and observation checklist to collect raw data, analysed by descriptive analysis and the SPSS program. The findings revealed that sustainability is enhanced by; use of appropriate implementation strategies that are participatory and involved all stakeholders. It indicated that sustainability subsisted on a strong resource base and depended on diversified strategies to bring in more resources. Favorable legal environment, sustainability policies as well as the roles and involvement of the founders, enhanced educational NGOs sustainability. It concluded that; NGOs have clear implementation strategies, affected by inadequate and insufficient funds. Sustainability of the NGOs greatly depends on legal environment, shaped by government and donor policies. More NGOs are religious founded and owned, although others exist. Founders provide various supports to the NGOs thus ensuring sustainability. The study recommended that governments should evenly distribute its structures in all rural areas; NGOs should use alternative local resource mobilisation options and twin during fund application. NGOs should operate within government and donor legal frameworks. Policies guiding NGOs founders and staff’s behaviors will ensure quality service delivery. It also recommended the need to investigate other methods of resource mobilisation opted for by NGOs; investigate further the legal environment most respondents were undecided about and develop and verify the model of educational NGO’s sustainability in post-war areas.
CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction
The provisions of educational services have key components which makes it vital as an integral human development factor to ensure quality participation of the population in economic, social and political issues. However, though NGOs are active and reliable partners in service provision within the education sector together with the government, so many challenges have undermined their possibility to survive and prosper. This study is an investigation of the determinants of sustainability of charity educational Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in the post-war situation: in Gulu district. The determinants of sustainability of charity educational NGOs are being regarded as the independent variable; while the sustainability of charity educational NGOs is the dependent variable. This chapter presents the background of the study, problem statement, purpose, study objectives, research questions and hypothesis, conceptual framework, significance of the study, justification and operational definitions.

1.1 Background to the study
Historical background
Gulu district is located in northern Uganda that has experienced over a two decade long civil war between the government of Uganda and the Lord’s resistance army. The humanitarian crisis that was set in by the civil war brought NGOs into play in the
education and many other sectors to try and avert humanitarian crisis as well as provide the much needed social services that was disrupted by the war. Before the civil war between the government of Uganda and the Lord’s Resistant Army (LRA), there were no charities educational NGOs operating in the northern Uganda. Only the different churches provided support for the poor within their congregations and church founded hospital that provided medical support. The coming of the NGOs during the war, would then bridge the gap in service delivery that has been left by government while they battled the rebellion since the communities were helpless. According to a USAID report (2011:11)

the economy in northern Uganda has been devastated, especially in light of the fact that much of the population is displaced internally and some have left the region…there are an estimated 446,300 internally displace persons (IDPs) in northern Uganda as of November 2010. More than 400,000 IDPs have returned to their home areas in 2009-2010.

With this disruption in the normal life of the communities in the north, so many parents were not able to pay the tuitions fees for their children; let alone provide them with the much needed basic needs and protection. They relied on the numerous charity NGOs who had come to respond to their plight for services such as education, health, food and nutrition as well as advocacy for peace. World vision (report 2004:4) stated:

Education for many of these children seems out of reach, since many are unable to stay in one place to attend school….. Children are losing vital educational opportunities; they are at greater risk for contracting
HIV/AIDS and other STDs; and they are forced into child prostitution, child soldiering, and other forms of bondage.

All these required the help of the NGOs to survived the hard times, thus the need for charity educational NGOs.

The concept of NGOs came into being in 1945 following the establishment of the United Nations Organisation (UNO) which recognised the need to give a consultative role to organisations which were neither classified as governments nor member states (Willet, 2002). The cooperate nature and legal status of the NGOs became an imperative question for both national and international governing bodies. As the NGOs activities and organisation began to grow in numbers, it became more important to understand, streamline and sustain it as an integral part of community service providers. However, it has always been a big challenge, in many cases, for the NGOs to grow, mature and live longer. Precisely, in Uganda, several NGOs have mushroomed over the past two decades with many collapsing before their fifth birthday and their benefits hardly sustained. For any project to be beneficial for its community now and in the long run, the issues of sustainability need to be addressed effectively, or else the benefits of the project will end with the initial efforts and seed funds put into it. While this fact is well known to all project initiators as well as managers, guaranteeing the sustainability of many projects, including those of NGOs seems to remain a challenge, especially in developing countries.
**Theoretical Background**

The study was guided by the Systems Theory of Organisations. This was the Open Systems Theory developed by a biologist, Ludwig von Bertalanffy in 1956, who articulated the interaction between the system and the environment. This means that systems internalise factors from the environment to maintain the system's organised structure and to increase the complexity of the latter. Bertalanffy’s idea was immediately applicable across all disciplines especially in the organisational theory. The system theory defines the concept of a system where “all system are characterised by an assemblage or combination of parts whose relations make them interdependent”, Scott (1977:77). As one moves from mechanical to organic and social systems, the interactions between parts in the systems become more complex and variable. In mechanical systems the parts are highly constrained, while in social systems, the connections are loosely coupled. Also important to note is the flow of materials, energy and information across systems boundaries separating the systems from its environment.

Simple systems transmit energy while higher order systems transmit information. Open systems like organisations are “a multi –cephalous: many heads are present to receive information, make decisions, direct actions” Scott (1977: 92). Individuals and subgroups form and leave coalitions; boundaries are amorphous, permeable and ever changing. But the systems must exchange resources with the environment to survive. To consider the organisation as an open system means to think of it as a mechanism of adapting and improving its identity, stability and activities through its continuous interaction with the
environment. An organisation influences and is influenced by the environment in which it operates, while paying attention to the external environment and making critical decisions to adjust itself to the changes in order to remain relevant. All parts of the organisation are interconnected and interdependent; if one part of the system is affected, all parts are affected. Just like the system, the organisation’s sustainability is dependent on the determining factors affecting or influencing its actions.

**Conceptual background**

The idea of sustainability stems from the concept of sustainable development which became a common language at the World's first Earth Summit in Rio in 1992. Cracknell (2000: 247) defines sustainability as “the ability to deliver an appropriate level of benefits for an extended period of time after major financial, managerial and technical assistance from an external donor is terminated”. Meanwhile Senge (2010:9) defines sustainability as “the need to live the present ways that do not jeopardize the future”. On the other side, Landlearns (nd) says sustainability could be defined as “an ability or capacity of something to be maintained or to sustain itself”. According to the Free Encyclopedia (2011:1), “sustainability is the capacity to endure”. The above definitions seem to point to the fact that sustainability is an economical way of living the present with the view of securing the continuity of a possible future. In the current study, sustainability meant the ability of the organisation to endure and survive beyond donor support be it financial, managerial or technical. Specifically, sustainability of education in NGOs was viewed in terms of the effective and efficient utilisation of resources, staffing levels after end of
initial donor funding, number of years an organisation can survive and level of operation after seed, capital as well as projection for continuity after end of donor funding.

**Contextual background**

The nature of NGOs varies from local NGOs operating in just one or two districts, to international NGOs operating in a number of districts within and out of the country. Their activities are either mono-sectoral or thematic while others are multi-sectoral (Ugandan Government, 2010). For these organisations to play their roles fully, they have to be self-sustainable. In the past, sustainability was not a big issue since many countries were always willing to provide resources and expert personnel to fill in any gap as and when it was required. Until recently, because of the dwindling donor resources and donor fatigue as Namakulu, (2010:1) puts it, “in Uganda over 4000 NGOs set up … are uncertain of the future due to financial sustainability challenges. They are …dependent on donor support, which seems to be insufficient and dwindles each day”. The NGO-government relationship does not make it any better as exemplified by the NGO Registration requirements (Amended) Act 2006, which has narrowed down the space of operation for the NGOs. Turner and Hulme (2007:3) observe,

> NGO and government relations are complex and diverse and are likely to affect the management of NGO activities. The relationships are affected by the specific contextual factors, which may include the nature of the NGO objectives and strategies, area of operation of an NGO, the behavior of the donor and nature and character of the regime.
Today in Uganda, because of the unfavorable legal environment and a decrease in donor funding, a number of NGOs are being forced out of action and the education NGOs have not been any exception. In Gulu District where the proposed study took place, out of the 24 education-focused agencies, seven have completely closed out their education programmes or projects (Gulu NGO Forum, 2011). The remaining 17 are grappling with financial problems as exemplified by the observation made by the head of AVSI Gulu, “there is no more giving, giving by the donor, they are tired” (Samuele Otim; NGO meeting) and the legal issues-NGO registration that require renewal periodically (The National NGO forum & DENIVA, 2006: 5). No study had been done in Gulu with particular attention to education NGOs and as such this study was important to establish the factors that were leading to the above occurrences.

During the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) rebels’ wars, donors were drawn to the suffering of people especially the children in Northern Uganda. Because children are the main beneficiaries of education, a number of donors were willing to give grants to charity NGOs and Community Based Organization (CBOs) working in the education sector then. But as soon as the cessation of hostilities agreement was signed between the Government of Uganda and the LRA in Juba, Sudan in 2006; the donors started withdrawing their financial support and directing it to Karamoja. A case in point was the Royal Netherlands Embassy that was running an Acholi Bursary Scheme with Windle Trust funding over 4000 school-going children closed down in 2009 leaving a number of other students who had their hope in the programme out. Acholi Education Initiative (AEI) that was receiving support from the same donor had to scale down their support from 700 students
annually to only 240 with support from the Embassy of Ireland only (AEI: 2009). To date, they are handling only 166 students and the programme was intended to close down at the end of 2012 since the Embassy of Ireland through their country strategic plan has directed education support to Karamoja. This study was intended to investigate the factors affecting the sustainability of charity education NGOs that have been operating in Gulu District with the aim of informing stakeholders of NGOs of the potential factors threatening the sustainability of their projects as well as their own existence.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Projects will have a long lasting impact if such projects can be sustained long enough to serve their beneficiaries. But several factors appear to indent the prospect of having projects that are sustainable, more so for projects that are initially funded by donors. In Gulu District over the past two years, a number of charity NGOs have been shutting down their education components. Of the 24 actively registered charity NGOs working in the education sector, seven have closed out their education programmes and a number of them have drastically reduced their activities in education support (Gulu NGO Forum, 2011). Factors that have led to these are not clear, though a number of charity educational NGOs cite inadequacy in their funding or financial viability; which has further been reduced by the withdrawal of donor support after the cessation of hostilities agreement was signed between the Government of Uganda and the Lord’s Resistant Army (LRA) rebels that had been operating in Northern Uganda for over 20 years. It is being hypothesized that the decimal performance of the charity educational NGOs in Gulu could be attributed to the strategies for programming and implementation, inadequate
financial resources, the unfavorable legal environment, the ownership of the organisations and their policies. To help address the above issues, some charity educational NGOs have reorganized their implementation strategies to involve the communities to address the issues of ownership that makes a project sustainable even after closure. Some Charity NGOs have ventured into local and electronic fundraising; looking for other financially viable projects to support their non-profiting NGOs. Agencies have also adhered to all the regulations imposed on them by the National NGO Board and others have come up with strict sustainability polices to be followed. But even with all these, the issue of sustainability still remains a challenge. Yet if the current situation persists, the future of several children depending on the support of NGOs for their education will be at stake, thus this study.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

This study was to establish the determinants of sustainability of charity educational NGOs in Gulu District.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The study specifically aimed at achieving the following objectives:

1. To establish the effect of implementation strategies on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs.
2. To establish the effect of resource mobilisation on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs.

3. To establish the effect of legal environment on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs.

4. To establish the effects of ownership of organization on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs.

1.5 Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the effect of implementation strategies on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs?

2. What is the effect of resource mobilization on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs?

3. What is the effect of the legal environment on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs?

4. What is the effect of ownership of organization on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs?
1.6 Hypotheses of the Study

The research tested the following hypotheses

1. Implementation strategies have no effect on the sustainability of educational NGOs.
2. Resource mobilization has no effect on the sustainability of educational NGOs.
3. Legal environment has no effects on the sustainability of educational NGOs.
4. Ownership of Organization has no effect on the sustainability of educational NGOs.

1.7 Conceptual Framework

Various concepts that constitute the pillars of this research have been presented according to their weight or importance in this work. Precisely, the study sought to explicate the type of variables that the concepts inherent to this study constitute. The study has investigated the determinants of charity educational NGO sustainability, with particular focus on implementation strategies, resource mobilization, legal environment and organizational ownership as the independent variables and organization sustainability as the dependent variable.
Figure 1, illustrates the hypothesized relationship between the variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DETERMINANTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDUCATIONAL NGO SUSTAINABILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Usage of local government structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Usage of community structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Qualified staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriate project design, monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource mobilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local fundraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electronic fundraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- International fundraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Donor funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Administrative sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Staffing level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Effective and efficient usage of resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.1: Conceptual Framework showing the relationship between factors affecting NGO Sustainability

Source: Adapted and modified from Shedia-Rickalla & Bone L.R (1998) and Bossert (1990)

Fig.1 presents four important composite concepts that constitute the independent variable and their related sub conceptual components which presumably have influence on the dependent variable. Institutional and financial sustainability in this case are presented as the dependent variables that are presumably affected by the four components of strategies of implementation, resource mobilisation, legal environment and ownership of organisation.
1.8 Scope of Study

1.8.1 Geographical Scope of Study
Geographically, this study was conducted in Gulu District, which is located in Northern Uganda. Gulu District has got a municipal council with four divisions of Pece, Laroo, Layibi and Bar-dege. It has two counties of Aswa and Omoro. The study covered 19 charity educational NGOs operating in Gulu district and addressing educational concerns.

1.8.2 Content Scope of Study
Conceptually, the study investigated the determinants of charity educational NGOs sustainability, with particular focus on implementation strategies, resource mobilization, legal environment and organizational ownership as the determining variables that have influence on the dependent variable, which was organisational sustainability.

1.8.3 Time Scope of Study
This study lasted for six months from September 2012 to March 2013. During this time the researcher collected the necessary data to support the study.

1.9 Significance of Study
The study is hoped to contribute to the many efforts made by other academicians in trying to solve the challenge of organization sustainability, thus adding to the existing body of knowledge, which can be made reference of by other scholars. The study
findings are expected to be of practical use to the NGO sector and government in helping them work together in promoting NGO sustainability in order to foster a better-sustained service delivery to the communities. The study findings should be of use to other scholars and researchers who can use them as a basis for further investigation in the field of educational NGO sustainability.

1.10 Justification of Study

The justification stance of this study was based on the fact that most of the scholars that have conducted researches on sustainability have not looked at charity educational NGOs sustainability in Gulu district. For example, Musoke (2011) investigated institutional sustainability; A case of ponseti treatment in Uganda, which was health-related. Another researcher, Gwokayala (2010) studied the factors affecting project sustainability of Human Immune Virus/ Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (HIV/ AIDS) disease service delivery, which is also health-related. Majority of studies on sustainability were done mostly on sustainable development with a connotation of economic growth; but no specific attention on sustainability of charity educational NGOs. The geographic specificity of this study makes it unique from the above cited schools of knowledge and precisely this work was situated in Gulu District, which was and continues to grapple with the problems of post war transition and development. The above rationale validated the need to conduct the study.
1.11 Operational Definitions

**Sustainability** meant the ability to deliver an appropriate level of benefits for an extended period of time after major financial, managerial and technical assistance from an external donor is terminated. It is the extensive capacity of an organization to exist on its own and continue to deliver services even after the donors cut off support.

**Determinants** were defined and looked at the different factors that influence the sustainability of an NGO.

**Implementation strategies** were defined as the means suitable, correct, or the right way of doing things using the right approaches. It precisely means how to be efficient and effective in meeting the objective and set targets. It externalizes the operational capacity of an organization.

**Resource mobilisation** was defined as the process of forming crowds, groups, associations, and organisations for the pursuit of collecting funds and human resources. It is the strategies that the organization employs in order to acquire economic and human capital for the alimentation of the organizational functioning.
**Legal environment** meant the legislative and regulatory framework that makes special provisions for the needs of NGOs or gives not for profit organizations special advantages to play their roles. It is the set of norms that guide the relationship of the NGOs organization with the state, community and other NGOs in what regards their action and status.

**Organisation ownership** was defined as the right to, possession of, tenure of the organization by person or group of people who founded, promoted or sustain it.

**Sustainability** meant the ability of the organization to endure and survive beyond donor support be it financial, managerial or technical. Specifically, sustainability of education in NGOS was looked at in terms of the effective and efficient utilization of resources, staffing level after end of initial donor funding, number of years an organization can survive and level of operation after seed capital as well as projection for continuity after end of donor funding.
CHAPTER TWO:
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

In this Chapter, the research analysed the relevant literature regarding the problematic factors that determined the sustainability of educational NGOs in the post-war situation of Gulu district. The chapter has been partitioned into three sections: - introductory part precedes the theoretical review, which outlines the main sociological theory or the main schools of thought under which the current research draw its rationale. The subsequent section is the literature review and summary that is directly concerned with identifying the current trends and gaps related to the challenges or the determinants of charity educational NGOs’ sustainability.

2.1 Theoretical Review

The study was guided by the Systems Theory of Organisations. This was the Open Systems Theory developed by a biologist, Ludwig von Bertalanffy in 1956, who articulated the interaction between the system and the environment. This means that systems internalise factors from the environment to maintain the system's organised structure and to increase the complexity of the latter. Bertalanffy idea was immediately applicable across all disciplines especially in the organisational theory. The system theory defines the concept of a system where “all system are characterised by an assemblage or combination of parts whose relations make them interdependent”, Scott (1977:77). As
one moves from mechanical to organic and social systems, the interactions between parts in the systems become more complex and variable. In mechanical systems, the parts are highly constrained, while in social systems, the connections are loosely coupled. Also important to note is the flow of materials, energy and information across systems boundaries separating the systems from its environment.

Simple systems transmit energy while higher order systems transmit information. Open systems like organisations are “a multi–cephalous: many heads are present to receive information, make decisions, direct actions” Scott (1977: 92). Individuals and subgroups form and leave coalitions; boundaries are amorphous, permeable and ever changing. But the systems must exchange resources with the environment to survive. To consider the organisation as an open system, mean to think of it as a mechanism of adapting and improving its identity, stability and activities through its continuous interaction with the environment. An organisation influences and is influenced by the environment in which it operates, while paying attention to the external environment and making critical decisions to adjust itself to the changes in order to remain relevant. All parts of the organisation are interconnected and interdependent; if one part of the system is affected, all parts are affected.

The case of charity educational NGOs sustainability can best be articulated by the classical idea of the father of system theory call Talcott Parson. Coser (1977:570) asserts; “Parson and his collaborators in the working papers call the theory of action as all action
systems”, which are faced with four major problems if they were to survive and develop. 1) They must secure sufficient resource from their environment and distribute these within the system and this is termed adaptation. 2) They must mobilise resources for the attainment of the system’s goals and this is called goal attainment. 3) They must coordinate and adjust the relation within the system and hence have mechanisms for the integration. 4) There must be ways of ensuring that component actors are sufficiently motivated to play their parts, pattern maintenance, as well as the mechanisms devoted to internal tension management.

Furthermore, Boulding, (1956: 200-207) developed a classification of the systems theory to include “… open system theory … which are described as self maintenance through exchange of resources with the environment (cell)”. However the open system theory in this study is an alternative to the human relations perspective theory and the administrative theories of Henry Fayol which treated an organisation’s departments as self contained entities. Fayol did not see the fact that organisations need to interact with the environment they serve to possibly acquire their finances, human resources, or even socialise with the environment they serve to achieve its goals. Because of the above shortcomings the above classical theories are not best suited for this study.

Charity educational NGOs are better managed like systems, the open systems theory refers to the concept that organisations are strongly influenced by their environment. Bastedo (2004: 1) notes “this environment consists of other organisations that exert
various forces of an economic, political or social nature”. Virtually all modern theories of organisations utilise the open system theory perspective in their development. As a result, the open systems theory is favored by many. Although in adapting the above theory, the researcher is not ignorant of the shortcomings of the open systems theory such as the management of the institution that must be robust to make the parts work well. The theory also ignores the fact that the system/ organisation can actually take decisions for its growth without having to consider the outside factors that might be confusing.

Contextually, the environments that interact with the NGOs are the government conditions and the communities in which they are inserted. Semboja & Therkildsen (1995:52, 53) observed;

while the state organisation: regulates, controls, through legitimate coercion by directing social behaviors, reallocating wealth, equalising access to services and opportunities in the society, the NGO/voluntary organisations are concerned with the promotion and realisation of values, goals that are important to groups in the same society and there are no limits to the nature of these value-goals.

Charity NGOs have a vision of more economic equitability and have high advantages compared with the government especially in the way they relate to the population on the basis of development interest; and they are able to adopt their organisational structure, methods and process to the specific situations and population groups. Niklas Luhmann (2011: 23) proposed that for a system to exist well, “it must be self-creative”
(autopoiesis) that means each system has a distinctive identity that it’s different from and also cannot exist without environment”. If a system fails to maintain that identity, it ceases to exist as a system and dissolves back into the environment it had emerged from. It is on the basis of this affirmation that we turn to consider those factors that determine the sustainability of Charity educational NGOs.

2.2 Actual Literature Review

2.2.0 Introduction

Northern Uganda has experienced an over two decade long civil war between the government of Uganda and the LRA rebels. Over 30,000 children and adults were abducted and thousands of life lost. This war devastated the lives and the economy of the north leaving people helpless and cramped up in the camps with no clear support from government except from the NGOs. Communities relied on the NGOs for almost everything for their day to day lives. After the signing of the Juba Peace Agreements in 2006 between the government of Uganda and LRA, communities that were incarcerated in the camps began trekking back home to their indigenous villages. They left the camps without any organised, pre designed process, armed with nothing to help them address the challenges the face ahead of them. IRIN news (9 January 2013) reported that, It has been years since northern Uganda's children had to troop to town centers at night for safety from abduction by the rebel Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), and most have moved on from the crowded displacement camps where they were born. But while they can sleep
at night and look forward to a peaceful future, their lives are rarely easy. While there are no more fears of abduction today, the children’s future are threatened because of many reasons such as poverty and diseases.

USAID report (2011:11) supported the above arguments and it noted;

the economy in northern Uganda has been devastated, especially in light of the fact that much of the population is displaced internally and some have left the region…there are an estimated 446,300 internally displace persons (IDPs) in northern Uganda as of November 2010. More than 400,000 IDPs have returned to their home areas in 2009-2010.

All these points to the fact that even if the communities have returned home, their life can never be the same again since their economic means of livelihood were all destroyed in the war and that is why they can not afford education for their children.

A report by the government of Uganda (2003:6) asserts that Poverty levels remain significantly high in Northern Uganda despite the numerous targeted interventions to reduce poverty in this region over the past decade. Even when income poverty is reported to have fallen elsewhere in the country between 1997 and 2000, poverty levels have remained high in Northern Uganda rising from 60 percent to 66 percent within this period. Even years later after the study, the situation is not any better; poverty levels keep getting worst with the general economic hardships suffered by the world after the global economic crisis. With this disruption in the normal life of the communities in the north, so many families are not able to meet their day to day basic needs; for those who
try, many struggle to afford their children's education. Even if primary and secondary school education is free in Ugandan government aided schools, these schools are not able to accommodate all the school going age children; thus communities turn to private schools that are very costly to attain education for their children. Even in the free primary and secondary education in government’s aided schools, related costs like transportation, uniforms, books and school supplies pose significant financial challenges to the poorer families in northern Uganda. Thus communities in the north has had to rely on the numerous charity NGOs who had come to respond to their plight for services such as education, health, food and nutrition as well as advocacy for peace. World vision (report 2004:4) stated:

   Education for many of these children seems out of reach, since many are unable to stay in one place to attend school….. Children are losing vital educational opportunities; they are at greater risk for contracting HIV/AIDS and other STDs; and they are forced into child prostitution, child soldiering, and other forms of bondage.

All these required the help of the NGOs to survived the hard times, thus the need for charity educational NGOs. According to IRIN news, even government officials in the north say the region's continued poverty is causing problems for children's education. Though enrolment is high, the dropout rate is equally high year in, year out. The worst affected are girls.
The current land conflicts in the Northern Ugandan districts including has just exacerbated the income problems and increased poverty levels in the districts since communities spend more time engaged in land conflicts as opposed to profitable economic activities. Communities in northern Uganda look at land as the only source of livelihood and a sense of belonging. It means life itself to them and thus deserves to be protected with their own life. This conflict has a potential of plunging the already poverty stricken communities back in to war. According to Shannon Golden (2013:1)

Disputes over land are contentious not only because land is essential to survival and rebuilding but also because land is symbolically important in establishing belonging in a community. Land conflict emerges out of a chaotic mass resettlement context, often involving exploitation of vulnerable residents and situations that escalate to physical violence.

This does not help the already bad economic situation that should have facilitated the education sector.

Angoma Okello (2013) noted that, the problem faced in post-war peace building social recovery is how far Non-Governmental Organisations can transform and rebuild a once destroyed social authority of war-affected population. The multitudes of actors in which NGOs work with, NGOs' own interests, values, principles, codes of conducts and modes of operations have implications on formerly war displaced returnees in respective villages of return. NGOs’ facilitation and representation of one of Africa's neglected and complicated contextual local crises to the international, regional and national levels were
slow. However, with NGOs' withdrawal from post-war reconstruction, Acholi people are stuck in a weak social authority with loose social bonding.

Although all the authors noted that, there is high level of poverty, weak household incomes, and insecurity interns of other conflicts, slow economic growth and the fact that NGOs have been very instrumental to averting a humanitarian crisis. They do not state how these NGOs can be sustainable so that the benefits of their works can be long lasting to the communities of northern Uganda in the post war situation. NGOs withdrawal in the post war situation has been noted but reasons for their withdrawal has not been stated thus the need to conduct the study on the determinants of the sustainability of charity educational NGOs in northern Uganda, a case of Gulu.

### 2.2.1 Implementation strategies and the sustainability of Charity educational NGOs

The correlation between the concept of implementation strategies and the sustainability of the charity educational NGOs is the guiding plan for the continuous existence of the organisation. The link between these two factors means, the different strategies put in place to ensure continuity of the project or programmes, for the charity educational NGOs, after the project closeout. This might be possible with the involvement of community members to participate in project design that is most suitable to address their needs without creating new problems, monitor as well as utilise community structures and qualified personnel. In fact, some charity NGOs have not used the most appropriate implementation strategies to make their organisations suitable or owned by the
community, which would make it sustainable when they leave. In that way Tedler (1982: 78) stated; “most NGOs are often top down rather than participatory in their decision making, villagers were marginally (if at all) involved in NGO project design”. The situation is not any different now, the issue of sustainability of NGOs has remained a challenge and this challenge is worse among the charity educational NGOs, since education is a very expensive venture that needs the participation of everybody.

Scaling up or scaling down approaches by the NGOs create a big challenge even for the sustainability of charity educational NGOs in Gulu. According to the National NGO Policy- Uganda (2010), weak sustainability among the NGO sector is one of the many challenges the policy is addressing. Local NGOs in education are currently facing major challenges in implementing education programmes. It is not about involving only the communities in the implementation strategies but also the hierarchical bodies or government as partners in the implementation plan. Though, lack of financial resources makes it difficult, if not impossible for the said local NGOs to operate without any constraints and this curtails their impact on the ground, one of the problems they face is that of scaling up. Some of the NGOs have had the assumption that government would scale up NGO activities once they have demonstrated impact on the ground. However, this has been limited because NGO programmes have not been adequately linked up with government programmes/plans and also due to lack of coordination and consultation between the two parties.
In the case of locally funded NGOs, irregularities in funding inflows have greatly affected the effective implementation of their programmes. Given that education is highly labor intensive, the local NGOs do not have the capacity to implement education programmes let alone ensure quality. This is supported by the assertion of Riddle (2007:273) “some NGO projects fail because of lack of managerial and technical skills with which to implement the projects”. They rely on volunteer teachers and instructors who cannot continue working in the absence of financial motivation. It is clear that some NGOs at the community level have not performed to the expectations of the people and other stakeholders.

Implementation strategies of any NGOs must also take into account these two aspects: 1) the responsive output flow of valued good and services on which the overall judgment on the quality of the NGOs is based 2) The cost-effective good and service delivery mechanism as base of organisations and management for an organisation. These follows that sustainability of NGOs is achieved where “lesson, impact and benefit of the development project continues to be disseminated and diffused after their completion” (Sarah, 2004: 132,139) and this can be realised if the two mentioned factors are met.

Generally, the current trends regarding implementation strategies and the sustainability of charity educational NGOs World over is that, most agencies are moving to work more closely in partnership with the communities and other agencies to share lessons learnt and best practices to be replicated as well as with governments; so that when funding ends,
the governments and communities can take over and ensure the intended benefits of the project are continuous and sustainable. However while doing this; there are gaps which have been generally identified that are affecting the implementation of all NGOs projects that need to be improved. These are related to the limited scale of NGOs implementation of identified needs in the community. In most cases, projects cover just a few communities, schools or areas and yet to achieve sustainable benefits, the whole communities in an area need to be targeted. Avolio-Toly. R (2010:14) notes;

It is unrealistic to believe that there are enough resources to enact these small scale programs in every needy area… In the future, it would be beneficial to scale up these projects to regional or national level if possible…. Scaling up would have to be done by larger organisations or taken over by the government, as the cost would greatly increase.

Secondly, the longevity of projects implementation is always limited by fund availability. This for example, does not allow the communities to be able to learn, cope and acquire management skills to sustain the project’s benefits. Most NGOs projects are short term and yet most charity educational programs outcomes need a long term investment to achieve the desired goal and thus guaranteeing sustainability. It should be noted, despite the fact that education is a public good and its provision to the citizens largely lies with governments, most governments are reluctant to cooperate with the NGOs without facilitation during implementation and are as well reluctant to take over the NGO projects when funding ends. Again Avolio-Toly (2010:14) observes;
Many of these NGOs are operating under tight budgets, with funding they may or may not be consistent over the years. While most of the programs are working with communities to build their capacity to provide services, at the moment these communities do not have the capacity to enact them on their own. If the NGOs ran out of funding, or moved on to another program, the local community would be unable to sustain these programs. There is need for effective planning as to how to make these programs sustainable in the long term—whether through government or institutional hand over.

Also to note, most NGO projects design and need identification processes do not involve all the communities during this process, so encouraging the communities to participate, monitor and own the projects becomes a problem during implementation. This show that NGOs have not been incorporating assessments into their programming thus the difficulties they experience.

All in all for NGOs have experienced gaps in their implementations strategies because they have not been sharing learning experiences and have not replicated those that are relevant and have been tested across the globe. Edwards and Alan (2002:367), note that, organisation’s sustainability rest on NGOs performance and how the NGOs maintain such performance which requires an NGO to learn and adapt to the changing environment and stay its civic self in the process”. This implies that if NGOs are not able
to learn and adapt to their environments, then they will not be able to survive and live their usefulness in the communities they serve.

2.2.2 Resource mobilization strategies and sustainability of education NGOs

Fundamentally, an organizational development and sustainability depend on the organisation’s capacity to mobilize resources. A renowned scholar; Babson (2011:45) defines resource mobilisation as “the process of forming crowds, groups, associations, and organizations for the pursuit of collecting funds and human resources”. Babson expresses the possibility to create the forward and backward linkages of capital formation and accumulation. In this study, resource mobilisation meant looking for resources both financial capital and human at local, national and international levels to facilitate the activities of charity educational NGOs.

The funding challenge is already well understood by most NGOs. This is exemplified by the trend now among official donors to decentralise decision-making to embassies and missions in developing countries. Although most developed countries still have a strategic focus to support African countries, International Non Governmental Organisations (INGOs) are relocating their fundraising troops to where their support is directed. INGOs also understand that sustainable development requires local people and institutions to have a growing financial stake in their own development. In a bid to improve local participation in resource mobilisation, INGOs begun helping the national NGOs and Community Based Organisations (CBOs) they work with to build their
capacity in resource mobilisation and resource alliance to do so. It is important to develop constituencies of support through the use of resource alliance and enhanced local ownership in the program countries where INGOs work. Local resource mobilisation is more and more emphasised in INGOs program work. They stress the importance of counterpart contributions and cost sharing from the communities, partner organisations or governments they work with. To do this, INGOs are expanding their fundraising efforts to the South. Some INGOs have even established national offices or foundations and boards in developing countries. This gives them the opportunity and legal leverage to penetrate the local philanthropic markets even if international bodies may disapprove of this.

The above circumstances indicate that donor funding is dwindling each day and for NGOs to be sustainable they must look to other sources other than their traditional donor. Greensmith (2002:1) noted:

Many Southern NGOs looking at INGOs as a source of funding should prepare for disappointment. They should have a minimum of competence in adding value and offer a minimum promise to deserve funding for investment in further building their capacity.

To this effect, many NGOs have responded with the same entrepreneurial spirit, good planning and hard work that brought them success in their core activities. They have expanded fund-raising activities directed at the general public, tapped new corporate
donors for monetary and in-kind support, and held one-time events such as the live concerts and dinners. They have redesigned program implementation strategies to include cost-recovery components whereby the beneficiaries of the program pay part, and sometimes all, program costs. And today we even see NGOs owning and managing restaurants, tour companies, banks, clinics and other businesses.

Charity educational NGOs can obtain funds to run their programs or project from three sources: 1) Interested third parties, who give to the NGO in return, primarily, for the personal satisfaction derived from doing good (grants and donations); 2) Beneficiaries of the charity NGOs programs or projects, who value their participation more than the cost of participating (cost recovery); 3) Unrelated third parties, who will pay the NGO in return for something of value that the NGO offers them (commercial ventures). But Riddle (2007:281) makes the following argument “the bulk of the NGO materials which looks into the issues of sustainability have concluded that most NGO projects are not financially sustainable without continual injection of external funds”. Synthetically, “an institutional sustainability depends on one of the resource flow which basically entails to know recurrent cost, capital investment and human resource” (Sarah, 2004; 132), which when managed well with outstanding and effective strategies of mobilisation can render solid the resource capacity of an NGO. Another internal sustainability mechanism of the NGOs regards the capacity building which deals with improvement of the skills and strategies in finance and planning. Taking experiences from Latin America, Stockmann
(1997:28) describes internal sustainability as the “ability to develop a problem solving structure that allows it to adapt successfully to the changing conditions around it”.

Internationally, the challenges of resources is being faced by most NGOs, most especially the southern or national NGOs. Financial sustainability is probably the biggest challenge that many NGOs face in Africa and Asia. Every indication is that this will remain the case unless NGOs and their stakeholders begin to define new resource mobilisation strategies and start exploring creative alternatives of resources mobilisation. These alternatives can be in the form of mobile money transfers, televisions programmes to pass information on new projects, encourage local people to give in order to support the project, and internet usage as opposed to traditional sources of funding like donor funding through grants. With traditional sources of funding for NGOs becoming ever more scarce and unpredictable, the civil society sector needs to continue thinking of coping strategies to have in place for financial sustainability. This should be done bearing in mind that, almost 70% to 80% of the NGOs’ budget comes from foreign donations (and in most cases very limited) or individual donors. Mobilising resources from local sources is an alternative means. In Tanzania, some NGOs have begun using the media especially the televisions to improve on their resource mobilisation channels. Mutakyahwa, (nd: 3, 4) revealed that,

Local resource mobilisation will not only reduce the level of dependency of Tanzanian organisations but also strengthen “local ownership” of projects. The future of the media’s role in resource mobilisation is bright.
More NGOs are seeing the important role the media can play in educating society on various issues and thus motivate people to give.

Although the media resource mobilisation channels seem to work in encouraging people to give more and often have yielded better results through online donations, most agencies have not taken this process seriously and thus have lost out on the opportunity to obtain funds through this process. In support of the above statement, Mutakyahwa (nd:4) noted, “A quick survey on resource mobilisation methods has revealed that the media fundraising method is yet to be exploited although it is estimated that its use is to increase. It should be noted that the media is willing and ready to give a helping hand provided they are asked.” Through this process, citizens can see the need to facilitate programmes that can alleviate the suffering of their own people for example in instances disasters such as earthquakes, landslides, floods strikes, and thus are encouraged to give more.

In West Africa, different forms of institutional forms of philanthropy are cropping up including individuals, communities, churches and corporate bodies, who come together in times of need or when called upon to give to a cause. Mohamadou and Hathie (nd: 18) agreed with the above view but they noted that to implement and improve the above plans “it is imperative that policy makers provide a supportive legal and fiscal environment. Foundations should also dedicate some time and resources to build their capacity in organisational development”.
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The gaps identified from these review is that donor funds are dwindling by the day, and the INGOs prefer to raise fund locally to enhance sustainability and create a sense of ownership among the local communities. It is further noted that there are many resource mobilisation channels or strategies that have not yet been exploited by most educational NGOs, which could help them secure the most needed funds locally to achieve their set goals. For the NGOs that have managed to beat the financial challenge and sustained their NGOs, this study too sought to find out the means used to attain this.

2.2.3 Legal environment and sustainability of education NGOs

Naturally, the educational NGOs are inserted in an environment governed by legal principles, frameworks or systems, which can be international, national, local or organizational laws and policies. Legal environment is the “legislative and regulatory framework that makes special provisions for the needs of NGOs or gives not-for-profit organizations special advantages to play their roles” (USAID-NGO Sustainability Index, 2010:13). In addition, when the legal environment is favorable, the organizations are assured of their legal existence and freedom to exercise their rights and play their roles.

In the current legal environment, where agencies that are seen to be advocating more for government accountability, transparency and issues of corruption are treated with an iron fist, the operations of such NGOs has been stifled. NGOs normally operate under different policies within the organisation, from their donors or those by the government in the countries they operate in. It is imperative to understand how these different policies operate to guide the legal operations of charity educational NGOs.
Bhattacharyaa (2006) points out that a policy is a predetermined established guideline towards the attainment of accepted goals and objectives. Before funds are disbursed to the educational NGOs for implementation, the funding agency or donor signs a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the implementing partner, a precondition for implementation to begin. Unwin (2004) critically note “the measurement of impact on policy and partnership are notoriously difficult. Funders do, however, need to know what the impact has been. The biggest conceptual obstacle to such measurement is the ownership of the outcomes”. Particularly, educational programme outcomes tend to take long to be seen clearly, if a donor requires and immediate outcome a prerequisite for continuity of funding, this may be difficult to prove. To make accountability easier, and for guaranteed sustainability, funders need to identify the inputs made, and then conclude that they have worked in partnership for the development of best practice, have impacted positively on the development of public policy or service. However over time most donor policies have changed from giving completely (grants) to co sharing with national NGOs (funding part of the programmes). For those that cannot afford to cost share they miss out on the grant and hence cannot achieve their planned objectives, thus the issue of the NGO sustainability come in whether they are able to sustain themselves beyond the donor fund.

An organisational policy is very important for the sustainability of any charity educational NGOs. A policy is not a strategy or tactic but a guiding principle. UNICEF (2004) suggests that, each organization should develop an explicit policy statement on sustainability. The policy should provide a clear explanation of the concept, role and factors affecting sustainability within the organization, including the institutional
framework and definition of roles and responsibilities. Most local and national organizations do not have sustainability policies in place, since it is not a requirement for their existence. For those that have, they hardly practice it, so they are normally taken unaware with the changes that come in the global environment; for example, the current financial and economic crisis.

In regard to government policies, Quesnel in (UNICEF 2005) observed that, governments are the member states forming the United Nations System, supporting its secretariat and many specialized offices, agencies, programs and funds. No doubt, governments have been the main protagonist of evaluation. They use evaluation for the purpose of good governance, accountability, learning by doing, reengineering ways and means for improving performance, value-for-money and assessing the taxpayer satisfaction. Another potent leverage used by governments for greater systematization, is the system of international financial institutions in order to achieve particular agreed ends. Since the governments are stakeholders in the United Nations and the International financial institutions, they can make a difference if they are in support of the work of charity educational NGOs.

In Uganda now, it is difficult to prove government support simply because they are also running similar activities with the NGOs. For example, government has put in place the Universal Secondary Education (USE) programme and this has outcompeted agencies that were providing bursaries or scholarships at secondary school level. A number of
times donors have indicated that, all their support will go through government line Ministries and yet the quality of government service delivery and equity of USE is still wanting. Riddle (2007:299) establishes: “it is difficult to know the extent to which poor outcomes are due to poor policies and faulty analysis, or to quite expect unexpected external influences. Policies can turn out to be right or wrong without NGOs and lobbyists telling government to continue implementing them or to change. Without continued review to ascertain the benefits of these programs, some of the will only become obstacles to other would be promising programs or projects with the charity NGOs.

From the literature, it can be noted that there are gaps in government policy to support NGOs to operate comfortably, and that donor policies are rigid and may not guarantee organisational sustainability. Further, some organisations have either week or no sustainability policies. To this effect a number of organisations have developed strategies to handle the problem of sustainability. For example, sustainability that is impeded by the legal environment has been addressed by the NGOs coming together under the National NGO Forum to seek legal redress on the NGO Act when the 1989 NGO act was introduced, in 2005 when the NGO amendment act was pushed on to the NGOs without proper consultation and review. Agencies also have policies in place both internally and donor policies to help them keep within government legal systems and framework. This is likely to enhance the charity educational NGO sustainability if implemented by all agencies involved.
2.2.4 Ownership of the organisation and sustainability of charity educational NGOs

Organisation ownership is defined as the right to, possession of, tenure of the organisation. In this study, organisation ownership was operationalised as those who own the organisation, whether the founding country or the communities that are served and feel part of the organisation. The NGOs boards are the owners of the organisation and its imperative that “after determining the mission of the organization, ensuring that the organisation is financially sound and well managed is one of the most important duties of the board. An NGO’s short-term health and long-term sustainability often depend on the attention the board gives to this critical task (Wyatt, 2004: 53). When organisations have attentive boards, interested and committed to the organisation’s goals, such boards will put more efforts to ensure that the organisations achieve the set objectives they were formed for; by conducting aggressive resource mobilisation to ensure financial sustainability. The board would also endeavor to put in place all the required legal documents in terms of policies and strategies to enhance administrative sustainability of the organisations. Normally the boards would provide all the technical and managerial support required by the secretariat to guarantee quality service delivery. At the end of the day, just as they have the mandate to mobilise resources from the communities, they also have to account to them. To this effect Wyatt (2004:59) again notes,

An NGO’s obligation to be accountable to the public takes many forms. To the government, it owes financial statements or periodic registration. To donors, it owes reports about the use of funds and assessments of program impact. To beneficiaries, it owes descriptions of services and the
way they meet a community need. This broad audience for an NGO demands an unusual degree of transparency.

With the above in mind, the second groups that will form the ownership of the organisations are the communities that the NGOs serve. It is noted that, when communities have a sense of ownership, then organisations are most likely to have efficient resources, both financial and human to enable them continue with their work as planned. Identification of an organisation with the needs and context of the community that it serves guarantee the continuity of services provided by the NGOs and thus it’s sustainability. This can be best explained by the participation, reflection and action; down- up approaches (Participatory Rural Appraisal- PRA) which became popular in 1980s and early 1990s. To this, Blackburn and Holland, (1991:14-15) notes; “it is about poverty sensitive policy or project management; it’s about making policy more sensitive to the needs of the poor and project more efficient and effective”. An example is the experiences of IFAD (2000:15),

Empowerment is the ownership of the development process by the people themselves. All development stakeholders –government, private sector, banks, NGOs and other members of civil society – must recognize the capacity of the poor to develop themselves as free, responsible and self-reliant groups and communities and create the environment for individuals to come together and organize themselves.
It is important that the ownership of an organisation develops into a community-rooted organisation. This gives a community the motivation to participate fully and even give required resources when called upon. The gap noted in the literature and the current situation is that, NGOs board’s commitment is required and yet wanting in educational NGOs, a crucial factor in the sustainability of any NGO. Community members need to be involved in NGO activities for ownership to be established.

2.3 Summary of Literature Review

It can easily be comprehended that implementation strategies and sustainability of education NGOs suffer from an acute shortage of funds, capacity constraints and other challenges; to be able to involve all the needed stakeholders to guarantee quality services delivery which will in turn ensure sustainable project benefits in the long run. Resource mobilisation requires more attention since this greatly determines the sustainability of any organisation and this will include the participation of all the stakeholders, drafting of new strategies and policies which will not dominantly be based on donor demands. It is clear that donor funding is reducing by the day and more INGOs are working towards obtaining more funds from the communities or countries they serve. But, it is imperative that national and local NGOs have not yet re-strategized to get more involved in untapped resource mobilisation channels like the electronic media, which could open up its base to include participation in income generating projects to fund part of their programs. However, operating without the legal awareness and outside the government legal frame work is fatal for charity educational NGO sustainability. Some NGOs have operated without clearly stipulated legal procedures and sustainability policies to be followed.
Specifically, some owners of the organisation have not endeavored be a point of legalisation for any member in order to further the objectives of the organisation. For some charity organisations, its ownership has not been committed to providing funds to achieve its goals. Community ownership and involvement, which is paramount for the ownership of charity NGOs programs and its sustainability have been overlooked over the years, thus more NGOs tend to crumble down before too long from the time they were formed.
CHAPTER THREE:

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter provides the research methodology that was employed in the investigation of the determinants of sustainability of education NGOs in the post-war situation. This chapter presents a description of the research design, study population, sample size and selection, sampling techniques, data collection methods, data collection instruments, validity and reliability testing, procedure of data collection and data analysis techniques and measurement of variables that were used in the study.

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a cross sectional descriptive survey research design. The researcher employed triangulation of qualitative and quantitative research approaches; triangulation enabled the researcher to achieve a higher degree of validity and reliability. This approach was selected because it involves intensive, descriptive and holistic analysis of a bounded case, in order to gain insight in to a larger setting and to describe and explain rather than predict results. Tools from both research methods were applied to collect data in the field study.
3.2 Study Population

The study targeted board members; executive directors, managers, coordinators, accountants and other officers directly connected to programme sustainability or financial sustainability such as the Advocacy officers and the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) officers. The number of the accessible population was 260 people picked from the 20 education NGOs in Gulu District, located in Northern Uganda.

3.3 Sample Size and Selection

The sample size for this study was 217 respondents consisting of the Executive Directors, Board Members, Managers, Coordinators, Accountants, Advocacy Officer and M&E Officers from the target organizations. The sample size was determined by and derived from the use of Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) table for determining sample size. Of the 20 Education NGOs operating in Gulu District (Gulu NGO Forum, 2011), the researcher used 19 of them in determining the sample size. According to the NGO structure, the target officers have one position for each organization except for the board members which had a minimum number of seven, which was considered in this research. The table below illustrates how the sample size was reached at.
Table 3.1: Showing the target, population, sample size, sampling techniques and data collection tools used by category of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Target Category</th>
<th>Accessible Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Sampling Technique</th>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Executive directors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Stratified random</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Advocacy officers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M&amp;E officers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>260</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Sampling Techniques and Procedures

Purposive sampling techniques were used to select respondents whose contribution was relevant in the study. This was because the researcher was aware of the NGO structure and the decision makers within the structure who determined organization sustainability and therefore they were chosen according to the roles they played in the organization. This technique was used because it helped in collecting focused data that helped in bringing out the key factors that determined organization sustainability. Secondly the researcher used stratified random sampling techniques to group the population into homogenous subsets that shared similar characteristics and ensured equitable representation of the population in the sample as well as accounting for the differences in the sub groups. This technique helped the researcher to identify subgroups in the population and their proportions were selected from each subgroup to form a sample. These techniques were chosen because it helped to identify the right target population, i.e. the employees of the NGO.

3.5 Data Collection Methods

The study employed two methods of data collection; namely: questionnaire survey, interview method and observation method. These methods were considered effective and efficient in information collection within the context of the research because they were considered cheap, easy to understand and effective in gathering the needed information.
3.5.1 Questionnaires survey

The main method of data collection was the use of the questionnaire survey method. This method was selected because it enabled the respondents to answer questions that were personal, more accurately than when it is face to face with the interviewer who is a complete stranger. It can be answered at the respondent’s convenience, presents a uniform stimulus to all the subjects. The researcher was assisted by research assistants in distributing the questionnaires since this did not require any training.

3.5.2 Interview Method

The interview method was used where a face to face or one-on-one semi structured interview schedule was administered. The method was selected because it is easy to arrange and control, information was obtained from one source making it easy to locate specific ideas with specific individuals. The interview method captures a wide range of opinions and gives freedom to the interviewee to express his/her views without limitations. It can as well bring out some untold emotions and body expression that are vital in describing the feeling of the respondent toward a given issues and at the same time bring out the truth about their expression on the same matters. In addition, this method allowed reviewing some of the documents like strategic plans, resource mobilisation plans, work plans, meeting minutes and annual reports relevant in the study.

3.5.3 Observation Method

The observation method was used in during interviews, and where the researcher required document verification. The method was also used during the face to face interviews to
examine the respondent’s emotional responses as well as body expression which were relevant in explaining certain untold truth. The method is easy to use.

### 3.5.4 Document Review Method

This method was used in areas where the researcher required document verification and to ascertain their existence. It was selected because it is very convenient and provides for real evidence and make referrals to the documents at any time easy. Documents review also help researcher to acquire certain information that might have not been easily referred to or answered in the interviews.

### 3.6 Data Collection Instruments

The study used questionnaires, interview guide, observation and document review as the types of instruments for data collection. It therefore used 217 questionnaires and 19 interview guide, to be applied to about 19 NGOs. The above instruments were employed in consideration of the nature of the population that it sought to study. While others could have time to complete the questionnaires at their convenient moment others could only feel comfortable with an interview that lasted only a moment and did not require paper work and effort of remitting the response sheet. Observation and document review supported the interviews process and verification of documents.

#### 3.6.1 Questionnaires

The data collection tools were self-administered questionnaires containing two categories of questions. Structured (closed-ended) and semi-structured (open-ended) questions. The
tool targeted all the respondent categories. Semi structured questions were applied in objective two and four, while structured questions applied to all the objectives under study. (see Appendix B on page: 132)

3.6.2 Interview guide

The interview was guided by semi structured, structured and unstructured questions that helped to bring out the best information for the data collected. Structured interviews required specific responses to a set of predetermined answers and it was good in time saving, besides giving precise response to the researcher’s most needed answer. The interviews were face to face and telephone interviews were employed in certain circumstances. Unstructured interview guides questions were more flexible in that the interviewer asked or guided the interviewee in such a way that led the respondents towards providing data that were relevant to the objectives of the study. Semi-structured interview guides questions contained both open and close-ended questions. In summary, 12 interviews were conducted out of the intended 19 interviews based on the availability and reliability of the respondents. (See Appendix C on page: 144).

3.6.3 Observation checklist

Observation was done during the face to face interviews of the respondents. Observation also enhanced the document review process. (See Appendix D on page: 149)

3.6.4 Document review guide

Document review process was done together during observation of the documents in the observation checklist for their availability and use. Examples of the documents and the
organisation’s activities reviewed by the researcher were annual budgets, resource mobilisation strategies, reports, human resource policies, financial manuals, organisation’s constitutions and registration certificates. This was also to ascertain whether the proper use of these documents was enhancing charity NGOs sustainability. (See Appendix E on page: 151)

3.7. Validity and Reliability of study instruments.

Validity refers to whether the statistical instrument measures what is intended to measure, i.e. accuracy of measurement (Saunders et al, 2000; 2007)

3.7.1 Validity

Validity of the questionnaire was ensured by the researcher through the use of Content Validity Index (Amin, 2005). After constructing the questionnaire, the researcher contacted the two supervisors and three other experts. Hence, the researcher established the validity of the instruments by using expert judgment method as suggested by Gay. L.R (1996). The instrument was refined based on the expert’s results. The following formula was used to test validity index.

\[
CVI = \frac{K}{N}
\]

Where; 
- \( K \) = Number of items declared by raters or judges as ok.
- \( N \) = Number of items in the questionnaire.
The computed CVI of the instrument was 0.84, this was considered valid because the minimum CVI recommended in survey studies is 0.7 (Amin, 2005: 288).

### 3.7.2 Reliability of the instruments

Reliability refers to whether a measurement instrument is able to yield consistent results each time it is applied (Amin, 2005). It is the property of a measurement device that causes it to yield similar outcomes or results for similar inputs. Statistically, reliability is defined as the percentage of inconsistency in the responses to the survey that is the result of the differences in the respondents. This implies that the responses to a reliable survey will vary because respondents have different opinions, and not because the questionnaire items are confusing or ambiguous.

Reliability of the data collection instrument was ensured through pilot testing on at least 13 subjects who have not participated in the final study. Cronbach’s Alpha co-efficient was generated through the use of the statistical package for social scientist (SPSS) on the computer.
Table 3. 2: Result for Reliability test for the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number of item</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Strategies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Environment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional sustainability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the 5 Variables above</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability test in Table 3.2 above indicates that all the items for each dimension were high except 0.542 which was slightly low but above 0.5, the widely accepted limit for high reliability test. In addition to the above, the following steps were taken to ensure reliable data collection and analysis process:

1. The right target population was identified, i.e the employees of the NGO.

2. The representativeness of the sample was ensured since the sample was made up of adequate representation of individuals from the NGOs.

3. The sampling method was appropriate since respondents were selected through purposive and stratified random sampling to remove participant errors and biases.

4. The data sources were all reliable since the researcher used published academic and professional journals and text books.
5. Structured questionnaire with Likert-scales were used and coded with numerical system to remove errors resulting from unstructured answers’.

6. In administering these instruments, the respondents were assured of anonymity and confidentiality so they could express their real feelings to remove subject biases.

7. Data was entered using SPSS with much care. Missing values were discarded because they were significantly small.

3.8 Procedures of Data Collection
The researcher sought an introductory letter from the Department of Higher Degrees at Uganda Management Institute (UMI), Kampala. Thereafter, the researcher wrote letters of introduction to the Heads of Departments of the different NGOs and to the other respondents requesting for their participation in the research as well as assuring them that the research was purely for academic purpose. The researcher assigned volunteers to help in the distribution of the questionnaires to the respondents. The researcher conducted the face to face interviews during which process the researcher was able to observe the respondent within their workplace environment. Also the document’s verification was done through checking the availability of the documents on the observation checklist. A few documents such as the strategic plan and the fundraising strategies were reviewed to ascertain their use. Thereafter, the questionnaires were sorted and coded ready for entry while the data from interviews, observation and document review were sorted and put into categories for analysis.
3.9 Data Analysis

3.9.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

Data analysis involved both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. In descriptive analysis, descriptive tables and graphs like frequency tables were used to present the data. The questionnaires were verified and no invalid paper was found; consequently the quantitative data was captured into electronic data base and analysed by the Statistical Package for Social Sciencetist (SPSS). Inferential analysis involved testing the hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance and drawing conclusions based on correlation coefficients. In inferential analysis, the researcher established the relationship between the related variables by running correlation coefficient that would yield a Pearson correlation coefficient.

3.9.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

The researcher used content analysis and observer’s impression to analyse qualitative data by examining the data collected from the field collected by use of face to face interviews, observation method and documents review methods. The findings were interpreted via forming an impression of the results and giving a narrative description of the findings.
3.10 Measurements of variables

3.10.1 Quantitative data measurement
Likert scale was used in measuring some of the questions with scales while those that were not in Likert scale were analyzed using frequency distribution to generate summaries that have meanings of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher presents the findings of the study. The chapter is divided into four parts. The first part is the response rate. The second section is information on the backgrounds of the respondents. The third part presents descriptive statistics on the independent and dependent variables and last part presents data on test of hypothesis. The chapter presents the empirical findings in reference to sustainability of educational non-governmental organisations in post war situations, a case of Gulu District. The findings are from the raw data from questionnaires retrieved from the respondents, interviews, observations and documents reviewed. It presents the analytical information of this raw data in tables, frequencies, percentages and verbatim in accordance with the research objectives. The researcher fundamentally made the correlative and descriptive analysis of the data with the help of the SPSS tool. The chapter was designed to describe the rates and character of the respondents, followed by the analysis of the independent and dependent variables and lastly presents data on the test of hypothesis.

4.1 Response Rate

The study targeted 217 respondents. Out of this number, 152 participated in this study. The response rates by category of respondent are illustrated in Table 4.1 below.
**Table 4.1: Response Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Respondents by Category</th>
<th>Targeted Sample Size</th>
<th>Actual Sample Size</th>
<th>Sample percentage of Response rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Executive directors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Advocacy officers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M&amp;E officers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Primary data*

The Table 4.1 above shows analyses and interprets the responses rate as follows; depicts that 63% of the executive directors, 83% of the board members, 68% of the managers, 73% of the coordinators, 63% of the accountants, advocacy officers, 100% response of the monitoring & evaluation officers responded to the study. The total overall percentage of response rates was 70%, implying that the response rate for the study was good and could contribute to validity of the study findings. According to Phelps et al. (2001), poor response rates reduce sample size and consequently precision. This is a potential source of bias lessening the confidence with which findings can be accepted and generalized. Phelps further stressed that although, there is no ‘standard’ for an acceptable response rate, but published opinion indicates that response rates below 60% are ‘barely
acceptable’. Therefore, overall response rate of 70% was considered high enough for this study.

4.2 **Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

In this study, since the demographic characteristics of respondents influence the results, a descriptive data of respondents was presented in terms of the title, gender, employment status, age, education level and number of years in the organization. The results are presented in their respective tables, analysed and interpreted.

4.2.1 **Title of Respondents**

The title of the respondent aids in determining his or her ability to understand the sustainability of educational non-governmental organizations in post war situations, since they are directly involved in the operation of the organization. For instance, the managers and accountants are the first to understand the undulations in the sustainability capacity of the organization before other members working in the organization. Titles of the respondents were grouped accordingly as shown in Table 4.2 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Executive Director</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Board Member</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manager</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinator</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accountant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Advocacy Officer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Officers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Primary data**

In Table 4.2 above, it was revealed that majority of respondents 46.0%, \(\frac{70}{152}\) were board members, executive directors, advocacy officers and accountants were 7.9%, \(\frac{12}{152}\), managers were at 8.6%, \(\frac{13}{152}\) while the coordinators were 9.2%, \(\frac{14}{152}\) the monitoring and evaluation officers were 12.5%, \(\frac{19}{152}\) among the others. This implies that board members made a significant contribution to the findings of the current study, which is good since they are more aware of the factors affecting the sustainability of the educational non-governmental organization in the post war situations, being the policy makers to guide the organisations and steer them in the right direction.
4.2.2 Gender of Respondents

This section shows the gender of the respondents who participated in the study which may help to find out whether the gender of the respondents has any effect on the sustainability of the organization. This is presented in Table 4.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The result as displayed in Table 4.3 above indicate that 69.0%, \( \frac{105}{152} \) of the respondents were males and only 30.9%, \( \frac{47}{152} \) were females. This may suggest that, more males are employed in charity educational NGOs compared to their female counterparts. Thus more males participated in educational non-governmental organisations in post-war situations and were aware of the determinants of its sustainability.

4.2.3 Employment Status of respondents

In an attempt to find out the determinants of sustainability of educational non-governmental organisations in post-war situations, the researcher sought to find out the
employment status of the respondents. This was expected to help in the study since the respondents are the immediate members of the organisations who are aware of the operations of the charity educational non- governmental organisations. The results are summarized in Table 4.4 below;

Table 4.4: Distribution of respondents by employment status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntarily</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On contract</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others specify</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The Table 4.4 portrays that majority of the respondents i.e.83.6% (127/152) were on contract basis, while 12.5%, (19/152) were volunteers and only 3.9%, (6/152) revealed other employment status, for example, permanent basis. This implies that majority of the staff who work with educational non-governmental organisations are on short term contract basis, which could limit their knowledge about the factors that affect the organizations if the contract period is not long enough to allow them learn. In addition, such staff may not work hard enough to ensure sustainability, since they know their tenure in that office is
just for a short period of time. However, the employees on long term contracts may be more stable in nature and fairly long lasting thus guaranteeing the sustainability of human capital in the charity educational NGOs than those who are volunteering and part time workers.

4.2.4 Age of respondents

The age of the respondent aids in determining his or her ability to respond to the questions asked. Ages were grouped into four categories as shown in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5: Distribution of respondents by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 29 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years and above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Primary data

Table 4.1 shows that majority (42.4%, \(\frac{64}{152}\)) of the respondents were in the age bracket of 30-39 years, 33.1% \(\frac{50}{152}\) were between 40 and 49 years, 13.9% \(\frac{22}{152}\) were fifty years and above, 10.6%, \(\frac{16}{152}\) were less than 29 years. This implies that the majority of
the respondents are between 30 and 50 an indication that majority of the respondents were an able bodied workforce full of energy, knowledge and maturity of judgment on the concepts used in the questionnaires especially in regard to the sustainability of the organisation.

4.2.5 Education level of respondents

This section shows the education levels of the respondents. This helped to find out whether the level of education has an effect on the sustainability of educational non-governmental organisation in post war situations. The results are presented in Table 4.6

Table 4.6: Distribution of respondents by education levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhDs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others specify</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data.
According to Table 4.6 above, the study depicts respondents’ level of education with majority (39.7% (60/152)) of the respondents being bachelor degree holders, 21.2% (32/152) had postgraduate diplomas, 17.9% (27/152) had diplomas and 16% were master degree holders, while 0.7% (4.6/152) had PhDs and 4.6% (8/152) had other levels of education. It can therefore be concluded that most of the respondents have attained the required education to understand the questionnaires and therefore were able to give clear responses to the questions asked.

4.2.6 Respondents’ number of years in NGOs

This section shows the length of stay of a person within their respective organisations. This helped to find out whether the years spent by respondents in an organisation may affect their level of commitment and consequently affect the sustainability of the organisation or the respondent’s understanding of charity educational non-governmental organisations’ level of sustainability. The results are presented in Table 4.7 below.
Table 4.7: Distribution of respondents by number of years in NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than One year</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.7 above revealed that 57.9%, \( \frac{88}{152} \) of the respondents had worked in the organization for a period of between 1-5 years, 30.9% \( \frac{47}{152} \) had been in the organisation for more than 5 years and 11.2%, \( \frac{17}{152} \) had been in the organisation for less than one year. This implies that majority of the respondents had been in the organisations for a period of between 1-5 years and more. This is a good indicator that the respondents were informed about the operations of the organisations, and hence were aware of the factors that affect the charity educational organisations’ sustainability. More importantly, a large number of 30.9%, \( \frac{47}{152} \) had been in the organisations for longer than 5 years which gave them more in-depth knowledge of the organisations’ operations. This however depends on the rate of exit and recruitment of the personnel in the organisations’ that was not captured in the respondent’s background information.
In a nutshell, as we observed above, the rate of respondents is big enough to give this study a credible interpretation of the findings. On the same note, the different characteristics of the respondents ranging from age, title of respondent, educational level, status and duration in organisation are likely to affect the sustainability of the educational organisation. At this point it is important to move on to the analysis of the influences of the different conceptual variables on the sustainability of the educational organisations. The findings have been presented objective by objective.

4.3 To examine the effects of implementation strategies on institutional sustainability

Under this section, respondents’ views on effects of implementation strategies on institutional sustainability of the organisations and the results extracted from the raw data are shown in Table 4.8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>UD %</th>
<th>DA %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This NGO uses government structures while conducting service delivery</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of government line departments is</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheaper for my organization</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear terms for my NGO to access the government structures</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My NGO always use community structures for their work</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have preference of community structures over government structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This NGO have / uses qualified staff</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff of this NGO are capable of handling the mass population</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are appropriate project design documents in my NGO</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is appropriate monitoring system in my NGO</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects in my NGO are evaluated frequently</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of project design documents in my NGO</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of projects monitoring in my NGO</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in monitoring projects in my NGO</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I participate in project evaluation in my NGO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Undecided (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I participate in project evaluation in my NGO</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community I work with participate in project design</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community I work with participate in project monitoring</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community I work with participate in project evaluation</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

4.3.1 Usage of local government structures

Table 4.8 above presents finding on the effects of implementation strategies on institutional sustainability. In an attempt to find out whether the NGOs use government structures while conducting service delivery, it was revealed that 55.3% (84/152) of the respondents agreed with the notion that NGOs use government structures while delivering services, 33.6% (51/152) strongly agreed, 2.6% (4/152) were undecided, 5.3% (8/152) disagreed and 2.6% (5/152) strongly disagreed. Majority of the respondents agreed that the charity NGO use government structures while conducting service delivery, which is a good indicator for sustainability of the institutions. Use of government structures is a good sustainability strategies which should be replicated by all NGOs intending to make the benefits of their services last longer in the communities since government structures guarantee continued supervision even after closure of direct implementation. Monitoring community development’s programs is government mandate under the community
development services and already government has community development officers at the district and sub county level that monitors activities of both NGOs and the communities.

The above view is supported by the responses from the key informant. According to the respondent from Save the Children International (SCI), the use of government structures is “for sustainability purposes”. While their counter parts, Action International Ministries mentioned that “the use of government structures guaranteed quality assurance during service delivery.” And according to St Jude children’s home, “use of government line departments is part of their mission”. This indicates that most NGOs use government structures, thus a factor for sustainability.

Table 4.8 also revealed that 42.1% (64/152) of the respondents agreed to the view that the use of government line departments is cheaper for the organisations, 15.8% (24/152) strongly agreed, 19.1% (29/152) were undecided, and 15.8% (24/152) of them disagreed. Most respondent from the interviews agreed to this fact. From the study it can therefore be concluded that the use of government line departments is cheaper. Therefore this means that government line departments are affordable leading to reduced implementation costs which are likely to lead to NGO sustainability.
In Table 4.8, the study also depicts that majority of the respondents, 61.2% \( (93/152) \) agreed that there are clear terms for the NGO to access government structures. 19.1% \( (29/152) \) strongly agreed 12.5%, \( (19/152) \) were undecided, while only 4.6%, \( (7/152) \) disagreed with the existence of clear terms for the NGO while accessing government structures. This however implies that there are clear terms for the NGO to access government structures and this will help to sustain the educational institution. As such, when there are no direct funds to provide the required services, the technical persons in the government structures can take up their full responsibilities and provide the necessary services. The representative from Comboni Samaritans noted that “NGOs activities is part and parcel of the national development plan, which is also incorporated in the international frameworks like the millennium development goals (MDGs) and thus NGOs cannot afford to work without the government structures” This is because education is a public good and it is government’s responsibility to provide it to its’ citizens, NGOs only step in to bridge the gaps where they exist.

4.3.2 Usage of community structures

According to Table 4.8, the study also denotes that majority of the respondents 43.4% \( (65/152) \) strongly agreed, 40.8% \( (62/152) \) agreed that the NGOs always use community structures for its work. This implies that community structures are easily accessible and convenient to the NGOs to easily implement its strategies. However, 5.3% \( (8/152) \) were undecided and 7.9% \( (12/152) \) disagreed and 2.6% \( (5/152) \) strongly disagreed to the notion. Most respondent from the interview agreed that NGOs use community structures during their operations. However, some members had reservations on the use of some community structures which can easily be manipulated. To this effect, the representative
of Hope Alive Gulu said, “local council can work well, only if they are not misused”. This explains the 15.8% (25/152) of respondents who were undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed. Therefore, the use of community structures can guarantee the sustainability of the benefits projects implemented, since the community does it for their own good. This will put the NGOs in good books of the government and donors, thus enhancing the sustainability of the institution.

On whether the NGOs have preference of community structures over government ones as presented in Table 4.8, majority of the respondents 38.8%, (58/152) agreed that indeed the NGOs preferred community structures to government, 32.9%, (50/152) strongly agreed whereas 17.8%, (27/152) disagreed and 7.9%, (12/152) were undecided. This implies that majority of the NGOs preferred to use community structures to government despite government structures being cheaper, having clear terms in accessing the structures, which is a good indicator to institution sustainability. The community structures are owned communally, hence serving community interests and this will make the community more active and participate in the organisations’ projects directly and even continue with the program after the project closes down. Also government structures should be used since it is their government’s mandate to provide supervisory role in the community.

Most respondents in the interview preferred community structures, although they opted for the use of both community structures and government structures. This they said was
to encourage cohesion and synergy in the work of the NGOs and the government for the communities they serve. The respondent from SCI concurred with the above statement and observed; “both government structures and community structures should be used depending on the activities being carried out”.

4.3.3 Qualified staff

Table 4.8 revealed that the NGOs use qualified staff since 49.3% ($\frac{74}{152}$) strongly agreed and 46.1% ($\frac{70}{152}$) agreed to the notion. This can clearly indicate that the NGOs have qualified staff, which is a good indicator that the organisations’ strategies to implement the sustainability of the institution strategies will be effected positively, since the staff qualifies to execute the organisations’ programs. However, only 1.3% ($\frac{1}{152}$) disagreed to the notion and 7.9% ($\frac{12}{152}$) were undecided; a result which can not affect the implementation of the organisations’ programs and may lead to their un-sustainability. According to the interviews conducted all the respondents agreed that NGOs use qualified staff during program implementation. This is supported by the data from the distribution of respondent’s level of education in Table 4.2.5(p, 40) of this report which indicate that over 95.4% ($\frac{144}{152}$) qualified from the level of diplomas to PhDs in the organisation sampled.

In addition to the above in Table 4.8, the study revealed that majority of the respondents 53.3% ($\frac{81}{152}$) agreed that the NGOs staff are capable of handling the mass population, a positive indicator of the sustainability of the NGOs, 34.2% ($\frac{51}{152}$) strongly agreed. This further implied that the staffs are qualified to handle mass population, which is a sign of
institutional sustainability. The respondents from the interview all concurred with the above finding. While 6.6% \( (10/152) \) disagreed and 5.9% \( (8/152) \) were undecided whether qualification of the staff to handle mass population can determine institutional sustainability and this has limited impact on NGO sustainability.

4.3.4 Appropriate project design, monitoring and evaluation

In Table 4.8 above, the study also found out that majority of the respondents 53.3% \( (81/152) \) agreed to the notion that the NGOs have appropriate project design documents, 40.8% \( (62/152) \) strongly agreed, 4.6% \( (6/152) \) were undecided and only 1.3%\( (1/152) \) disagreed. This implies that majority of the NGOs have appropriate project designs, an indication that the NGOs have defined strategies they follow while implementing their projects, and this will lead to the sustainability of the NGOs.

Similarly, the study revealed that only 2.6% \( (3/152) \) of the respondents disagreed that the NGOs have an appropriate monitoring systems, whereas the majority of the respondents 61.2%, \( (93/152) \) agreed that indeed the NGOs have appropriate monitoring systems while 28.3% \( (43/152) \) strongly agreed and 7.9% \( (12/152) \) were undecided to the notion. From the results, it can therefore be concluded that the NGOs an appropriate monitoring systems they use while implementing their organisations’ strategies hence, a positive indicator for the sustainability of the institution. Further still, majority of the respondents 47.4% \( (72/152) \) agreed that NGO projects are evaluated frequently, 31.6%, \( (48/152) \) strongly agreed, only 5.3%, \( (8/152) \) were undecided and 13.2%, \( (20/152) \) disagreed. This therefore means that, the NGOs frequently evaluate their projects, which leads to multiplying the lessons
learnt, best practices and taking actions on corrective measures to ensure institutional sustainability.

Table 4.8 revealed that only 3.3% ($5/152$) of the respondents disagreed that they were aware of the NGO projects’ design documents, 3.9% ($6/152$) were undecided, whereas majority of the respondents 59.9% ($91/152$) agreed and 32.9% ($50/152$) strongly agreed to the notion. This however implies that most staff and board members were aware of the NGO project designs leading to correct decisions made and informed strategies developed for the projects’ implementation, a stimulus to institutional sustainability.

In the same context, the study revealed in Table 4.8 that, there was no respondent who was undecided and only 3.3% ($5/152$) disagreed to the notion that staffs were aware of the projects monitoring systems in the NGOS. However majority of the respondents i.e. 61.8%, ($94/152$) agreed that they were aware of projects monitoring system in the NGOs and 34.9%, ($53/152$) also strongly agreed. It can therefore be concluded that staff were aware of the projects monitoring systems in the NGOs, a suggestion that there is transparency and accountability in the operation of the NGOs, a virtue of institutional sustainability.

It was found that, that majority of the respondents 57.9% ($88/152$) as revealed in Table 4.8, participated in project evaluation of their NGOs, 30.3% ($46/152$) strongly agreed, 5.3% ($8/152$) were undecided and 4.6% ($7/152$) disagreed. This implies that evaluation of the NGO projects was done collectively and the assessment of the impact of the project to the
community and areas of improvement were then assessed, corrective measures recommended for action, hence sustainability of the NGOs.

In addition Table 4.8 above, depicts that majority of the respondents 48.6% \( \left( \frac{74}{152} \right) \) agreed that they participate in monitoring projects in their NGOs, 28.3% \( \left( \frac{43}{152} \right) \) strongly agreed to the notion whereas 8.5% \( \left( \frac{13}{152} \right) \) were undecided and 9.9% \( \left( \frac{15}{152} \right) \) disagreed. All the respondents interviewed agreed that the NGOs actively and continuously monitor their projects. This however shows that monitoring projects in the NGOs is a collective responsibility upon all and not limited to only the management of the NGOs. This will ensure sustainability of the respective projects within the NGOs.

Table 4.8 also depicted that 40.1% \( \left( \frac{61}{152} \right) \) of the respondents agreed that communities participate in project design, 19.1% \( \left( \frac{29}{152} \right) \) strongly agreed to the notion, however 20.4% \( \left( \frac{31}{152} \right) \) were undecided and 16.4% \( \left( \frac{25}{152} \right) \) disagreed. From the study therefore it can be concluded that communities participate in project design, however, this needs to be improved by educating the communities about the essence of the project since the percentage of those who disagreed and those undecided was high. Low community participation can be a threat to institutional sustainability especially if the community is not engaged from initiation of the projects which lead to issues of ownership of the project.
Last but not least Table 4.8 illustrates that 50.0% \( \frac{76}{152} \) of the respondents agreed that communities participate in project monitoring, 15.1% \( \frac{23}{152} \) strongly agreed whereas 19.1% \( \frac{29}{152} \) were undecided and 13.2% \( \frac{20}{152} \) disagreed to the notion. It can be concluded that communities participate in project monitoring and since the community is the beneficiary of the project, their participation in monitoring of NGO projects leads to institutional sustainability. And Table 4.8 also illustrates that communities participate in project evaluation, since majority of the respondents 46.1%, \( \frac{70}{152} \) agreed to the notion, 13.8%, \( \frac{21}{152} \) strongly agreed whereas 17.1%, \( \frac{25}{152} \) were undecided and 19.1%, \( \frac{29}{152} \) disagreed. This implies that majority of the communities participate in project evaluation. The participation of communities in project evaluation is a positive indicator of institutional sustainability, since the community is aware of the benefits of their participation in the project, hence sustainability of the charity educational NGOs.

However, in terms of communities’ participation in project design, monitoring and evaluation, most respondents from the key informant interviews agreed that they do participate, but selectively. This explains the variance in percentage of communities who participate in project design, monitoring and evaluation which ranges from 35% and 46% of the respondents illustrated in Table 4.8. Despite the fact that the percentage is big, it does not affect the project’s sustainability substantially. This is because the above activities do not require the participation of the whole community members, but mostly their selected representatives.
### 4.3.5 Correlation analysis on the effects of implementation strategies on institutional sustainability

To measure the effects of implementation strategies on institutional sustainability using correlation analysis, it was basically to find out the relationship between the variables as indicated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Strategy</th>
<th>Institutional Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.427**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Sustainability</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.427**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Source: Primary data**

The results in Table 4.9 show a positive relationship of 0.427 between implementation strategies and institutional sustainability as variables at a level of significance at 0.5% level; since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there is significant relationship between implementation strategies and institutional sustainability. This finding is supported by the
responses from the face to face interviews. According to the results from the observer’s impression on the qualitative findings, majority of the respondents explained that they used both the government and community structures during implementation of activities. In addition all the NGOs stated that their beneficiaries got involved in the project life cycle.

4.3.6 **Regression analysis on the effects of implementation strategies on institutional sustainability**

Linear regression was used to further ascertain the results. In this regard, it should be noted that regression analysis indicates the direction of dependence between two variables and assumes the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is linear; that these variables have equal variance (homoscedasticity); that there is no correlation between two or more of the independent variables (multi-co linearity); and the data is normally distributed (Cooper and Schindler 2006; Saunders et al 2007). Regression analysis can be simple involving one dependent variable and two or more independent variables. This procedure was used because the researcher wanted to establish how implementation strategies impact on NGO sustainability all in simple regression to test the entire hypothesis as follows.
Table 4.10: Regression analysis on the effects of implementation strategies on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.52084</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), IMP

Source: Primary data

From Table 4.10 above, 18.2% of the variations in the institutional sustainability are explained by implementation strategies. This implies that to a less extent institutional sustainability depends on the implementation strategies used by the NGOs. This finding confirms the earlier findings which indicated that, NGOs use the local government and communities structures to implement their activities instead of the NGOs implementing alone.

4.4 To establish the effects of resource mobilization on institutional sustainability

This objective was set to measure the effects of resource mobilization on institutional sustainability. The information was obtained through questionnaires given to respondents, document reviews, face to face interview and observation with the respondents since these were the valid tools used in this study. The results of the study were presented in Table 4.11 below.
Table 4.11: Descriptive analysis of the effects of resource mobilization on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>UD %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization has a resource mobilization strategy</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization implements the resource mobilization strategy</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization conduct fundraising drives frequently</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my view donor funds are sufficient</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has a challenge of inadequate funding</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Primary data**

Table 4.11 portrays that 36.8%, \(\frac{35}{152}\) of the respondents strongly agreed that the organisation has a resource mobilization strategy, the majority (51.3%, \(\frac{77}{152}\)) agreed, while only 5.3%, \(\frac{8}{152}\) and 6.6%, \(\frac{10}{152}\) disagreed and none strongly disagreed with the notion. It can therefore be concluded that the NGOs have resource mobilisation strategies they use to gather their resources which are a positive indication on institutional sustainability. This is supported by the documents reviewed, which showed that most
organisations visited had a resource mobilisation strategy either in soft copy or hard copy.

Taking into consideration whether the NGOs implemented the resource mobilisation strategies, Table 4.11 depicts that most of the respondents 48.0%, \((\frac{72}{152})\) agreed, 30.9%, \((\frac{47}{152})\) strongly agreed, 13.8%, \((\frac{21}{152})\) were undecided, 6.6%, \((\frac{10}{152})\) disagreed and 7%, \((\frac{10}{152})\) strongly disagreed. This therefore implies that the NGOs implemented their resource mobilization strategies an indication of sustainability. However, in some organisations, there was no documented evidence to show that the strategies were regularly used or followed to mobilize resources for the organisation. This is explained by the 6.6%, \((\frac{10}{152})\) disagreed and 7%, \((\frac{10}{152})\) strongly disagreed with this assertion.

Table 4.11 further shows that majority of the respondents 39.5%, \((\frac{60}{152})\) agreed that the NGOs frequently conducted fundraising drives, 13.2%, \((\frac{20}{152})\) strongly agreed, 17.1%, \((\frac{25}{152})\) were undecided, 26.3%, \((\frac{39}{152})\) disagreed and 3.9%, \((\frac{5}{152})\) strongly disagreed. This implies that the NGOs frequently conducted fundraising drives and this enabled them to sustainably operate effectively amidst the little funds from the donors and other funding agents. With respect to whether the donor funds were sufficient, the study revealed that 9.2%, \((\frac{13}{152})\) strongly agreed, 18.4% \((\frac{27}{152})\) agreed, 11.8%, \((\frac{17}{152})\) were undecided whereas majority 47.4%, \((\frac{72}{152})\) disagreed and 13.2%, \((\frac{20}{152})\) strongly disagreed. This implies that donor funds were insufficient for the sustainability of the NGOs which is a serious threat to the sustainability of the NGOs. According to the interviews conducted; 10 organisational heads observed; “donor funds are not sufficient”, even the 2 organisations that agreed that donor funds were sufficient had reservations and attached conditionality to what they agreed on. The head of Save the Children (SCI) in
Gulu who agreed that it was sufficient added; “donor fund is only sufficient, depending on the scope of the interventions and mostly only for small interventions”. The head of Comboni Samaritan Gulu who also agreed that the donor funds are sufficient added; “yes it is sufficient but seasonal”. With the fact that they had reservations on the level of intervention and the seasons when these funds come in implies that donor funds are still insufficient for NGO sustainability. For example at Acholi Education Initiative only less than 1% of the total annual organisational budget that ranges between one billion to one and half billion shillings are locally raised, 99% come from donor funds which include staff salaries and welfare.(AEI annual budget review 2013). With the exception of a few international NGOs with strong membership, most NGOs cannot fund more than 25% of the annual budgeted costs and rely mainly on donor funds for financial support.

In addition Table 4.11 indicated that the majority of the respondents 49.3%, \( \left( \frac{74}{152} \right) \) agreed that the organizations have a challenge of inadequate funding, 23.7%, \( \left( \frac{36}{152} \right) \) strongly agreed, 13.2%, \( \left( \frac{20}{152} \right) \) were undecided, however 9.2%, \( \left( \frac{13}{152} \right) \) disagreed and only 4.6%, \( \left( \frac{4}{152} \right) \) strongly disagreed to the notion. This implies that to a great extent the NGOs faced challenges of inadequate funding and which affect the sustainability of their activities. This was especially revealed during the interviews and most local NGOs revealed that they were not able to fund their administrative costs which is now a requirement for most donor funded projects. The head of Gulu War Affected Training Center had this to say “yes most donors require us to fund our own administrative cost which is difficult to meet” This is in agreement with the findings above which show that most NGOs face challenges of inadequate funding.
Table 4.12 as shown below will present a descriptive analysis on the effects of resource mobilisation on institutional sustainability.

Table 4.12: Descriptive analysis on the effects of resource mobilization on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>STDEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The kind of methods used in resource mobilization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local fundraising manual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local fundraising manual and international fundraising Electronic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International fundraising manual and donor funding</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International fundraising manual</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for the methods chosen above</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is economical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable / dependable</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable / dependable and brings in funds timely</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable / dependable, flexible and brings in more funds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is economical, reliable / dependable, flexible and brings in more funds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
From the Table 4.12 above, the study revealed that 0.7% \(\frac{1}{152}\) of the NGOs use manual local fundraising strategies, 2.6% \(\frac{4}{152}\) of the NGOs use both the manual local fundraising and electronic international fundraising mechanism, where as 11.2% \(\frac{17}{152}\) agreed that they used both the manual international fundraising and donor funding mechanism, 11.8% \(\frac{18}{152}\) said they used international manual fundraising mechanism and majority of the respondents 73.7% \(\frac{78}{152}\) said that the NGOs used other means. This implies that the NGOs use several methods while mobilizing resources, but more important of all minimal or no effort in local fundraising methods, and less use of fundraising electronically, which seriously affects the sustainability of the organizations in case the international methods and donors funding is short lived and concluded. However, since majority of the NGOs i.e. 73.7% \(\frac{78}{152}\) opted for other methods of resource mobilisation in consideration of sustainability, and then such methods were good. But if the methods catered less for sustainability strategies, then NGOs failure was eminent.

From the interviews conducted different members of different organisations had this to explain about the different resource mobilisation means they use, 73.7% \(\frac{78}{152}\) who observed that other methods were responsible for the resources they received. Gulu War Affected Training Center, observed; “they sell their products made at the center by their beneficiaries to get finances that funds other programs”. While Save the Children International (SCI) remarked; “the registered members of the organisation make annual contributions, proposals are developed and submitted in response to call for proposals,
private individual make donations, submitting fund application in partnership with other agencies for a consolidated fund” to raise the required funds. St Jude children’s Home noted, “they raise fund by receiving gifts from friends of the organisations and selling farm products from the different income generating activities that they have on the Children’s homes farms”. While Action International Ministries said; “they raise funds through local projects”. The management of Acholi Education Initiative (AEI) said; “board members, members of the Annual General Assembly (AGM) and staff make annual contribution to funding their administrative costs. Also sometimes funds are received from students who passed through the institution’s scholarship program”. All these point to the fact that different organisations use different methods of raising funds for their organisations apart from the different fundraising methods mentioned above.

According to Table 4.12, several reasons where captured regarding why the NGOs opted for the above mechanisms and the findings depict that 5.3% ($8/152$) of the respondents noted that the local fundraising manual is economical, 15.8% ($24/152$) observed that both the local fundraising manual and international fundraising electronic are reliable / dependable, 5.9% ($9/152$) accepted that both manual international fundraising and donor funding mechanisms are reliable / dependable and brings in funds timely, 2.6% ($4/152$) noted the manual International fundraising mechanisms are reliable / dependable, flexible and brings in more funds while 0.7% ($1/152$) also agreed that such mechanisms are economical, reliable / dependable, flexible and bring in more fund and the majority of the respondents 69.7%, ($106/152$) agreed that the NGOs opted for other methods. Therefore,
one can conclude that the NGOs have several reasons why they use other methods other than the ones above. Investigation and further studies need to be conducted to explicate on the other methods that the majority of the organizations have opted to indicate instead of the mentioned methods of fundraising.

### 4.4.1 Correlation analysis on the effects of resource mobilization on institutional sustainability

Similarly, this objective was tested using correlation, and later regression analysis to find out the relationship and the impact of the resource mobilization on the sustainability of NGOs. The correlation results obtained were summarized as in the Table 4.13 below.

Table 4.13: Correlation analysis on the effects of resource mobilization on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resource Mobilization</th>
<th>Institutional Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Mobilization</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td><strong>.278</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Source: Primary data**
The results in Table 4.13 show that the correlation between the two variables is significant at 1% level of significance; since the p-value (0.001) is less than 0.01. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is significant relationship between resource mobilisation and NGOs sustainability.

4.4.2 Regression analysis on the effects of resource mobilization on institutional sustainability

The study was further subjected to linear regression analysis as presented in the Table 4.14 below;

Table 4.14: Regression analysis on the effects of resource mobilization on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.55322</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), IMP

Source: Primary data

From the Table 4.14 above, 77% of the variations in the educational NGOs sustainability are explained by resource mobilization. This implies that to a great extent NGO sustainability depends on resource mobilisation, hence dependence in the variables. This finding concurs with findings from the qualitative interviews. According to the opinion of
one key informant from Save the Children, resource mobilisation “is done regularly”. While respondent from St. Jude Children’s acknowledged that they “do it frequently”. 

According to the respondents, resource mobilization was done through member’s contribution, private donation, proposal writing and application for grants. All these interventions mentioned depended on the type of intervention by the respective organization. This finding was supported by the opinion from other NGOs like St. Jude Children’s home where the representative said; “we get support from friends of the organisation who visits the organisation and those we visit to lobby funding from.” Other institutions that concurred were, Action International Ministries, Comboni Samaritan, Gulu War Affected Training Centre among others. However, only world Vision did not participant in resource mobilization activities as explained by the representative who said, “World Vision is an International organisation with branches around the world. New projects keep coming up but we do not participate in resource mobilisation.” World Vision, Staff.

4.5 To determine the effect of legal environment on institutional sustainability

This objective was established the effects of the legal environment on institutional sustainability. This information was obtained by the use of questionnaires, observation, document review and face to face interview with the respondents and the findings are presented in Table 4.15 below.
Table 4.15: The effects of legal environment on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>UD %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My NGO is legally registered under the NGO Registration Acts 2006</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear procedures that were followed during registration of this NGO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to register an NGO in Uganda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization always meets all the legal requirements for registration.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal requirements are affordable to all NGOs in Uganda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Government has good will towards my NGO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Government is supportive of my NGO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor policies are favorable to my NGO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sustainability policies in place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>71.7</th>
<th>21.7</th>
<th>5.3</th>
<th>2.69</th>
<th>.589</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization has</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative policies for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization has financial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies for sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization is</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administratively sustainable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization is</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financially sustainable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Government policies</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are favorable to NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Primary data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 NGO Registration Act 2006

From the Table 4.15 above, it was revealed that the majority of respondents 77.6% \((118/152)\) agreed that their NGOs are legally registered under the NGO Registration Act 2006, 7.2% \((11/152)\) were undecided, and 12.5% \((19/152)\) disagreed. This therefore implies that the NGOs are legally registered, and thus no effect on the institutional sustainability. In addition to that, the study revealed that the majority of the respondents 85.5% \((130/152)\) were undecided on whether there were clear procedures that were followed during the registration of the NGO, 11.2% \((17/152)\) disagreed and only 3.3% \((5/152)\) strongly disagreed. It can therefore be concluded that it is not clear whether the NGOs used the correct
procedures of registration, but since they have all the legal documents to operate, this is likely to have no effect on their sustainability.

Furthermore, Table 4.15 revealed that only 0.7% (\(1/152\)) of the respondents agreed that it is difficult to register NGOs in Uganda, 25% (\(38/152\)) were undecided, majority of respondents 48.7% (\(74/152\)) disagreed and 25.7% (\(39/152\)) strongly disagreed to the notion. It can therefore be concluded that registration of NGO’s in Uganda is not difficult, a clear indication that the NGO registration Act 2006 might not substantially affect institutional sustainability. This finding concurs with the finding from the qualitative interviews. Most of the key informants interviewed consented to the fact that they were registered and understood the procedures for registration.

### 4.5.2 Legal requirements for registration

This section shows whether the NGOs always meet the legal requirements for registration. Findings in Table 4.15 showed that majority 77.0%, (\(117/152\)) of the respondents were undecided whether their organizations always meet all the legal requirements for registration, only 0.7% (\(1/152\)) agreed, 17.1% (\(26/152\)) disagreed and 5.3% (\(8/152\)) strongly disagreed to the notion. This implies that it is not clear whether the NGOs always meet the legal requirements for registration which is not a good indicator for NGO sustainability. In addition to the above, majority of the respondents 42.8% (\(65/152\)) disagreed that legal requirements are affordable to all NGO in Uganda, 18.4% (\(28/152\)) strongly disagreed, 0.7% (\(1/152\)) agreed and 38.2% (\(58/152\)) of the respondents were undecided. This implies that legal requirements are not affordable and that is the reason
why the organizations often do not meet the legal procedures of registration which is
likely to affect their sustainability. According to Action International Ministries, the
representative stated that it is very difficult for their organisation to meet all the
requirements such as organizing Annual General Assembly each year which is costly and
having audit annually. He said; “this is always a challenge for us”.

Table 4.15 further revealed whether the Uganda Government has good will towards the
NGOs. Only 7% \(\frac{1}{152}\) of the respondents agreed to the notion, whereas 65.1%, \(\frac{99}{152}\)
who were the majority were undecided, 30.9%, \(\frac{46}{152}\) disagreed and 3.3%, \(\frac{5}{152}\) of the
respondents strongly disagreed that the government has a good will towards the NGOs.
From the results therefore it can be concluded that it is not clear whether the government
has good will towards NGO sustainability. It can also be concluded that since the
percentage of those who disagree is greater than those who agreed, then the government
has no good will towards NGOs. However, most respondent from the interviews agreed
to the notion that government has goodwill towards their NGOs but clarified that only
governments at the local government level since they work together. Gulu War Affected
Training Center noted; “yes, but only local government not central government”. Thus
they had reservation on the goodwill from central government.

The study findings as presented in Table 4.15 also showed whether the Government is
supportive to NGO activities. Majority of the respondents 65.5% \(\frac{99}{152}\) were undecided,
0.7% \(\frac{1}{152}\) agreed, 30.9% \(\frac{47}{152}\) disagreed and only 3.3% \(\frac{5}{152}\) strongly disagreed. It
can therefore be concluded that there is no substantive support from government. With this situation where the government is not supportive of NGO activities, this therefore creates a great threat towards NGOs sustainability. This finding does not concur with the opinion of the key informants views, since majority of them who were interviewed consented that the legal requirements were met by NGOs who registered in the country. Their agreement does not indicate how easy or difficult it was to register, since it is a prerequisite for an NGO to be fully registered before it begins to operate.

4.5.3 Policies (Donor, Organisational and Government policies)

Analysing results of the respondents in Table 4.15 above show that 1.3% \((2/152)\) agreed to the notion, 66.4% \((101/152)\) of the respondents were undecided on the donor policies being favorable while 32.2% \((48/152)\) disagreed. The key informants’ opinions concurred with the above findings. According to the observer’s impression, donor policies were not convenient as the representative of Gulu War affected Training Centre said, “Donor policies are not convenient because they give strict conditions on donations.” While Hope Alive Gulu, noted; “donor polices are not relevant to their NGO sustainability since it is restrictive”. All the above limit the initiative and innovations in implementation that could lead to cost reduction; thus efficiency and effectiveness that would lead to NGO sustainability. Thus, it can be concluded that donor policies greatly affect charity educational NGO sustainability.

Regarding the organisations having sustainability policies, Table 4.15 revealed that, 70.4% \((107/152)\) of the respondents were undecided, 21.1% \((32/152)\) disagreed and 7.9% \((12/152)\) strongly disagreed, while only 0.7% \((1/152)\) agreed with the notion. In regards to
行政政策以支持可持续性，大部分受访者中有71.7%（109/152）未决定NGO是否设有行政政策以支持可持续性。27%（41/152）不同意，而仅1.3%（2/152）同意。然而，关键信息人的观点更肯定他们的组织设有行政政策以支持可持续性。根据关键信息人的访谈，83.3%（10/12）的受访者承认有行政政策以支持可持续性。代表SCI的人评论：“这是一个有良好声誉和强有力《儿童权利联合国公约》（UNCRC）使命的庞大组织，致力于全球儿童需求。”Action International Ministries指出：“我们不只依赖捐款，我们有本地项目，如养牛和养鸡，以支持我们的可持续性，以满足我们的行政成本。”而16.7%（2/12）的受访者不同意他们的组织有这样一项政策。支持以上观点，Gulu War Affected Center指出：“资金不足和高运营成本影响员工薪酬和留任”，而Hope Alive Gulu则指出：“我们的行政成本只依赖捐赠基金。”

在表4.15中，受访者对NGO的可持续性财务政策的看法分析如下：69.1%（105/152）的受访者未明确同意或不同意该观点，而0.7%（1/152）同意，30.3%（46/152）不同意。然而，从关键信息人的访谈中，75%（09/12）同意财务可持续性在他们的组织中存在不足，只有25%（03/12）表示他们有财务可持续性。这与问卷的回答形成对比。
Majority of the respondents according to Table 4.15, i.e. 67.1%, \( \frac{102}{152} \) remained undecided if the organisation had administrative sustainability, 31.6%, \( \frac{48}{152} \) disagreed accordingly and 1.3% \( \frac{4}{152} \) were in agreement. Regarding financial sustainability, 70.4% \( \frac{107}{152} \) disagreed, 27% \( \frac{41}{152} \) were undecided while 2.6% \( \frac{4}{152} \) agreed. The researcher however observed that, most of the heads of the organisations put their policy documents under key and lock and there was no evidence to ascertain that staffs were aware of the existence of such policy documents. This could probably explain the high numbers of respondents being undecided about the different polices. Analysing if Ugandan government policies were favorable to NGOs, 57.9% \( \frac{88}{152} \) respondents disagreed while 39.5% \( \frac{60}{152} \) failed to agree or disagree and 2.7 % \( \frac{4}{152} \) agreed. In regard to the continuity of operations after end of donor funding, most NGOs noted that operations will continue with difficulties except for a few who were mostly international NGOs who agreed that their operations will continue normally.

From the above findings, it is wise for one to conclude that the legal environment greatly affects NGO sustainability, since majority of the respondents failed to either agree or disagree to the notion that policies have an effect on the sustainability of the organization. However, since those who disagreed ranked higher than those who agreed, it is evident that the existing polices greatly affect NGO sustainability.
4.5.4 Correlation analysis on the effect of legal environment on institutional sustainability

To test this objective, bivariate correlation was used and later linear regression analysis as summarized in Table 4.16 below.

Table 4.16: Correlation analysis of the effects of legal environment on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legal Environment</th>
<th>Institutional Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Environment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.00 level (2tailed).

Source: Primary Data

The results in Table 4.15 showed that the correlation between the two variables is significant at 0.5% level of significance; since the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that there is significant relationship between the legal environment and institutional sustainability.
4.5.5 Regression analysis of the effects of legal environment on institutional sustainability

The evidence was further subjected to the linear regression analysis to determine the direction of the relationship and findings are presented in the table below.

Table 4.17: Regression analysis of the effects of legal environment on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.49883</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), L

Source: Primary data

From the Table 4.17 above, 25% of the variations in the institutional sustainability are explained by legal environment. This implies that to a less extent institutional sustainability depends on legal environment, hence, dependence in the variables.

4.6 To determine the effects of ownership of the organisation on institutional sustainability

This section illustrates the findings on the effect of ownership of the organization on institutional sustainability. The respondents’ views about the effect of ownership of the organization on institutional sustainability and the results are further presented in Table 4.18 below.
Table 4.18: Descriptive analysis of the effects of ownership of the organization on institutional sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>STDEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do you receive any kind of support from founders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The kind of support received from founders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical support and Financial support</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial support and managerial support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical support, Financial support, and Managerial support</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kind of foundation the NGO comes from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious founded</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community founded</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious founded and Community founded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
4.6.1 Ownership of the organization

The Table 4.18 above revealed that the NGOs receive support from founders, since 82.9% \( \left( \frac{126}{152} \right) \) of the respondents agreed and only 17.1% \( \left( \frac{25}{152} \right) \) did not agree. All the respondent’s from the key informant interviews agreed that their founders give them support in various forms like financial, technical, policy and strategic guidance, material support, capacity buildings in form of trainings and even spiritual support. Therefore one can conclude that the NGOs receive support from their founders.

To further ascertain the kind of support got, findings from Table 4.18 revealed that: 9.9% \( \left( \frac{15}{152} \right) \) said that the NGO received technical support, 25.7% \( \left( \frac{39}{152} \right) \) noted receiving financial support, and 17.1% \( \left( \frac{25}{152} \right) \) received both technical support and financial support, 5.3% \( \left( \frac{8}{152} \right) \) agreed on financial support and managerial support while 25.7% \( \left( \frac{39}{152} \right) \) noted receiving technical support, financial support, and managerial support and 16.4% \( \left( \frac{26}{152} \right) \) noted receiving other support services. With the results, it can be derived that the NGO received varying technical, financial and managerial support from the funders. The fairly significant percentage of 25.7% \( \left( \frac{39}{152} \right) \) indicates that to some lesser extent the NGOs depended on their founders for support for technical, financial and managerial needs. Such influence has some effect on the sustainability of the NGOs, especially when there are no internal strategies to provide such support when the founder ceases to grant support for one reason or another.
The study also sought to find out the kind of foundation the NGOs originated from. Findings in Table 1.18 above indicate that, the majority of the NGOs are religious founded with 56.6% (86/152), 19.7% (29/152) are community founded, 0.7% (1/152) of the NGOs are both religious and community founded and 23.0% (3/152) are founded by others. Therefore, this implies that most of the NGOs are religious founded and owned. It is important to note that high percentages, i.e. 56.6% (86/152) of the INGOs are sustainable in regard to the meager percentages of organizations founded by community. This finding concurred with the finding from key informants’ interviews. Some of the NGOs that participated in the Study were formed by the community like Gulu War Affected Training Centre and Hope Alive. While St. Jude children’s home, Acholi Education Initiative, Comboni Samaritans, World Vision and Action International Ministries are religious founded. A few such as Save the Children International, Gulu District NGO Forum were founded by others such as coalitions and liberal groups. What was realised was that, there was need for capacity building of management of these NGOs especially in financial management and resource mobilisation.

4.7 Sustainability of charity educational NGOs

This sub section discusses the sustainability of charity educational NGOs, this will include institutional sustainability, administrative sustainability to ascertain whether NGOs can meet their administrative cost that includes staffing and effective and efficient running of the organisation. And financial sustainability that will determine whether the organisations will continue with their operations after the seed capital or whether organisational operational level will increase or decrease after donor exit. While some
data are got from the questionnaires, it is the interviews that provided more information from key informants on the institutional sustainability of charity educational NGOs.

4.7.1 Institutional Sustainability of charity educational NGOs

For an organisation to be sustainable, it must have sustainability policies to ensure that their operations will be effective and efficient to guarantee continuity of the project benefits both for the beneficiaries and the staffs within the organisation, both administratively and financially. Regarding the organisations having sustainability policies, Table 4.15 revealed that, 70.4% (107/152) of the respondents were undecided, 21.1% (32/152) disagreed and 7.9% (12/152) strongly disagreed, while only 0.7% (1/152) agreed with the notion the existence of these policies. This implied that institutional sustainability is not probably guaranteed because most respondent were even undecided about its existence. If these policies exit then they are not probably aware of it and thus are not utilizing the policy documents.

From the researcher’s document review, it is noted that 66.67% of the organisations had sustainability policies in place but only 50% of the NGOs had evidence of having implemented the sustainability policies. This was noted that mostly only high level managers have access to the documents and plans for the organisational sustainability. This finding corresponded to the findings in Table 4.15 which revealed that 70.4% of the respondents from the questionnaires were undecided whether their organisation had sustainability policies in place.
4.7.2 Administrative Sustainability of charity educational NGOs

In regards to administrative policy for sustainability, Table 4.15 revealed majority of the respondent 71.7\% \((\frac{109}{152})\) were undecided whether the NGOs had administrative policy for sustainability in place, 27\% \((\frac{41}{152})\) disagreed and only 1.3\% \((\frac{2}{152})\) agreed to the notion. However, the views of the key informants were more certain about their organisations having administrative sustainability in place.

According to the key informant interviews 83.3\% \((\frac{10}{12})\) of the respondents acknowledged that there was administrative policy for sustainability in place. The representative of SCI remarked; “this is a huge organisation with a good reputation and strong mandate for the United Nation Convention on the Rights of Children (UNCRC) to serve the needs of the children worldwide”. Action International Ministries noted; “we do not depend on donations only; we have projects locally such as cattle rearing and poultry keeping for our sustainability which can meet our administrative costs”. While 16.7\% \((\frac{2}{12})\) of the respondents, disagreed to the fact that their organisations had such a policy in place. In support of the above view Gulu War Affected Center stated; “inadequate funding and high running costs which affect staff remuneration and retention after the closure of a project”, and Hope Alive Gulu noted; “our administrative costs depend on donor funds only”. This means that staffs can only stay in the organisations as long as the projects to implement were available. As soon as projects come to an end, staffs are laid off because there are no funds to paying their salaries. The cut across all boards for even organisations that said they had administrative sustainability. The only difference is that in the international organisations depending on individual staff capabilities, when one
project ends a staff can be moved to another project, and for those whose services are found wanting, they are laid off at the end of their projects.

The key informants’ opinions concurred with the above findings. According to the observer’s impression, donor policies were not convenient as the representative of Gulu War affected Training Centre said, “Donor policies are not convenient because they give strict conditions on donations.” While Hope Alive Gulu, noted; “donor polices are not relevant to their NGO sustainability since it is restrictive”. All the above limit the initiative and innovations in implementation that could lead to cost reduction; thus efficiency and effectiveness that would lead to NGO sustainability. Thus, it can be concluded that donor policies greatly affect charity educational NGO sustainability administratively.

In addition Table 4.11 indicted that the majority of the respondents 49.3%, (74/152) agreed that the organizations have a challenge of inadequate funding, 23.7%, (36/152) strongly agreed, 13.2%, (20/152) were undecided, however 9.2%, (13/152) disagreed and only 4.6%, (4/152) strongly disagreed to the notion. This implies that to a great extent the NGOs faced challenges of inadequate funding and which affect the continuity of their programme activities. This was especially revealed during the interviews and most local NGOs revealed that they were not able to fund their administrative costs which is now a requirement for most donor funded projects. The head of Gulu War Affected Training Center had this to say “yes most donors require us to fund our own administrative cost
which is difficult to meet” This is in agreement with the findings above which show that most NGOs face challenges of inadequate funding. There is a direct link between administrative sustainability and financial sustainability. Organisations can only exit and operate normally with availability of funds. Administrative sustainability greatly relies on finances for its operations, staff costs as well as ability to organize and implement their plans.

### 4.7.3 Financial Sustainability of charity educational NGOs

In Table 4.15, respondents’ views on NGOs having sustainable financial policies were analysed as follows: 69.1% \((105/152)\) of the respondents failed to either agree or disagree with the notion though, 0.7% \((4/152)\) agreed and 30.3% \((46/152)\) disagreed. However from the key informant interviews 75% \((9/12)\) agreed that financial sustainability was lacking in their organisations. Only 25% \((3/12)\) noted that they had financial sustainability. This is in contrast with the responses from the questionnaires where majority of respondents were undecided, although the indecision could mean there is no financial sustainability in their organisations.

Table 4.15 revealed; regarding financial sustainability, 70.4% \((107/152)\) disagreed, 27% \((41/152)\) were undecided while 2.6% \((4/152)\) agreed. The researcher however observed that, most of the heads of the organisations put their policy documents under key and lock and there was no evidence to ascertain that staffs were aware of the existence of such policy documents. This could probably explain the high numbers of respondents being
undecided about the different policies. Analysing if Ugandan government policies were favorable to NGOs as presented in Table 4.15; 57.9% (88/152) respondents disagreed while 39.5% (60/152) failed to agree or disagree and 2.7% (4/152) agreed. In regard to the continuity of operations after end of donor funding, 75% of the NGOs noted that operations will continue with difficulties except for a few (25%) who were mostly international NGOs who agreed that their operations will continue normally. Off the few, some were not certain of even continuing after donor exit for just a few more years. They largely depend on donor funding for their existence and continuity. To a higher extent financial sustainability is difficult to exist in the NGOs since most of the NGOs can not even meet their own administrative coat to continue operating when donors exit.

According to the interviews conducted; 10 organisational heads observed; “donor funds are not sufficient”, even the 2 organisations that agreed that donor funds were sufficient had reservations and attached conditionality to what they agreed on. The head of Save the Children (SCI) in Gulu who agreed that it was sufficient added; “donor fund is only sufficient, depending on the scope of the interventions and mostly only for small interventions”. The head of Comboni Samaritan Gulu who also agreed that the donor funds are sufficient added; “yes it is sufficient but seasonal”. With the fact that they had reservations on the level of intervention and the seasons when these funds come in implies that donor funds are still insufficient for NGO sustainability. For example at Acholi Education Initiative only less than 1% of the total annual organisational budget that ranges between 0ne billion to one and half billion shillings are locally raised, 99% come from donor funds which include staff salaries and welfare. (AEI annual budget
review 2013). With the exception of a few international NGOs with strong membership, most NGOs cannot fund more than 25% of the annual budgeted costs and rely mainly on donor funds for financial support.

All the above is made worst by the fact that the legal environment is very unfriendly to the NGOs and quite costly and yet for their continuity, they require to be legally registered. Sustainability of educational NGOs is still a big problem considering the fact that this rely mostly on financial sustainability to facility institutional and administrative sustainability and the legal wellbeing of the organisations.

4.8 Conclusion

The study concluded that the use of community and government structures is key as well as their participation for proper implementation to take place. There is need to use qualified staff, follow the project design documents and conduct frequent monitoring and evaluation during the project period. Thus, implementation strategies have an effect on the sustainability of NGOs.

The study revealed that donor funding is insufficient and that NGOs use various methods for resource mobilisation in order to realise a better return. It was also noted that NGOs have adopted local strategies to counter the dwindling donor funds by engaging in activities or projects that can raise funds locally. Hence, resource mobilisation has a substantial effect on educational NGOs sustainability.
It was noted that there were no clear policies to support NGOs’ sustainability. Majority of the NGO staffs could not agree or disagree about clear channels followed for NGO registration, although all the NGOs acknowledged registering with the National NGO board. Donor policies were observed to be very strict and at times impede implementation of the projects thus affecting sustainability. NGOs founders provided support to the NGOs and most NGOs were found to be religiously founded and owned. NGOs founder’s support was found to enhance their sustainability.

The study also revealed that institutional, administrative and financial sustainability is still a very big challenge to most local and national NGOs although the case is a bit different for the international NGOs.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the summary, discussions, conclusion and recommendations of the study were presented according to the findings, and where appropriate, existing literatures was included in the discussions. Limitations, contributions and implications for future research were also integrated in this chapter. The summary gave a brief and concise understanding of the finding of the different objectives set in the study. The discussion gave an open consideration of the analytical and research results based on the four respective objectives. The conclusion and recommendations outlined the inferences from the research considered decisive and proposals for future consideration and possible areas of new research.

5.1 Summary of findings

The study purpose was to establish the determinants of sustainability of charity educational NGOs in Gulu District using the following objectives: To establish the effect of implementation strategies on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs; To establish the effect of resource mobilisation on sustainability of charity educational NGOs; To establish the effect of the legal environment on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs; and To establish the effect of ownership of organisation on the sustainability of charity educational NGOs. Based on an objective analysis of data and
interpretation of results and findings, the following are the summary of the major finding of this study.

Research findings revealed that the charity educational NGOs use government structures while implementing their services especially through government line departments. This is cheaper compared to other service providers, and there are clear terms for the NGO to access government structures. However, charity educational NGOs always prefer and use community structures for their work as compared to government structures, since it is believed to create a sense of ownership by the communities leading to sustainability.

The study found out that the charity educational NGOs use qualified staff with an ability of handling mass population, it has appropriate project design documents and the NGOs’ projects are monitored and evaluated frequently to ensure sustainability. In addition to the above, staff are aware of the charity educational NGO’s project designs and there is transparency in the operation of the charity educational NGOs since majority of them participate in project monitoring and evaluation.

Finally, communities participate in project design, project monitoring and evaluation. According to the findings, generally implementation strategies determined the sustainability of charity education NGOs in the post war areas, although not very substantially.
The study found out that the selected charity educational NGOs had various resource mobilisation strategies, further more; they implemented their resource mobilisation strategies by frequently conducting fundraising drives in ensuring their sustainability despite the challenge of inadequate donor funds and other sources of funding. The findings revealed that the charity educational NGOs use several methods for mobilizing resources like local, manual fundraising mechanism and international electronic mechanisms. Most charity NGOs have come up with strategies for acquiring more funds through opening up local income generating activities to overcome the financial challenges, while some organisations twin up for project fund applications to get a higher chance of winning the fund awards. Additionally, the charity NGOs have several reasons why they opted for such methods including the fact that they were economical, reliable / dependable and flexible.

In order for the educational organisations to perform their activities effectively, it was discovered that the charity educational NGOs were legally registered though most respondents were uncertain if the charity educational organisations followed the correct procedures of registration; though registration of NGO’s in Uganda seems not to be difficult. The research found out that, it is not clear whether the charity educational NGOs always meet the legal requirements for registration since legal requirements are not affordable and it is not clear whether the government has a good will when the government is not supportive of the charity educational NGO activities.
The findings revealed further that, the legal environment greatly affects institutional sustainability of the charity educational NGOs, since majority of the respondents failed to either agree or disagree to the notion regarding whether policies have any effect on the sustainability of the organisation. However, since those who disagreed ranked higher than those who agreed, it is evident that the existing polices will greatly affect charity educational NGO sustainability.

In addition, the findings revealed that the NGOs received support from their founders including technical, financial and managerial support. Furthermore, majority of the NGOs were religiously founded. It also revealed that NGOs that have international founders seemed to be more sustainable both administratively and financially as compared to their local counter parts. Thus ownership of the organisations affects their sustainability.

5.2 Discussions

5.2.1 The effect of implementation strategies on institutional sustainability

Table 4.8 in chapter four revealed that majority of the NGO used local government structures while conducting services, since government services are free from competition, hence non-profit making. This has enabled the NGOs to have access to services. The difference from NGOs that did not use local government structures was
slightly higher since government services are often not near the targeted community areas because of their location.

The community participation scales beyond their physical participation, but also their ability to allow the charity NGOs to use their structures. The study finding revealed that majority of the community structures were more often used than government structures. This indicated that charity NGOs preferred to use the community structures to government structures. Furthermore, the organisations involved the community in project designs, monitoring and evaluation of projects throughout. The results can be examined in the table 4.8 respectively.

Tedler (1982: 78) stated “most NGOs are often top down rather than participatory in their decision making, villagers were marginally (if at all) involved in NGO project design”. However, the findings in this study revealed that the NGOs preferred the bottom up approach and encouraged the participation of the community by using community facilities as well as the participatory rural appraisal approaches to enhance ownership of the projects and its sustainability. Riddle (2007:273) stated; “some NGO projects fail because of lack of managerial and technical skills with which to implement the projects”. The current study however revealed that the educational NGOs have qualified staff with the ability of handling mass population. The NGOs are further supported with technical, financial and managerial expertise from the founders and the government line departments in the district local governments. Further Michael and Fowler (2002:367)
noted; “organisation’s sustainability rest on NGOs performance and how the NGOs maintain such performance which requires an NGO to learn and adapt to the changing environment and stay its civic self in the process”. This is in agreement with the finding of the study which revealed that NGOs conduct monitoring to provide check for good performance and also conduct project evaluation where lesson learnt and best practices as well as recommended corrective actions are adopted and implemented by the NGOs. This ensures quality assurance of service delivery and sustainability of the projects.

5.2.2 The effect of resource mobilisation on institutional sustainability
An organisation’s development and sustainability depends on its capacity to understand its’ resource needs and mobilise resources to that effect. Sarah, (2004:132) could not agree more with this assertion and noted; “an institutional sustainability depends on one of the resource flow which basically entails to know recurrent cost, capital investment and human resource”. The studies revealed that organisations were aware of their resource needs and have therefore developed and defined resource mobilisation strategies to address the needs. These among them included local fundraising, electronic fundraising, international fundraising and donor funding as illustrated in Table 4.10, among other methods. Some of the NGOs have twinned up for project fund application while others have come up with income generating activities (IGAs) or projects to acquire enough resources to meet their administrative costs and fund other activities, respectively. Greensmith (2002:1) noted; “many Southern NGOs looking at INGOs as a source of funding should prepare for disappointment. They should have a minimum of competence in adding value and offer a minimum promise to deserve funding for
investment in further building their capacity”. In order for the NGOs to be competitive for funds awards, over ¾ in the current study of the NGOs implemented their resource mobilisation strategies effectively, which enabled them to raise fund to meet their administrative costs thus they survived, despite insufficient funds.

It is further noted that the NGOs frequently conducted fundraising drives underscoring the urgency of resource mobilisation for educational NGOs as a source of security and sustainability. It can be held as true the belief that sustainability is all about planning and reporting, budgeting and financial management, its learned rather than acquired and it is all about survivals, (Sarah, 2004: 132-139). Further, Boulding, (1956: 200-207) developed a classification of the systems theory to include … open system theory … which are described as self maintenance through exchange of resources with the environment (cell). The different entrepreneurial activities that NGOs have started engaging in are to help sustain themselves which is in line with the postulation of the open system’s theory by Boulding (1956).

Additionally, all most all NGOs were affected by the challenge of insufficient funds that are not timely; this has greatly affected the performance of most NGOs forcing some of them to close down. This finding is in agreement with Namakulu, (2010:1) who reported that, the dwindling donor resources and donor fatigue has made some NGOs uncertain of the future due to financial sustainability challenges. This partly is due to the dependence on donor support, which is insufficient and dwindles each day.
Generally, the study revealed that NGOs are faced with inadequate and insufficient funding by the donors, which funds keep reducing each day. To counter this challenge, most NGOs have diversified their resource mobilisation strategies and are implementing to obtain more resources locally. Organisations that have been successful should share their experiences with others to guarantee sustainability.

5.2.3 The effect of legal environment on institutional sustainability

The NGO-government relationship does not make it any better as demonstrated by the NGO registration requirements (Amended) Act (2006) which has narrowed down the space of operation for the NGOs (NGO Registration Act 2006). Additionally, the NGOs are registered since it is a government requirement under the Ministry of Internal Affairs to register before they begin their operations and are also required to renew its’ registration periodically.

According to USAID-NGO sustainability Index (2010), when the legal environment is favorable, the organisations are assured of their legal existence and freedom to exercise their rights and play their roles. This was confirmed with majority of the respondents in the current study who disagreed that Uganda has favorable legal environment. Turner and Hulme (2007) observed that NGO-government relations are complex and diverse and are likely to affect the management of NGO activities. The finding in the current study indicates that it is not clear whether the government has a good will towards the
operations and sustainability of the NGOs. However, results show that the government is not supportive of NGOs activities which create threats toward NGOs sustainability.

From findings revealed, the policies i.e. donor, organisational and government policies greatly affect operations and the sustainability of the NGOs. For example, donors provide grants with strict conditions for its implementation that may not be favorable for the sustainability of the NGOs. Government policies were revealed to be very unfavorable since government does not support or enhance the sustainability of the NGOs despite the fact that NGOs provide their services on behalf of the government. NGOs are better managed like systems, the open systems theory refers to the concept that organisations are strongly influenced by their environment. Bastedo (2004: 1) agreed with this finding and note that this environment consists of other organisations that exert various forces of an economic, political or social nature, on the NGOs. NGOs are advised to follow the legal requirements strictly in order to be in the good books of government and gain their support thus guaranteeing sustainability.

5.2.4 The effect of ownership of the organization on institutional sustainability

The study sought to find out the ownership of the NGOs, it was revealed that majority of the NGOs are religiously founded as illustrated in table 4.18 However, there exist other organisations that are community founded and coalition or group founded and others. Therefore, this implies that most of the NGOs are religious founded and owned but work in partnership with the communities.
The study sought to find out whether NGOs receive any support from their founders. Findings generally revealed that, NGOs receive various kinds of support from founders. According to Wyatt (2004: 53), the board are the owners of the organisation and it's imperative that after determining the mission of the organisation, ensuring that the organisation is financially sound and well managed is one of the most important duties of the board. An NGO’s short-term health and long-term sustainability often depend on the attention the board gives to this critical task. Coser (1977:570) asserts, “Parson and his collaborators in the working papers call the theory of action as all action systems”, which were faced with four major problems if they were to survive and develop. 1) They must secure sufficient resource from their environment and distribute these within the system and this is termed adaptation. 2) They must mobilise resources for the attainment of the system’s goals and this is called goal attainment. 3) They must coordinate and adjust the relation within the system and hence have mechanism for the integration. 4) There must be ways of ensuring that component actors are sufficiently motivated to play their parts, pattern maintenance, as well as the mechanisms devoted to internal tension management. The founders are obligated to provide the necessary support (financial, technical and managerial) to address the above four problems Parson and his collaborators postulated in order for the organisations to be sustainable. However, from the study, a few NGOs noted that at times they do not require all the support from their founders since they can manage the organisations on their own. But the support of the founders comes in handy when the issues to be solved are beyond the management.
The study findings revealed that members of the public, who formed some of the organisations general assemblies, planned together with the organisations and also made contributions through membership and subscriptions fees which funds organisations’ activities. According to IFAD (2000:15),

Empowerment is the ownership of the development process by the people themselves. All development stakeholders – government, private sector, banks, NGOs and other members of civil society – must recognise the capacity of the poor to develop themselves as free, responsible and self-reliant groups and communities and create the environment for individuals to come together and organize themselves.

This meant that for organisations to be sustainable with community participation and involvement which creates a sense of ownership of the entire NGOs programme should be encouraged. NGOs should capitalise on community’s participation to broaden their membership base.

5.3 Conclusions

From the discussions, it can be concluded that the NGOs have clear implementation strategies which include; using government structures, use of cheaper government line departments, and clear terms in accessing government structures. The involvement of the Community in appropriate participation in project design, project monitoring and evaluation has contributed greatly to the sustainability of the organisation.
From the research findings on the second objective, it was found out that the level of resource mobilisation is good and organisations frequently organise fundraising drives to improve their resource base. A number of them have diversified their resource mobilisation sources to include local IGAs projects and twinning for project fund application. However, despite the good resource mobilisation strategies developed, the NGOs are still affected and faced by inadequate funding and insufficient funds.

This research on the third objective further showed that the sustainability of the NGOs greatly depends on the legal environment. The legal environment is created by the government and donor policies which affect NGO management and operations. The periodic renewal of NGO registration greatly affects NGOs amidst weak government will to support NGOs activities, which consequently affects the implementation of activities.

From the results on the fourth objective it can be concluded that most NGOs are religious founded and owned, though there exists some other organisations which are community founded, among others. Religious founders have contributed to the sustainability of such organisations compared to those that are funded by individuals who later on either change their preference or get tired of supporting the organisation.

5.4 Recommendations

From the above discussion and conclusion, the following measures are recommended in response to the sustainability of educational NGOs.
The government should evenly distribute its structures by setting up offices in rural areas so as to enable the NGOs use these facilities for synergy and cost reductions other than using the community structures that can easily be manipulated for other individual gains. Clear government policy should be developed to support those NGOs that employ qualified staff since most NGOs cannot afford to maintain them after their projects close when the funds are insufficient. Citizen’s employment is a key government role, only supported by the NGOs. This can be done by linking the NGOs employees to the various line departments such as education, health and community development. The NGOs should create capacity building programs like community governance programmes using the PRA approach to motivate all the community members to fully participate in the organisations activities. This will enhance accountability, ownership and sustainability of the project gains.

The NGOs should improve on the different ways of resource mobilisation in order to sustain all their activities. It is imperative for the organisations to improve on their internal fundraising strategies and seek alternative local resource mobilisation mechanisms through; opening up more IGAs or projects as well as recruiting more local members to support fund their activities by payments of subscription and membership fees. Local NGOs should twin up with INGOs whose credibility is not doubted during project fund application to have a higher chance of winning the project fund award. On the other hand, with the globalisation of communication, it is important for NGOs to improve on international electronic fundraising strategies especially through the use of
websites and social media channels for improved visibility thus arousing interest of intending funders to support the organisations.

Policy makers i.e. donors and the government should set policies that do not inconvenience the activities of the NGOs. There should also be flexibility on how activities can be implemented if it saves the cost of implementation. This will ensure that the NGOs run their activities without interference but innovatively, effectively and efficiently. The government should make the registration process of the organisations more affordable and less tedious in order to encourage the NGOs to follow clear channels of registration and also to encourage other NGOs who operate illegally or with expired permits to register. The government should support NGO activities by providing the needed technical support. This will help sustain NGOs in Uganda as well as providing quality service delivery bridging the gaps in government budget funding. The government should remove the periodic renewal of the NGO registration process, which greatly affects NGO activities during implementation and its requirements are always very costly leading to high administrative costs. NGOs on their part should endeavor to find information on the government requirements and adhere to them. On issues that affect their freedom to operate and implement their activities, NGOs are advised to form themselves into groups with similar interest for a stronger bargaining power with government.
The government should monitor and deeply ascertain the ownership and capital base of the NGOs before licensing them to operate in order to be assured of their sustainability since most organisations do not live to celebrate their 5th birth day. A great emphasis should be established to clearly separate powers between NGO management and their founders. This will define roles, reduce roles overlaps, and enhance administrative sustainability. For improved community’s participation, NGOs should use their founder members to encourage more recruitment of members to raise more funds by paying membership fees and subscriptions. Also communities must be involved in assessment for project development and encouraged to monitor projects to guarantee continued interest in the projects and thus will enhance sustainability.

5.5 Limitations to the study

1. The main limitations of this study were resource constraints, access to the target groups and the constant changes in the situational context of the region. The finance and material resources needed for a larger sample size for this study was inadequate.

2. The number of NGOs in Gulu has been deteriorating from 20 NGOs proposed to participate in the study to twelve of them; eight had either closed shop or had abandoned educational themes in their programming within the district. Others had moved away from the district by the time the researcher went for data collection. This reduced the number of the target population that could be accessed.
5.6 Areas for future Research

This study mainly assessed factors affecting the sustainability of educational non-governmental organizations in post-war situations in Uganda a case of Gulu district. It is recommended that future research should:

1. Investigate and further explicate on the other methods of resource mobilisation that the majority of the organisations have opted to use as indicated, instead of the mentioned methods of fundraising.

2. Investigate further the legal environment that most respondents were undecided about.

3. Develop and verify the model of education sustainability in post-war areas.
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Benson C. Basheka (PhD)  
HEAD, HIGHER DEGREES DEPARTMENT
APPENDIX B: STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRES

A Questionnaire for NGO BODs and selected staffs on determinants of Sustainability of Educational NGOs in Gulu district

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire has been designed for the purpose of the study on the determinants of sustainability of education NGOs in the post-war situation in Gulu district.

The information that you will provide shall entirely be used for academic purposes only.

Please respond as frankly and honestly as you can because your views on this subject will determine the validity and reliability of this study.

Thank you so much

Susan Toolit Alobo

SECTION A: Background information (Please tick eg. C.[ ] the most appropriate option that suits your response)

1) What title do you hold in this organization you are working for?
   a. Executive Director
   b. Board member
   c. Manager
   d. Coordinator
   e. Accountant
   f. Advocacy officer
g. Others specify.................................................................

2) What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

3) What is your employment status?
   a. A voluntarily
   b. On contract
   c. Others (specify).........................................................

4) In what age group do you fall?
   a. Less than 29
   b. 30-39
   c. 40-49
   d. 50+

5) What is your highest level of education?
   a. PhD
   b. Master
   c. Postgraduate Diploma
   d. Bachelors Degree
   e. Diploma
   f. Others

   specify.................................................................

6) For how long have you worked in this organisation?
   a. Less than one year
b. 1-5 years  
c. More than 5 years

SECTION B: Factors affecting the sustainability of education NGOs in the post war situation, Gulu district

Implementation strategies

Please use a tick to mark the most appropriate response category according to number allocated to each response as stated below to answer each question in the table.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This NGO use government structures while conducting service delivery.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The use of government line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There are clear terms for my NGO to access the government structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Your NGO always use community structures for their work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>You have preference of community structures over government structures while carrying out duties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>These NGOs have/use qualified staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The staffs of this NGO are capable of handling the mass population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There are appropriate project design documents in your NGO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>There is appropriate monitoring system in your NGO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Projects in your NGO are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluated frequently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>You are aware of project design documents, in your NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>You are aware of projects monitoring in your NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>You participate in monitoring projects in your NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>You participate in project evaluation in your NGO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The communities you work with participate in project design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The communities that you work with participate in monitoring the project that you implement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The communities that you work with are involved in project evaluation at all times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resource Mobilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Your organization has a resource mobilization strategy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Your organization implements the resource mobilization strategy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Your organization conducts fundraising drives frequently</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>In your view donor funds are sufficient</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Your organization has a challenge of inadequate funding.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Which kind of method do you often use in resource mobilization? (Please tick as many as appropriate)

   a) Local fundraising manual
   b) International fundraising manual
   c) local fundraisings Electronic
   d) International fundraising Electronic
   e) Donor funding
   f) Others Specify

30. Of the above methods chosen, why did you opt for that method? (Tick as Many as appropriate)

   a) It’s economical
   b) Reliable/dependable
   c) Flexible
   d) Brings in funds timely
   e) Brings in more fund

Legal Environment

Please use a tick to mark the most appropriate response category according to number allocated to each response as stated below to answer each questions in the table.

3. Yes 2. Not sure 1.No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Your NGO is legally registered under the NGO Registration Acts 2006.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>There are clear procedures that was followed during registration of this NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>It is difficult to register an NGO in Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Your organization always meets all the legal requirements for registration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Legal requirements are affordable to all NGO in Uganda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ugandan government has good will towards your NGO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ugandan government is supportive of your NGO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Donor policies are favorable to your NGO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. Your organization has sustainability policies in place.

40. Your organization has administrative policies to enhance sustainability.

41. Your organization has financial policies to enhance sustainability.

42. Your organization is administratively sustainable.

43. Your organization is financially sustainable.

44. Ugandan government policies are favorable for the sustainability of NGOs.

Ownership of the organization

(Tick the most appropriate response)

45. What is the type of Ownership of your NGOs?

a) Local ownership

b) International ownership

(c) Others

Specify……………………………………………………………………………………………………
46. Do you receive any kind of support from your founders?
    Yes □
    No □

47. What kind of support do you receive from your founders? (Please tick □ as many as appropriate)
   a) Technical support
   b) Financial support
   c) Managerial support
   d) Others
      Specify………………………………………………………………………………

48. What kind of foundation does your NGO come from?
   a) Religious founded
   b) Community founded
   c) Individual founded
   d) Others
      specify………………………………………………………………………………

Institutional sustainability Please use a tick □ to mark the most appropriate response category according to number allocated to each response as stated below to answer each questions in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Administrative Sustainability is high/adequate in your education NGO.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Your organisation has sufficient staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Your organisation efficiently using the available resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Your organization effectively utilizes the available resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Financial Sustainability is high/adequate in education NGO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Financial sustainability is easily managed in your organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>You expect your project will last for at least 10 years after donor funding ends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The magnitude of your operation has favorably changed since the withdrawal of some donor support.

Your organisation will continue to operate even after the seed capital is completely utilized.

For any comment/opinion on the research to the researcher, please write in the space provided:

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your cooperation
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE

An interview guide for selected NGO BODs and staffs on the determinants of Sustainability of Educational NGOs in Gulu district

Dear Respondent,

The interview schedule has been designed for the purpose of the study on the determinants of sustainability of education NGOs in the post-war situation in Gulu district.

The information that you are going to provide shall entirely be used for academic purposes of this study only.

The interview will focus on the following:

   a) Implementation strategies and the sustainability of education NGOs in Gulu.

   b) Resource mobilization strategies and sustainability of education NGOs in Gulu.

   c) The legal environment and sustainability of education NGOs in Gulu.

   d) The ownership of the organization and sustainability of education NGOs in Gulu.

Please respond frankly and honestly because your views on this subject will determine the validity and reliability of this study.

Thank you

Susan Toolit Alobo
SECTION 1: SOCIO ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

District..........................................................................................................................................

Organisation of the respondent...................................................................................................

Gender of respondent ..................................................................................................................

Age of respondent .......................................................................................................................

What title do you hold in this organization? ..................................................................................

What roles/ functions do you play in your position?
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

What is your employment status? ..................................................................................................

Professional/occupational background .........................................................................................

What is your highest level of education? .....................................................................................

For how long have you worked in this organization? ..................................................................

SECTION 11

Appropriate implementation strategies

1. Does your NGO use government structures while implementing their activities?
   ➢ Why do they use or not use government structures in implementing their activities?
   ➢ Is it true that education NGO use community structures during activity implementation?
In your opinion what would be the best way or structures to use for project implementation?

Do you think your NGO have qualified staff to conduct their activity implementation?

Does your NGO involve the community in:
- Project design
- Monitoring
- Evaluation

Does your NGO have project documents in place to guide their implementation?

Does your NGO monitor and evaluate their projects frequently?

**Institutional sustainability**

2. Do you agree that Administrative sustainability is lacking in your NGO?

   Why is it so?

   Do you project to maintain the same number of staffing even after your donors withdraw?

   What mechanism do you have in place for staff retention?

   Resources in your organisation are effectively and efficiently utilized.

   Do you agree that financial Sustainability is lacking in your NGO?

   How long do you project your organization to live on after end of donor funding or seed capital?

   Do you think your programme operation will increase after end of donor funding?

   Will your programmes continue running normally after donor funding?

3. Do implementation strategies affect the sustainability of your NGO?
Resource Mobilization

4. Do you have a resource mobilization strategy or system in your NGO?
   ➢ How often do you implement your resource mobilization strategy?
   ➢ How do you raise funds for your organization?

   Through;
   
   g) Local fundraising
   h) Electronic fundraising
   i) International fundraising
   j) Donor funding

   ➢ How reliable and efficient is your mean so f fundraising?
   ➢ Are the donor funds that your organisation receives Sufficient?
   ➢ Your organization has a challenge in financing its programme.
   ➢ How do you solve or plan to solve this challenge?

5. Does resource mobilisation affect the sustainability of your organisation?

Legal Environment

1. Is your NGO registered under the NGO registration acts 2006?
   
   Response
   
   ➢ Are there clear procedures for NGO registration?
   ➢ Does your organization always meet the NGO registration requirements easily?
   ➢ Do you think your NGO is supported by the government?
   ➢ Does government have a good will towards your organization and its efforts towards education service delivery?
How convenient are donor policies towards your organisation?

How relevant is organizational policies towards sustainability?

In your opinion do you think government policies are helpful to the education NGOs?

2. How does the legal framework affect the sustainability of your NGO?

3. Do you think donor policies affect the sustainability of your NGO?

Ownership of the organization

4. Do you think your NGO have ownership?

➢ What type of foundation does your NGO come from?

➢ Does your foundation body give you any financial, technical or material support to help sustain your organisation?

➢ If yes state how and what kind of support they always provide?

5. Does the kind of ownership or foundation your NGO come from affect the sustainability of your organization?

If you have any additional comments to make, please feel free to write it in the space provided here or you can speak to the interviewer.

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Thank you so much for your cooperation
APPENDIX D

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST FOR NGOs PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s/no</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Organisational Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HPG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GG</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SJCH</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GWAC</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acholi Education Initiative (AEI), Save the children International (SCI), World Vision (WV), Hope Alive Gulu (HAG), Action Ministries International (AMI), Gulu War Affected Center (GWAC), St. Jude’s Childrens’ home (SJCH), GUSCO Gulu (GG), African Revival (AR), Caritas Gulu (CG), Invisible children Uganda (ICU)**
### APPENDIX E: DOCUMENT REVIEW GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HPG</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GG</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SJCH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GWAC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acholi Education Initiative (AEI), Save the children International (SCI), World Vision (WV), Hope Alive Gulu (HAG), Action Ministries International (AMI), Gulu War Affected Center (GWAC), St. Jude’s Childrens’ home (SJCH,) GUSCO Gulu (GG), African Revival (AR), Caritas Gulu (CG), Invisible children Uganda (ICU)
APENDIX F: MAP OF UGANDA SHOWING GULU DISTRICT