THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Adoption on Implementation of County Government Sponsored Projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya

Leslie Kobe Pingano

Masters Student, College of Human Resource Development,
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Nakuru, Kenya

Dr. Caleb Odhiambo Onjure

Lecturer, College of Human Resource Development,
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Nakuru, Kenya

Abstract:

In Kenya, County Governments are mandated to carry out development projects anchored on their County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs). The implementations of these projects have been met by higher number of failures. However, irrespective of the outcome of the projects, the aspect of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is rarely cited in relation to the outcome. The objectives of conducting Evaluations is to determine the relevance and realization of project objectives, efficiency and effectiveness levels of the project, impact and sustainability as well as to haul along the lessons learnt; these together, helps in decision making. This study sought to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation adoption on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai sub-county. Specifically, the study investigated the influence of top management support, M&E planning, budget allocations for M&E, and community involvement on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai sub-county. The study employed descriptive survey research design and had a target population of 46 county governments sponsored projects in Rabai sub-county from which the accessible population comprised 92 project officials were derived. The study used pre-tested questionnaires for data collection. Descriptive, correlation, and inferential data analysis were carried out and results presented in form of table and figures. The findings revealed that the top management support for M&E had no significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects. It was also revealed that top management gave very minimal supports to carrying out capacity assessment for firms bidding for M&E and that M&E planning, adequate Budget allocations for M&E, and facilitating Community involvement in M&E leads to a rise in implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. The study concluded that there is need to improve M&E processes. The study recommended for top management support for M&E adoption, by actively carrying out capacity assessment for firms bidding for M&E, and ensuring that the firms selected for M&E are committed to top deliverables.

Keywords Top management support, M&E, M&E planning, budget allocation for M&E, community involvement

1. Background to the Study

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a defined as composite term involving processes of both monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring however, is said to be the continuous assessment of project implementation about design schedules on inputs, infrastructure, and services by project beneficiaries (Posavac, 2015). Project monitoring is periodic of a project's relevance, performance, efficiency, and impact both expected and unexpected about stated objectives; and evaluation is a comprehensive appraisal that looks at the long-term impacts of a project that exposes what worked, what did not, and what should be done differently in future projects (Muchelule, 2018). Further, Kamau and Mohamed (2015) asserted that monitoring and evaluation of project work is the process of tracking, reviewing, and regulating the progress to meet the performance objectives defined in the project management plan. It includes status reporting, progress measurement, and forecasting.

The first documented formal use of evaluation traces its roots in the year 1792 when William Farish utilized the quantitative mark to assess students' performance. In China, evaluation has a long history, dating back four thousand years when it was used to assess public programmes (Myrick, 2013). The practice of M&E however gained ground in the post-World war II period when donor agencies began to recognize evaluation as an essential management tool and started emerging at the country level and in the UN system in the early 1950s (Fu *et al.*, 2010). The latter part of 1950's and throughout the 60's saw a slow period of country level focus on M&E with the United Nations promoting the development of national development planning capabilities (UN Taskforce, 1984), whereby capacity building was meant to enhance ownership over the development process for governments and their citizens in the countries where development

programs were being implemented. Monitoring and Evaluation has been a key performance management tool for planning, decision making and economic policy management. Performance reports provide information on the project's performance with regard to scope, schedule, cost, resources, quality, and risk, which can be used as inputs to other processes.

According to the World Bank (2007), there is need for effective M&E which is increasingly being recognized as an indispensable tool of both project and portfolio management. This is because M&E provide a basis for accountability in the use of development resources. Further M&E can be applied to strengthen the project design and implementation and stimulate partnership with project stakeholders. Countries such as Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom, have stressed a broader suite of M&E tools and methods that include performance indicators, rapid reviews, impact evaluations and performance audits (Lahey, 2005). On the other hand, Brazil stressed a whole-of-government approach to the setting of programme objectives and the creation of a system of performance indicators (Nielsen & Ejler, 2008).

It is plausible that some countries have succeeded in building a whole-of-government M&E system, yet regrettable that others have an uncoordinated and disparate collection of separate sectoral monitoring systems (Mugo, 2014). Nevertheless, Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) today has become an increasingly important tool within the global efforts in achieving environmental, economic and social sustainability. At national and international scales, the sustainability criteria and indicators for M&E are very crucial in defining, monitoring and reporting on ecological, economic and social trends, tracking progress towards goals and influencing policy and practices (Van Dooren, Bouckaert & Halligan, 2015).

The entry of M&E into Africa has been largely through donor programs and accompanied by an import of theories and methodologies that are largely Nordic in origin. According to Naidoo (2011), M&E in Africa emerged largely from observations of the practice of M&E in countries outside Africa and was, therefore, a relatively late entrant to Africa. Monitoring and Evaluation has essentially been seen as a way of strengthening democratic governance both in the developed and the developing countries of Africa. This supports Ekouevi, Karcher and Coffie (2011) who argued that M&E is seen as supporting the governance function. Further, Ekouevi *et al.*, (2011) point out that M&E encompasses the entire management, operating systems and culture of any institution. Mackay (2007) argued that a sound M&E system should not just improve compliance; it should also enhance the reflective capacity of organizations, whilst simultaneously increasing transparency, accountability and supporting a culture of learning.

Taye (2013) observed that M&E in Africa has taken on a transformative and social justice emphasis and demonstrates societal transformation which comes about when there is a greater transparency and accountability of its operations. In Uganda, increasing attention has been given to the role of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) within public management. National M&E policy and M&E strategy 2013 was developed and approved (Ojok, 2016). M&E has been identified as a priority area of cross-cutting public sector reform within which the policy matrix and series of operations have been planned and implemented since early 2000. Myrick (2013) argued that the objective of M&E is seen as the improvement of the performance and effectiveness of government and its public service delivery system. Mackay (2007) asserts that most governments in the world are working towards entrenching M&E in their economic governance system. Evidence from literature point out that in Sub-Saharan Africa substantial M&E achievements on the ground are rare (Ekouevi *et al.*, 2011; Njuki *et al.*, 2010). Delivery of quality services by the public sector organizations has been of concern to successive governments and various stakeholders including international development partners, investors, non-governmental organization and the citizenry (Calamai, 2009). Public pressure to improve service delivery in various sectors in the country, has therefore necessitated the enactment and promulgation of laws, formulation and implementation of policies and frameworks, and lately the introduction of devolved governments as a model to increase the efficiency of service delivery and promote good governance (Cheema & Rondinelli, 2007).

The promulgation of the Kenyan new constitution in 2010 with devolution as a key feature, created 47 County governments as its main structure of devolution. The operations of the county governments in the country are anchored on the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) which is a domesticated approach to Integrated Development Planning (IDP) used in other countries such as South Africa (Onabolu & Ndlovu, 2006). An Integrated Development Plan (IDP) is a super plan for an area that gives an overall framework for development (Khumalo, 2015). It aims to co-ordinate the work of local and other spheres of government in a coherent plan to improve the quality of life for all the people living in an area. It should take into account the existing conditions and problems and resources available for development (Musyoka, 2010).

The plan should look at economic and social development for the area as a whole. It must set a framework for how land should be used, what infrastructure and services are needed and how the environment should be protected. The Integrated Development Plan (IDP) is a five-year plan which local government is required to compile to determine the development needs of the devolved government. The projects within the IDP are also linked to the devolved government's budget (Abuza, 2011). Since the inauguration of the county governments, several projects have been undertaken by the county governments within their counties. While some projects have been undertaken successfully, a number of projects have either failed or stalled owing to poor monitoring and evaluation as cited in the Contoller of Budget Report (2017). Furthermore, Nyandemo and Kongere (2010) argued that the M&E of decentralized development in Kenya was not systematic, failed to adopt the M&E requirements and the information generated was not timely and accurate. This points out that all real variables that influence and determine the implementation of M&E framework may not have been identified by these policy measures.

According to Kamau and Mohamed (2015), there are three key variables involved in monitoring and evaluation in project management; strength of the monitoring team, approaches to M&E and stages in project lifecycle. Concerning strength of the monitoring team, Naidoo (2011) noted that if the M&E function is located in a section or associated with

significant power in terms of decision-making, it is more likely to be taken seriously. This means that the monitoring team needs to be enhanced and strengthened in order for it to have more power which will increase its effectiveness. In addition to power of M&E teams, effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation is also dependent on the approach of M&E.

Myrick (2013) expresses that a pragmatic approach to M&E is ideal however in the real-world practitioners may be limited by constraints of methodology. However, whatever the approach used, at least the basic principles for M&E which are measurable objective, performance indicator, target and periodic reporting should be used in a reporting tool. Project life cycle is also critical to the success of the M&E process. Standard (2011) describes project life cycle as the project phases and their relationship to each other and to the project, and includes an overview of organizational structure that can influence the project and the way the project is managed. However, of interest to the present study is to establish how these aspects embedded in the M&E practices in the county governments influence the implementation of their development projects.

Successful project implementation requires a strategy, and the CIDP which is basically the blueprint on which all county development projects are anchored is essentially a strategy document or a strategic plan. Strategies are methods or plans chosen to bring about a desired future, such as achievement of a goal or solution to a problem. A strategy is a competitive plan that relates to the overall pattern of activities and provides a sense of direction to an organization (Johnson et al., 2017). Strategy implementation implies making the strategy work as intended or putting the organization's chosen strategy into action (Rajasekar, 2014). Strategy implementation includes designing the organization's structure, distributing resources, developing decision making process, and managing human resources. However, it has been observed that strategy implementation still remains one of the major problems confronting developing nations (Makinde, 2005). Among the issues affecting strategy implementation is strategic alignment which calls for effective M&E to be done.

Studies carried out in Kenya show that quite a number of projects have been successful. One of the examples is the Youth Enterprise Development Fund (YEDF); whose objective was to increase economic opportunities for the youth as a way of enabling them to participate in nation building (Kimando, 2012). On the other hand, several projects in Kenya have been informally cited as failed projects; meaning that they did not achieve the desired success. According to Kamau and Mohammed (2015), examples of such projects include the Kibera slum upgrading project, the Lake Turkana fish processing plant project, The Anglo-leasing ICT related projects, Modambogo Health Center in rain water harvesting in Mwatate, and Tumaini Women Self Help group project in Kisumu among others. Some of the 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 et al, 2012). As recent as the year 2019, the government sponsored flagship food security project – The Galana – Kulalu irrigation project wound up and was written off as a failed project despite years of work and billions of shillings' worth of investment. A significant share of the failed projects is government funded or donor funded projects. These projects usually undergo the necessary monitoring and evaluation processes which are often a requirement of the law. The contradiction is however that, 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 study was carried out in Rabai Sub-County which is one of the seven sub-counties in Kilifi County in the Coastal region of Kenya. This is the southernmost Sub-County of Kilifi county. It borders Mombasa county in the south, Kwale County in the west and Kaloleni Sub-County in the north. Rabai Sub County covers an area of 205.9 square kilometers and as of the 2009 census, the population of the sub-county was 97,185 which comprised of 46,500 females and 50,685 respectively (KNBS, 2009), while the population grew by 17% to 113,622 (KNBS, 2019). Rabai Sub-County is divided into various administrative and political units crucial for management of the Sub-County. In terms of political units, the sub-county is divided into 4 electoral wards, namely Mwawesa Ward, Kambe / Ribe, Ruruma Ward and Rabai / Kisurutini Ward. According to the Kilifi County CIDPs for 2013 – 2017 the County Government had instituted over 150 projects in the Sub-County falling under various categories of development.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Delivering essential services to citizens is a key mandate of any government. The Kenya's governance system has been changed to adopt a devolved system which is essentially a bottom up approach where grassroots challenges and aspirations for public service delivery inform policy decisions at the high decision-making levels in county governments. Most county governments have subsequently embarked on development projects anchored in their CIDPs. The implementation of these projects has, however, been met by varying levels of success. While in the best case successfully completed projects have been instrumental in-service delivery, the failed or stalled projects in the alternative scenario have meant that service delivery will still be constrained and in addition the costs of the projects may increase leading to loss of funds. For instance, a study by Sikudi (2017) in Kilifi County found that size of the project, allocation of funds; political interference and the level of security affect the rate of implementation of county funded development projects. However, irrespective of the outcome of the projects, the aspect of M&E is rarely cited in relation to the outcome. For the several failed projects in the country, the high failure rates have been largely attributed to limited application of project cycle management (PCM) model. Furthermore, projects fail despite heavy presence of monitoring and evaluation undertakings. This therefore raises serious issues as to whether monitoring and evaluation employed is effective enough to achieve project success.

Several studies agree that monitoring practices is a factor to project performance. Monitoring practices of projects in Kenya state corporations are weak due to poor practices embraced (KNBS, 2012). Tengan and Aigbavboa (2018) found

out that over 60% of substantive projects fail to meet targeted goals due to ineffective monitoring practices. This leads to projects being delivered over budget, behind schedule and timeframe thus affecting quality and projects performance. A recent study by Iddi and Nuhu (2018) found that most organizations lack effective monitoring practices due to misuse of resources, poor planning, conflict of interest and poor communication in meeting obligatory requirements; hence failing to deliver results that meet stakeholders needs despite monitoring practices being in place. Most of these studies however did not focus on County government sponsored projects, and as such little was known about the influence of M&E adoption on their implementation. This therefore was the motivation behind carrying out this study, which sought to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation adoption on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County in Kenya.

1.2. General Objective

The main aim of the study is to determine the influence of monitoring and evaluation adoption on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.

1.3. Specific Objectives

- To determine the influence of top management support for M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.
- To investigate the influence of M&E planning on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.
- To examine the influence of budget allocations for M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.
- To establish the influence of community involvement in M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.

1.4. Research Hypothesis

- Ho₁: There is no significant influence of top management support for M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.
- Ho₂: There is no significant influence of M&E Planning on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.
- Ho₃: There is no significant influence of budget allocations for M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.
- Ho₄: There is no significant influence of community involvement in M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The present study focused on Rabai Sub-County whose health care provision, provision of clean and safe drinking water, reliable road network and other socio-economic enablers have been inadequate for a very long time prior to the advent of the county governments. Given that the CIDP provides a clear road map for the implementation of development plans, such as, those outlined in the County Integrated Development Plan (2013-2017) of Rabai Sub-County government, it is important to examine how the implementation of this plan has impacted on the development projects such as development of healthcare centers, provision of clean and safe drinking water as well as those other socio-economic enabling projects in the Sub-county. Therefore, the outcome of this study was meant to reiterate to the management of the Rabai Sub-county government on the need for pursuing the implementation of the CIDP especially in the critical areas and in accordance to the sub county specific needs. Other stakeholders in the devolution process such as development partners; NGOs, the Civil Society, the business community etc. would also find the results of the present study useful in guiding their initiatives in the area and beyond. Understanding the implementation of the CIDP in service delivery to the public is very useful to the policy makers at the government level. They are supposed to be able to anticipate issues emerging in the devolved governments and find appropriate ways of addressing them at the policy level. Therefore, the outcome of this study together with other similar studies should prove instrumental in shaping policy decisions on devolution. Finally, the finding of this study is meant to be of benefit to the academic community by adding to the growing body of knowledge in this area and consequently enable them to identify gaps upon which to build cases for further research.

1.6. Scope of the Study

This study was confined to the influence of monitoring and evaluation adoption on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kilifi County, Kenya. In this study, primary data for the study concerning top management support for M&E, M&E planning, budget allocations for M&E and community involvement in M&E influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County was obtained directly from the respondents. The study was conducted between May 2019 and July 2019 and was implemented at a cost of Kshs. 123,932.00

1.7. Limitation of the Study

Although this research was carefully prepared, the researcher was aware of its limitations and shortcomings. First of all, the research the population of the survey group was small and this may not necessarily be generalized over other areas of the country. However, appropriate sampling methods as well as inferential statistical methods were used for generalizations. Second, since a self-designed questionnaire was designed to measure the perceptions of the respondents, the accuracy of the findings may not be very high like in the case where standard psychometric instruments were used. However, this limitation was overcome through pretesting for validity and validity. In addition, the respondents were reluctant to give the information for the study; however, this limitation was overcome through presenting the research authorizations from the university and other relevant authorities.

2. Theoretical Review

The study reviewed theories that were used to test hypothesis: stakeholder theory, theory of constraint, and the programme theory.

2.1. Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a research tool intended to assist a researcher to develop awareness and understanding of the situation under scrutiny and thereby be able to communicate that situation. It is used in research to outline possible courses of action or to present a preferred approach to an idea or thought.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

3. Research Design

The study used descriptive survey research design. This type of design is appropriate for gathering information, summarizing, presenting and interpreting it for the purpose of clarification (Orodho & Njeru, 2004). According to Orodho (2005), descriptive survey research design can generate accurate information for large number of people over a wide area using a small sample. It is used to explore relationships between variables and allows generalizations across populations. Since this study sought to obtain descriptive and self-reported information on how certain challenges affect service delivery in a particular devolved unit of government, the descriptive research design enabled the researcher to expose the respondents to a set of standardized questions to allow comparison. The researcher used Quantitative research methods. Quantitative research methods address an investigation that; seeks to confirm hypothesis about phenomena, uses highly structured methods such as Questionnaires, surveys and structured observations.

3.1. Target Population

According to Kothari (2004), a population is a well-defined set of people, services, elements, and events, group of things or households that are being investigated. The target population is 152 projects that have been undertaken by the Kilifi County Government in the four wards of Rabai Sub-County under the CIDP framework in the period between 2013 and 2017. These projects are categorized in terms of Education, Health, Roads, Agriculture, Co-operative development, Water & Sanitation as well as Sports & Youth Fund. The study targeted the 152 projects. The sampling frame of the projects is given in Table 1.

Project Category	No. of Projects
Education Sub-sector	46
Health	24
Roads	16
Agriculture	32
Co-operative Development	8
Water and Sanitation	18
Sport and Youth Fund	8
Total	152

Table 1: Target Population
Source: Rabai Sub County Administrator Office (2019)

3.1.1. Sample Size

Mugenda and Mugenda (2009) recommend that 30% of the entire population can form a representative sample size for small populations. Therefore, applying the 30% rule on the target population gives 46 projects which are then sampled further according to the strata as shown in Table 2.

Project Category	No. of Projects	Sample Size (30%)
Education Sub-sector	46	14
Health	24	7
Roads	16	5
Agriculture	32	10
Co-operative Development	8	2
Water and Sanitation	18	5
Sports and Youth Fund	8	2
Total	152	46

Table 2: Sample Size

The study further carried out stratified proportionate distribution among strata of projects. The unit of analysis was 92 comprising one project manager and one community representative in every project.

3.2. Research Instruments

The study made use of questionnaires as data collecting instrument. The questionnaire was of the structured type containing only closed ended items. The selection of these tools was guided by the nature of data to be collected, time available and the objectives of the study. It has quite a number of advantages which include: confidentiality; time saving; and reduced interviewer bias. Questionnaires also have the advantages of low cost, easy access, physical touch to widely dispersed samples (Fowler, 1993) and also the fact that the results are quantifiable. However, the use of questionnaires requires careful preparation as it could easily confuse the respondents, or discourage them, or simply fail to capture important information needed in the study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). This also enabled the researcher to reduce both researcher and respondent biases. The questionnaires were distributed randomly among the strata.

The study also employed both primary and secondary data. Primary data is important as it involves creating "new" data (Kombo & Tromp, 2006) and this was collected from existing sources. Data collected was based on the perceptions and attitude of the respondents towards the subject of the items in the questionnaires. Secondary data was also collected to supplement the primary data. This was not collected directly by the researcher but was obtained from the diverse store of information in both print and electronic media.

3.3. Validity

The study carried out content validity to test whether the test items in the instrument represented the content that the instrument was designed to measure (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999). In order to ensure that all the items used in the questionnaires are consistent and valid, the instruments were subjected to scrutiny and review by my supervisor and other researcher's at Jomo Kenyatta University. The items were rephrased and modified where necessary to avoid ambiguity before being used for data collection.

3.4. Reliability

The researcher used the internal consistency method to check the reliability of the research instruments. This was done by calculating the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for all the sections of the questionnaire from the results of the pilot study. A value of 0.7 or below of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient would show low internal consistency (Cronbach & Azuma, 1962), which would subsequently solicit modifications, additional questions and any shortcomings that would be found in the questions duly corrected as in Table 3

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Management Support for M&E	0.881	6
M&E Planning	0.797	6
Budget Allocations for M&E	0.932	6
Community Involvement in M&E	0.855	6
Implementation of projects in Rabai Sub-County	0.901	6
Overall instrument reliability	0.8732	30

Table 3: Reliability Statistics

The instrument reliability test yielded a high value for each of the five variables all being above the recommended Cronbach's alpha coefficient threshold of 0.7 indicating a high internal consistency (Cronbach & Azuma, 1962). Subsequently, modifications, additional questions and any shortcomings that were found in the questions were duly corrected at this stage.

4. Data Analysis and Presentation

4.1. Descriptive Analysis Results

This section presents the results of the descriptive statistical analyses of the data and their interpretations. The descriptive statistics helped to develop the basic features of the study and form the basis of virtually every quantitative analysis of the data. The results were presented in terms of the study objectives.

4.1.1. Top Management Support for M&E on Implementation of County Projects

The first objective of the study was to determine the influence of top management support for M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya. This variable was described in terms of Capacity assessment, Experience and Commitment. A five-point Likert scale was used to rate responses of this variable and it ranged from; 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree and was analysed on the basis of the mean score and standard deviation. The closer the mean score on each item was to 5, the more the agreement concerning the statement. A score around 2.5 would indicate uncertainty while scores significantly below 2.5 would suggest disagreement regarding the statement posed. The findings are presented in Table 4.

Statement	SA Freq (%)	A Freq (%)	N Freq (%)	D Freq (%)	SD Freq (%)	Mean	Std. Dev.
Our top management in the county supports carrying out capacity assessment for firms bidding for M&E	12(15)	30(38)	12(15)	15(19)	10(13)	3.18	0.748
Only firms with adequate capacity are shortlisted for M&E in the county	14(18)	42(53)	19(24)	2(3)	2(3)	3.84	0.824
Our top management prefers working with experienced firms on M&E	12(15)	44(56)	16(20)	5(6)	2(3)	3.81	0.752
The experienced M&E firms are allowed to track projects from the onset	12(14)	39(49)	22(28)	3(4)	3(4)	3.88	0.629
The top management ensures that the firms selected for M&E are committed to the deliverables	9(11)	37(47)	9(11)	17(22)	7(9)	3.66	0.814
The top management always provides all the necessary support for the M&E program	18(23)	40(51)	13(16)	7(9)	1(1)	3.95	0.752
Aggregate Score						3.56	0.753

Table 4: Top Management Support for M&E on Implementation of County Projects

As indicated by the aggregate mean (mean = 3.56, SD = 0.753) in Table 4, there was agreement with the statements describing the influence of top management support for M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. In particular, majority of the respondents agreed that the top management in the County supports carrying out capacity assessment for firms bidding for M&E (mean = 3.18). Majority also agreed that only firms with adequate capacity are shortlisted for M&E in the county (mean = 3.84). This was because the top management

preferred working with experienced firms on M&E (mean = 3.81). Further, the experienced M&E firms were allowed to track projects from the onset (mean = 3.88). Most of the respondents also agreed that the top management ensures that the firms selected for M&E are committed to the deliverables (mean = 3.66) while majority strongly agreed that the top management always provides all the necessary support for the M&E program (mean = 3.95).

These findings imply that there was some level of input by the top management in the M&E function in the county government sponsored projects. These findings agree with Turner *et al.*, (2009) who found that management support was an important determinant of M&E within the Malaysian public sector, after sufficiency of the auditing staff. However, the finding show dismal performance in carrying out capacity assessment for firms bidding for M&E, and the study has indicated that top management has laxity in ensuring the firms selected for M&E are committed to top management. Alzeban and Gwilliam (2014) found the absence of management support negatively affected the budget function by creating a poor attitude towards that function by auditees, who perceived it as unimportant because it appeared not to be high on the agenda of senior management.

4.1.2. M&E Planning on Implementation of County Government Sponsored Projects

The second objective of the study was to establish the influence of M&E planning on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya. The status of this variable was described on the basis of Scope, Reporting and Results. A five-point Likert scale was used to rate responses of this variable and it ranged from; 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree and was analysed on the basis of the mean score and standard deviation. The closer the mean score on each score was to 5, the more the agreement concerning the statement. A score around 2.5 would indicate uncertainty while scores significantly below 2.5 would suggest disagreement regarding the statement posed. These results are presented in Table 5.

	SA	A	N	D	SD		Std.
Statements	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Mean	Dev
The scope of the M&E program is always limited when assessing county projects	9(11)	15(19)	11(14)	29(37)	15(19)	2.57	1.046
The scope of the M&E usually covers all phases of the projects	23(29)	28(35)	11(14)	9(11)	8(9)	3.68	0.679
We have well designed reporting procedures for M&E	16(21)	33(42)	17(20)	8(10)	5(6)	3.51	0.712
We try and disseminate the M&E results to all relevant stakeholders	16(21)	41(52)	13(16)	4(5)	5(6)	3.75	0.677
We have a committee appointed to receive and discuss the M&E results	9(11)	9(11)	17(20)	38(48)	6(7)	2.68	0.814
We have a committee that implements the recommendations of the M&E	8(10)	15(19)	12(16)	28(35)	16(21)	2.3	0.991
Aggregate Score						3.08	0.819

Table 5: M&E Planning on Implementation of County Government Sponsored Projects

The aggregate mean (mean = 3.08, SDev. = 0.819) in Table 5 indicates that majority of the respondents either disagreed or were uncertain with the statements describing the influence of M&E planning on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya. For instance, majority (mean = 2.57) of the respondents were not sure whether the scope of the M&E program was always limited when assessing county projects. However, when asked whether the scope of the M&E usually covers all phases of the projects, majority agreed (mean = 3.68). Most of the respondents also agreed that the projects had well designed reporting procedures for M&E (mean = 3.51), they also agreed that the M & E results were disseminated to all relevant stakeholders (mean = 3.75). However, most of them further disagreed that they had a committee appointed to receive and discuss the M&E results (mean = 2.68). They further disagreed that they had a committee that implements the recommendations of the M&E (mean = 2.30).

These findings imply that there were several aspects of M&E planning that were not in place as expected. These could erode the gains of M&E if left unattended. The findings agree with Nyaguthii and Oyugi (2013) who argues that programme planning was an important element of M&E and should encompass the identification of proper information to be used during programme evaluation. Responsibilities on coordination and management of information rely on experts' abilities and capabilities of work and well-coordinated planning (Bamberger, Rugh & Mabry, 2011).

4.1.3. Budget Allocations for M&E on Implementation of County Projects

The third objective of this study was to examine the influence of budget allocations for M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya. The status of this variable was described in terms of; Allocations, Disbursement and Contingencies. A five-point Likert scale was used to rate responses of this variable and it ranged from; 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree and was analyzed on the basis of the mean score and standard deviation. The closer the mean score on each score was to 5, the more the agreement concerning the statement. A score around 2.5 would indicate uncertainty while scores significantly below 2.5 would suggest disagreement regarding the statement posed. The results are presented in Table 6.

	SA	A	N	D	SD		Std.
Statements	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Mean	Dev
We make budget allocations for M&E for every project	10(13)	17(22)	10(13)	31(39)	11(14)	2.72	0.902
Our county's annual capital budget has provisions for M&E	20(25)	29(37)	13(16)	9(11)	8(10)	3.62	0.657
All funds for M&E are disbursed in good time	8(10)	10(13)	9(11)	35(44)	17(22)	2.15	0.799
Disbursements for M&E are always adequate	9(11)	15(19)	10(13)	31(39)	14(18)	2.29	0.925
We factor in contingencies when planning for M&E	18(23)	25(32)	12(15)	13(16)	11(14)	3.68	0.679
We use contingencies to avoid additional budgeting	16(20)	30(38)	11(14)	14(18)	8(10)	3.52	0.784
Aggregate Score						2.99	0.791

Table 6: Budget Allocations for M&E on Implementation of County Projects

With an aggregate mean of 2.99 and a standard deviation of 0.791, the results in Table 6 reveal that majority of the respondents did not agree with the statements pertaining to the influence of budget allocations for M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. In particular, the findings suggest that budget allocations for M&E were not made for every project as indicated by majority of the respondents who disagreed (mean = 2.72). However, majority of the respondents were of the view that the county's annual capital budget has provisions for M&E (mean = 3.62). Nevertheless, all funds for M&E were not disbursed in good time as indicated by majority of the respondents who disagreed (mean = 2.15). Most of the respondents further disagreed that the disbursements for M&E were always adequate (mean = 2.29). However, they often factored in contingencies when planning for M&E (mean = 3.68) and that the contingencies were used to avoid additional budgeting (mean = 3.52). It is evident from these results that there were challenges in budgeting adequately for M&E in the county government sponsored projects in the area. According to Wamugu and Ogollah (2017), budgeting is required to ensure accountability, that is, the public is not taxed any more than that required for appropriate government functions, and also prioritization as it helps identify those public functions to which scarce resources should be allocated. Therefore, in adequate budgeting for M&E would affect the outcome of the process and even the actual implementation of the projects (Kinyanjui et al., 2017).

4.1.4. Community Involvement in M&E on Implementation of County Projects

The fourth objective of this study was to establish the influence of community involvement in M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya. The status of this variable was described in terms of; Skills development, Facilitation and Public discussions. A five-point Likert scale was used to rate responses of this variable and it ranged from; 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree and was analysed on the basis of the mean score and standard deviation. The closer the mean score on each score was to 5, the more the agreement concerning the statement. A score around 2.5 would indicate uncertainty while scores significantly below 2.5 would suggest disagreement regarding the statement posed. The results are presented in Table 7.

	SA	A	N	D	SD		Std.
Statements	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Mean	Dev
We train the community stakeholders on basic M&E skills to enable them oversight the projects	14(18)	32(41)	20(24)	9(11)	5(6)	3.77	0.51
Through training the community on M&E we are able to get timely reports on the status of the projects prior to the actual M&E	17(22)	31(39)	7(9)	16(20)	8(10)	3.7	0.814
We facilitate communities to monitor the projects	9(12)	31(39)	8(10)	20(25)	11(14)	3.26	0.773
Facilitating community M&E is always limited to transportation and meals	12(15)	29(36)	12(15)	15(19)	11(14)	3.38	0.831
We do facilitate public discussions on the state of the projects	12(14)	26(33)	12(14)	19(23)	10(12)	3.37	0.748
Public discussions on M&E are often captured in our reports for future reference	15(19)	24(30)	16(20)	14(18)	10(13)	3.49	0.712
Aggregate Score						3.5	0.731

Table 7: Community Involvement in M&E on Implementation of County Projects

It can be deduced from the aggregate mean of 3.5 and standard deviation of 0.731 that there was a high level of agreement with the statements regarding the influence of community involvement in M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. The findings specifically indicate that the community stakeholders were trained on basic M&E skills to enable them oversight the projects (mean = 3.77). Through training the community on

M&E, the management of the projects were able to get timely reports on the status of the projects prior to the actual M&E (mean = 3.7). Majority of the respondents further indicated that they facilitated communities to monitor the projects (mean = 3.26). However, facilitating community M&E was always limited to transportation and meals (mean = 3.38). The management of the county sponsored projects also facilitated public discussions on the state of the projects (mean = 3.37) and the public discussions on M&E were often captured in their reports for future reference (mean = 3.49).

From these results, there were strong indications of the involvement of the community in the M&E of projects sponsored by the county. The findings agree with Marangu (2012) who found that community participation right from the onset of the project is critical as it ensures that the community owns up the project which is viewed as one of the factors that could ensure project success. According to Mathbor (2008) model of effective community participation, community begin their dialogue at conceptualization of a development project and continue to work together until successes and failures of the project are fully evaluated and reintegrated into future planning.

4.1.5. Implementation of County Government Sponsored Projects in Rabai Sub-County

Finally, the study sought to determine the status of implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya. This was the dependent variable and the status of this variable was described in terms of; Completion of projects, Usability of projects and Costs of the projects. The status of this variable was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from; 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree and was analysed on the basis of the mean score and standard deviation. The closer the mean score on each score was to 5, the more the agreement concerning the statement. A score around 2.5 would indicate uncertainty while scores significantly below 2.5 would suggest disagreement regarding the statement posed. These results are presented in Table 8.

	SA	A	N	D	SD		
Statements	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Mean	Std. Dev.
All of our projects are completed in time	9(11)	14(18)	13(17)	23(29)	20(25)	2.62	0.749
All projects are completed without disputes arising from stakeholders	10(13)	11(14)	16(20)	25(32)	17(21)	2.83	0.837
The projects are well utilized by the community as intended	11(14)	16(20)	14(18)	23(29)	15(19)	2.99	0.768
The projects solve the problems of the community they were meant to address	6(8)	13(17)	16(20)	27(34)	17(21)	2.68	0.737
All our projects are completed within the budgeted costs	13(17)	20(25)	6(7)	26(33)	14(18)	2.74	1.108
We do not have liabilities arising from completed projects	13(17)	18(21)	12(16)	28(36)	8(10)	3.51	1.046
Aggregate Scores						2.73	0.871

Table 8: Implementation of County Government Sponsored Projects in Rabai Sub-County

The results in Table 8 indicate that there was disagreement regarding the status of implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County as indicated by the aggregate mean scores of the statements (mean = 2.73; S. Dev = 0.871). In particular, most of the respondents disagreed that all of projects were completed in good time (mean = 2.92). Most of the respondents also disagreed that all projects were completed without disputes arising from stakeholders (mean = 2.83). In addition, there was uncertainty on whether the projects were well utilized by the community as intended (mean = 2.99) with most of the respondents disagreeing that the projects solved the problems of the community they were meant to address (mean = 2.68). Other results indicate that most of the respondents were of the view that all of their projects were completed within the budgeted costs (mean = 2.74) and that they did have liabilities arising from completed projects (mean = 2.51).

		Management support	Planning	Budget allocations	Community involvement	Implementation
Management support	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N	79				
Planning	Pearson Correlation	.199	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.069				
	N	79	79			
Budget allocations	Pearson Correlation	-.001	.184	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.994	.094			
	N	79	79	79		
Community involvement	Pearson Correlation	.033	.133	0.419	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.763	.227	.742		
	N	79	79	79	79	
Implementation	Pearson Correlation	.096	.218*	.528**	.443**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.386	.047	.000	.000	
	N	79	79	79	79	79

Table 9: Summary of Correlations

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

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

4.2. Correlation Analysis

In this subsection a summary of the Pearson's product moment correlation analyses is presented. It seeks to first determine the degree of interdependence of the independent variables and also show the degree and strength of their association with the dependent variable separately. These results are summarized in Table 9.

The first correlation was done to determine whether top management support for M&E significantly influenced implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. The results in Table 9 shows that the relationship between the variables was not significant ($r = 0.096$, $p > 0.05$). This means that the support from the top management support for M&E was not making a notable contribution in the implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. This finding is consistent with Alzeban and Gwilliam (2014) who found that there is a positive relationship between top management support and performance effectiveness.

The study also sought to determine whether M&E planning significantly influenced implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. The correlation results in Table 9 indicates that a significant relationship ($r = 0.218$, $p \leq 0.05$) existed between the variables. The Pearson's product moment coefficient of correlation further suggests that a weak but positive relationship existed between the variables. This implies that the with more emphasis on M&E planning, the implementation status of county government sponsored projects in the area was bound to improve further. These results agree with da Silva et al., (2013), despite relative success in the provision of new rural water infrastructure in the last two to three decades, studies in many countries show between 30 to 40 per cent of facilities either do not function or are operating below capacity owing to inadequate planning.

It was also important to determine whether budget allocations for M&E significantly influenced implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. The correlation analysis in Table 9 indicates that there was indeed a significant relationship ($r = 0.528$, $p \leq 0.05$) between the variables. The result suggests that there was a strong, positive and significant relationship between the variables. This indicates that the budget allocations for M&E had a very important bearing on the implementation of county government sponsored projects in the area. The findings support those of Reynolds and Sutherland (2013) who found that the process of Monitoring and evaluation should be allocated more in the budget than just the nominal amount for effective M&E of the projects which affects the outcome of the projects significantly.

Finally, the study sought to determine whether community involvement in M&E significantly influenced implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. The correlation analysis in Table 9 indicates that there was indeed a significant relationship ($r = 0.443$, $p \leq 0.05$) between the variables. This finding suggests that the relationship between the variables was moderate implying that the training of the community was an essential requirement for successful implementation of the county government sponsored projects in the area. This finding is in agreement with Nyandika and Ngugi (2014) who established that the community's satisfaction with the system will lead to greater system usage.

4.3. Regression Analysis

Multivariate regression analysis was used to determine the multiple regression model hypothesized in chapter three. It was also used to determine how the independent variables influenced the dependent variable collectively. The

analysis was also meant to establish the extent to which each independent variable affected the dependent variable in such a collective set up and which were the more significant factors. The results are summarized in Table 10.

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.712 ^a	.507	.482	2.449197

Table 10: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Model Summary

a. Predictors: (Constant), Top Management Support, Planning, Budget Allocations, Community Involvement

The regression analysis in Table 10 shows that the relationship between the dependent variable and all the independent variables pooled together had a model correlation coefficient = 0.712. The adjusted r-square ($R^2_{Adj} = 0.482$), further, indicates that the model could explain upto 48.2% variations in the implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. It also suggests that the model could improve when more predictive variables were incorporated into the model.

Sen and Srivastava (2011) state that the appropriateness of the multiple regression model as a whole can be tested using F test. Therefore, the study also performed an ANOVA on the independent and dependent variables and the results are summarized in Table 11.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	189.856	4	47.464	7.91256	.000 ^b
Residual	443.894	74	5.999		
Total	633.750	78			

Table 11: Summary of ANOVA

a. Dependent Variable: Implementation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Top Management Support, Planning, Budget Allocations, Community Involvement

The results in Table 11 indicate that there is a significant difference between the means of M&E independent variables and the dependent variable of implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai sub-county ($F_o = 7.91256 > F_c = 2.50$; $\alpha < 0.05$; $df = 4, 74$; $p = 0.000$). This finding confirms that the model predicted by Table 10 shows it is indeed significant in explaining the implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County on the basis of the identified independent variables.

In order to determine which of the monitoring and evaluation adoption variables was more important when it came to implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, the beta value was used. The results are given in Table 12 provides a summary of the multiple linear regression analysis correlation coefficients.

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.010	4.759		0.422358	0.638
Top Management Support	-0.063	0.108	-0.055	-0.583333	0.522
M&E Planning	0.175	0.083	0.161	2.108434	0.000
Budget Allocations	0.444	0.084	0.407	5.285714	0.000
Community Involvement	0.358	0.117	0.279	3.059829	0.000

Table 12: Multiple Linear Regression Results

a. Dependent Variable: Implementation

Top management support, planning, Budget Allocations, Community Involvement

It can be deduced from the findings in Table 12 that the most influential monitoring and evaluation adoption variables in the model as per the beta values was Budget Allocations for M&E ($\beta = 0.407$, $p < 0.05$). This was followed by Community Involvement in M&E ($\beta = 0.279$, $p < 0.05$) and M&E Planning ($\beta = 0.161$, $p < 0.05$) respectively. This indicates that the dependent variable, that is, the implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, would change by a corresponding number of standard deviations when the respective independent variables changed by one standard deviation. However, the top management support was not found to be significant in the model ($\beta = -0.055$, $p = 0.522 > 0.05$). The study therefore establishes that M&E Planning, Budget Allocations for M&E and Community Involvement in M&E were all factors affecting implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. Top Management Support was, however, found not to be a factor of implementation of county government sponsored projects in the area.

4.4. Hypothesis Testing

The first hypothesis was tested under the null hypothesis;

- H_{01} : Top management support for M&E has no significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.

From the beta values in Table 4.12, it was evident that there was no significant relationship between the variables ($\beta = -0.055$, $p > 0.522$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted and the view that top management support for M&E as currently exercised in the area indeed had no significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects accepted as well. These findings are not consistent with Aagaard and Andersen (2014) who in their research observed that managerial ability to deliver a project was found to be strongly related to the application of strong project top management support based on planning and cost control methodologies. According to Yong and Mustafa (2012), it is the role of the top management to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of the projects. Management's competence, commitment to the project, communication and cooperation with the project teams has a significant contribution towards the success of a construction project. These factors were found to be of significance as assessed in Malaysian construction industry

The second hypothesis was tested under the null hypothesis;

- H_{02} : M&E Planning has no significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.

The beta value from the multiple regression results in Table 12 indicate that there was a significant relationship between the two variables ($\beta = 0.161$, $p < 0.05$). Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected and the study concluded that M&E Planning would lead to an improvement in implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. These findings support those of Da Silva *et al.*, (2013) who found that despite relative success in the provision of new rural water infrastructure in the last two to three decades, studies in many countries show between 30 to 40 per cent of facilities either do not function or are operating below capacity owing to inadequate planning. In Kenya, about 25 to 30 per cent of the recently completed managed rural water supply projects will become dysfunctional in the first three years following completion thus affecting their performance that is they will not be sustainable or will not successfully it achieve its intended results (Reynolds & Sutherland, 2013).

The third hypothesis was tested under the null hypothesis;

- H_{03} : Budget allocations for M&E have no significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.

It is evident from the results in Table 12, it is evident that there was indeed a significant relationship between the variables ($\beta = 0.407$, $p < 0.05$). This meant that the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, it can be inferred that making adequate Budget allocations for M&E could translate to higher levels of implementation of county government sponsored projects in the area. These results are in agreement with Reynolds and Sutherland (2013) who contends that the process of Monitoring and evaluation should be allocated more than just 2% as outlined in the CDF Act. It is recommended for an allocation of between 5% -10 % for monitoring and evaluation. Musumba *et al.*, (2017), however, contended that even with growth of CDF, allocations to the kitty are greatly increasing but only 2% of the fund to each constituency is given to capacity building, monitoring and evaluation. That leaves a question as to whether the allocation can meet the current capacity in terms of human resources (Ngui, 2016).

The fourth hypothesis was tested under the null hypothesis;

- H_{04} : Community involvement in M&E has no significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya.

The results from the multiple regression analysis suggest that there was indeed a significant relationship between the two variables ($\beta = 0.279$, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and, subsequently, the accept the view that facilitating and increasing Community involvement in M&E will lead to a rise in implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. This result supports that of Mathbor (2008) who found that community participation in development projects was effective by involving local people in all stages. Pierre and Peters (2011) contends that the effectiveness of community participation at each stage is the result of a set of elements that emerged from the views, opinions, and perspectives of the stakeholders.

Therefore, the resulting linear model was;

Implementation of projects in Rabai Sub-County= 2.010-0.063Top Management Support for M&E+ .175M&E Planning+ .444Budget Allocation for M&E+ 0.358 Community Involvement in M&E

Or more concisely;

$Y = 2.010 - 0.063 \text{ TMS} + .175 \text{ MEP} + .444 \text{ BA} + 0.358 \text{ CI}$

5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Summary of the Findings

The study established that M&E adoption has a significant relationship with implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub County. The study further revealed a weak uphill positive linear relationship between top leadership support of M&E, planning, community involvement and project implementation. The study also revealed a moderate uphill positive linear relationship between correlation between budget allocation and projects implementation.

The study revealed that top management support for M&E has no insignificant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. In particular, the study established that the top management gave minimal supports in carrying out capacity assessment for firms bidding for M&E and ensuring the top management ensure that the firms selected for M&E are committed to top deliverables. The study established that only firms with adequate capacity are shortlisted for M&E in the county. This was because the top management preferred working with

experienced firms on M&E. Further, the experienced M&E firms were allowed to track projects from the onset. The study also established that the top management ensures that the top management always provided all the necessary support for the M&E program.

The study established that M&E planning has a significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County, Kenya. Similarly, the study revealed that the scope of the M&E usually covers all phases of the projects. The study however revealed that the scope of the M&E program is not always limited when assessing county projects, and that they do not have committee appointed to receive and discuss the M&E results. The study further established that they have committee that implements the recommendations of the M&E.

The findings show that budget allocations for M&E have significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. In particular, the findings established that the county's annual capital budget has provisions for M&E; that they factor in contingencies when planning for M&E; and that they use contingencies to avoid additional budgeting. However, the study has disclosed that they do not make budget allocations for M&E for every project; that all funds for M&E are not disbursed in good time; and that disbursements for M&E are not always adequate.

The study has established that there is significant influence of community involvement in M&E on implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. The findings specifically revealed that the community stakeholders were trained on basic M&E skills to enable them oversight the projects. Through training the community on M&E, the management of the projects were able to get timely reports on the status of the projects prior to the actual M&E. However, the study revealed that they have a problem with facilitating communities to monitor the projects. The study further established that, facilitating community M&E was always limited to transportation and meals. The management of the county sponsored projects also facilitated public discussions on the state of the projects and the public discussions on M&E were often captured in their reports for future reference.

5.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the study concluded that top management support for M&E as currently exercised in the area indeed had no significant influence on implementation of county government sponsored projects. This caused by the top management giving very minimal supports to carrying out capacity assessment for firms bidding for M&E, and not doing enough in ensuring that the firms selected for M&E are committed to top deliverables. Secondly, the study also concludes that M&E Planning would lead to an improvement in implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. However, M&E planning is not achieved because the scope of the M&E program is not always limited when assessing county projects, and that they do not have committee appointed to receive and discuss the M&E results. Third, another conclusion of the study is that making adequate Budget allocations for M&E could translate to higher levels of implementation of county government sponsored projects in the Sub-county. It was, however, they do not make budget allocations for M&E for every project, and all funds for M&E are not disbursed in good time; the disbursements for M&E are also not always adequate. Finally, the study concludes that facilitating and increasing Community involvement in M&E will lead to a rise in implementation of county government sponsored projects in Rabai Sub-County. However, this is faced with the challenge of non-facilitating of communities to monitor the projects.

5.3. Recommendations

From the conclusions the study the following recommendations were put forward: The County government must ensure top management support M&E adoption, by actively carrying out capacity assessment for firms bidding for M&E, and ensuring that the firms selected for M&E are committed to top deliverables. The county government should improve on M&E planning by ensuring the scope of the M&E program is always limited when assessing county projects, and that they have committee appointed to receive and discuss the M&E results. In order to improve on M&E budget allocation, the county government should make budget allocations for M&E for every project, and all funds for M&E are disbursed in good time; the disbursements for M&E should always be adequate. Finally, the county government should increase community involvement by facilitating communities to monitor the projects.

5.4. Recommendations for Future Studies

Future studies should be carried out to establish the reason for insignificant relationship between top leadership support for M&E and the performance of the county sponsored projects in the larger county. Studies should also be done on the influence of top management support for M&E and implementation of the county sponsored projects in the area under study and beyond.

6. References

- i. Aagaard, A., & Andersen, T. (2014). How can HR practices support front-end innovation and increase the innovativeness of companies? *European Journal of International Management*, 8(5), 488-505.
- ii. Abuza, F. (2011). TQM implementation and its impact on organisational performance in developing countries: A case study of Lybya. [Electronic] Available: <http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4314&context=theses> [2017, March 23]
- iii. Alhyari, S., Alazab, M., Venkatraman, S., Alazab, M. & Alazab, A. (2013) 'Performance evaluation of e-government services using balanced scorecard: An empirical study in Jordan', *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 20 (4) 512 – 536

- iv. Alotaibi, M. (2011). *Evaluation of contractor performance for pre-selection in the Kingdom of Saudi* (Doctoral dissertation). Loughborough University, Leicestershire, UK.
- v. Alzeban, A., & Gwilliam, D. (2014). Factors affecting the internal audit effectiveness: A survey of the Saudi public sector. *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation*, 23(2), 74-86.
- vi. Attarzadeh, I., & Ow, S. H. (2008). Project management practices: the criteria for success or failure. *Communications of the IBIMA*, 1(28), 234-241.
- vii. 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/>)
- viii. Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., & Mabry, L. (2011). *Real World evaluation: Working under budget, time, data, and political constraints*. sage.
- ix. Barasa, T. & Eising, W. (2012). *Reforming Local authorities for better service delivery in developing countries*. Institute of Policy analysis and Research, Kenya.
- x. Blair, H. (2000). Participation and Accountability at the Periphery: Democratic Local Governance in Six Countries" in *World Development*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2000
- xi. Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and private management: what's the difference? *Journal of management studies*, 39(1), 97-122.
- xii. Calamai, L. (2009). The link between devolution and regional disparities: evidence from the Italian regions. *Environmental and planning*, 41
- xiii. Cheema, G. S., & Rondinelli, D. A. (2007). *Decentralizing governance: emerging concepts and practices*. Brookings Institution Press.
- xv. Chesos, R. (2010). Automated M&E system for NGOs. *The co-ordinator* (5), 1.
- xvi. 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
- xvii. Chumba, S. K., Wekesa, E. M., & Benjamin, W. K. (2017). Monitoring and Evaluation Dimensions in Public Secondary Schools in Kenya: Assessment of Its Effect on Implementation of Strategic Plans. *European Journal of Education Studies*.
- xviii. Cohen, A., & Sayag, G. (2010). The effectiveness of internal auditing: an empirical examination of its determinants in Israeli organisations. *Australian Accounting Review*, 20(3), 296-307.
- xix. Cox III, J. F., & Boyd, L. H. (2018). Using the theory of constraints' processes of ongoing improvement to address the provider appointment scheduling system design problem. *Health Systems*, 1-35.
- xx. Da Silva, W.C., Van Lieshout, R., & Uytewaal, E. (2013). Monitoring for learning and developing capacities in the WASH sector. *Water policy*, 15(S2), 206-225.
- xxi. Davidson, E. J. (2000). Ascertaining causality in theory-based evaluation. In P. J. Rogers, T. A. Hacs, A. Petrosino, & T. A. Huebner (Eds.), *Program theory in evaluation: Challenges and opportunities* [Special issue]. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 87, 17-26.
- xxii. Davidson, E. J. (2004). *Evaluation methodology basics: The nuts and bolts of sound evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- xxiii. Deloitte (2018). 13pc of infrastructure projects in Kenya are completed on time: Deloitte report. Retrieved from: www.deloitte.com/dtt/cda/doc/content/ie_M_generation.
- xxiv. Donaldson, S. I. (2003). *Theory-driven evaluation in the new millennium*. In *Evaluating social programs and problems: Visions for the new millennium*. Claremont Symposium Series, Claremont, CA.
- xxv. Douvère, F., & Ehler, C. N. (2011). The importance of monitoring and evaluation in adaptive maritime spatial planning. *Journal of Coastal Conservation*, 15(2), 305-311.
- xxvi. Ekouevi, D. K., Karcher, S., & Coffie, P. A. (2011). Strengthening health systems through HIV monitoring and evaluation in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS*, 6(4), 245-250
- xxvii. Endaya, K. A., & Hanefah, M. M. (2016). Internal auditor characteristics, internal audit effectiveness, and moderating effect of senior management. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 32(2), 160-176.
- xxviii. Enshassi, A., Mohamed, S., & Ekarriri, A. (2009). Essential Skills and Training Provisions for Building Project Stakeholders in Palestine. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 14 (1), 31- 50.
- xxix. Ensor, T., Firdaus, H., Dunlop, D, Manu, A., Mukti, A.G., Puspandari, D. VonRoenne,
- xxx. F., Indradjaya, S., Suseno, U. & Vaughan, P. (2012) Budgeting based on need: a model to determine sub-national allocation of resources for health services in Indonesia. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation*, 10:11
- xxxi. Erzurumlu, S. S., & Erzurumlu, Y. O. (2015). Sustainable mining development with community using design thinking and multi-criteria decision analysis. *Resources Policy*, 46, 6-14.
- xxxii. Faniran, O. O., Love, P. E. D., & Smith, J. (2000). Effective front-end project management—a key element in achieving project success in developing countries. In *Proceedings of Construction Development Conference*.
- xxxiii. Fjeldstad, O. H., Heggstad, K., Piracha, M., & Magongo, J. (2011). The political economy of property tax collection in Tanzania. *International Centre for Tax and Development (ICTD)*.
- xxxiv. Fjeldstad, O. H., Katera, L., Msami, J., & Ngalewa, E. (2010). *Local government finances and financial management in Tanzania. Empirical evidence of trends 2000-2007*. REPOA.

- xxxv. Freeman, R., & Moutchnik, A. (2013). 'Stakeholder management and CSR: questions and answers'. *Umwelt Wirtschafts Forum*. 21 (1): 5–9. doi:10.1007/s00550-013-0266-3
- xxxvi. Fu, C. Y., Xie, X., Huang, J. J., Zhang, T., Wu, Q. Y., Chen, J. N., & Hu, H. Y. (2010). Monitoring and evaluation: removal of pathogens at municipal wastewater treatment plants. *Water Science and Technology*, 61(6), 1589-1599.
- xxxvii. Goldratt, E.M. (2009). Standing on the shoulders of giants: production concepts versus production applications. The Hitachi Tool Engineering example. *Gestão & produção*. 16 (3): 333–343.
- xxxviii. Görgens, M., & Kusek, J. Z. (2010). *Making monitoring and evaluation systems work: a capacity development tool kit*. The World Bank.
- xxxix. Gwadoya, R. A. (2012). *Factors influencing effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation practices in donor funded projects in Kenya: a case of Turkana District* (Masters dissertation). Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya
- xl. Harrison, N., Wicks, P. & De Colle, H. (2010). *Stakeholder Theory, State of the Art*, Cambridge University Press.
- xli. Hatch, T. (2013). Beneath the surface of accountability: Answerability, responsibility and capacity-building in recent education reforms in Norway. *Journal of Educational Change*, 14(2), 113-138.
- xl.ii. Horngren, C. T., Foster, G., & Datar, S. M. (2003). *Cost Accounting: A Managerial Emphasis*, Prentice Hall.
- xl.iii. Hyvari, I., (2006). Success of Projects in Different Organizational Condition. *Project Management Journal*. 37.
- xl. iv. Idoro, G. I. (2012). Influence of project plans on the outcome of construction projects procured by Design-Build (DB) in Nigeria. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 17(2), 81-103.
- xl. v. Iddi, B., & Nuhu, S. (2018). Challenges and Opportunities for Community Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation of Government Projects in Tanzania: Case of TASAF II, Bagamoyo District. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 2(1), 1.
- xl. vi. Ike, L. A., Diallo, A. & Thuillier, D. (2012). Critical Success Factors: An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30 (2) 105-116.
- xl. vii. International Budget Partnership (2014) Fair Play: Inequality Across Kenya's Counties and What It Means for Revenue Sharing Budget Brief 18B.
- xl. viii. IFC (International Finance Corporation). (2007). *Stakeholder Engagement: A Good Practice Handbook for Companies Doing Business in Emerging Markets*. IFC, World Bank Group, Washington D.C.
- xl. ix. Johnson, G., Whittington, R., Scholes, K., Angwin, D., & Regné, P. (2011). *Exploring strategy*. Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- l. i. Kamau, C.G., & Mohamed, H. (2015). Efficacy of Monitoring and Evaluation Function in Achieving Project Success in Kenya: A Conceptual Framework. *Science Journal of Business and Management*, 3(3), 82-94. doi: 10.11648/j.sjbm.20150303.14.
- l. ii. Khumalo, N.Y. (2015) *A Review of the Alignment Between the Integrated Development Plan and the Performance Management System of the Capricorn District Municipality*. (Unpublished Masters Thesis), Stellenbosch University.
- l. iii. Kimando, L. N., Njogu, G. W., & Kihoro, J. M. (2012). Factors Affecting the Success of Youth Enterprise Development Funded Projects in Kenya; A Survey of Kigumo District Muranga County. *International Journal of Business & Commerce*, 1(10), 61-81.
- l. iii. Kimenyi, S. M. (2012). Efficiency and Efficacy of Kenya's Constituency Development Fund. Theory and Evidence. UK: University of Connecticut.
- l. iv. Kinyanjui, J. N., Bulitia, G., & Machogu, C. (2017). Monetary Resources Utilization and Implementation of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Kenya: a Case of Kiharu Constituency Murang'a County.
- l. v. KNBS, D. (2012). Kenya Facts and Figures 2012 (Booklet) (p. 83). *Nairobi, Kenya: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics*.
- l. vi. Kotter, P. J. (2015). *A Sense of Urgency*, Harvard Business Press, Boston MA.
- l. vii. Lahey, R. (2005). A Comparative Analysis of Monitoring and Evaluation in Four Selected Countries: Canada, United States, Australia and United Kingdom. *Unpublished manuscript*.
- l. viii. Laplume, A., Karan, S., & Litz, R. (2008). Stakeholder Theory: Reviewing a Theory That Moves Us. *Journal of Management*. 34 (6): 1152–1189. doi:10.1177/0149206308324322.
- l. ix. Lee, R. D. (2010). *Public Personnel Systems*, 3rd (ed) Maryland: Gaithersburg, Aspen Publisher.
- l. x. Linhares, A. (2009). Theory of constraints and the combinatorial complexity of the product-mix decision. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 121 (1), 121–129. doi:10.1016/j.ijpe.2009.04.023.
- l. xi. Machogu, C., Kinyanjui, J. N., & Bulitia, G. M. (2016). Monetary Resources Utilization and Implementation Of Constituency Development Fund Projects In Kenya. 104-125.
- l. xii. Mackay, K. R. (2007). *How to build M&E systems to support better government*. The World Bank.
- l. xiii. Magundu, A. (2013). Factors Influencing Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation in HIV Research Projects: A Case of Kenya Aids Vaccine Initiative (KAVI). *Unpublished Thesis*.
- l. xiv. Manowong, E., & Ogunlana, S. (2006), Public Hearings in Thailand's infrastructure Projects: effective Participations? *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 13(4), 343-63.
- l. xv. Marangu, J. M. (2012). Employee perception on strategic change management practices and performance at Kenya Power & Lighting Company Limited. *Unpublished MBA project, University of Nairobi*.
- l. xvi. Mathbor, G. (2008). Uniting project proponents and the community: A model for coastal development projects. *Social Development Issues*, 30(2), 1-14.
- l. xvii. Miles, S. (2012). Stakeholders: essentially contested or just confused? *Journal of Business Ethics*. 108 (3), 285–298. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1090-8.

- lxviii. Muchelule, Y. W. (2018). *Influence of Monitoring Practices on Projects Performance of Kenya State Corporations*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.
- lxix. Mugambi, K. W., &Theuri, F. S. (2014) The Challenges Encountered by County Governments In Kenya During Budget Preparation, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(2), 128-134
- lxx. Mugo, P. M. (2014). Monitoring and evaluation of development projects and economic policy development in Kenya. *Unpublished Thesis*.
- lxxi. Musumba, M., Grabowski, P., Palm, C. &Snapp, S. (2017). Guide for the sustainable intensification assessment framework. Kansas, USA: Kansas State University
- lxxii. Musyoka, J.M. (2010). Participation and accountability in integrated development planning: The case of Ethekwini municipality's small businesses-related local economic development in the Ethekwini Municipality.
- lxxiii. [Electronic]Available:http://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10413/799/Musyoka_JM_2010.pdf?sequence=1 [2017 June 29].
- lxxiv. Mwangi, A. W., &Iravo, M. A. (2015). How monitoring and evaluation affects the outcome of constituency development Fund Projects in Kenya: a case study of projects in Gatanga Constituency. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 5(3), 2222-6990.
- lxxv. Myrick, D. (2013). A Logical Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation: A Pragmatic Approach to M&E. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(14), 423-428.
- lxxvi. Naidoo, I. A. (2011). *The role of monitoring and evaluation in promoting good governance in South Africa: A case study of the Department of Social Development* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Witwatersrand).
- lxxvii. Ngacho, C. (2013). *An Assessment of the Performance of Public Sector Construction Projects: An Empirical Study of Projects Funded Under Constituency Development Fund (CDF) In Western Province, Kenya*. (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation), University of Delhi.
- lxxviii. Ngui, T. K. (2016). Relationship Between Employee Relations Strategies and Performance of Commercial Banks In Kenya. *International Journal of Research in IT, Management & Engineering*, 6(1), 17-52.
- lxxix. Nielsen, S. B., & Ejler, N. (2008). Improving performance? Exploring the complementarities between evaluation and performance management. *Evaluation*, 14(2), 171-19.
- lxxx. Njuki, J., Pali, P. N., Nyikahadzoi, K., Olaride, P., & Adekunle, A. A. (2010). Monitoring and evaluation strategy for the sub-Saharan Africa challenge program. Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA).
- lxxxi. Ntuala, M. (2011). Factors Influencing Implementation of Constituency Development Funded Projects.
- lxxxii. Nyaguthii, E., & Oyugi, L. A. (2013). Influence of community participation on successful implementation of constituency development fund projects in Kenya: case study of Mwea Constituency. *International journal of Education and Research*, 1(8), 1-16.
- lxxxiii. Nyandemo, S. M., & Kongere, T. O. (2010). Project management, from design to implementation. *Richmond Designers and Printers: Nairobi*.
- lxxxiv. Nyandika, O. F., & Ngugi, K. (2014). Influence of Stakeholders' Participation on Performance of Road Projects At Kenya National Highways Authority. *European Journal of Business Management*, 1(11), 384-404.
- lxxxv. Onabolu, B., & Ndlovu, M. (2006). *A methodical approach to health and sanitation integration*. Water Research Commission.
- lxxxvi. Ochieng, F., Chepkuto, P., Tubey, R., & Kuto, L. Y. (2012) Effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects in Kenya. A case of Ainamoi Constituency, 1(6), 186-194
- lxxxvii. Ojok, J. (2016). *Effective Role of Public Sector Monitoring And Evaluation In Promoting Good Governance In Uganda: Implications From The Ministry Of Local Government* (Doctoral Dissertation), Uganda Technology And Management University.
- lxxxviii. Orodho, A. J. (2004). Techniques of writing research proposals and social sciences: Nairobi.
- lxxxix. Rajasekar, J. (2014). Factors affecting effective strategy implementation in a service industry: A study of electricity distribution companies in the Sultanate of Oman. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(9).
- xc. Rogers, P. J. (2000). Causal models in program theory evaluation. In P. J. Rogers, T. A. Hacsí, A. Petrosino, & T. A. Huebner (Eds.), *Program theory in evaluation: Challenges and opportunities*. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 87, 47-55.
- xc. Pawson, R., & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic evaluation*. London: Sage.
- xcii. Pierre, J. & Peters, B.G. (2011). *The handbook of Public Administration*. Sage publications Ltd. London.
- xciii. Posavac, E. J. (2015). *Program evaluation: Methods and case studies*. Routledge.
- xciv. Project Management Institute (2013). *Organizational Project Management Maturity Model (OPM3) Knowledge Foundation*. PMI Standards Committee, Project Management Institute, Newtown Square, PA.
- xcv. Pretorius, S., Steyn, H., & Jordaan, J. C. (2012). Project management maturity and project management success in the engineering and construction industries in Southern Africa. *South African Journal of Industrial Engineering*, 23(3), 1-12.
- xcvi. Reynolds, H. W., & Sutherland, E. G. (2013). A systematic approach to the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of integrated health services. *BMC health services research*, 13(1), 168.
- xcvii. Sande, P. N., & Ogollah, K. (2016). Effect of Technical Capability on Implementation of Family Planning Projects by Non-Governmental Organizations in Kenya. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management*, 1(1), 1-12.

- xcviii. Schragenheim, E; Dettmer, H.W., & Patterson, J. W. (2009). *Supply Chain Management at Warp Speed*. Boca Raton: Auerbach publications.
- xcix. Shri, S.M. (2010). DBR, Buffer Management, and VATI flow classification.
 - c. Siddiquee, A., Noore, P., Nastiti, D., and Sejati, N. A., (2012). Regional Autonomy and Local Resource Mobilization in Eastern Indonesia: Problems and Pitfalls of Fiscal Decentralization. *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 39 (1), 44-68.
 - ci. Sikudi, L.A. (2017). Factors Influencing Implementation Of County Funded Development Projects By County Governments, In Kenya: A Case of Kilifi County Government. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*. University of Nairobi
 - cii. Standard, A. (2011). Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK (R) Guide)–. In *Project Management Institute*.
 - ciii. Steyn, H. (2000). An Investigation into the Fundamentals of Critical Chain Project Scheduling. *International Journal of Project Management*, 8 (19), 363–369.
 - civ. Stufflebeam, D. L. (2004). The 21st century CIPP model. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), *Evaluation Roots* 245-266.
 - cv. Taye, H. (2013). Evaluating the impact of agricultural extension programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Challenges and prospects. *African Evaluation Journal*, 1(1), 9.
 - cvi. Tengan, C., & Aigbavboa, C. (2018). Validating factors influencing monitoring and evaluation in the Ghanaian construction industry: a Delphi study approach. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 1-12.
 - cvi. Thomas, S. R., Macken, C. L., Chung, T. H., & Kim, I. (2002). Measuring the impacts of the delivery system on project performance—Design-build and design-bid-build. *NIST GCR*, 2, 840.
 - cviii. Thompson, A.A., & Strickland, A.J. (2003). *Strategic management: concepts and cases*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
 - cix. Turner, R., Zolin, R., & Remington, K. (2009). Monitoring the performance of complex projects from multiple perspectives over multiple time frames. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Research Network of Project Management Conference*. IRNOP.
 - cx. Umble, M.; Umble E., & Murakami, S. (2006). Implementing theory of constraints in a traditional Japanese manufacturing environment: the case of Hitachi Tool Engineering. *International Journal of Production Research*, 44(10), 1863-1880.
 - cx. Van Dooren, W., Bouckaert, G., & Halligan, J. (2015). *Performance management in the public sector*. Routledge.
 - cxii. Van Gansberghe, C. N. (2005). Internal Audit: Finding its Place in Public Financial Management. *Public Expenditure and Fiscal Accountability Programme, Washington DC, World Bank*.
 - cxiii. Waithera, S. L., & Wanyoike, D. M. (2015). Influence of project monitoring and evaluation on performance of youth funded agribusiness projects in Bahati sub-county, Nakuru, Kenya, *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 3 (2), 375-394.
 - cxiv. Wamugu, J. W., & Ogollah, K. (2017). Role of stakeholders' participation on the performance of constituency development fund projects in Mathira East constituency in Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management*, 2(1), 104-125.
 - cxv. World Bank (2007) "Monitoring and Evaluation: Tips for strengthening organizational capacity" Available from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBELARUS/Resources/M&E.pdf>, accessed 5-08-2014.
 - cxvi. World Bank. (2012). *Devolution without Disruptions – Pathways to a successful New Kenya* Poverty Reduction Economic Management unit Africa Region Kenya
 - cxvii. Yang, J., Chi, J., & Young, M. (2011). A review of corporate governance in China. *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature*, 25(1), 15-28.
 - cxviii. Yong, C.Y., & Mustaffa, E.N. (2012). Analysis of factors critical to construction project success in Malaysia. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 19(5), 543-556.