

Yusuf, Muchelule; Otonde, Mbawi Geoffrey; Achayo, Muchelule Saada

## Article

# Influence of monitoring and evaluation on performance of constituency development fund projects In Kajiado East Sub-County, Kenya

The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT)

## Provided in Cooperation with:

North American Institute of Science and Information Technology (NAISIT), Toronto

*Suggested Citation:* Yusuf, Muchelule; Otonde, Mbawi Geoffrey; Achayo, Muchelule Saada (2017) : Influence of monitoring and evaluation on performance of constituency development fund projects In Kajiado East Sub-County, Kenya, The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT), ISSN 1923-0273, NAISIT Publishers, Toronto, Iss. 23, pp. 12-26

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/178835>

## Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

## Terms of use:

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

An official publication of The North American  
Institute of Science and Information Technology

ISSN:1923-0265

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF**

# **Management Science and Information Technology**



NAISIT  
PUBLISHERS ■■■

[www.naisit.org](http://www.naisit.org)

# **The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT)**

NAISIT Publishers

Editor in Chief

J. J. Ferreira, University of Beira Interior, Portugal, Email: jjmf@ubi.pt

Associate Editors

Editor-in-Chief: João J. M. Ferreira, University of Beira interior, Portugal

Main Editors:

Fernando A. F. Ferreira, University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal and University of Memphis, USA

José M. Merigó Lindahl, University of Barcelona, Spain

Vanessa Ratten, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

Assistant Editors:

Cristina Fernandes, Polytechnic Institute of Castelo Branco, Portugal

Jess Co, University of Southern Queensland, Australia

Marjan S. Jalali, University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal

Editorial Advisory Board:

Adebimpe Lincoln, Cardiff School of Management, UK

Aharon Tziner, Netanya Academic College, Israel

Alan D. Smith, Robert Morris University, Pennsylvania, USA

Ana Maria G. Lafuente, University of Barcelona, Spain

Anastasia Mariussen, Oslo School of Management, Norway

Christian Serarols i Tarrés, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain

Cindy Millman, Business School -Birmingham City university, UK

Cristina R. Popescu Gh, University of Bucharest, Romania

Dessy Irawati, Newcastle University Business School, UK

Domingo Ribeiro, University of Valencia, Spain

Elias G. Carayannis, Schools of Business, USA

Emanuel Oliveira, Michigan Technological University, USA

Francisco Liñán, University of Seville, Spain

Harry Matlay, Birmingham City University, UK

Helen Lawton Smith, Birkbeck, University of London, UK

Irina Purcarea, Adjunct Faculty, ESC Rennes School of Business, France

Jason Choi, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, HK

João Ricardo Faria, University of Texas at El Paso, USA

Jose Vila, University of Valencia, Spain

Kiril Todorov, University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria

Louis Jacques Filion, HEC Montréal, Canada

Luca Landoli, University of Naples Federico II, Italy

Luiz Ojima Sakuda, Researcher at Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

Mário L. Raposo, University of Beira Interior, Portugal

Marta Peris-Ortiz, Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain

Michele Akoorie, The University of Waikato, New Zealand

Pierre-André Julien, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Canada

Radwan Karabsheh, The Hashemite University, Jordan

Ricardo Chiva, Universitat Jaume I, Spain

Richard Mhlanga, National University of Science and Technology, Zimbabwe

Rodrigo Bandeira-de-Mello, Fundação Getulio Vargas – Brazil  
Roel Rutten, Tilberg University - The Netherlands  
Rosa Cruz, Instituto Superior de Ciências Económicas e Empresariais, Cabo Verde  
Roy Thurik, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands  
Sudhir K. Jain, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India  
Susana G. Azevedo, University of Beira Interior, Portugal  
Svend Hollensen, Copenhagen Business University, Denmark  
Walter Frisch, University of Vienna, Austria  
Zinta S. Byrne, Colorado State University, USA

#### Editorial Review Board

Adem Ögüt, Selçuk University Turkey, Turkey  
Alexander B. Sideridis, Agricultural University of Athens, Greece  
Alexei Sharpanskykh, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
Ali Kara, Pennsylvania State University -York, York, USA  
Angilberto Freitas, University of Grande Rio, Brazil  
Arminda do Paço, University of Beira Interior, Portugal  
Arto Ojala, University of Jyväskylä, Finland  
Carla Marques, University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Portugal  
Carla Pereira, University of Beira Interior, Portugal  
Cem Tanova, Çukurova University, Turkey  
Cristiano Tolfo, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil  
Cristina S. Estevão, Polytechnic Institute of Castelo Branco, Portugal  
Dario Miocevic, University of Split, Croatia  
Davood Askarany, The University of Auckland Business School, New Zealand  
Debra Revere, University of Washington, USA  
Denise Kolesar Gormley, University of Cincinnati, Ohio, USA  
Dickson K.W. Chiu, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong  
Domènec Melé, University of Navarra, Spain  
Dina Miragaia, University of Beira Interior, Portugal  
Emerson Mainardes, FUCEPE Business School, Brazil  
Eric E. Otenyo, Northern Arizona University, USA  
George W. Watson, Southern Illinois University, USA  
Gilnei Luiz de Moura, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Brazil  
Jian An Zhong, Department of Psychology, Zhejiang University, China  
Joana Carneiro Pinto, Faculty of Human Sciences, Portuguese Catholic University, Lisbon, Portugal  
Joaquín Alegre, University of Valencia, Spain  
Joel Thierry Rakotobe, Anisfield School of Business, New Jersey, USA  
Jonathan Matusitz, University of Central Florida, Sanford, FL, USA  
Kailash B. L. Srivastava, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India  
Karin Sanders, University of Twente, The Netherlands  
Klaus G. Troitzsch, University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany  
Kuiran Shi, Nanjing University of Technology, Nanjing, China  
Liliana da Costa Faria, ISLA, Portugal  
Luiz Fernando Capretz, University of Western Ontario, Canada  
Lynn Godkin, College of Business, USA

Maggie Chunhui Liu, University of Winnipeg, Canada  
Marcel Ausloos, University of Liège, Belgium  
Marge Benham-Hutchins, Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas, USA  
María Nieves Pérez-Aróstegui, University of Granada, Spain  
Maria Rosita Cagnina, University of Udine, Italy  
Mayumi Tabata, National Dong Hwa University, Taiwan  
Micaela Pinho, Portucalense University and Lusíada University, Portugal  
Paolo Renna, University of Basilicata, Italy  
Paula Odete Fernandes, Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal  
Paulo Rupino Cunha, University of Coimbra, Portugal  
Peter Loos, Saarland University, Germany  
Pilar Piñero García, F. de Economía e Administración de Empresas de Vigo, Spain  
Popescu N. Gheorghe, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania  
Popescu Veronica Adriana, The Commercial Academy of Satu-Mare and The Bucharest University of Economic  
Studies, Bucharest, Romania  
Ramanjeet Singh, Institute of Management and Technology, India  
Ricardo Morais, Catholic University of Portugal  
Ruben Fernández Ortiz, University of Rioja, Spain  
Ruppa K. Thulasiram, University of Manitoba, Canada  
Soo Kim, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ, USA  
Wen-Bin Chiou, National Sun Yat-Sem University, Taiwan  
Willaim Lawless, Paine College, Augusta, GA, USA  
Winston T.H. Koh, Singapore Management University, Singapore

# **The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT)**

NAISIT Publishers

Issue 23 - (Jan-Mar 2017)

## **Table of Contents**

- 1        **FACTORS AFFECTING E-COMMERCE ADOPTION: A CASE OF TURKEY**  
BIRGUL BASARIR-OZEL, Bogazici University, Turkey  
SONA MARDIKYAN, Bogazici University, Turkey
- 12       **INFLUENCE OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION ON PERFORMANCE OF  
CONSTITUENCY DEVELOPMENT FUND PROJECTS IN KAJIADO EAST SUB-  
COUNTY, KENYA**  
MUCHELULE YUSUF, 1Umma University –Kajiado, Kenya  
MBAWI GEOFFREY OTONDE, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture at Technology,  
Kenya  
MUCHELULE SAADA ACHAYO, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture at  
Technology, Kenya
- 27       **MODELLING CONCEPT FOR ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS CONFORMANCE  
USING ONTOLOGY**  
TENGGU ADIL TENGGU IZHAR, Universiti Teknologi MARA , Malaysia  
TORAB TORABI, La Trobe University, Australia  
M. ISHAQ BHATTI, La Trobe University, Australia
- 49       **ANALYTIC APPROACH FOR DEPENDENCY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
DATA AND ORGANISATIONAL GOALS**  
TENGGU ADIL TENGGU IZHAR, Universiti Teknologi MARA , Malaysia  
TORAB TORABI, La Trobe University, Australia  
M. ISHAQ BHATTI, La Trobe University, Australia

This is one paper of  
The International Journal of Management Science and  
Information Technology (IJMSIT)  
Issue 23 - (Jan-Mar 2017)

## **Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on Performance of Constituency Development Fund Projects In Kajiado East Sub-County, Kenya**

Muchelule Yusuf<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Umma University –Kajiado, Kenya*

Mbawi Geoffrey Otonde<sup>2</sup>

&

Muchelule Saada Achayo

<sup>2, 3</sup>*Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology- Kakamega Campus*

### **ABSTRACT**

The objective of this study were to Establish the influence of training and Time Allocated on performance of monitoring and evaluation of Government Projects case of CDF projects in Kajiado East Sub-County and Determine how Funds available for monitoring and evaluation influence performance of monitoring and evaluation of Government Projects case of CDF projects in Kajiado East Sub- County. The study employed a descriptive survey research design. The target population was 138 respondents from which same sample of 122 was obtain from. The researcher used selected 122 respondents. Numerical data collected using questionnaires was coded and entered and analyzed with help of a computer Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 21 software programme. The data was analysed using Correlation and regression where the study used karl-pearson correlation to relate the variables. The findings of the study were, in relation to the first objective found that that the level of training on M & E was of central importance to the performance public projects, second objective found that There was a high correlation between Influence of Training and Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation, Influence of Time and Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation and Influence of Strength of Monitoring Team. M & E is important for success of any project, yet it is in most Government projects they have not been able to adopt it effectively. The role of Training, Time Management and Strength of Monitoring Team only 22.6 percent unexplained. The P- value of 0.004 (Less than 0.05) implies that the model of factors influencing performance of M & E is significant at the 95% confidence level. A continuous improvement process typically contains three activities that operate in an interactive manner in project management: Time cost and Quality

**Keyword: Time, Training, Monitoring and Evaluation, performance**



## 1.0 Introduction

Monitoring is an ongoing function that employs the systematic collection of data related to specified indicators in Public projects. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is described as a process that assists project managers in improving performance and achieving results. The goal of M&E is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact (United Nations Development Programme, 2002). Williams (2000) asserts that monitoring provides management and the main stakeholders of a development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of expected results and progress with respect to the use of allocated funds. Monitoring provides essential inputs for evaluation and therefore constitutes part of the overall evaluation procedure. Evaluation is an organized and objective assessment of an ongoing or concluded policy, program/project, its design, execution and results. The aim is to provide timely assessments of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of interventions and overall progress against original objectives. According to Ballard et al., (2010), monitoring and evaluation is a process that helps program implementers make informed decisions regarding program operations, service delivery and program effectiveness, using objective evidence.

Project M & E performance can be measured and evaluated using a large number of performance indicators that could be related to various dimensions (groups) such as time, cost, quality, client satisfaction, client changes, business performance, health and safety (Cheung et al. 2004). Time, cost and quality are, however, the predominant performance evaluation dimensions. Another interesting way of evaluating project performance is through common sets of indicators (Pheng and Chuan, 2006). Dissanayaka and Kumaraswamy (1999) found that project time and cost performances get influenced by project characteristics, procurement system, project team performance, client representation's characteristics, contractor characteristics, design team characteristics, and external conditions. Similarly, Iyer and Jha (2005), identified many factors as having influence on project cost performance, these include; project manager's competence, top management support, project manager's coordinating and leadership skills, monitoring and feedback by the participants, decision-making, coordination among project participants, owners' competence, social condition, economic condition, and climatic condition. Elyamany et al. (2007) introduced a performance evaluation model for construction companies in order to provide a proper tool for the company's owners, shareholders and funding agencies to evaluate the performance of construction companies in Egypt.

The CDF Act 2013 stipulates that the responsibility of CDF projects monitoring and evaluation is vested on the CDFC and the CDF board who may also obligate PMCs the functions of supervising the projects that are on-going and respond on such projects. The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) in Kenya was established through CDF Act (2003) and Amended in 2007. The CDF Act and Implementation Guidelines place great emphasis on the monitoring and evaluation of CDF money. In CDF, the responsibility of monitoring is placed upon the

various stakeholders. To be effective, monitoring must ask the right questions, investigate the real issues and generate relevant information to enable those monitoring the project to make an accurate assessment of the project. Unfortunately, at present, the monitoring systems instituted under the CDF Act are not thorough enough. Most CDF monitoring exercises entail visits to the project site and a verbal report on the project, which gives a very superficial picture. Chapter 12 gives some suggestions on how CDF monitoring and reporting can be strengthened and deepened (The CDF social Guide book, 2008).

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

There have also been concerns on governance and representation, and that the funds had been established in a rush without preparing the grassroots communities on participation in the management of the fund. Issues on conflict of interest were raised around the proposed structure for the management of the CDF, arising from the role of MPs as the conveners of CDCs. The existing monitoring and evaluation (M & E) mechanisms of such funds are said to be weak due to poor accountability; improper procurement and tendering; over-invoicing; wasteful expenditure; and lack of openness in the budget process. A research by Wambugu (2008), in Dagoretti Constituency reveals that there is political interference on the implementation of CDF projects which leads to underperforming of CDF projects in the period of study. The performance of the CDF is to be determined or measured by reduction in poverty index, improved infrastructure, better education facilities, improved health care as well as completion of the said CDF funded projects. Mutunga (2010), reports that public funds go to waste since CDF projects stall and yet the government keeps pumping more money into the kitty. It further reports that in some areas within the country, most of the projects have either stalled or failed to kick off; in others, shoddy performance by merchants had been noted. However, no systematic study has been carried out and revealed to the public to support these arguments. A report by Mars Group 2012, reveals that project that were initiated between 2009 and 2013 amounting to over 12 billion most of them are yet to be completed( Mars Group, 2013).

It is upon this that this study will investigate Factors Influencing Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Kenya. This has posed a knowledge gap which this study seeks to fill, particularly Projects Initiated by Constituency Development Fund in Kajiado East Sub-County that has continually made poverty index to go up, instead of reducing and the public not having a better quality of life which is the core objective of the CDF as stipulated in the Act 2003 (CDF Act, 2003).

The objectives of this study were:

- i. *Establish the extend of training on Performance of monitoring and evaluation of Government Projects*

- ii. *Determine how Time Allocated for monitoring and evaluation influence performance of monitoring and evaluation of Government Projects*

## **2.0 Literature Review**

Managing development projects require an operational M&E system. The M & E system is the set of planning, information gathering and synthesis, reflection, and reporting processes, along with the necessary supporting conditions and capacities required for the outputs of M & E to make valuable contributions to decision making and learning. A well-functioning M & E system manages to integrate the more formal, data-orientated side commonly associated with the task of M&E together with informal monitoring and communication, such as project field staff sharing impressions of their fieldwork with each other and their managers over lunch (or coffee). Clear definition of the purpose and scope of the intended M & E system helps when deciding of issues such as budget levels, number of indicators to track, type of communication needed and so forth. When formulating the project purpose at appraisal or revising it during start-up, ask yourself the following questions; What are the main reasons to set up and implement M & E for implementing partners and primary stakeholders –and for other key stakeholders

### **2.1 Training and Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation**

The technical capacity of the organization in conducting evaluations, the value and participation of its human resources in the policymaking procedure, their incentive to impact resolutions, that can be enormous determinants of how the evaluation's lessons are made, conversed and perceived (Vanessa and Gala, 2011). Human capitals on the project should be given clear job allocation and designation be fitting their skill, if they are insufficient then training for the necessary skills should be set. For projects using staff that are referred out in the field to carry out project activities on their own there is need for constant and intensive onsite support to the field staff (Ramesh, 2002). Individual of the larger aspects of developing employee's skills and abilities is the actual organizational focus on the employee to turn out to be better, either as a individual or as a contributor to the firm. The responsiveness by the organization coupled with increased expectations following the opportunity can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of enhanced output by the employee, (Pearce and Robinson, 2004).

Foresti, (2007), argues this means not objectively training, but a whole suite of learning approaches: from secondments to research institutes and opportunities to work on impact evaluations within the organization or somewhere else to improve their performance, to time spent by project staff in evaluation section and similarly, time taken by evaluators in the ground. Evaluation must also be autonomous and relevant. Independence is attained when it is carried out by firms and persons free of the control of those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention; OECD, (2002) and Gaarder and Briceno, (2010). The study shows that it is vital to determine what methods are appropriate to the users' needs the given

context and subjects of data, baseline and indicators, (Hulme, 2000). In spite of the fact that the Constituencies Development Fund disbursement is growing at higher rate, the Fund commits 2% of its budget for capacity building into which Monitoring and Evaluation of CDF Projects involved. What is required of the Board and in addition, the community level organs together with which it functions cannot be met by the existing capacity both in terms of human resources as well as existing skills, CDF Board, Strategic Plan, (2011).

In order to carry out monitoring evaluation efficiently, there are some critical factors that essential be taken into the version. These comprise use of pertinent skills, sound methods, adequate resources and accountability, in order to be a quality (Jones et al, 2009). The resources include skilled personnel and financial resources. Rogers (2008) suggests the use of multi-stakeholders' dialogs in data collection, hypothesis testing and in the intervention, in order to let bigger involvement and recognize the differences that may arise. All these must be done within a supportive institutional framework while being cognizant of political influence

## **2.2 Time and Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation**

Time dimension of assessing project success is the most common aspect brought out in the literature review. Pretorius et al (2012) found out that project management organizations with mature time management practices produce more successful projects than project management organizations with less mature time management practices. Project time is the absolute time that is calculated as the number of days/weeks from start on site to practical completion of the project. Speed of project implementation is the relative time (Chan, 2001). Peterson & Fisher (2009) established that construction firms are usually interested in monitoring project time variance and verifying contractor progress payments requests. Kariungi, (2014) expressed that energy sector projects were completed on time due to factors such as efficient procurement procedures, favorable climatic factors, timely availability of funds and proper utilization of project planning tools. Project completion within scope is considered as one of the success factor. The project charter or statement of work requires the implementers to develop a scope of work that was achievable in a specified period and that contained achievable objectives and milestones, (Bredillet, 2009).

Monitoring gives information on where a policy, program, or project is at any given time (and over time) relative to respective targets and outcomes. It is descriptive in intent. Evaluation gives evidence of why targets and outcomes are or are not being achieved. It seeks to address issues of causality. Of particular emphasis here is the expansion of the traditional M&E function to focus explicitly on outcomes and impacts (Channah Sorah, 2003). Evaluation is a complement to monitoring in that when a monitoring system sends signals that the efforts are going off track (for example, that the target population is not making use of the services, that costs are accelerating, that there is real resistance to adopting an innovation, and so forth), then good evaluative information can help clarify the realities and trends noted with the monitoring system.

For example, “If annual performance information is presented by itself (in isolation) without the context and benefit of program evaluation, there is a danger of program managers, legislators and others drawing incorrect conclusions regarding the cause of improvements or declines in certain measures. Simply looking at trend data usually cannot tell us how effective our government program interventions were” (ChannahSorah, 2003). We stress the need for good evaluative information throughout the life cycle. An M & E system should be regarded as a long-term effort, as opposed to an episodic effort for a short period or for the duration of a specific project, program, or policy. Sustaining such systems within governments or organizations recognizes the long term process involved in ensuring utility (for without utility, there is no logic for having such a system). Specifically, we will examine six critical components of sustaining results-based M & E systems, the importance of incentives and disincentives in sustaining M & E systems, possible hurdles in sustaining a results-based M&E system, validating and evaluating M&E systems and information; and M & E stimulating positive cultural change in governments and organizations (ChannahSorah, 2003).

### **2.3 Theoretical Review**

Theory of Effective Project Implementation according to Nutt, (2006) puts a series of steps taken by responsible organizational agents to plan change process to elicit compliance needed to install changes. Managers use implementation to make planned changes in organizations by creating environments in which changes can survive and be rooted (Nutt, 2006). Implementation is a procedure directed by a manager to install planned changes in an organization. There is widespread agreement that managers are the key process actors and that the intent of implementation is to install planned changes, whether they be novel or routine. However, procedural steps in implementation have been difficult to specify because implementation is ubiquitous (Nutt, 2006). A study by Edward Njenga (2013), On Factors Influencing performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Projects (A Case Study Of Machakos District), found that monitoring and evaluation budget, stakeholders’ participation, M & E plan, source of funding (donor) and training in M&E had a positive relation with the probability of implementing M & E which was significant at 95% confidence level. However, M&E guidelines were found to have no effect on implementation of M & E. Based on results of the study concluded that performance of Monitoring and Evaluation is important in providing the feedback mechanism of economic development interventions.

### **3.0 Research Methods**

This study employed a descriptive survey research design. The population for this study was CDF M & E Committee members, head of projects funded by CDF in Kajiado East Sub county, 3 Project Committee members from the 28 projects this are Chaiman, Secretary and Treasurer, Community Leaders drawn from the four wards of Kajiado East Constituency this leaders are religious leaders, Youth leaders and women leaders. The sample size is based on table of Krejcie

and Morgan (1970) as adopted by Sekaran and Bougie (2010). Thus, the sample size for this study was 138 from the population. However, the researcher decided to distribute 138 questionnaires in consideration of late responses and rejected questionnaires. The study targeted CDF M & E Committee members, head of the 28 projects funded by CDF in Kajiado East Sub County, Community Leaders drawn from wards of Kajiado East Sub County were religious leaders, youth leaders and women leaders. This was necessary because the technique gave all people a chance of being selected into the sample. The main tools of data collection for this study were questionnaires. The findings from the pilot study were 0.67, the 0.3 difference in the reliability as per the Cronbach 0.7 was corrected by adjusting the questionnaire. The data was also be analyzed using Correlation regression; the study used Spearson correlation to relate the variables, while multiple regressions was guided by the model specification

## **4.0 Findings and Discussions**

### **4.1 Sample characteristics**

The results show that 77(63%) of the respondents were males while 45 (27%) of the respondents were females. This implies that there were more male respondents than females who took part in M & E of CDF projects in Kajiado East Sub-county, the gender findings indicate that most men took part in M & E of CDF projects in Kajiado East Sub-county. 44 (36%) of the respondents were between 30 - 40 years of age were the majority, those of the age between 19 - 29 years with 32 (26%), those between 41 - 51 years were 19 (16%), and those with ages 52 years and above were 27 (22%) young people are more active and likely to participate in M & E process. Majority of the respondents 50 (41%) had Primary education, 39 (32%) were Secondary leavers, 19 (16%) Never attended school and 14(11%) were College/University from the findings the low level of M & E participation in Kajiado East Sub-county is because of low level of education as, Majority of the respondents 50 (41%) had Primary education and 14(11%) had College/University education.

### **4.2 Training and Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation**

The study first sought to establish the extend of Training and its influence to performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of the respondents. The results on this are given in Table 1. The results show that the majority of the respondents indicated that Human capitals on the project should be given clear job allocation and designation be fitting their skill influence performance of monitoring and evaluation of Government Projects the case of CDF projects in Kajiado East Sub-County to a Very high extent with a mean of (3.767), The technical capacity of the organization in conducting evaluations, the value and participation of its human resources in the policymaking procedure, their incentive to impact resolutions, that can be enormous determinants of how the evaluation's lessons are made to a High extent with a mean of (3.453),



The responsiveness by the organization coupled with increased expectations following the opportunity can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of enhanced output by the employee Moderately high extent (3.045), and In order to carry out monitoring evaluation efficiently, there are some critical factors that essential be taken into the version to a Very low extent with a mean of (2.712). The respondents were further asked to express their view on how Level of training influences implementation of monitoring and evaluation of influence performance of monitoring and evaluation of Government Projects. They argued that untrained staff will have a challenge in implementation of M & E thus poor results whereas trained and knowledgeable teams or stakeholders are key in ensuring quality M & E and implementation of all projects on keys issues like quality feedback and information on program planning and design. Other factors mentioned included acquiring managerial skills necessary in training of staffs, improving project visits, and securing funds to enable swift and efficient running M & E activities.

**Table 1 Training and Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation**

Statement	mean	std
Human capitals on the project should be given clear job allocation and designation be fitting their skill	3.767	0.687
If they are insufficient then training for the necessary skills should be set.	3.453	0.598
The responsiveness by the organization coupled with increased expectations following the opportunity can lead to a self-fulfillin prophecy of enhanced output by the employee,	3.045	0.563
Independence is attained when it is carried out by firms and persons free of the control of those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention	3.004	0.532
In spite of the fact that the Constituencies Development Fund disbursement is growing at higher rate, the Fund commits 2% of it budget for capacity building into which Monitoring and Evaluation o f CDF Projects involved	2.873	0.481
What is required of the Board and in addition, the community level organs together with which it functions, cannot be met by the existin capacity both in terms of human resources as well as existing skills CDF Board, Strategic Plan,	2.783	0.455
In order to carry out monitoring evaluation efficiently, there are some critical factors that essential be taken into the version	2.712	0.402

#### 4.3 Time Allocated to Monitoring and Evaluation and Its Influence on Performance

The study found out that majority of the respondents agreed to Very high extent that Evaluation gives evidence of why targets and outcomes are or are not being achieved with a mean of (3.875). An M & E system should be regarded as a long-term effort, as opposed to an episodic effort for a short period or for the duration of a specific project, program, or policy to a High extent with a mean of (3.654), Evaluation is a complement to monitoring in that when a monitoring system sends signals that the efforts are going off track to a moderately high extent rate with a mean of (3.643), Evaluation gives evidence of why targets and outcomes are or are not being achieved Very low extent. (3.456). Respondents' opinions were also sought at establishing how stakeholders' Time allocated for M & E influence

implementation of M & E Government initiated projects in Kajiado East Sub- County, they pointed out lack of support by CDF office in allocating funds required to reinforce M & E activities. Interviewees pointed out that Time dimension of assessing project success is the most common aspect brought out in the literature review they pointed out that project management organizations with mature time management practices produce more successful projects than project management organizations with less mature time management practices. Project time is the absolute time that is calculated as the number of days/weeks from start on site to practical completion of the project. Speed of project implementation is the relative time. Pretorius et' al (2012) found out that project management organizations with mature time management practices produce more successful projects than project management organizations with less mature time management practices. Project time is the absolute time that is calculated as the number of days/weeks from start on site to practical completion of the project. Speed of project implementation is the relative time (Chan, 2001)

**Table 2 Time Allocated to Monitoring and Evaluation**

	mean	std
Monitoring gives information on where a policy, program, or project is at any given time (and over time) relative to respective targets and outcomes.	3.875	0.634
Evaluation gives evidence of why targets and outcomes are or are not being achieved.	3.456	0.685
Evaluation is a complement to monitoring in that when a monitoring system sends signals that the efforts are going off track (for example, that the target population is not making use of the services, that costs are accelerating, that there is real resistance to adopting an innovation, and so forth), then good evaluative information can help clarify the realities and trends noted with the monitoring system.	3.643	0.643
An M&E system should be regarded as a long-term effort, as opposed to an episodic effort for a short period or for the duration of a specific project, program, or policy	3.654	0.641
Sustaining such systems within governments or organizations recognizes the long term process involved in ensuring utility (for without utility, there is no logic for having such a system).	3.584	0.611

#### **4.4 Effect of training and time on Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation**

The coefficient of determination (the percentage variation in the dependent variable being explained by the changes in the independent variables)  $R^2$  equals 0.774 (77.4%), that is, the influence of Training, Costs, Time and Strength of Monitoring Team only 22.6 percent unexplained. The P- value of 0.001 (Less than 0.05) implies that the model of Performance of Monitoring & Evaluation is significant at the 95% confidence level. The ANOVA results indicate that the independent variables significantly ( $F=11.640$ , was significant at 0.04 per



cent level (Sig.  $F < .005$ ) thus confirming the fitness of the model Analysis in table below shows that the coefficient of determination (the percentage variation in the dependent variable being explained by the changes in the independent variables).

**Table 3 Regression Results**

	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients			
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	.023	1.040	0.053	0.021	0.004
Training	.940	.130	0.061	0.519	0.003
Time	0.113		0.145	0.056	0.459
R Square	0.87				
Adjusted R square	0.774				
F	4.971				
Sig.	0.001				

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of M & E

$X_1 = 0.940$ , shows that one unit change in Card Training results in 0.940 units increase in Influencing Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Kenya: A Case of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Kajiado East Sub-County. the results showed that training of M & E to both the committee members and other beneficiaries of the CDF projects on M & E skills and The results show that the majority of the respondents indicated that Human capitals on the project should be given clear job allocation and designation be fitting their skill influence performance of monitoring and evaluation of Government Projects the case of CDF projects in Kajiado East Sub- County to a high extent with a mean of (3.767) were found to influence implementation of monitoring and evaluation of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Kajiado East Sub- County, there untrained staff will have a challenge in implementation of M&E thus poor results whereas trained and knowledgeable teams or stakeholders are key in ensuring quality M&E and implementation of all projects on keys issues like quality feedback and information on program planning and design.

$X_3 = .113$ , shows that one unit change in Time frame results in 0.113 units increase in Influencing Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Kenya: A Case of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Kajiado East Sub-County. therefore the study concludes that short time allocation to M & E are some of the challenges that constantly face the project monitoring function of Government Projects in Kenya: the Case of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Kajiado East Sub-County. Pretorius et' al (2012), found out that project management organizations with mature time management practices produce more successful projects than project management organizations with less mature time management practices. Project time is the absolute time that is calculated as the number of days/weeks from start on site to practical completion of the project. Speed of project implementation is the relative time (Chan, 2001).

### **Conclusions and Recommendation**

For the first objective that was to determine how Training Influence Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Kenya: A Case of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Kajiado East Sub County, the results showed that training of M & E to both the committee members and other beneficiaries of the CDF projects on M & E skills and The results show that the majority of the respondents indicated that Human capitals on the project should be given clear job allocation and designation be fitting their skill influence performance of monitoring and evaluation of Government Projects the case of CDF projects in Kajiado East Sub County. This is due to the fact that the respondents stated that lack of proper training on M & E and inappropriate tools inhibit proper monitoring and evaluation. The study found that untrained staff will have a challenge in implementation of M & E thus poor results whereas trained and knowledgeable teams or stakeholders are key in ensuring quality M & E and implementation of all projects on keys issues like quality feedback and information on program planning and design.

The second objective Time and Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation concluded from the study that financial management influence implementation of M & E. The study reveals time frame to conduct M & E is very important for project success, this suggest that Time frame allocated for M & E has a strong effect performance of M & E. If the time frame is short then the essence of conducting M & E became irrelevant, therefore the study conclude that short time allocation to M & E are some of the challenges that constantly face the project monitoring function of Government Projects in Kenya: A Case of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Kajiado East Sub County. There was a high correlation between Influence of Training and Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation. M & E is important for success of any project, yet it is in most Government projects they have not been able to adopt it effectively. The role Training and Time Management only 22.6 percent unexplained. A continuous improvement process typically contains three activities that operate in an interactive manner in project management: Time cost and

The paper has the following recommendations to make with regard to Influencing Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Kenya. The factors Influencing Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Kenya have numerous weaknesses, which if not redressed will seriously affect the success of the program. These include funds required in carrying out some running costs of traversing the vast Kajiado East Sub County and payments like allowances for M & E committee are inadequate leading to poor execution of M & E activities. Due to inadequate financial resources and expenditure restrictions by treasury, team charge for M & E is therefore unable to carry out continuous M&E and develop a proper M&E system. There is need to include all stakeholders in project M & E in each stage as they play an active role since they are the consumers of the project for the sake of sustainability. Cooperation of stakeholders should also be encouraged. The study also recommends that further research should be carried out on; determining how to strengthen primary stakeholders' participation M & E Government Projects particularly how to ensure the beneficiaries can participate effectively in monitoring and evaluating projects.

## REFERENCES

- Aden (2008), Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Projects. Community Based Project Monitoring, Qualitative Impact Assessment and People Friendly Evaluation Methods. Journal, August 2008 edition Vol.6.
- Agevi (2013). Resource Requirements and Environmental Dependency. European Scientific Journal, August 2013 edition Vol.12.
- Alan, B. (2003). Triangulation Encyclopedia of Social Research Methods. SAGE Publications
- Ashley and Barney (2010). Role of Project Managers in Effective Monitoring and Evaluation Process. Economics Working Papers paper.200542 on [www.digitalcommons.ucon.edu](http://www.digitalcommons.ucon.edu) accessed on 18th March 2014.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational Research: An Introduction (Fifth ed.). New York: Longman.
- Briceno, B. and Gardner, M. 2009). 'Institutionalizing Evaluation: Review of International Experience'. Research Paper. London.
- Bruijn, H. 2007. Managing performance in the Public Sector.
- Casley D and Kumar K. (1988): The collection, Analysis and use of Monitoring and Evaluation Data. Maryland: World Bank.
- Chandran E (2004). Research methods a quantitative approach, Daystar University. Nairobi: Kenya. Pp. 3-9
- Cheema and Rondinelli (1983), Implementing Decentralization Policies. An Introduction in Decentralization and Development: Policy Development in Developing Countries.11. Sage publications.
- Chen, H.T & Rossi, P. H. (1983). Evaluating with sense: The Theory Driven Approach. Evaluation Review 7, 283 – 302.13.

- Chen, H.T. (1997). Applying mixed methods under the framework of theory-driven evaluations. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 74, 61 – 72.
- Constituencies Development Fund Board (2011). 2010 – 2014 Strategic Plan, Equitable Development for Kenyans, Government Press.
- Cooper, D.R., & Schindler, P.S. (2003). *Business Research Methods*. (8th Ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Crawford P & Bryce P., (2003). Project Monitoring and Evaluation: A method of enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21(5): 363 – 373.
- Crook Richard, (2003). Decentralization and Poverty reduction in Africa: The Politics of local Central Relations, *Public Administration Development*, 23, 77 – 7820.
- Donaldson S & Lipsey M (2003), *Roles for Theory in Contemporary Evaluation Practice: Developing Practical Knowledge, Evaluating Social Programs and Problems: Visions for the new Millennium* (pp111 –142).
- Gay, L.R. (1992). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application* (4th Ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company. 217-22.
- Government of Kenya (2003) *Constituencies Development Fund Act*  
2003.<http://www.cdf.go.ke/images/docs/revised%20cdf%20act%20annotatedversion.pdf>  
<http://www.cdf.go.ke>. Retrieved 11th April 2011.
- Government of Kenya (2003). *Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2000/03*. Government Press.
- Gyorkos T. (2003). Monitoring and Evaluation of large scale Helminth control programmes. *ActaTropic*, 86(2): 275 – 282.
- Hulme, D. (2000). ‘Impact Assessment Methodologies for Microfinance: Theory, Experience and Better Practice’, *World Development* 28 (1): 79 – 98.
- IFAD – Managing for impact in Rural Development. A guide for Project M & E31.
- Jack, E. F. (2008). Response Rates and Responsiveness for Surveys and Standard. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*. Apr 15, 2008 edition; 72(2): 43.
- Johan.M. Owen and Patricia J. Rogers, (1999). *Program Evaluation: Forms and Approaches*: (London: Sage,.33.
- Jones, N. et al. (2009). ‘Improving Impact Evaluation Coordination and Use’. A Scoping study commissioned by the DFID Evaluation Department on behalf of NONIE ([www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/3177.pdf](http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/3177.pdf)). Retrieved June 15, 2011.
- Kelly K and Magongo B. (2004): *Report on Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity of HIV/AIDS organization in Swaziland*. Swaziland: NERCHA.35.
- Kenya Human Rights Commission (KHRC, 2010). *Social and Public Accountability Network (SPN, 2010) – Harmonization of Decentralized Fund in Kenya, Towards Alignment, Citizen Engagement and Accountability*, Government Press.
- Khan, M. Adil (1989). *A south Asian Regional Study on Current Thoughts and practices in Monitoring and Evaluation*. Washington DC: Economic Development Institute of the World Bank..
- Khasnabis R (2005). *Resources for Autonomy-Financing the Local Bodies*, Salt Lake City: Manirban Calcutta Research Group. London Printers.

- Kimani F, Nekesa P. and Ndung'u B (2009). Best Practices in Constituency Development Fund, Collaborative Centre for Gender Development.
- Kombo, D. K. and Tromp, D. L. A. (2006). Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction. Paulines Publications' Africa, Nairobi.
- Krishnaswamy, J., Bawa, K. S., Ganeshaiah, K. N., & Kiran, M. C. (2009). Quantifying and mapping biodiversity and ecosystem services: Utility of a multi-season NDVI based Mahalanobis distance surrogate. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 113, 857 –867
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Litvack (2000). Rethinking Decentralisation at the World Bank, Washington DC: World Bank.
- Manor and Cook (1998). Democracy and Decentralization in South Asia and West Africa: Participation, Accountability and Performance, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mawhood (1993). Local Government in the third World: Experience of decentralization in Tropical Africa. East African Research Bureau.
- Mars Group report (2012). Public Finance Reforms in Kenya: Published by Society for International Development
- Mugenda A. & Mugenda, O., (2003). Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Acts Press, Nairobi.
- Mugenda O and Mugenda A., (2003). Research Methods, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches, Nairobi: Acts Press
- Mugenda Olive M. and A.G.Mugenda (1999). Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches: African Centre Of Technology Studies, Nairobi.
- Mugenda, A.G., (2008). Social science research, theory and principles. Published by applied research and farmer training services, Acts press
- Mwangi & Kimenyi S., (2005). Efficiency and Efficacy of Kenya's Constituency Development Fund: Theory and Evidence. Economics Working Papers paper. 200542([www.digitalcommons.ucon.edu](http://www.digitalcommons.ucon.edu)) Retrieved April 23, 2011.
- Nachmias, C.F. & Nachmias, D. (2007). Research Methods in the Social Sciences (7th Ed.). London: Worth Publishers Inc.
- Ochieng M. F., & Tubey, D. (2013). Effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation of CDF Projects in Kenya: A case of Ainamoi Constituency. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*.
- OECD. (2002). Glossary of Key terms in Evaluation and Results based Management. Paris: OECD.
- Ongoya ZE and Lumallas E. (2005). A critical Appraisal of the Constituency Development Fund Act, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Orodho J. A. (2002). Techniques of Writing Research Proposals and Reports in Education and Social Sciences. Nairobi: Masola Publishers. PASSIA: Civil Society empowerment: Monitoring and Evaluation. [www.passia.org/seminars/2002/monitoring.htm](http://www.passia.org/seminars/2002/monitoring.htm) (Accessed on 21/4/2011)59.
- Rogers P., (2009). Matching Impact Evaluation Design to the Nature of the Intervention and the purpose of the Evaluation in Designing impact evaluations: different perspectives. 3ie Working paper 4.London: 3ie ([www.3ieimpact.org/admin/pdfs\\_papers/50.pdf](http://www.3ieimpact.org/admin/pdfs_papers/50.pdf)).
- Shao, L., R., Halvorsrud, R., Bouskila, Y., Ramakers, G. M. J. , Borg-Graham, L. & Storm, J.

- F. (1999). Evidence that BK-type  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ -dependent  $\text{K}^{+}$  channels contribute to frequency-dependent action potential broadening in rat CA1 hippocampal pyramidal cells. *The Physiologist* 42, A-21
- Shapiro J., (2004): *Monitoring and Evaluation*. Johannesburg: CIVICUS.
- Smoke, (2003). *Decentralization in Africa: Goods, Dimensions, Myths and Challenges*, Public Administration and Development, Vol 23.67.
- The CDF Social Audit Guide (2008). *A Handbook for Communities* A Publication of The Open Society: Initiative Of East Africa Nairobi, Kenya UNDP, (2006). *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results*, UN: Millennium Development Goals Report 2006.
- Weiss H., (2004). On Theory – Based Evaluation: Winning Friends and Influencing People *Evaluation Exchange*, 9(4): 2 -7.
- Work, (2002). *Overview of Decentralization Worldwide: A stepping stone to improved Governance and Human Development*. A paper presented at 2nd International.