

The Prospects of Participatory Planning and Development: Experiences from Bugwema Village Dwellers in Musoma Rural District Integrated Project Support (MRDIPS) in Tanzania

¹ Benjamin Mbeba Meli

Dares Salaam Maritime Institute
Department of Science and Management
P.O Box 6727 Dares Salaam Tanzania, East Africa,
Email: benjaminmbeba@gmail.com; benjamin.meli@dmi.ac.tz

Hiacinter Burchard Rwechungura,

Dares Salaam Maritime Institute,
Department of Maritime Transport and Nautical Sciences,
P.O Box 6727, Dares Salaam, Tanzania, East Africa,
Email: hiacinter@yahoo.co.uk or hiacinter.rwechungura@dmi.ac.tz

Lucas Pastory Mwisila

Dares Salaam Maritime Institute,
Department of Science and Management,
P.O Box 6727, Dares Salaam, Tanzania, East Africa,
Email: lmwisila@yahoo.com or lucas.mwisila@dmi.ac.tz

DOI: [10.56201/wjimt.v8.no2.2024.pg13.30](https://doi.org/10.56201/wjimt.v8.no2.2024.pg13.30)

Abstract

This paper tries to examine the success or failure of Musoma Rural District Integrated Project Support (MRDIPS) which was initiated at Bugwema village in Musoma Rural District for the purpose of improving the well beings of the village dwellers by supporting them in all issues of participatory planning and development. It looks both at various strategies in rendering such support, the capacity building in local government authorities as well as all grassroots stakeholders in attaining participatory planning and development in the Bugwema village. The paper starts by exploring some of the issues used in participatory planning like the problem of stereotype of application of participatory tools, the problem in achieving true participatory planning and development, like to be able to reconcile the development agencies missions, their norms and values to the real actual situations and needs as well as the expectations of the targeted communities at Bugwema village dwellers.

MRDIPS was one of the most important donor programmes which supported participatory planning and development in Musoma Rural District in Tanzania at the early of 1995's, with conscious and clear mission towards participatory planning and development . However, the

programme faced a lot of challenges associated with whole process of participatory planning and development experienced by almost every development agency or NGO, including the top-down approach of selecting programme design for suitable to the village dwellers of Bugwema and their activities; and creating dependency on local communities and capacity building problems. Furthermore, the paper tries to question whether participatory planning and development in Musoma rural District should always entail bottom-up approach of decision-making in order to bring positive results in terms of success and challenges, and on how to organize the programmes or projects such that community dependency can be avoided. The paper ends by the way forward in order to avoid such problems to occur again and to kill out the dream of poor rural areas that always is to see their daily lives are improving and getting sustainable development.

Key Words: *Development, participation, participatory planning, bottom-up approach, top-down approach.*

1.0 Introduction

Over the last decade the concept of participatory planning and development in Africa has been emerging and to be as one of the most important strategies and principles of the local community level for development for achieving a successful development plans or projects. It has been a major focus in any electoral political campaigns and distributive economics for many years (Chambers, 1994). The important issue which seems to be very crucial in recent years about participatory planning and development among the African states is the greater thrust given on the subject, and the way it attempts to draw a linkage between it and success in resource mobilization, management, development; and reducing mass poverty among the citizens. With this fact participatory planning and development has come greater recognition of the need to involve the various stakeholders to decision-making; as well as involving and taking care of gender discrimination and other marginalized social groups

In discussing on participatory planning and development has focused on mainly aspects, such as the form, content and scope of participatory planning and development, institutions and institutionalizations, tools or techniques which have been used to realize it, people's capacity to participate fully in a freedom way. This discussion of participatory planning and development can be on the issues like the degree of participatory planning and development and whether both the two may entail transfer and sharing of power between government or development agencies on the one hand, and local people on the other hand, whether women or youths and to make all marginalized people in the particular localities to be heard. Also the avenues for enhancing participatory planning and development especially the role of civil society institutions ; institutionalization of participatory planning and development in the community life and development programmes initiated these civil societies; relevance of various tools of participatory planning and development; and some obstacles or barriers of inherited power

structures and cultures and how to overcome them (Morrisey,2000).

This paper will definitely use the examples of the leading organizations in Tanzania, particularly, Musoma Rural District Integrated Project Support (MRDIPS) in the early of 1990's and 2000's to show how the participatory planning and development in Tanzania has been done in terms of success and challenges and the way forward.

2.0 The Essence of Participatory Planning and Development in Tanzania

In Tanzania, particular, the essence of participatory planning and development originated from Presidential Circular No.1 and the ruling party guidelines, (*Mwongozo WA TANU*) of 1971. Mongula (1976) succinctly investigated on participatory planning and development in Tanga districts, he (ibid) noted some attempts in local participatory planning and development was not taking place until 1980's, with the rise of numerous donor-supported projects made the essence of participatory planning and development became acknowledged by International project donors. It was then Chambers (1994) came up with the idea of "participatory rural appraisal" as an alternative to, or complement to the dominant economic biased "project appraisal" techniques used in measuring planning projects. Thus is why Chambers (1994) and Morrisey (2000) have succinctly pointed out that international donors or development partners-both governmental and non-governmental have been in the forefront by insisting on participation as means to better planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of development programmes. The concept and theory today are widely acclaimed by development researchers, trainers and policy makers alike; and as stated by Mohan (2001) that participatory planning and development has now become one of the routines of public sector agencies.

To a large extent participatory planning is the act and process of involving people in decision making and implementation of the activities and projects established within the rural poor people. This includes involving them in planning and management. In a broader sense, participatory planning is believed to be a basis for people-centered development; and essentially as means for enhancing peoples' choices officials and elected leaders. It becomes an empowering tool as far as it gives -village dwellers the responsibility to identify and prioritize local problems, as well as to propose the possible solutions jointly with development (REPOA, 2005).

Lecuwis (2000) on his side, tries to analyze different forms of participation that include 'passive participation', ' participation in information giving', ' participation by consultation', ' functional participation', ' interactive participation', 'self-mobilization', etc depending on distribution of decision-making authority between target group and interventionists; and functions played by target group in planning process. Morrisey (2000) sees participation, at its highest level, entailing citizens' control. He (ibid) advances various reasons for participation including instrumental and developmental reasons, some of the advanced reasons for participation are:

- To provide citizens opportunities to take part in decision-making, for enhancing people democratic rights (Maier, 2001).

- To provide knowledge and information sharing by development agencies and communities, and this serves to eliminate information gaps and helps in building confidence and trust between development agencies and the local communities. This is the most commonly advanced reason. It is claimed that participation makes it easier for local communities to accept for new ideas and values entailed in development projects, and in this case to identify themselves with them rather than treating them as alien and irrelevant to their lives. In this regard, participation has also helped to reduce the cynicism associated to development projects by communities who see those projects as benefiting the development agencies rather than by the so called intended beneficiaries. In this respect participation helps both strengthen the planning process and legitimizing plans.
- It has been seen as the means for capacity building and empowerment in terms of promoting new values, attitudes, skills and knowledge. In participating communities or target groups Morrissey (ibid) is referring it as a means of “.....*empowering people to take control over their lives and solve their own problems*”. In this respect participation instills confidence in communities, and an interest –self explore local problems and their solutions as well as enhancing local self-organized capacity.
- It is a means of reaching the disempowered and disadvantaged social groups in a community or society (Maier, ibid).

We agree with Maier (ibid) that the process of pursuing participation is a continuation struggle. What is involved here is the question of awareness, passion and confidence of local communities or project beneficiaries to demand for, and share power with those already monopolizing (local authorities) on the side of the coin. Undoubtedly this is not an easy task to achieve in a short time given the legacy of government control of power (Bradshaw, 2003; Cooke and Kothari, 2001; Glicken, 2000).

The scope and limits of participation has always seen as a subject of contention, although perhaps this is likely to vary between one to another. It should not be put in mind that participation does not nullify or substitute or professional knowledge in planning and decision-making, nor does it displace duly elected government structures: the challenge rests on how these can be properly integrated to yield rapid development. Furthermore, Glicken (2000) maintains that there are two varied inputs into planning process: namely scientific or technical analysis, and non-scientific or non-technical aspects. Both two aspects are important information sources during planning. Social and political concerns cannot be ignored in planning process in favor of so called robust technical concerns. If this will happen the stakeholders feel ignored, discounted, or alienated, and therefore distance themselves from what is being planned (Glicken, ibid). Therefore according to Maier (2011), there is need to strike a balance between participation and professional and authority concerns. He (ibid) claims in this respect that “*unlimited participation has come into question recently as in effective and counterproductive*’.

3.0 Awareness Building on Principles of Participatory Planning and Development

Reyes (1994) points out that there are five main factors that are contributing to awareness building on participatory planning and development; these can be summarized as follows:

- i. Development should be seen as a change from the bottom-up rather than from top-down approach;
- ii. The development process should be managed as a natural organic process rather than according to plans, goals, objectives, targets and schedules, implying that goals and targets may change and therefore, their timing should be tentative and flexible to make room for adaptation to local conditions;
- iii. Development programmes should aim to strengthen local organizations and not state and central government bureaucracies. Here, new programmes should be chosen according to their ability to increase local development management capacity. According to him (ibid), this will start with a few schemes to solve immediate local problems to build local confidence and experience;
- iv. The development process is always supported by local institutions with village dwellers, primary cooperatives, religious, youths, community based users and self-help groups playing a leading role. It is more important to make sure the development process is rooted in a strong local institutions than ensuring that local institutions has a group of all the firm finer technical points. It is comparatively easy to arrange technical services from outside than to bring about social involvement and willing popular participation in the development process. Strong local institutions are necessary as support posts quite independently of whatever technical skills and other background they may have; and
- v. It follows from the above that the development process must be based primarily on confidence and learning rather than experts and training. It is more important for the people who will take decisions at the local level to have full confidence of the trained experts. This also implies that technical staff of departments should work in tandem with local institutions rather than assist on judgment on the plans prepared by these institutions.

4.0 How to Initiate Participatory Planning and Development

Kpierekoh (2011) analyses eight steps which must be considered when participatory planning and development is taking place within the disadvantaged people. These are:

- a. Identify local needs, particularly, rural poor families. The best way to find what people need and what they see as possible solutions to their problems is to ask them directly. This will create awareness and willingness among people and to take part in any action

that will follow. Under this stage, it is necessary to establish common ground of understanding with them. It is important to ensure steady fast community support for a pro-poor development initiative. Local officials, community based organizations, field workers of voluntary organizations, teachers, women, and retired people, must be involved in the consultations and discussions;

- b. Collect basic data. Once local contacts are established, the next step is to collect data, with people's help, basic data about the community, characteristics of the area, resources situations, socio-economic status and other relevant facts. The aim here is to get a factual baseline picture which will help in setting goals and measuring changes brought about by the project at a later stage. It is helpful this step to associate with local officials and NGOs functionaries in collective and verifying facts from different sources and to seek people's cooperation. It is important to respect their ideas and abilities and the focus should be on community as whole and seeking commitment to helping the poor;
- c. Formation of working groups. It is helpful to form working groups that will include local officials, to prepare status reports and develop perspectives. The main of working group is to analyze and compare data, draw inferences and identify priority areas for interventions. This is aimed at greater clarity and strengthening of participation of local people, particularly the local people, by giving them greater local planning responsibility and establishment of good working relationship between technical planning experts and the local people. Importance is to be given to detailed specification of the roles of participant individual groups and committees in carrying out the tasks. Conflicts and disagreement may rise in the process, which are not in themselves a negative factor, but have to be properly resolved and managed at every step of decision –making;
- d. Formation of the objectives. In this step it required to define precisely what specific objectives are to be achieved, which should be stated in concrete terms, like increasing;
 - Incomes of identified households
 - Production of certain crops and
 - Illiteracy among locally elected women officials. The objective may not be always quantifiable, particularly when it involves attitudinal changes. Still it is helpful because people can see how much change has taken place.
- e. Deciding the strategy. This is the most difficult step of participatory planning and development as it involves assessing and mobilizing needed resources and choosing the planning methods. It is important to specify the following important issues:
 - Resources that are locally available and those needed from outside (people with skills, funds, raw materials inputs);

- If resources are available when needed ; and
 - Who should be approached, who will approach and with whose help to secure these. In this regards, try to consider alternative local planning methods and approaches such as ; whether to contract a job to private individuals or to do it comparative basis; whether to focus on several small households-based units or one big unit and; whether to train local people as trainers for the jobs or to hire trained personnel from outside. Once a cause of action is chosen, it should be explained and specified in clear terms to avoid confusion and misunderstanding among the local stakeholders.
- f. Ensuring feasibility. The working groups at this step should consider whether then objectives are realistic. It s important to ensure that:
- Assumptions and stipulations regarding the availability of resources , managerial competence and technical expertise are realistic
 - Proposed activities are economically viable and
 - Local market can absorb the expected outputs. This step is very important because you need to identify potentials project beneficiaries and check how the benefits would flow to them.
- g. Preparing work plan. This blue print for decentralized project management drawn up by project implementation committee, specify the what, who, when and how of local project implementation. The work plan should contain the following information in simple tabular form:
- All activities for implementation of the project,
 - Names of the persons responsible for each activity
 - Stating and completion time for each activities and
 - The means to carry out the activities. I should also define the outputs expected from each activity to measure performance during g the implantation or completion of the project, for effective monitoring and evaluation.
- h. Preparing budget. The materials and human resources must be given a monetary cost, which for the project budget. The cost is further down in terms of availability whether locally available or to be secured from outside. Extended resources can be government grants or loans from financial institutions.

4.1 Tools Used for Participatory Processes

Participation was rather unfortunately introduced more in terms of the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) as the tools than in terms of the general philosophy and attitudes it entails, which are perhaps more important than the tools. Similar experiences characterize other techniques, for example, the conventional project appraisal technique for analyzing and planning projects. Therefore, because of the manner in which it was introduced and the heavy emphasis laid on the tools, participation became applied unconsciously and in a stereotype manner which did not take full account of the specific situations, and the intended objectives and outputs of participation. The tools became parochially replicated in each and every situation by-also unfortunately –unqualified participation facilitators. The outcome of this was to leave public administrators, and even the communities unconvinced of its tools (Shivji and Peter, 2000).

But as the days went on these mistakes were slowly being ignored out and facilitators are being asked to become selective on which tools to use. In real practice, however, neither do development agencies have the patience and capacity to pursue participation properly, nor are facilitators capable or mandated by the authorities above them to adapt the tools to differentiate circumstances. One may go further to point out that development agencies are also unable to monitor everything being done by their staff and projects in the name of participation, or document processes and systematically detect mistakes to improve those processes. In some cases it is development agencies that are most cost and results sensitive which are most clear and insistent on participation.

In this regards, one can argue that for participation to become truly realized and bear fruits, development agencies must be prepared to devote sufficient time and resources into participatory processes and, where necessary, treat this as one of the objectives of their projects. Furthermore, the agencies ought to promote a passion to participation amongst their entire staff and departments, so that everyone and every department realize how their functions support or undermine participation.. Not only should they build their own capacities to engage with participatory processes, but as Eade (1997) and Kasiaka (2004) point out that they should always seek to build local capacities in their engagement with local communities.

4.2 Brief historical background of participation in Tanzania

The historical background of participation in Tanzania can be traced back during the time of Arusha declaration in 1967. The declaration articulated much the philosophy of socio-economic liberation based on African socialism and self-reliance. Nyerere who was the first president in Tanzania with the ruling party TANU laid out the principles upon which Tanzania's development was to be built (Nyerere, 1967). Nyerere observed that Tanzania had no money, and that development projects depend on money, it was recognized that development was putting a country in the position of dependency on other socialist countries.

IF Tanzania was to achieve the goals of independence freedom and socialism-then was not be compromised by debt to outside agents. Further, Nyerere was worry of urban based development projects, because then majority of people who lived I rural areas would be paying for an infrastructure that they would rarely have the opportunity to use. The solution was to introduce the philosophy of self-reliance-*kujitegemea*. This would lead to development without exploitation within the rural areas.

Despite Nyerere's egalitarianism and his distaste for exploitation of the peasantry, there is a hint of paternalism in his 1967 speech that characterizes attitudes towards people in rural areas today, and is at the heart of the current ambivalence of Tanzania officials towards "local knowledge". One of the principle aims of TANU stated in the Arusha declaration was "to see that the government mobilizes all the resources of this country towards the elimination of poverty, ignorance and diseases (Nyerere, 1967). Therefore, there are definite continuities between the concept of Self-reliance (*kujitegemea*) and participation as it is defined by development discourse. However, when Tanzania's are discussing participation, they may well be drawing on self-reliance-*kujitegemea* rather than invoking a Friereian concept of liberation through involvement or Robert Chambers (1997) idea of "putting the first last".

In the early of 1990's various national policies were formulated by the government including Local Government Reform Programme, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, Sustainable Industrial Development Policy, and other policies view participation as an important means to attain their goals. Participatory processes have been seen as the major pre-occupation of development agencies and other NGOs operating in Tanzania, as well as some regional and local government authorities. This has been found in various projects such as those of TASAF, UNICEF, UNESCO, Water Aid, Action Aid, Oxfam, in poverty reduction planning and monitoring etc (Kasiaka, 2004; Mongula, 2004; REPOA, 2005). Some districts, for example Musoma rural in Mara region, Lindi and Mtwara regions in Tanzania have been practicing participation projects to mention the few.

Currently, Tanzania, in particular, local government authorities (LGA), and other public administration and service delivery agencies are not merely a stakeholder in participation although they are actually becoming the permanent source of back-up support in these processes. The opportunities and obstacles to development (O&OD) in planning approach is widely supported by central government and LGAs today to entail participation of various social groups, village governments and finally village assemblies in making village plans is a major positive results in participatory planning and development (URT/ PO-RALG, 1998). There is certainly a huge challenge to internalize a participatory planning and development at village level due to capacity constraints, and given the capital-intensive nature in which opportunities and obstacle to development is being introduced in different districts, and sometimes has been involving some outside consultants with luxurious heavy duty vehicles coming consecutively to one village alone for as many as even ten days (

Kajimbwa, 2002).

In this regards, this paper examine deeply of one development agency involved in marginalized rural people of Musoma rural district in Mara region, particularly, at Bugwema village dwellers with the programme of Rural Integrated Project Support (RIPS). The programme was jointly supported by the government of Finland and Tanzania. Therefore, much of the discussion will pay attention mainly how did this programme promoted positively participatory planning processes, and to be able to change the life style of Bugwema dwellers, which over time had been the focus of the programmme, and finally the practical challenges and constraints involved for realization of participatory planning and development.

5.0 The Implementation of Musoma Rural District Integrated Project Support in Participatory

The MusomaRural Integrated Project Support programme was established slowly in Musoma rural district since in 1995 and in 2000 it gained more momentum for supporting seriously the Bugwema village dwellers. In this juncture, the paper will examine the main thrust of the programme itself, which was to promote participation; and later it will look at the practical experiences which used by the stakeholders to the implementation of the programme, the widespread of the Programme and how did it work, the success and the failure of the program as well as the way forward.

5.1Musoma Rural Integrated Project Support to Participation Process and its thrust

As I said earlier that, the programme was jointly supported by two countries, the republic of Tanzania and Finland to another side. The major objective of the programme was to support participatory rural development in some of regions in Tanzania. It was essentially a participatory planning focused on building capacity for participatory planning and good governance in local governance, village and civil society, including local NGOs and other CBOs like Musoma Fisheries Group, as well as supporting farmers, small scale private sector, local artisans (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Finland,2005). The support covered towards construction of schools, dispensaries, water supply, market places, livestock-keeping, agricultural, and micro-enterprise entailed participatory planning and implementation by way of community own contributions. All in all the programme was intended to empower civil society, strengthen democratic participation, increase local mobilization and control of resources, and to improve delivery of services by local governments. Furthermore, the programme covered also areas like offering training at grassroots level on (PRA, data base, planning), for local government staffs, district councilors and grassroots community leaders and officials.

5.2 The widespread of the Programme and How did it work?

In order to enhance widespread adoption of participatory planning in Musoma rural district,

the programme formed a facilitation service centre and facilitation teams, which were coordinated by Facilitation Service Centre Coordination Meeting (FSCCM). This was final decision-makers of the programme and it was made up of both leaders of the programme and regional secretariat staff. The team was responsible to assist districts in capacity building on participation through regular visits to the districts, attending villages meetings, coordinating training, and working closely with, and assisting team of Local Government staffs charged with participation, called District Participatory Resource Team (DPRT). On top of that, each Local Government Authority (LGA) created a DPRT to enhance participatory planning processes. Lower down at village level, they established village facilitators who were quite effective in villages like Maneke Mgango, Suguti, Mrangi and Chumwi, and these processes increased much awareness on participatory planning in LGAs and in the communities, starting at village level, ward level to regional level planning.

5.3 The Success of the Programme towards the Beneficiaries

Since the beginning of the programme in Musoma rural district, it managed progress during the initial stage of institutionalizing participatory approaches project design and implementation which was largely devoted to institutional capacity building of Local Governments, Non-Government Organizations, Community Based Organizations, and the private sector, in the areas of Good governance, technical expertise and improved service delivery. When Facilitation Service Centre Coordination Meeting (FSCCM) of programme was directly interviewed, they noted that:

“ the programme is going smoothly because the programme is covered all sectors and all levels of decision-making from grassroots level to regional level. The project proposals, budgets, training plans, drawing and other relevant planning documentation are now available in all villages ”

It is clear from the above quote that the programme was real effective for empowering the marginalized people so as to improve their life standard. On the other side of the coin, the interviewed was made to some villages’ dwellers who benefited by this programme and pointed out that:

“ Our villages are now growing cash and food crops well and majority of us able to send our children to private secondary schools and build good houses because of the establishment of this programme support to poor rural people ”

From the above quote, it is noted that village dwellers benefited much by this introduced programme. Some respondents from the local government and regional secretariat staffs went

further to point out that:

“ there are a number of success contributed by this programme among the rural poor people. These successes are summarized as follows”.

- It has improved governance
- Increased quality of the function performed and services provided agencies.
- Revitalization of democratic practice in general
- Maintaining the stability of society, when people are diversity involved in the decision-making process, they become more aware of the possible problems and are more willing to live with consequences than they are when decisions are imposed from outside. They become more aware of problems and tend to be less towards explosive situations or conflicts.
- Guarding public interest. To make public agencies to be more responsive to the needs of public and disadvantaged groups in the society, citizens can work as watchdog of society.
- Increased community cohesion and unity, and capacity building to reduce alienation of the individuals.

The programme assisted district councils and village dwellers to undertake participatory planning systematically and efficiently and facilitated moderation workshops. With the help of this facilitation, it has been noted that, full Musoma rural district council participated planning and budgeting. In addition, moderation workshops have created high opportunity to the full council and facilitation teams for mutual learning and confidence building. This is mainly supported by Kajimbwa (2002) and Moose (2001) that moderation workshops have a great positive impact to improve processes of participatory planning, budgeting, management, monitoring, and reporting.

5.4 Challenges / constraints facing Musoma Rural Integrated Project Support.

Despite the efforts made by both two governments (Tanzania and Finland) to the whole concept of participatory planning and development by introducing special programme of Rural Integrated Project support, the programme faced a lot of challenges which to a large extent contributed to die for a natural death.

The problems involved in the Local Government Reform Programme (LGR) contributed much to the failure of many programmes in Tanzania including the Rural Integrated Project Support in Musoma rural district. The Local Government Reform Programme (LGRP) which was started with the broad goal of restructuring local governments in Tanzania in the early of 2000s years looked at all aspects of local governments, it had several challenges which one way or another

affected the programme. Some of the challenges identified by the LGRP were:

1. Weak human resource capacity and management which constrained local governments.
2. Weak leaderships and poor management of the councils
3. Shortage of qualified and disciplined and committed personnel
4. Over employment within the councils
5. Shortage of revenues due to narrow tax base
6. Lack of transparency and accountability the conduct of councils' business.
7. Low pay for workers of local government.

Due to low pay for local government workers, it has been seen this problem as a chronic problem which is limiting the potentially good leaders from working in this sector. Good pay is an incentive for people to join and remain in a particular sector. Local Government Authority (LGA) financially depend on subsidies from central government and thus remunerations to employees are limited (PORALG, 2005). This situation some regional secretariats and district councilors and other technical staff who involved in this programme were too corrupt to the all resources financed by this programme. The village chairmen of Bugwema, Maneke, Mugango and Suguti noted that:

“after three years of starting of the programme, every village dweller was required to pay money than Tsh10,000/= as meeting fee and training fees. Also we were required to buy our own agriculture tools from them for the reason of cost-sharing”

The above testimony tells us that the goals of the programme turned upside down because corruption was used for the benefits of minority rather than majority in number. Avery and Marcossy (2017) points out that corruption in Local Government Authorities in most African states is affecting much the civil service accountability. In Tanzania, in particular, local government authorities have been affected by corruption and this has speeded up less accountability and efficiency among the public civil servants. Most of the public civil servants serve for their own personal gains instead of serving for public interest (Kasuka (2013). Lack of technological capacity among the poor rural people was observed as another challenge for Musoma Rural district Integrated Project Support. Almost all villages which had implemented this programme their people did not have enough and sustainable technological capacity to match with the global changes of science and technology. Kajimbwa (2002) supports the above challenge that there was a large demand of farm implements and artisans tools, and that this demand could not be met. His (ibid) findings revealed that low technological capacity of village

blacksmiths, a situation typical and persisted for many years in many parts of the country. The reasons for this persistence were given as problems of accessing raw materials, inappropriate working tools, low skills and unfavorable work organization. All together were the barriers of the programme.

Other views point out directly to the poor leadership of the local government as reflection of the central government. One respondent from regional secretariat staff went further to point out that:

“ Our Local Government Authorities have critical problems of misuse of funds, resources, human resource management, procurement problems, etc and CAG has with them of embezzlement but they are not taken any discipline measures against them.

All these are reflections of weak leadership in managerial positions”.

From the above quote, it is noted that Rural Integrated Project support died slowly due poor leadership. Musoka (2017) points out that although there are laws and regulations that guide Local Government Authorities, they require a good level of leadership innovation in order to address all issues and challenges facing them. In some situation innovations are required to not only manage the immediate situation but also avoid re-occurrence of the problem. Leaders who are innovative enough are endowed with good managerial skills for solving the problems of people, particularly poor rural people by mobilizing them and creating conducive environment for them to do what will solve their problems, rather than relying of public funds. It is leadership that transforms their mindset so that may be empowered to control their own resources (Musoka, 2017).

Another challenge that was mentioned by respondents was the application of top-down approach used in this programme. In spite the mission and goals of the project, which was firmly rooted in the participatory bottom-up approach of decision-making, in a real sense, the top-down approach still seemed to run the programme. The Facilitation Service Centre Coordination Meeting (FSCCM) who was the final decision-making of the programme monopolized everything and did not any room to poor rural people to provide their views on the established programme. This was contrary to the whole concept of participatory planning and development because in participation processes must recipient communities be always the source of project ideas because they are ones who are affected by the problems and not the top management. The outcomes of this approach led to members of communities to disagree with the experts about what is needed in their villages.

Lack of education among the beneficiaries of the programme had been seen as another challenge to the implementation of this programme. It has been argued that there was high rate of illiteracy (55%) of the rural poor people in Musoma rural district. Most people did not know how to read, write and count, and a person who does not know how to read, write and count is always likely

to be cheated by technocrats (Meli, 2004). In this regards, some of poor rural people did not see the importance of the programme because of high illiteracy level. Abadzi (2003) points out that illiteracy particular limit a person's ability to access, understanding and applying knowledge to combat with surrounding problems. He (ibid) goes further that illiterate people are more likely to have the following impact;

- Poverty life
- Parents with little schooling
- Difficult with living conditions
- Limited ability to obtain and understand essential information
- Unemployment
- Reduced access to lifelong learning and professional development
- Precarious financial position

6.0 Conclusions: the future of established Programme

Looking at the discussion above, a number of conclusions can be made from this paper. The discussion above reveals that a number of important findings, and reaffirms some of the questions frequently raised about participatory planning and development processes. During the initial stage of programme, it worked very well according to its mission, and rural people enjoyed the project because they were empowered and sometimes they felt that they were part and parcel of the project. This was due to the fact the programme used bottom-up approach in supporting participatory planning and development. This is because the programme mission was to raise and improve the quality of life style among Tanzanians' poor rural people. But as the day went on the mission and its goals of the programme began to deteriorate. The main challenge of the programme was weakness of leadership of the programme and poor managerial councils. The programme did not work effectively due the fact that the technical staffs that pioneered the programme lose their integrity and used the programme for their private gains rather than public gains. This situation made technical officials to be corrupt and forgot the mission and goals of the programme. The application of top-down approach was also demoralizing the majority of people because they did not feel as part and parcel of the project.

7. O What is the way forward?

It is true that the mission and goals of Musoma Rural Integrated Project Support were good although it faced several challenges which accelerated to fail of the programme. The following measures should be taken by both local government authorities and people to avoid the mistakes which might occur again to any programme established to the poor rural people.

- Provision of education among village dwellers to enable them to be aware of what is going on
- Civic education against corruption should be given to all people especially leaders
- Application of bottom-up approach and not applying top-down approach
- Government should improve social services delivery in rural areas
- The politicians should not intervene the technocrats' job
- Employment opportunities should be given to rural youths so as to empower them
- Government through Local Government Authority, NGOs, Civil Society and CBO should
make sure that they support informal sector by giving them loans from financial institutions

8.0 References

- Abadzi, H (2003). *Improving Adult Literacy Outcomes: Lessons from Cognitive Research for Developing Countries*, Lusaka, Pretty Press.
- Bradshaw, (2003). “.Questioning the Credibility and Capacity of Community-based Resource Management” *The Canadian Geographer*, Vol47.
- Chambers, R, (1994). “The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal”. *World Development*
- Cooke, B and Kothari, U (2001). *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London, New York, Zed Books
- Eade, D, (1997). *Capacity Building: An Approach to people-Centered Development*, Oxfam UK, An
- Glicken, J, (2000). “Getting Stakeholder Participation right: A Discussion of Participatory Processes and Possible Pitfalls, *Environment Science and policy* 3, (2000), Elsevier Science Ltd Oxfam Publication.
- Kajimbwa, M, (2002). *Facilitative Managerial Innovations towards Local Democratization: An*

- Assessment of rural Integrated project Support, Dares Salaam,
- Kasiaka, K, (2004). “Participatory Planning and Sustainability of Water Aid and TASAF Projects: A Case Study of Temeke Municipality,” Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of Dares Salaam.
- Kasuka, Y, M, (2013). The Performance of Kinondoni Municipal Council: Accountability and . Transparency at Wards Level, MBA Dissertation, Mzumbe University
- Kpierekoh, J. (2001). Participatory Planning: Fostering Stakeholders Engagement in Sustainable Land Management, London, Inc press
- Lecuwis, C, (2000). “Reconceptualizing Participation for Sustainable Rural Development”, in Cooke and Kothari (2002).
- Maier, K, (2001). “Citizen Participation in Planning: Climbing the Ladder”? European Planning Studies, Vol9, No 6.
- Meli, B, (2004). Factors Contributing to Poor teaching by Primary School Teachers, Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of Dares Salaam.
- Mohan, G, (2001). “Beyond Participation Strategies for Deeper Empowerment”, in Cooke and Kothari (2001)
- Mongula, B, (1976). “Regional Development Planning and Mass Participation”. Unpublished MA. Dissertation, University of dares Salaam.
- Morrisey, J, (2000). “Indicators of Citizen Participation: Lessons from Learning Teams in Rural Communities”, *Community Development Journal*, Vol35 No 1.
- Research on Poverty Alleviation (REPOA), (2005). Researching Poverty in Tanzania: Problems, policies and Perspectives: Chapter 6: foreign Aid, Grassroots Participation and Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania Dares Salaam, Mkuki na Nyota Press.
- Marcossy, A, M. (2017). Why Is Tanzania Poor? The Role of social Accountability in Poverty Reduction,. USA, Amazon Press.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Finland, (2005). Partnership for Change: Experience in Democratic

Partnerships for Poverty Reduction from Lindi and Mtwara, Tanzania, Scanagri

Finland Oy

Mosse, D (2001). “Peoples’ Knowledge, Participation and Patronage: operations Representations in rural Development”, in Cooke and Kothari (2001).

Musoka, C, (2017). The Role of Leadership in Urban Development: Reflections from Selected Urban Centers in Tanzania, *Tanzania Journal of Development Studies, Vol15, NO1&2*

United Republic of Tanzania (URT)/PO-RALG, (1998). Policy Paper on Local Government