



## **Efficacy of Monitoring and Evaluation Framework on Implementation of Development Projects. A Comparative Analysis of Machakos And Embu County, Kenya**

Lukes Onyango and Njenga Gitahi  
Kabarak University

### **Abstract**

Monitoring and evaluation frameworks allow for project activities to be measured and analyzed. There is a gap in the design of M&E frameworks to generate information during the process of monitoring and evaluation and use of this information in future designs. The purpose of this research study was to establish the influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in the successful implementation of County development projects. The study was guided by the main determinants of monitoring and evaluation which are: Monitoring and Evaluation framework dimensions results based performance indicators, learning capacity, participatory tracking and beneficiary accountability. The moderating effects was Government funding and disbursement of funds. The research adopted a descriptive survey design with a mixed method centered within a wider exploratory, cross-sectional framework. The study was conducted in Machakos and Embu County. The population of this study was 132 staff mandated to monitor and evaluate projects undertaken under County government devolved functions from Machakos and Embu County. A sample of 99 respondents was determined and individual elements in different categories were also determined using Stratified random sampling technique. Questionnaires were distributed to respondents through “drop and pick later” method and were subjected to a reliability test using Cronbach’s alpha and their response was analyzed quantitatively by means of SPSS. A normality test was conducted using the Shapiro Wilk’s test. Factor analysis was undertaken to determine which of the factors are important in determining project completion. The research findings were subjected to regression and correlation analysis to establish the effect and relationship between the independent and dependent variables using a multiple regression model. Data was then be summarized and presented using data tables, percentages and frequency tables. The results were discussed and conclusions made from the objectives. Recommendations were made according to the conclusions made.

**Key Words:** Beneficiary Accountability, Learning and Adaptive Capacity Monitoring and Evaluation, Performance Indicators, Participatory tracking.

### **1.1 Background of the Study**

The concepts of monitoring and evaluation are usually approached together, as a function of project management, which provides a real perspective upon the stage of the financed project, in order to make all the adjustments necessary in the project implementation process. Monitoring and evaluation are regarded as core tools for enhancing the quality of project management, taking into account that in short and medium run managing complex projects will involve corresponding strategies from the financial point of view, which are supposed to respect the criteria of effectiveness, sustainability and durability (Dobrea et al., 2010). Monitoring activity supports both project managers and staff in the process of understanding whether the projects are progressing on schedule or meet their objectives, inputs, activities and deadlines (Solomon & Young, 2007).



Therefore, monitoring provides the background for reducing schedule and cost overruns (Crawford & Bryce, 2003), while ensuring that required quality standards are achieved in project implementation. At the same time, evaluation can be perceived as an instrument for helping planners and project developers to assess to what extent the projects have achieved the objectives set forth in the project documents (Field & Keller, 1997). Thus, developing a successful project usually involves the development of monitoring and evaluation systems and workflows. (Yaghootkar & Gil, 2011). By including monitoring and evaluation from the pre-project stage, both the project manager and the project team will be providing themselves with thorough and ongoing feedback systems (Stead & Stead, 2003) that will allow them to make timely management decisions without waiting for the results of an evaluation.

Even if the monitoring and evaluation processes are complementary and are part of the same project management function, they are regarded separately (Pollack, 2007). Each supports the other although they seek to ask different questions. Monitoring is based on a current management practice with a focus on improving day-to-day project operation, while evaluation uses a research framework to evaluate the extent to which project objectives have been met or surpassed (Sheperd, 1994). Monitoring and evaluation plays an important role in the wider project planning and implementation cycle of an organisation.

#### 1.1.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Concept

Monitoring has been defined by many authors in different ways. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2002) defined monitoring as a continuous function that uses systematic collection of data on specific indicators to provide management and main stakeholders of an on-going development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives. Evaluation on the other hand is a systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy with the aim of determining relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

Monitoring and evaluation are essential to improving project effectiveness. Effective project monitoring allows a project team to make appropriate decisions on a day-to-day basis and ensures that projects are carried out as planned, and modified when necessary. Evaluation enables project managers to understand and demonstrate the results of their work, determine the best strategies for achieving the project objectives and document lessons learned to improve future programmes (Kasule, 2016).

The success of projects plays a key role in achieving growth and development. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems provide the means to compile and integrate this valuable information into the policy cycle, thus providing the basis for sound governance and accountable public policies. Monitoring and evaluation moves beyond emphasis on inputs and outputs to a greater focus on outcomes and impacts (namely, results) of development projects and programmes (Kusek and Rist, 2004). Effective policy making requires information on whether governments are doing things right and whether they achieve the results intended. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems provide the means to compile and integrate this valuable information into the policy cycle, thus providing the basis for sound governance and accountable public policies.



One common feature of all the types of monitoring and evaluation is the collection of information and reporting on the progress made in project implementation. Traditional monitoring and evaluation collects information and reports on project activities and outputs, while participatory monitoring and evaluation is more concerned with collecting and reporting the participation of all stakeholders. The information generated by these two types of monitoring and evaluation do not demonstrate value for county's funds being invested to benefit constituencies.

As Kusek and Rist, (2004) argue, Monitoring and Evaluation Systems and policies are crucial management tools in achieving results and meeting specific targets. Within all policy areas; what to evaluate, when to evaluate, and how to evaluate are questions of central importance. Proper evaluation demands appropriate evaluation methods, and knowing when (or when not) to use a method in relation to questions posed in a specific evaluation context is often a difficult task. This is true for evaluators (who also need to know how to apply the method) as well as for citizen of evaluations (who also need to have an opinion about the usefulness of the method being proposed by evaluators).

Monitoring activities often feed into evaluation. Evaluation is the process of determining the merit and worth (value) of a programme, serving as a basis for determining if and how a programme needs to be improved or even terminated (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). To ensure that their services or programmes are meeting the needs of their clients, organisations need to "continually obtain pertinent evaluative feedback" on their programmes and services (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Hwang and Lim (2013) also established that Monitoring and evaluating, budget performance, schedule performance and quality performance could lead to project success.

According to Flaman, Gallagher, Gonzales and Matsumoto (2001), project success involves business and direct organisational success, impacts on customer and project team, project efficiency and preparation for the future. Failure to implement projects successfully can result in unintended outcomes and impacts. This success requires an all-inclusive stakeholder monitoring and evaluation framework approaches. Yet this is often lacking, ultimately leaving most of the already started projects to tarry from implementation (Kyalo & Muturi, 2015).

#### Statement of the Problem

Kenya today faces a major transition challenge from a centralized state to one that has adopted the concept of devolution. The new political dispensation has heralded both challenges and enormous opportunity and its success will depend on how it can learn from and experiences of other decentralized and devolved countries. This emerging consensus arises from widespread displeasure with the performance of development programmes in many counties today. Scenarios suggest that the expected delivery of various development projects and programmes has not been fulfilled as per expectation.

Counties are under increasing pressure to show "value for money". Constituents and donors are demanding transparency and accountability for projects, processes since monitoring progress are far less established. Therefore, it is of little surprise that the quality of those monitoring processes can vary widely. By quality, at a minimum timeliness, relevance, reliability, accuracy,



usability and credibility. Unless monitoring processes demonstrate these characteristics, they are unlikely to improve performance and enhance accountability.

In Africa including Kenya, project management is also complicated by some factors such as lack of skills in project management, political and community or societal demands. So they lack localized approaches to create relevant outcomes. Since 1970s to 2016 lacking is learning and adaptive ability of stakeholder and their participatory tracking ability. Again, lack of evidence of stakeholder learning experience and adaptive strategies to cope with change impacts realized to reduce the failure rates.

There is inadequate stakeholder participatory tracking of projects leading to unintended outcomes and impacts. There is lack of ability to make choices and decisions allowing for continued realization of sustainable development and reduce and spread risks in the face of continuous change. Since there is no study relating to the influence of learning and adaptive capacity and participatory tracking to project implementation, in particular in Kenya, a gap that needs to be investigated exists.

In Kenya and for a long period of time, M&E has been done in an *ad hoc* manner without a coordinated system. Studies carried out in Kenya shows that quite a number of projects have been successful. For example, The Youth Enterprise Development Fund; whose objective was to increase economic opportunities for the youth as a way of enabling them to participate in nation building (Kimando, 2012). Some other studies show that one of the drawbacks of monitoring and evaluation in Kenya is failure by the management to implement the recommendations offered by the M&E team (Ochieng, 2012). These projects usually undergo the necessary monitoring and evaluation processes which are often a requirement of the law. The paradox is, despite a consensus among scholars that proper monitoring and evaluation leads to project success, there are still cases of project failure in Kenya.

Further projects fail despite heavy presence of monitoring and evaluation activities. This therefore raises serious issues as to whether the monitoring and evaluation employed is effective enough to achieve project success. The monitoring team perhaps may be lacking the necessary capacity or strength to carry out their work effectively, or they may be approaching their work using incorrect methodologies. The project monitoring team may also be lacking the necessary management support.

Each project is meant to address a specific need in a community. The biggest challenge that project initiators face is to identify the needs of the community and address the most important. The success or failure of a project can be measured in terms of how well it is addressed to the target problem it seeks to address. The problem that this study intends to address is why despite the noble ideas and commitment of findings, projects still fail to address the needs they set out to address by stalling or remaining incomplete over a long period being abandoned or even when completed fall far below expectations of the beneficiary communities.

The success of projects plays a key role in achieving organization growth and development. Project monitoring and evaluation exercise adds value to the overall efficiency of project planning, management and implementation by offering corrective action to the variances from



the expected standard. Effective service delivery therefore requires that; the principles, objectives, indicators, inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact and implementation strategies are well structured in a way that allows collection of quality data which would be used to inform policy and project implementation, hence the need for a monitoring and evaluation framework. Several projects lack the relevant local indicators making it hard to measure the outcomes and impacts change as expected. This will continue the decades of declining development achievements hindering realization of millennium development goals by 2015 (Care International, 2012; World Health Organization, 2015). Recently it is a main requirement in all policies, programs and projects of the World Bank (WB), Asian Development Bank (ADB) and international donor institutions, such as JBIC, CIDA, and USAID, among many others.

In spite of the powerful influence of monitoring and evaluations in the performance of most organisations, particularly in the public sectors, there are still skepticisms about its efficacy in terms of implementation of projects to completion. However, these skepticisms cannot overshadow the relevance of their influence on evaluation on service delivery within the public sector organisations thus the study seeks to examine the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation in achieving project success in Kenya.

### 1.3 Objectives of the study

The general objective of the study was to establish the Efficacy of Monitoring and Evaluation Framework on Implementation of Development Projects, a Comparative Analysis of Machakos and Embu County, Kenya.

#### 1.3.1 Specific objectives:

The study was guided by the following specific objectives:

- i) To determine the influence of result based performance on the implementation of development projects.
- ii) To establish the influences of learning capacity on implementation of development projects.
- iii) To examine the effects of participatory tracking on implementation of development projects.
- iv) To determine the influence of Beneficiary accountability on implementation of development projects
- v) Moderating effect of national government funding and disbursement on the implementation of development projects.

#### 1.4 Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were used for the study:

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant influence in results based performance and implementation of development projects.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no significant influence in learning capacity and implementation of development projects.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no significant influence in participatory tracking and implementation of development projects.

**H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no significant influence in Beneficiary accountability on implementation of development projects

**H<sub>05</sub>:** Moderating effect of national government funding and disbursement has no significant influence on the implementation of development projects.

## LITERATURE REVIEW



### **Theory of Effective Project Implementation**

According to Funnell & Rogers (2011), the Theory of Effective Project Implementation is a series of steps taken by responsible projects managers to plan change process to elicit compliance needed to install changes. The managers use implementation to make planned changes by creating environments that support survival of such changes (Nutt, 2006). Implementation is a procedure directed by a manager to install planned changes. 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.

### **Contingency Theory**

This theory describes how situations influence leadership actions. The Hersey Blanchard Situational Leadership Theory created by Hersey and Blanchard (2009) encourages leaders to choose a style based on the capability of their subordinates. If new subordinates need specific instructions, effective project managers tell them what to do, typically by providing comprehensive step-by-step procedures (Hersey & Blanchard, 2009). When team members know how to accomplish a task, project managers tell subordinates what needs to be done but spend less time communicating how to do it. If the project team members don't require much direction, the project leader focuses on motivating the team to produce quality results.

### **Theory of Constraints Knowledge**

Further, according to Mackey (2005), the Theory of Constraints Knowledge a constraint is anything that prevents the system from achieving its goals. This is a management paradigm that views any manageable system as being limited in achieving more of its goals by very small number of constraints. According to Eliyahu (2013), in order to ensure that the main goal of a project is achieved, various stages have to be followed. They include identification of constraints, exploring the constraints, channel resources to the constraints and finally make changes to increase constraints capacity. Eliyahu (2013) further observes that buffers should be placed before the governing constraints, thus ensuring that the constrained is never strained.

### **Complexity Theory**

This study was therefore guided by complexity theory since it offers more strengths than weaknesses in project implementation based on available literature. Complexity theory evolved from chaos theory and works on the notion that a system should not be broken down into fundamental parts to understand the whole system. The theory states that critically interactive components self-organize to form potentially evolving structures exhibiting a hierarchy of emergent system properties (Rist, Boily, & Martin, 2011). The theory acknowledges that humans by nature when living or working together are an open system. The theory differs with other traditional approaches in that it acknowledges that there are parts of the system that cannot be explained but acknowledges that there is normalcy in the randomness. Complexity theory accepts that there are simply unknowns when handling projects and the best manner to handle these would be to have a flexible process rather than a rigid contingency (Weiss, 2000). The theory further adds that too many individuals believe that certain systems are predictable and can be modeled mathematically thus becoming a major stumbling block towards the acceptance of complexity theory.

Conceptual Framework



The framework adopted by these study views performance indicators (Management support, organization capacity Baseline survey), learning capacity(Team learning, Shared vision) participatory tracking(Institutional capacity, Time, Other stakeholders) and beneficiary accountability(Feedback levels, Relationship ) as critically influencing project implementation. The framework further identifies moderating variables (Disbursements and Funding) that may influence project implementation.

**Independent Variable (IV)                      Moderating Variable                      Dependent Variable (DV)**

### **Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework Linking Independent and Dependent Variables Monitoring and Evaluation Practices**

Source: Researcher, 2017

The framework depicts the relationships between monitoring and evaluation framework and project implementation success. It conceptualizes that performance indicators, learning and adaptive capacity, participatory tracking and beneficiary accountability will influence project implementation. Disbursement and funding is a mediating variable in the relationship between monitoring and evaluation and the project success. According to Pequegnat et' al (1995) a mediating variable is the intervening variable that must change in order to see change in the dependent variable. On the other hand the moderating variable tends to interact in some fashion to alter the relationship between the dependent and the independent variable. Normally the mediating variable changes while the moderating variable does not. In some instances it is the one targeted for change in the intervention.



## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research adopted a descriptive survey design. This study adhered to the foregoing beliefs and practices, it would be appropriate to assert that a predominantly positivist framework was followed

The Study Area

The study was conducted in Machakos and Embu County

Target Population

The target population is that which researcher wants to generalize the results of the study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The target population of this study was 132 county government officials from all the 2 counties in Kenya..

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

Stratified random sampling was used to group the respondents and select the respondents from the different stratum.

**Table 3.1 Sample Size and Sampling Procedure**

County	Category	Population	Sample size
<b>Machakos</b>	Top management	3	2
	Mid-level management	12	9
	Technical managers	32	24
	Lower level management	28	21
<b>Embu</b>	Top management	3	2
	Mid-level management	7	5
	Technical managers	29	22
	Lower level management	19	14
<b>Total</b>		<b>132</b>	<b>99</b>

Source: Research data, 2017

Data Collection Procedures

Questionnaires was designed and distributed to the respondents and given time frame enough to collect back completed questionnaires

Data Collection Instruments

The instruments that were used in collecting primary data are questionnaires and interview schedule. The questionnaires covered areas of study objectives and the conceptual framework.

### Data Analysis and presentation

The research findings were subjected to regression and correlation analysis to establish the effect and relationship between the independent and dependent variables using a multiple regression model.

## DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Model Summary**

Model	R	R Squared	Adjusted R Square	Std of Error Estimate
1	0.720 <sup>a</sup>	0.518	0.514	0.54947

Source: Research data, 2018



Results displayed in Table 1 from regression analysis which was used to produce a best fit line to predict independent variables from the dependent variable determined how the independent variables influenced the dependent variable, to what extent each independent variable affected the dependent variable and which of those factors were more significant. The results obtained show the adjusted r square value of  $r^2 = .518$  which indicate that when all the variables are combined, the multiple linear regression model could explain for approximately 52% of the variation in the dependent variable by the variation in the independent variables on Implementation of County Projects. The results from the Coefficient of Determination shows a significant relationship ( $p = 0.000$ ) in all the variables.

**Table 2: Correlation Results of effect of the monitoring and evaluation frameworks**

		Learnin Result based g performance capacity	Participator y tracking	Beneficiary accountability	Implementatio n of projects
<b>Result based performance</b>	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	79			
<b>Learning capacity</b>	Pearson Correlation	.173**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
	N	79	79		
<b>Participatory tracking</b>	Pearson Correlation	.479**	.172**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	
	N	79	79	79	
<b>Beneficiary accountability</b>	Pearson Correlation	.515**	.517*	.471**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.011	.000	
	N	79	79	79	79
<b>Implementati on of projects</b>	Pearson Correlation	.718**	.676**	.771**	.544**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.011	.000	.000
	N	79	79	79	79

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Research Data, 2017

The correlation summary table indicates a strong and significant association between the independent and dependent variable. From the correlation results, it was found that the result based performance ( $r = 0.718$ ,  $\alpha = 0.01$ ), learning capacity ( $r = 0.676$ ,  $\alpha = 0.01$ ), Participatory tracking ( $r = 0.771$ ,  $\alpha = 0.01$ ), Beneficiary accountability ( $r = 0.544$ ,  $\alpha = 0.01$ ), had a significant positive effect on implementation of development projects

The correlation between the independent and dependent variables indicated presence of moderately strong correlation. The results displayed in Table 2 indicate that participatory tracking exhibited the strongest association with implementation of development projects followed by result based performance, learning capacity and Beneficiary accountability.



**Table 3: Coefficient of Determination**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	.435	.167		2.608	.009		
<b>Result based performance</b>	.529	.043	.505	5.334	.000	.0702	1.425
<b>Learning capacity</b>	.680	.041	.693	4.440	.000	.0551	1.815
<b>Participatory tracking</b>	.455	.043	.457	10.694	.000	.0569	1.759
<b>Beneficiary accountability</b>	.432	.322	.421	9.564	0.002	0.433	1.654

- a. Dependent Variable: Implementation of County Projects
- b.

Information in Table 3 indicates the prediction equation is implementation of county projects = .435 + .529 (result based performance) +.680 (learning capacity) + .455 (Participatory tracking) + .432 (beneficiary accountability). The standard error was (0.167), being an estimate of the standard deviation of the coefficient, is a random variable with a mean of zero and which captured the variables that could not be quantified. If a coefficient is large compared to its standard error, then it is probably different from 0.

The independent variable which was most important in the implementation of county projects was also determined. This was obtained by the beta value whereupon the results identified learning capacity as the most important variable of the study followed by result based performance, Participatory tracking and lastly beneficiary accountability in that order. Table 3 shows the beta value for these variables .505, .693, 0.457 and .421 which indicate that dependent variables would change by a corresponding number of standard deviation when the respective independent variable changed by one standard deviation.

The VIF value for all the independent variables were lesser than 10, and the Tolerance was also less than 0.1, thus there were no concerns over multi-collinearity. This led to the conclusion that learning capacity, Participatory tracking, and result based performance and beneficiary accountability were all important factors in the implementation of county projects

**Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)**

The statistical method of testing the null proposition such that the means of several populations are equal is called the analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Burns & Burns, 2008:289). The testing of two independent variables calls for the introduction of ANOVA and is used to test the main and interaction effects of categorical variables on a continuous dependent variable, controlling for the effects of selected other continuous variables which co-vary with the dependent (Cooper & Schindler, 2006:493). ANOVA is a versatile statistic which tests for the significant differences



between two or more groups of means and additionally breaks down the variability of a set of data into its component sources of variation. ANOVA is carried out in order to provide a more in-depth analysis of the data. As with correlations, some of the study's propositions are built on the significant differences between variables and factors. ANOVA is therefore used to prove or disprove the last three hypotheses of the study.

The ANOVA results for regression coefficients on Table 4.36 show the significance of the F statistics is 0.000 which is less than 0.05. This implies that there was a significant relationship between the learning capacity, Participatory tracking, and result based performance and beneficiary accountability and the implementation of county projects

Discussion of findings

#### **4.9.1. Discussions of findings on effect of results based performance and implementation of development projects**

The stated null Hypothesis 1 was H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant influence in results based performance and implementation of development projects. The specific dimensions considered by the study were: management support, organisational capacity and baseline data. The correlation analysis on Table (4.19) validates a positive and linear relationship between results based performance and implementation of county projects.

#### **4.9.2. Discussion of findings on effect of learning capacity and implementation of development projects**

The stated null Hypothesis 2 was H<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant influence in learning capacity and implementation of development projects. The specific dimensions considered by the study were: accountability, team learning and shared vision. The correlation analysis on Table (4.19) validates a positive and linear relationship between learning capacity and implementation of development projects. The findings indicate that the respondents agreed that learning capacity has a significant effect on implementation of development projects thus leaders need to employ operational mindset in order to enhance service delivery.

#### **4.9.3. Discussion of findings on effect of participatory tracking and implementation of development projects.**

The stated null Hypothesis 3 was H<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant influence in participatory tracking and implementation of development projects. The specific dimensions considered by the study were: institutional capacity, time and stakeholder. The correlation analysis on Table (4.19) validates a positive and linear relationship between participatory tracking and implementation of development projects.

#### **4.9.4. Discussion of findings on effect of Change consciousness on Service Delivery**

The stated null Hypothesis 4 was H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant influence in Beneficiary accountability on implementation of development projects. The specific dimensions considered by the study were: feedback and relationships. The correlation analysis on Table (4.19) confirms a positive and linear relationship between Beneficiary accountability on implementation of development projects.

Conclusions



The study can conclude that Monitoring and evaluation is a key activity in the project implementation success cycle. Monitoring enables the project team to track the performance of a project on a continuous basis so as to ensure that it is implemented as planned. Evaluation allows the project team to determine the effectiveness of the projects in view of achieving pre-established targets. It also concludes that official in the county governments only participate in processes that are beneficial to them and in instances where the benefits outweigh the costs that are entailed. The benefits include networking opportunities, access to information and resources, personal recognition, skill enhancement and a sense of contribution and helpfulness in solving community problems. On the contrary the costs they would be required to incur would include contribution of time required plus the skills and resources. Thus a balance needs to be made so that any effort towards community participation in local governance has a net benefit for participants. (Drunker, 2005).

#### Recommendations for policy

In light of the major findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed: Community participation is an important aspect of the vision 2030, because, the critical cornerstones of the social and economic pillars is devolution. It is anticipated that policy-making, public resource management and revenue sharing and as especially as devolved funds become key drivers of development communities will need to be actively engaged so that there is better targeting of resources. In addition to this, there is also a need for a deepened and enhanced consultation and information sharing process in the budgeting, implementation and monitoring and evaluation aspects in development projects. Developing mechanisms for participation, which also entail real citizen participation, should be encouraged at the smallest unit of the devolved governance similar to the “barazas” of the former Provincial Administration.( Ebel, D., & Serdar ,Y. (2002).Funds for carrying out M&E activities should be adequate, well budgeted and disbursed as planned. Findings also showed that project stakeholders are not known and documented. They are also not involved in M&E activities. It is therefore recommended that stakeholders should participate in M&E activities to an agreed extent by the project managers

#### 5.5 Suggested areas for further study

The study investigated influence of result based performance, learning capacity, participatory tracking, beneficiary accountability the moderating effect of national government funding and disbursement on the implementation of development projects. The concept of devolution being relatively new in Kenya has brought with it immense challenges on utilization of resources at the county level. Other factors e.g work environment, employees’ competency, use of technology and existing project policies can be investigated to show how implementation of development projects can be enhanced. Other studies on how can the county governments can enhance their revenue collection in order to implement of development projects can be carried out

#### References

- Adhiambo, T., 2012; Encounter satisfaction versus overall satisfaction versus quality: The customer’s voice.” *Service Quality—New direction in theory and practice*, R. T. Rust and R. L. Oliver, eds., Sage, Thousand Oaks, Calif., 72–94.
- African Development Bank. (1999). *African Development Report 1999: Infrastructure Development in Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Andersen, E. S., Birchall, D., Jessen, A. S. and Money, A. H. (2006). Exploring Project Success. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 1 (2) 127 – 147.



- Atencio, M. (2012). A critical success factors framework that includes leadership competencies for successful delivery of projects (Doctoral dissertation). University of Salford. Retrieved from Dissertations and Theses database. (<http://usir.salford.ac.uk/30638/>)
- Attarzadeh, I., & Ow, S. H. (2008) Modern Project Management: Essential Skills and Techniques. Communications of the IBIMA 2, 1-9.
- Bartle, R. (2007). The Politics of Service Delivery Reform. *Development and Change*, 35(1), 31-56.
- Beaulieu, N., Fatima, D., Orindi, V. & Carter, S. (2008) *CCAA's approach to using monitoring and evaluation to strengthen climate adaptive capacity*. In: International Workshop on Evaluating Climate Change and Development, 10th - 13th May 2008 of Conference Alexandria [Online]. Available from: [www.esdevaluation.org/images/Vulnerability-Beaulieu.ppt](http://www.esdevaluation.org/images/Vulnerability-Beaulieu.ppt)
- Chen, H. (2005). Practical program evaluation: *Assessing and improving planning, implementation, and effectiveness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chin, C. M. M. (2012). Development of a project management methodology for use in a university-industry collaborative research environment (Doctoral dissertation). University of Nottingham, Semenyih Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia
- Chesos R. (2010). *Automated M&E system for NGOs. The Co-Ordinator, Issue No. 5.*, p. 1. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.ngobureau.or.ke/Publications/Board%20Newsletter%20%28Issue%20No.%205%29.pdf>.
- Coglianesi C (1999) Limits to consensus. *Environment* 41:28–33