

Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management

ISSN Online: 2616-8464



Critical Success Factors Influencing Adoption of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems of County Government Projects in Kenya: A Case of Mombasa County Government

**Okuto Maureen Akinyi & Dr. Johnbosco Kisimbii
(PhD)**

ISSN: 2616-8464

Critical Success Factors Influencing Adoption of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems of County Government Projects in Kenya: A Case of Mombasa County Government

¹*Okuto Maureen Akinyi & ²Dr. Johnbosco Kisimbii (PhD)

¹*Post Graduate candidate - Graduate school, University of Nairobi

²Lecturer, School of Open and Distance Learning University of Nairobi

[Email of the Corresponding Author: maureenokuto@gmail.com](mailto:maureenokuto@gmail.com)

How to cite this article: Akinyi, O., M., & Kisimbii, J. (2020) Critical Success Factors Influencing Adoption of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems of County Government Projects in Kenya: A Case of Mombasa County Government. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project management*, 4(5), 35-50

Abstract

Monitoring and Evaluation systems are crucial in ensuring that the project meets the targeted objective. Monitoring and Evaluation helps organizations to retrieve important information from previous and current projects. This information is useful in planning for the future, avoiding pit-falls, keeps the project within the right track and reduction in delays during project implementation. Government projects are planned for at both the national level and the county government level. Despite the existence of a robust M&E system, County Governments in Kenya have continually misappropriated and/or diverted funds meant for development projects. County government Projects are over-priced and lack adequate and meaningful public participation in the planning, implementation and evaluation. An effective and efficient monitoring and evaluation system is critical for successful implementation of projects. Whereas Mombasa County Government has received negative successive mentions in the Auditor General reports, since 2013, an analysis of these reports, between 2013 and 2018, indicates that no significant change has been achieved. The study was an investigation into the critical success factors influencing the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in County Government projects in Kenya, the case of Mombasa County. The researcher investigated the influence of organisation culture, budgetary allocation, organisation structure and staff competence on the successful adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems of county government projects. The dependent variable used for the study was adoption of M&E systems, while the independent variables were organization culture, budgetary allocation, organization structure and staff competence. The literature reviewed the themes of organization culture, organization structure, budgeting, and staff development. The study was anchored on the Results Based Management Framework and the participant-oriented approach. The target population for the study was 50 respondents drawn from the staff members in the county government delegated the M&E function, their directors and chief officers of the departments.

Based on the Krejcie and Morgan model used to determine the sample size, 44 respondents were used in this study. Data collection was done by aid of a structured questionnaire with items ranked using a 5-point Likert scale. Piloting was conducted using 11 members of staff and the validity of the data collection tool was determined. Reliability of the research instrument was determined using the inter-rater approach. Data analysis was done by both descriptive statistics, using the mode and the mean; and by inferential statistics. The Spearman correlation coefficient was used to determine associations between the dependent and independent variables used in the study. A weak positive association between organization culture and adoption of M&E systems was noted ($r_s = 0.1$, p two-tailed = 0.87). There was a moderate positive association between budgetary allocation and adoption of M&E systems ($r_s = 0.5$, P two-tailed = 0.391). Organization structure's influence on the adoption of M&E systems was very weak ($r_s = -0.05$, p two-tailed = 0.93). There was a moderate negative association between staff competence and adoption of M&E systems ($r_s = -0.5$, p -two-tailed = 0.391). Based on the study objectives the study concluded that there is a significant relationship between organization culture, budgetary allocation, organisation structure and staff competence on the successful adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems of county government projects. The study recommended that organization culture influences the overall performance of the organization. Besides, it was recommended that county governments should budget for the M&E of the projects and that the M&E unit should be well funded. Similarly, training should be carried out at least once in a year for the staff in the M&E unit.

Keywords: *Organizational culture, budgetary allocation, organization structure, monitoring and evaluation, Mombasa County Government*

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Majority of the government projects have failed to deliver optimally either for the absence of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Systems or due to adoption flaws. The UNDP (2009) Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results emphasized on the importance of adoption of Monitoring and Evaluation in organizations' projects. Monitoring and Evaluation help organizations to retrieve important information from previous and current projects. This information is useful in planning for the future, avoiding pit-falls, keeping the project within the right track and reduction in delays during project implementation. To improve on project success, the handbook further recommends four areas of focus for organizations: Planning and program/project definition, stakeholder involvement, communication and monitoring and evaluation.

Adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in organizations requires sufficient knowledge of the monitoring and evaluation systems. A monitoring and evaluation system as defined by Simister (2009) refers to developing monitoring and evaluation systems for complex organizations is a series of the policies, practices and the processes that enable the systematic and effective collection and analysis and use of the monitoring and evaluation information. Successful adoption of a monitoring and evaluation system is a gradual process. . The monitoring and evaluation system should also be periodically assessed to identify its successes and failures.

Lahey (2015) observed that over two-thirds of ILO's independent evaluations indicated poor or non-existent M&E approaches and practices as fundamental constraints to project effectiveness. His report, titled 'Common Issues Affecting Monitoring and Evaluation of Large ILO Projects: Strategies to Address Them' identifies serious structural flaws such as weakness

in the articulation of project theories of change as well as M&E plans, which limit the ability to measure and report on results. This is noted to have implications in ongoing management decision-making, as well as the eventual evaluation of the project to determine project effectiveness and success.

Tengan and Aigbavboa (2016) identified some of the challenges to adoption of M&E Systems as Weak institutional capacity, limited resources and budgetary allocations for monitoring & evaluation, the weak linkage between planning, budgeting and monitoring & evaluation, weak demand for and utilization of monitoring and evaluation results and finally, poor data quality, data gaps and inconsistencies. In the global scene, the adoption of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems is guided by frameworks and policies. The Department of State program and Project Design Monitoring and Evaluation Policy in the United States of America (2017) outlines the rules relating to the adoption of M&E. Adoption begins with budgeting for the M&E activities. The M&E of projects is based on the goals and objectives of the project. The Funds allocated to M&E are managed by the State or an independent office from another federal agency. The funds are utilized by following appropriate procedures for managing the funds. Further, the state department must receive from the benefiting institution records of the utilization of the M&E funds, monitoring data associated with progress and results achieved and evaluation findings related to the outcomes achieved.

Jili and Mthethwa (2016) noted that the improvement of service delivery in local governments in Africa requires the design and adoption of comprehensive monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems. These are envisioned to continually assess, monitor and evaluate local government structures, systems and processes, in line with the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs), service delivery outcomes, and operational plans to implement the budget. Their study, which focused on the challenges that hindered successful adoption of M&E in the Mfolozi municipality, in South Africa, found that shortage of skills and lack of financial resources contribute to the ineffectiveness of M&E. They recommended that remedial actions were needed to address the challenges of employing and retaining highly skilled workers from an increasingly diverse and mobile labour market. Additionally, the municipality should involve the local community in the planning and execution of projects to ensure their success. This has been echoed by Biwott, Egesah and Ngeywo (2017) in their study of Importance of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Sustainability of Constituency Development Fund (CDF) projects in Kenya. They noted that embedding of Monitoring and Evaluation in CDF projects increased their utility and sustainability.

In Kenya, previously, development projects were implemented by the line ministries of the National Government. The advent of devolution in the country saw the implementation of development projects being shared between the national level and county levels of government. With this, has come the challenge of linking national and devolved levels monitoring and evaluation systems, leading to ineffective adoption of M&E systems and lapses in accountability. According to a study conducted for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in 2011, titled 'Devolution in Kenya- Policy Analysis and Programming Strategies, Management Systems International(MSI)' notes that effective decentralization is not just about an increase in county authority, autonomy, accountability and capacity, but a delicate balance between the national government and the county government. The MSI notes that too much power for subnational governments (SNGs) can be as detrimental as too little if central governments are unable to coordinate national policies, achieve economies of scale in public services, or supervise the spending and borrowing of SNGs. It recommends that counties must balance upward accountability to national actors with downward accountability to local actors (MSI. 2011).

The setting up and adoption of an effective M&E system must be anchored on suitable policy frameworks within an organisation. In the case of County Governments in Kenya, including Mombasa County Government, the County Government Act No.17 of 2012 provides a good framework for such a system. The Act of Parliament grants County Governments partial independence from the National Government and assumes them constitutional body-corporate status, with perpetual succession and powers for the discharge of their functions. Specifically, a County Government may enter into partnerships with any public or private organization following the provisions of any law relating to public or private partnerships for any work, service or function for which it is responsible within its area of jurisdiction. The fact that these contracts lawfully entered into is valid and binding on the county government, its successors and assigns necessitates an investment in an integrated monitoring and evaluation system, especially where projects are concerned. The Act specifies that the exercise of any of its functions shall ensure efficiency, effectiveness, inclusivity and participation of the people. As such, any monitoring and evaluation system should incorporate these four pillars in their establishment.

Act in Article 117 spells out minimum standards and norms and outlines principles to be adhered to in public service delivery. Accordingly, the county government and its agencies are expected, in delivering public services, to give priority to the basic needs of the public and promote the development of public service delivery institutions within its jurisdiction. The services must be equitably delivered in a manner that accord to the prudent economic, efficient, effective and sustainable use of available resources, continual improvement of standards and quality, appropriate incorporation of the use of IT and, financial and environmental sustainability. Because of challenges in implementing some of these principles, and relevant to this study, the Act provides for the establishment of a County Public Service Board, tasked with, among other things, the recruitment, deployment and retaining of suitably qualified workers for the county. What has not been well documented, though, is that despite the existence of such a Board, and the setting up of M&E systems in the county, there is still no concomitant effective adoption of the same systems. Therefore, the study was worthy being conducted.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in every project promotes accountability to all stakeholders of the project. Proper documentation of the projects improves on decision making as the necessary information is provided to the management timely and corrective action is taken if necessary. Future projects will also not fall into similar project pitfalls of weak adoption systems. Project deliverables will also be in line with the needs of the targeted beneficiaries. According to Cashin (2012), Monitoring and Evaluation of projects are aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of a project or organization. It is based on targets set and activities planned during the planning phases of work. It helps to keep the work on the track and can let management know when things are going wrong

Conflicting evidence from The Auditor General's Annual Reports has continually cited misappropriation and/or diversion of funds meant for development projects, over-priced and poor-quality project outputs, as well as lack of adequate and meaningful public participation in the planning, implementation and evaluation of county government projects. This would not be expected where proper monitoring and evaluation systems are in place. But, the existence of such anomalies concurrent with M&E systems in an organization, as evidenced in the Auditor General's Report on Mombasa County Government between 2013 and 2018, would appear to point at weaknesses in the process of adoption of the M&E systems.

Despite the existence of a robust M&E system in an organization, weaknesses in its adoption framework may still cause it to underperform. Without this, it would be impossible to conceptualize why glaring anomalies would still be cited by the Auditor General's Reports, despite the County Government Act (2012) being detailed on the conduct of projects within the counties. M&E systems try to measure performance. The availability of a legal framework, political will, capacity of concerned personnel, accessibility and reliability of evidence are critical issues that influence the level of impact and the sustainability of good M&E systems. This study attempted to investigate critical success factors influencing adoption of M&E systems of County Government projects in Mombasa County.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The study was guided by the following objectives:

- i. To establish the extent to which organizational culture influences the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems of County Government projects
- ii. To assess how budgetary allocation influences the adoption n of monitoring and evaluation systems of County Government projects
- iii. To investigate how organization structure influences the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems of County Government Projects
- iv. To assess how staff competence influences the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems of County Government projects

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Empirical Review

2.1.1 Influence of Organization Culture on the adoption of M&E Systems

In a study on organisation culture and organisation performance in the banking sector in Ghana, Zakari, Poku and Owutsu-Ansa (2013) found a positive correlation between an organization's culture and the organization's performance. Using the Denison's Model of Culture, which comprises of four parameters (involvement, consistency, adaptability and mission), they concluded that the organization's mission bears the largest significance in determining its cultural orientation. Mbabazize, Mucunguzi and Twesige (2014) reported that organisation culture significantly influences an organisation's effectiveness and efficiency. Citing that most studies on the subject had been conducted in European contexts, their study attempted to investigate the practicality of the observation in less developed country settings. They were specifically interested in how an organisation's culture influences the way the organization manages its internal and external factors that impact its performance. Their study found that organization culture's influence on an organization's performance is universal, and is as applicable in less developed countries, as it is in more developed ones.

Albrecht (2003) observed that, for most government organizations, the culture tends towards complacency and mediocrity mainly due to the absence of natural threats to their existence. He cites that in a typical government agency, it is more important not to be wrong than it is to be right. Government institutions are mainly funded by public money and tend to be the monopoly in the market. This unfair advantage over other nongovernmental institutions may make their

officers complacent, leading to costly ineffectiveness and inefficiencies that demean service delivery to the citizens. The observation that an organization's culture effect on the performance systems was universal, is important in considering the implementation of M&E systems in the County Government of Mombasa in Kenya. It becomes important to determine the extent to which the apathy associated with public servants, of which county government personnel are, affects the adoption process for M&E systems.

2.1.2 Influence of Budgetary Allocation on the adoption of M&E Systems.

Egbunike and Unama (2017) found that budgets and budgetary control could be used to evaluate the performance of hospitality firms in Nigeria. They also found that there was a significant variation in the budget, budgetary control and performance evaluation. They recommended that hospitality firms in Nigeria should carry out performance evaluation on every aspect of their budget and budgetary activities as a way of ensuring that budgeted outcomes are met. The study was carried out among 600 employees from 10 selected hospitality firms in Nigeria.

Silva and Jayamaha (2012) observed that the budgetary process significantly impacts the performance of organisations. They state that the budgetary process, being a part of a management control system of an organisation, enables managers to plan effectively and improves decision-making, departmental coordination, ultimately, evaluation. In their study, which focused on the apparel industry in Sri Lanka, gauged the performance of the organisations by measuring their Return on Assets (ROA), based on data from their financial statements. They used correlation coefficients and regression analysis to show that the budgetary process has a significant association with the organisational performance of the apparel industry in Sri Lanka.

Murei, Kidombo and Gakuu (2017) reported a positive correlation between budgeting for M&E and performance. In their study on the Monitoring and Evaluation budget and performance of horticulture projects in Nakuru County, they found that Budgeting for M&E is considered an accountability issue. The Budgeting process was top-down involving only a few group officials. This reduced the ownership of the adoption of M&E. Involving those tasked with the M&E function in budgeting increases the chance of ownership and improves on performance. They recommended the need for a participatory approach in issues of budgeting.

The County Government Act (2012) acknowledges the importance of planning for effective delivery of services by County Governments. It requires county governments to develop plans such as the five-year County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), ten-year programme-based county sectoral plan as parts of the CIDP, county spatial plans and cities and urban areas plans. According to the Institute of Economic Affairs (2014), the budgeting and spending of the county are dependent on these plans. As such, no public funds shall be appropriated without a planning framework developed by the county executive committee and approved by the county assembly.

Given that, from the foregoing, budgets and budgetary control are important components in organization performance, they become a critical consideration in the implementation of M&E systems. As such it becomes important to determine the extent to which this is funded in budgets, as well as the degree of decentralization of the budgetary process, to significantly include all ranks of staff.

2.1.3 Influence of Organization Structure on the adoption of M&E Systems

Organisation structure has been known to have the potential of limiting or enhancing the productivity of organisations. Organisations are human constructs to achieve specific

objectives, which may vary, depending on whether the organisations are business- or public benefit-oriented. The principles employed in the management of performance in an organisation include the setting and review of well-defined goals and targets, prioritization of work, and investment in the measurement of progress towards attainment of targets.

Serpa and Ferreira (2019) hold that Max Weber's bureaucratic model is important in addressing the difficulties of complexity and uncertainty inherent in large organisations in changing environments. But, despite the inherent positive attributes envisaged by Weber, bureaucracy has also come to be identified with many negative connotations. Godoi, Silva, & Cardoso (2017), for instance, associate bureaucracy with delays in operation, actions centered on opaque standards, excessive requests for documentation, and difficulty in meeting users or customers' requests.

Ferreira, Neves and Caetano (2004) envisioned a bureaucratic organisation as having well-defined functions that are formalised through written rules and regulations. It is also characterized by the presence of a hierarchy of authority, with formal relationships according to the position held. There is a division of work with high specialization and standardization of the functions to perform, and employees are assessed and selected for their technical competence. According to them, in a bureaucracy, there is a separation of ownership and the employee function, and there are guaranteed wage stability and pension upon retirement. Employees are also guaranteed a regular career over time.

2.1.4 Influence of Staff Competence on Adoption of M&E Systems

Janes (2018) opined that given the direct relationship between employee development and organisation performance, continuous employee training must not be undermined. In a study that targeting 219 employees of drilling companies in Geita, Shinyanga, and Mara Regions in Tanzania, Janes found that, though employee training has a significant effect on the performance of drilling companies, the absence of comprehensive policy frameworks within the companies interfered with the employee's capacities to perform well. As such he recommends the need for drilling companies to develop proper and effective training and development policies which will guide their training procedures and help in the adoption of training strategies. Though the study was done in the context of the private sector, and it handled 'employees' in general, the findings are not unique to the drilling sector, but also public organisations, and in various departments.

Ooko, Rambo & Osogo (2018) observed that healthcare services in hospitals in developing countries did not prioritize monitoring and evaluation systems in their operations. Using a descriptive research design, the study targeted a sample comprising of 60 doctors, 102 Nurses, 43 M&E officers, 9 social workers, 16 community health volunteers and 55 patients, the study used multiple regression to find that technical support increased the knowledge on monitoring and evaluation systems to a moderate extent. The study concluded that technical support increased the knowledge on monitoring and evaluation systems to a moderate extent and recommended that the public health institution management should offer technical support to the personnel, to increase the knowledge on monitoring and evaluation systems.

Yusuf, Otende et al (2017) also did a study on the influence of training and time allocated on the performance of Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects of the CDF projects in Kajiado East Sub County. The study found a positive correction between training and performance of M&E of Government Projects. The untrained staff, according to their study, will have a challenge in implementing Monitoring and Evaluation thus poor results whereas the trained and knowledgeable teams give quality feedback and information on project planning and design.

From the foregoing, it can be argued that since staff competence is a critical success factor in organization performance, through the mediation of improved knowledge, skills and attitudes; it becomes essential to determine the degree of staff competence in the M&E function and how this relates to the establishment of M&E systems in the County Government projects in Kenya.

3.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used a descriptive survey design model. The target population included County Government officers that have been delegated the M&E function. The unit of observation included directors and the Chief Officers. The officers delegated the M&E functions are spread across the 11 function departments of the county government. The target population, therefore, consisted of 11 chief officers, 17 directors and 22 M&E officers. The total target population was 50 and using Krejcie & Morgan (1970) Model a sample size of 44 was obtained. Stratified sampling was used to determine the distribution of respondents within the sample size.

4. 0. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics on Organization Culture

The descriptive statistics on organisation culture is presented in Table 1

Table 1: Descriptive statistics on organisation culture

	Mission, Vision and Norms are supportive	Staff are aware of the M&E Reporting Framework	Input by M&E staff is valued	M&E framework is strictly followed by the M&E Officers	Frequent meetings are held with project teams
Valid	32	32	32	31	32
Missing	0	0	0	1	0
Mean	2.47	2.41	2.31	2.32	2.59
Std. Deviation	.879	1.103	.931	.909	1.132

The study made some assumptions. These include that the county government's mission, vision and norms were instrumental in guiding its culture. It was also assumed that if the county government had adopted M&E systems, then the staff would be aware of the M&E reporting framework and would be strictly following it. It was also assumed that if input by M&E staff is always valued by the supervisors and that frequent meeting are held with project teams for M&E purposes, then it would be easy to adapt M&E systems. From Table 1, the mean for all the items ranged from 2.31 to 2.59, with an average mean of 2.42. This implied that there is a consensus that organizational culture influences the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in county government projects.

4.1.2 Inferential Statistics on Organization Culture

The comparison of means for organization culture and adoption of M&E systems is depicted in Table 2

Table 2: Comparison of means for organization culture and adoption of M&E systems

Dependent Variable	N	Mean	Independent Variable	N	Mean
Timely project reports	32	2.47	Mission vision & norms supportive	32	1.97
ME unit well recognized and resourced	32	2.41	Staff aware of a reporting framework	32	2.25
External influence in the adoption of M&E	32	2.31	The input of staff in process valued by supervisors	32	2.41
M&E reports used in decision-making	31	2.32	M&E framework strictly followed	32	2.63
M&E activities in all project stages	32	2.59	Frequent project team meetings	32	2.81
Valid N (list-wise)	31		Valid N (list-wise)	32	

In determining the influence of organizational culture on the adoption of M&E systems, the study was guided by two hypotheses.

H₀ There is no relationship between organizational culture and the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in the County Government projects

H₁ There is a relationship between organizational culture and the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in the County Government projects.

The Spearman Correlation analysis results of the means in Table 2: $r_s = 0.1$, p (2-tailed) = 0.873, indicated that there was a weak positive association between organizational culture and adoption of M&E systems in the County Government projects. P (2-tailed) 0.872) was greater than 0.05 and therefore statistically nonsignificant; and thus, provided support for the null hypothesis.

4.2.1 Descriptive statistics on budgetary allocation

Table 3 summarizes the descriptive statistics concerning budgetary allocation and adoption of M&E systems.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics on budgetary allocation

		Monitoring and evaluation well-funded	Monitoring and evaluation funds well-used	Officers involved in the budget process	Cost of the project determines M&E allocation	Truthful disclosure on the allocation
N	Valid	32	32	32	32	32
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.59	2.44	2.53	2.66	2.75	
Std. Deviation	.837	.716	.915	.827	.622	

The study made the assumption that the budgetary allocation is one of the parameters influencing adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in county government projects. The study assumed that if the M&E function as well funded in the county government projects and that funds set aside for the M&E function were well utilized, then there would be easy adoption of M&E systems in county government projects. The study had also assumed that if M&E officers were involved in the budgeting process, and the number of funds allocated to M&E function truthfully disclosed, then M&E systems would be easily adopted. This was also to be the case if amounts allocated for M&E were not arbitrary but were informed by the cost of the projects at hand. As per the results in Table 3 mean response ranged from 2.44 to 2.75, with an overall average of about 2.6. This indicated that the general response tended towards being unsure.

4.2.2 Inferential Statistics on Budgetary Allocation and Adoption of M&E Systems

The means of the items under the adoption of M&E systems (dependent variable) and budgetary allocation (independent variable) were analyses and presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Summary means of budgetary allocation and adoption of M&E systems

Adoption of M&E systems	N	Mean	Budgetary allocation	N	Mean
Timely project reports	32	2.47	M&E well-funded	32	2.59
ME unit well recognized and resourced	32	2.41	M&E funds well used	32	2.44
External influence in the adoption of M&E	32	2.31	M&E Officers involved in the budget process	32	2.53
M&E reports used in decision-making	31	2.32	Cost of the project determines M&E allocation	32	2.66
M&E activities in all project stages	32	2.59	Truthful disclosure on the allocation	32	2.75
Valid N (list-wise)	31		Valid N (list-wise)	32	

To determine the influence of budgetary allocation on the adoption of M&E systems, the study was guided by two hypotheses:

H₀ There is no relationship between budgetary allocation and the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in County Government projects.

H₁ There is a relationship between budgetary allocation and the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in County Government projects. The Spearman Correlation analysis results: $r_s = 0.5$, p (2-tailed) = 0.391, indicate a moderate ($r_s 0.5$) positive association between budgetary allocation and adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in the County Government

projects. The p (2-tailed) = 0.391 value was greater than 0.05. This was statistically nonsignificant and suggests a greater-than 95% probability; this qualified the null hypothesis.

4.3.1 Descriptive statistics organization structure

In considering whether the hierarchy of the County Government was perceived to be in support of the smooth flow of the M&E function, responses were tabulated in table 5.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics on organization structure and adoption of M&E systems

	Hierarchy supportive of smooth flow	Decision making is participatory	Clearly defined roles for officers	Fast access to reports	Structure supports adoption
Valid	32	32	32	32	32
Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	2.00	2.22	2.00	2.78	2.16
Std. Deviation	.672	.975	.803	1.157	.884

The study assumed that a supportive organization structure would ensure a smooth flow of the M&E function. A supportive structure was assumed to be one that was highly participatory and in which M&E officers had clearly defined roles and reporting mechanisms. A supportive organization structure would also be measured by the ease of accessing M&E reports of county government projects. The results presented in Table 5 indicate that the mean for the five items ranged from 2.00 to 2.78. The average mean for the items was 2.23, which showed a great strength towards agreeability. This meant that the consensus was that organization structure influenced the adoption of M&E systems.

4.3.2 Inferential Statistics on Organization Structure and Adoption of M&E Systems

The means of the dependent variable (Organization structure) and the independent variable (adoption of M&E systems) were compared and presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Summary means organization structure and adoption of M&E systems

Adoption of M&E systems	N	Mean	Organization structure	N	Mean
Timely project reports	32	2.47	Hierarchy supportive of smooth flow	32	2.00
ME unit well recognized and resourced	32	2.41	Decision-making is participatory	32	2.22
External influence in the adoption of M&E	32	2.31	Clearly-defined roles for officers	32	2.00
M&E reports used in decision-making	31	2.32	Fast access to reports	32	2.78
M&E activities in all project stages	32	2.59	Structure supports adoption	32	2.16
Valid N (list-wise)	31		Valid N (list-wise)	32	

To determine the influence of organization structure on the adoption of M& E systems, the study was guided by two hypotheses:

H₀ There is no relationship between organization structure and the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in County Government projects

H₁ There is a relationship between organization structure and the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems in County Government projects. The Spearman correlation analysis results: $r_s = -0.0513$, p (2-tailed) = 0.93471, indicated a very weak negative relationship ($r_s -0.0513$) between organization structure and the adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems. P (2-tailed) =0.93471 is greater than 0.05, and as such statistically nonsignificant qualifying the null hypothesis

4.4.1 Descriptive statistics staff competence

Table 7 summarizes the findings on the measures of central tendency concerning staff competence and adoption of M&E systems.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics on staff competence

		Proper training improves capacity	Adoption needs sufficient knowledge & skills	Officers are well trained	Staff consulted during implementation	Staff understand their role
N	Valid	32	32	32	32	32
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0
Mean	1.72	1.47	2.47	2.50	2.28	
Std. Deviation	.523	.621	.983	.916	1.023	

The study assumed that proper training of M&E staff contributes to the effective adoption of M&E systems since this adoption requires specialized knowledge and skills. The study further assumed that M&E officers in the county government are well trained and experienced in their field. The study also assumed that if knowledgeable and experienced staff are frequently consulted during project implementation, it would be easier to install effective monitoring and evaluation systems. It also assumed that the staff in the M&E function of the county government understood their role in the adoption of M&E systems. With reference to the results in Table 7, the individual means suggested that respondents agreed with the proposal that staff competence influenced the adoption of M&E systems in county government projects. The average of the means, 2.01, strongly leaned to the agreement side.

4.4.2 Inferential Statistics on Staff Competence and Adoption of M&E Systems

The means of staff competence (independent variable) and the adoption of M&E systems were calculated and compared in table 8.

Table 8: Summary means of staff competence and adoption of M&E systems

Adoption of M&E systems	N	Mean	Staff Competence	N	Mean
Timely project reports	32	2.47	Proper training improves capacity	32	1.72
ME unit well recognized and resourced	32	2.41	Adoption needs sufficient knowledge skills	32	1.47
External influence in the adoption of M&E	32	2.31	Officers are well-trained	32	2.47
M&E reports used in decision-making	31	2.32	Staff consulted during implementation	32	2.50
M&E activities in all project stages	32	2.59	Staff understand their role	32	2.28
Valid N (list-wise)	31		Valid N (list-wise)	32	

To determine the influence of staff competence on the adoption of M&E systems, the study was guided by two hypotheses:

H₀ There is no relationship between staff competence and the adoption of M& E systems in County Government projects

H₁ There is a relationship between staff competence and the adoption of M& E systems in County Government projects. The Spearman correlation analysis results: $r_s = -0.5$, p (2-tailed) = 0.391, indicated a moderate negative association ($r_s = -0.5$) between staff competence and adoption of monitoring and evaluation systems. The P (2-tailed) = 0.391 is greater than 0.05, which is statistically nonsignificant. This shows strong evidence for the null hypothesis.

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were made on the factors influencing the adoption of M&E systems in County Government projects in Kenya. Organization culture and budgetary allocation organization showed a weak positive association and moderate positive association respectively with the adoption of M&E systems in County Government projects in Kenya. Organization Structure and Staff Competence showed very weak negative relationship and moderate negative relationship respectively with the adoption of M&E systems in County Government projects in Kenya.

Organization culture was found to influence the adoption of M&E systems in County Government projects. However, it was noted that frequent consultative meetings among team members were not in place. This could explain the lack of clear distinction that the work of M&E officers was valued by their supervisors. The study also noted that strict adherence to set frameworks for M&E systems was not in place, which could largely be due to presence of vested interests from without the County Governments.

From the study, it was established that budgetary processes lacked transparency, hence causing an erosion of the integrity of the systems. Despite M&E officers being involved in various aspects of the budget process, it was not a guarantee that their input would be used in final decision-making. It has also been noted that allocation for M&E purposes was not dependent on magnitude of project undertaking, and hence its systems adoption may not be adequately supported. This is despite a moderate positive association being noted between budgetary allocation and adoption of M&E systems in County Government projects.

Proper training was a major factor influencing adoption of M&E systems. It was acknowledged that training increased technical knowledge and skills in staff, but that feeling of competency

was lower than the expressed need. As such, even if M&E staff understood their role in adoption of M&E systems, their incompetency limits their effectiveness and efficiency.

6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings from the study, it is recommended that:

Organisation culture has influence the overall performance of the organisation. In this case the organisation culture influences the adoption of M&E Systems in government projects. The county government staff tasked with carrying out the M&E Function should be encouraged to hold more consultative meetings with their supervisors. The meetings will help identify the progress in county government projects, reports will be submitted before deadlines and the government project will meet the expected objectives set. The perception among staff that M&E is a fault-finding mission will be dispelled if the staff in the M&E unit work together with their supervisors and all the relevant stakeholders. Budgetary allocation is important in successful adoption of M&E systems. The researcher recommended that county governments should budget for the M&E of the projects and that the M&E unit should be well funded. The funding should also be done timely and be adequate. This will motivate the staff in the M&E unit because the number of follow ups on payments and allocation will reduce. The M&E function should be prioritized by county governments.

Organisation structure of the M&E unit in the county government as observed from the findings is such that each department has its M&E officers. Ideally all the staff performing the M&E function should be in a single department. If they are within the same department flow of information, feedback from supervisors and budgeting can be made possible. Barriers to access of reports should be reduced by provision of clear guidelines on how interested stakeholders can access the reports. M&E concept is a fairly new concept to the County governments. Few government institutions are training the government staff on M&E. This therefore means that a majority of the staff are learning on the job. Staff competence in M&E Function is boosted by their training. Training if adequately budgeted for should be carried out at least once in a year for the staff in the M&E unit. The National government state department of Planning should work together with county government in offering such training. More staff should be trained and added to the M&E unit.

REFERENCES

- Albert Karl, PhD. (2003). *The Power of Minds at Work: Organizational Intelligence in Action*. New York: American Management Association AMACOM Print.
- Biwott, T., Egesa, O., & Ngeyo, J. (2017). Importance of monitoring and evaluation in the sustainability of constituency development fund (CDF) projects in Kenya. *IRA-International Journal of Management and Social Sciences* 7 (1), 45-51.
- Cashin, C. (2012). IEG Working Paper 2012/1 Comparison of the Monitoring and Evaluation Systems of the World Bank and the Global Fund. Washington, D.C: World Bank.
- "Department of State Program and Project Design, Monitoring and Evaluation policy."(2017)
- Cronbach, L.J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologists*. 30(1), 116-127.
- Egbunike, A., & Unamma, A. (2017). Budgeting, Budgetary Control and Performance Evaluation: Evidence from Hospitality Firms in Nigeria. Studies and Scientific Researches. *Economics Edition*. 10.29358/second.v0i26.398.
- Ferreira, J. M., Neves, J., & Caetano, A. (2004). *Manual de psychosociology das organizações [Handbook of psychosociology of organisations]*. Lisboa: McGraw-Hill.
- Gakuu, Kidombo & Murei. (2017) Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Budget on Performance of Horticulture Projects in Nakuru County Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and management: United Kingdom*.
- Gay, L.R. (1992). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application*. Macmillan Publishing Company: New York.
- Godoi, A., Silva, L. F., & Cardoso, O. O. (2017). Ensaio teórico sobre a burocracia em Weber, o conflito da agência e a governança corporativa: Uma reflexão sobre a burocracia profissionalizante [Theoretical essay on bureaucracy in Weber, the agency conflict and corporate governance: A reflection on professional bureaucracy]. *Revista de Administração de Roraima-UFRR*, 7(2), 426-447.
- Godoi, A., Silva, L. F., & Cardoso, O. O. (2017). Ensaio teórico sobre a burocracia em Weber, o conflito da agência e a governança corporativa: Uma reflexão sobre a burocracia profissionalizante [Theoretical essay on bureaucracy in Weber, the agency conflict and corporate governance: A reflection on professional bureaucracy]. *Revista de Administração de Roraima-UFRR*, 7(2), 426-447.
- Hailey, J and Sorgenfrei, M (2004). *Measuring Success: Issues in performance measurement*. INTRAC, Occasional Paper Series 44.
- Hamed Taherdoost (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM)*.
- Janes, O.S. (2018). Impact of Employee Training on Organizational Performance – Case Study of Drilling Companies in Geita, Shinyanga and Mara Regions in Tanzania. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR) Volume 6, Issue 1, January 2018, PP 36-41*
- Jili, N.N., Mthethwa, R.M. (2016). Challenges in implementing monitoring and evaluation: the case of Mfolozi Municipality. *African Journal of Public Affairs*. Vol. 9. No4, 2016.

- Kamau, C.G. & Bin Mohamed, H. (2015). Efficacy of Monitoring and Evaluation Function in Achieving Project Success in Kenya: A Survey of County Government's Projects. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*, May-June, 2015. Vol.4, Issue3, 168-179 Available online www.managementjournal.info
- Kassu Jilcha Sileyew (2019). Research Design and Methodology, Cyberspace, Evon Abu-Taieh, Abdelkrim El Mouatasim and Issam H. Al Hadid, IntechOpen, DOI: 105772/intechopen.85731 Available from <https://www.intechopen.com/books/cyberspace/research-design-and-methodology>.
- Kottner J, Audigé L, Brorson S. (2011). Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS). *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011; 64(1):96-106
- Mango (2014). What is Wrong With Results-Based Management?
- Margaret E. Ross (2010). Designing and Using Program Evaluation as a tool for Reform. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*. Aurburn University.
- Mbabazize, P.M., Mucunguzi, A.; Twesige, D., (2014). The importance of building organisational cultures for effective management of people and organisations: a case study of Bushenyi Local Government in Uganda. *Research Journal's Journal of Sociology*. V.2, No.3, March 2014.
- MSI (2011). Devolution in Kenya- policy analysis and programming strategies. USAID.
- Nigel Simister (2009). Developing Monitoring and Evaluation Systems for Complex Organisations. *Oxford Court, UK*
- Ooko, S.O., Rambo, C.M. & Osogo, J.A. (2018). Influence of human capacity for monitoring and evaluation systems on the provision of health care services in public health institutions in Migori County. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 20, Issue 8. Ver. III (August. 2018), PP 62-71 www.iosrjournals.org
- Resnik, D.B. (2015). What is Ethics in Research & Why is it Important? *National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences*.
- Riege, A. M. (2003). Validity and reliability tests in case study research: a literature review with "hands-on" applications for each research phase. *Qualitative market research: An international journal*, 6(2), 75-86.
- Serpa, S. & Ferreira, C. (2019). The Concept of Bureaucracy by Max Weber. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*. 7. 12. 10.11114/ijsss.v7i2.3979
- Tengan, C. & Aigbavboa, C.(2016). Evaluating Barriers to Effective Implementation of Project Monitoring and Evaluation in Ghanaian Construction Industry. *Elservier Ltd*
- UNDG (2011). Results-Based Management Handbook: Harmonizing RBM concepts and approaches for improved development results at the country level. *United Nations Development Group, October 2011*.
- UNDP (2009). Handbook on planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results.
- Zakari, M., Poku, K., & Owutsu-Ansa, W. (2013). Organisational culture and organisational performance: empirical evidence from the banking industry in Ghana. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*. Vo. 3.No1; January 2013