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ABSTRACT

The study aimed to assess factors that influence completion of CDF project in Lari sub-county. The specific study objective was to examine the impact of project identification, fund provision, stakeholder’s involvement and examining and evaluation on completion of CDF programs in Lari sub-county. Empirical literature of the works of scholars was reviewed in this study. The study used theory of Project Implementation and Program Theory as key theoretical models. The nexus of interrelationships between study variables was demonstrated by a conceptual framework configured. This study employed descriptive research design. The research also employed the use of a mixed research approach that takes into consideration both qualitative and quantitative aspects of data collection. Krejcie and Morgan table for determining sample size was used. Simple random sampling method was applied. Data was collected through semi-structured questionnaire. Test retest was done to ensure instrument reliability. A pilot study was also done. The research instrument was examined by the research supervisor to enhance its validity. The research instrument was also tested for internal data consistency using Cronbach alpha method so as to ensure its reliability. High standards of research ethics were observed. Information obtained during data collection was treated with optimal confidentiality and discretion. Data was analyzed using SPSS. After analysis, the research findings were summarized and exhibited in tabulation form and recommendations for further action given. From the analysis it was found that there was slightly high number of incomplete project initiatives in the region, mostly class rooms. The study also found that project identification had greater influence in project completion. Fund allocation also significantly affects the completion of programs through misallocation of fund, underfunding and delay in availing fund as a major fund allocation affecting project completion, community participation is another factor found to be affecting project completion in addition to monitoring and evaluation where regular visiting of the site greatly affect program completion. In conclusion for the time completion of the community initiatives all the four variables (project identification, community participation, monitoring and evaluation and timely funding) must be implemented to the latter. Based on the outcome it was recommended that feasibility study should be done before embarking on implementing a project. There is need to broadly provide sufficient fund for the CDF project at the right time for proper implementation and well-timed completion of the program and since community involvement is key to programs completion, project leaders should strive to sensitize community on participation in CDF initiatives.
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Background to the study
Decentralization refers to the delegation of authority and duties for public functions from central government to local governments. World economies have adopted decentralization as a crucial element of the development agenda (Burkiet et al., 1991; World Bank, 2000). In Indonesia, for instance, the government developed a blue print dubbed Project Management Implementation Guideline (PMIG) to guide the implementation of government and donor funds. The document incorporates the agenda of the Jakarta commitment of 2009 and the commonly agreed principles of the Paris declaration: ownership, competition, transparency and accountability in assisting the government to ensure effectiveness of project implementation. (Kuswoyo, 2009).

African countries have embraced decentralization as way of changing the society by aiming at deployment of resources for Nation building. Uganda for instance started decentralization on political front since 1986 so as to meet the demands and interests of its population. Through decentralization effort the Ugandan Government was able to achieve transfer of power to lower Government levels, enhancing resource responsibility and accountability by relating taxes to service delivery and enhancing capacity at local level to plan finance, manage and implement programs and projects (Odhiambo, 2006).

In Kenya over the years, there has been a deliberate effort by the government to decentralize some of its development projects. Among these include-Special Rural Development Program (1969/1970), District Development Grant Program (1966), District Development
Planning (1971), Rural Trade and Production Centre (1988-1989) and District Focus for Rural Development (1983-1984) and many more. These were formulated with the aim of attaining development in all parts of the country. These programs however, failed largely due to problems of funding (Makori, Aduda & Ngacho, 2015). The Government of Kenya initiated and implemented the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) in the year 2003. The objective of the CDF was to facilitate development project at constituency-level. CDF is a national government financing containing an amount of money of not below 2.5% of all the share of the total revenue of national government as apportioned by the annual Division of Revenue Act enacted pursuant to Article 218 of the Constitution (Constituencies Development Fund Act, 2015). The fund is managed by CDF committee. Five percent of this fund should be set aside as Emergency Reserve for any emergencies that may occur within the constituency (GoK, 2015). There is an established National Government Development Fund Board that considers initiative proposals submitted from a number of constituencies in compliance with the Act, consents for funding those project proposals that are in line with this Act and direct finances to the individual account of constituency fund of the appropriate initiatives.

Projects under the CDF Act should be those that are relating to works and services under the roles of the national government as written in Constitution and be communal based in so as to safeguard availability of values to an extensive range of the inhabitants of a certain area (GoK, 2015).

The CDF programs involve reorganization of decision making roles for program identification, planning, and implementation and monitoring from the National Government to the constituencies (Odhiambo, 2006). As noted by Owour (2013), CDF management in Kenya has faced various challenges including the organization structure in managing CDF initiatives,
The performance of the CDF is determined by decline in poverty index, improved infrastructure, better health care, improved education facilities as well as completion of the stated CDF funded initiative (Odhiambo, 2006).

1.2 Statement of the problem
The aim of CDF was to realize equity in development resources allocation among regions and to address inequalities in regional development as a result of the funds being managed locally by individuals who were aware of the community needs. Every constituency development initiative was targeted, especially those aiming to fight poverty at the grass roots level like construction of boreholes construction of health centers. This explains why tangible projects such as construction of classrooms, bridges, hospitals, roads and water storage facilities have been undertaken in most constituencies across the country, as well as remote regions that were originally overlooked during the allocation of funds in national budgets (Kimenyi 2005). There are however many incomplete projects or projects that are abandoned all together in many parts of the country Lari sub-county included (Owuor 2013). This begs the question on whether funds from the CDF kitty are objectively employed for successful completion of developmental projects. Kimenyi (2005) argues that management of CDF encounters different challenges such as the organization structure in managing CDF initiatives and criteria of project identification.

A project is believed to be completely successful if it is completed on time, as per the budget and performs just consistent with the designer’s specification, however this is a tall directive and several initiatives would conform to these requirements (Choudhury, 2002). Projects implemented by CDF require huge capital investment and is therefore a matter of interest to the public which is the beneficiary of the CDF projects. Many projects have been initiated but a few
have been completed, while others have stalled and therefore, are not serving the community at all in making their lives better (Kibebe & Mwirigi, 2014). It is in contrast to this background that this study seeks to Explore Factors that Affect Completion of CDF Initiatives in Lari sub-county, Kiambu County.

1.3 Purpose of the study
This study sought to assess factors affecting successful completion of CDF funded initiatives in Lari sub-county, Kiambu County.

1.4 Objectives of the study
This study was guided by the following objectives:

i. To measure the influence of project identification on completion of the CDF funded project

ii. To investigate how funds allocation affect completion of CDF project

iii. To investigate the effect of stakeholders involvement on completion of CDF funded programs.

iv. To determine the influence of Monitoring and evaluation on completion of CDF funded initiatives

1.5 Research questions
The study was guided by the following research questions:

i. To what extent does project identification affect completion of CDF funded project?

ii. How does funds allocation affect completion of CDF funded projects?

iii. How does stakeholder involvement affect completion of CDF funded projects?
iv. To what degree does Monitoring and Assessment affect completion of CDF funded initiatives?

1.6 Significance of the study
The study sought to explore factors that affect successful completion of CDF funded programs in Lari sub-county. Findings may be used for organizational learning and improve project planning, implementation and management. The results of this study can be embraced by any organization and government to plan and make policies on its initiative that are geared towards enhancing the overall performance of initiative.

The project managers will have an insight on each stage in a project cycle and how it impacts on project completion. This may further give a deeper insight to those who are charged with project implementation to effectively implement the required processes such as monitoring and evaluation. The study findings could be useful to project managers in sub-counties on project implementation and evaluation. The findings and recommendations arising from this study may be useful to the national government as well as county governments in project authorization, funding, monitoring and evaluation.

1.7 Limitations of the study
Extraneous factors might be experienced such as environmental disasters and political violence. There might be limited literature on the theme of CDF internationally.

1.8 Delimitations of the study
The study is restricted to investigation of factors influencing successful completion of CDF funded initiatives in Lari constituency. The study will be limited to the study of foreseen factors due to the fact that the stakeholders do not provide for occurrence of risks when disbursing funds
for various projects. The study will target stakeholders and chairpersons and members of CDF committees in wards within Lari sub-county.

1.9 Assumptions of the study
The study was grounded on the following assumptions:

The respondents will be given true and honest responses to the objects in the research instruments.

The respondents will give true and unbiased responses to the questions.

Each ward where research will be carried out has a CDF funded project.

1.10 Definition of significant terms used in the study
Project: A project is a distinctive process involving of a set of coordinated and controlled activities with commence and end dates undertaken to attain specified goals that usually conform to particular requirements that include constraints of time, cost as well as resources.

Project implementation: This is a stage in a project where funds are used to complete the intended project activities to realize desired objectives.

Project monitoring: This is an endless and regular review and management of the initiatives to ensure that input work schedules, deliveries, target outputs and other necessary actions continue consistent with the project. It involves continuous method of gathering information at systematic intervals about ongoing initiatives regarding the type and their performance level.

Project evaluation: It is a process that encompasses organized collection, analysis and interpretation of data related to initiative that can be used to understand how the initiative is running in relation to its objectives.
**Project identification:** Project identification is the first stage of an initiative in which the setting and clarifying of the initiative objectives is done. It is at this stage where the need analysis and baseline surveys are undertaken to ascertain the problems, needs and interests of possible stakeholders.

1.11 Organization of the study

The study consists of five chapters. Chapter One comprises of the background to the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objective of the study, research questions, significance of the study, limitations of the study, delimitations of the study and meaning of important terms used in the study. Chapter Two constitutes the literature review of the related areas under: project identification, fund allocation, political interest, project monitoring and evaluation, summary of literature review, theoretical framework and conceptual framework. Chapter Three consists of research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedures, research instruments, validity and reliability of the research instrument, data collection, data analysis procedures and ethical consideration. Chapter Four has data analysis, presentation and interpretations and Chapter Five comprises of the summary of the study, conclusions and recommendations and recommendations for future studies.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter reviewed Literature related to the study on the factors affecting successful completion of Constituency Development Funded initiatives in Kenya. It elaborates on management of CDF projects and the project life cycle. It also focuses on project identification, fund allocation, stakeholder involvement, monitoring and evaluation and how these factors influence completion of CDF initiatives.

2.2 Project identification and completion of CDF projects
The initiatives which are funded by the constituencies development fund (CDF) are identified and formulated by the community representatives and they should have a lasting and significant social economic impact on the community (GOK, 2003). A project goes through a Project Cycle in which Project Identification is a key stage. Stages in a project cycle include: identification, formulation, appraisal, implementation and evaluation.

At the program identification stage, all main activities are geared towards formation of general principles and guidelines for cooperation, agreement of sectorial and thematic focus and outlining of wide-ranging ideas for initiatives and programs. This stage is important in setting the ground for general agreement on how the activities will be implemented and monitored. The identification stage is very significant in setting and clarifying the project objectives. Need analysis and baseline surveys are undertaken to ascertain the difficulties, needs and welfares of likely stakeholders. At the appraisal stage, all important features of the initiative idea are studied, with regards to the views of stakeholders, relevance to problems, achievability and many more.
Financing is the stage where a decision is taken by the appropriate persons on whether or not to fund the initiative, on the basis of appraisal. At the implementation stage, the agreed upon resources are used to perform the intended project activities and accomplish desired objectives. Monitoring is done to assess progress to enable alteration to changing situations. Evaluation which is the final stage entails the evaluation of the accomplishments and impact, examination of the significance and fulfillment of the objectives, effectiveness, efficiency, effect and sustainability of the initiative (Nyonje, Ndunge and Mulwa, 2012).

The CDF Act (2013) provides that the elected Member of Parliament across all constituencies shall, convene location meetings in the constituency within the twelve months of a new parliament and not less than once every two years afterwards. This is to deliberate on issues relating to development in the location, the constituency and the district. Every location shall produce a listing of priority initiatives to be submitted to the Constituency Development Fund Committee which shall deliberate on initiative proposals from every location in the constituency. Initiatives shall be society based to safeguard the potential benefits is obtainable to an extensive representation of the population of a certain area. Any funding shall be for the whole initiative or an outlined phase, unit or element of an initiative and may consist of the land acquisition and buildings. PMC’s initiate a request for funding based on a felt need. Munns et al(1996) observed that choosing the right initiative at the beginning and screening out possible unsuccessful in iterative would be more significant in safeguarding total initiative success. This is very important in CDF funded projects since without proper project screening means poor project selection and thereafter the project fails to meet the stakeholder’s needs.

Kinyoda (2009) conducted a study establishing participation level in initiative identification and selection by constituents a case of Makadara CDF. The study recommended that the government
and civil society ought to facilitate public awareness drives. There should also be guidelines in
how public involvement should happen. In his study on the influence of the public in
safeguarding successful completion of CDF initiatives in Kitutu Chache constituency Kisii
central District Mochiemo (2007) observed that the government CDF NGO’s as well as any
other body intending to initiate a program in a community have to involve and the society
participation from the first initiative identification to the end and to safeguard its effective
completion as well as sustainability. Participatory leadership and goal oriented leadership among
others increase project implementation (Hussein, 2010).

Members of parliament are expected to only spearhead the process of identifying the CDF
projects while the local communities are supposed to identify the project. However, this is not
the case since the members of parliament decide which initiatives to be implemented minus the
stakeholders ‘participation. Such projects may not be of much benefit to the local people who
may end up rejecting them making the project a vague investment. Mapesa et al.(2006) in his
research on Kangundo constituency shows that the local people never participate in project
identification. It also shows that majority of people were not satisfied with the CDF Committee.
It pointed out that a number of challenges face CDF which include: lack of monitoring and
assessment, low awareness levels, insufficient community participation and community
interference among others.

2.3 Fund allocation and completion of CDF projects
Various quarters have criticized the management and implementation of CDF. According to
Transparency International, there have been skepticisms as to whether the CDF has met its
indicated purpose. There is lack of transparency in funds allocation for development initiatives
(NMB, 2009). The CDF Act 2003 highly promotes the involvement of experts to aid M & E as
well as in the implementation of projects through the line ministries of the projects who expressly are supposed to be government officers in the respective districts. However, there is an observed apathy in consulting these officers by the Project Management Committees (IPAR, 2006). This tendency is attributed to inadequate staffing, bureaucracy, outright ignorance by the PMCs and corruption tendencies by public officers. This non-involvement of such expert opinion throughout the project cycle has resulted in the allocation of inadequate funds to projects leading to high non-completion rates, dragging of projects over a long time, poor quality work and non-utilization of completed CDF projects. In their study, (Oyalo & Bwisa (2015) noted that CDF did not fully fund the projects and there was delays in availing funds which affected the completion of projects since the cost of project kept changing. Not much success is achieved as a result of politicization and resources misallocation of a number of these initiatives (Cort & Kinyanjui, 2010).

While studying factors influencing the implementation of CDF financed initiatives in Lari Constituency, Omanga (2010) observed that the public believed that CDF initiatives fail as a result of procurement not done in a transparent manner. He observed from the research that 70 % of the respondents strongly believed that the procurement procedure is greatly affected and therefore adversely influences performance of CDF initiatives while only 30 % believe that the CDF initiatives fail due to several reasons and not as a result of procurement procedure. The study further shows that 12 % of the initiatives were complete, 67 % of the initiatives were ongoing, 15 % had stuck and 6 % had been stopped completely. This is to mean that so much money is wasted in procurement which leads to incompletion of projects as scheduled.
2.4 Stakeholders involvement and completion of CDF projects

Participatory development involves people making decisions on what affect their own lives. Community members have to contribute in the identification, planning and controlling their needs without outside prescriptions (Barasa & Jelagat, 2013). However, this is not always the case. Ogolla (2016) cites a Kenyan based National Anti-Corruption Campaign Steering Committee (NACCSC) 2008 report indicating that approximately 60 percent of Kenyans don’t have the chance to participate in initiative prioritization and selection. Members of parliament have allocated themselves excessive powers through the CDF Act 2003 and the CDF amendment Bill 2007. Democracy, transparency and accountability have been seriously undermined by the duplication of roles by the Member of Parliament (OSIEA-social Audit report, 2008).

In his study, Nyaga (2010) concluded that the biggest challenge that faced CDF funded projects is that projects undertaken were substandard and implemented selectively. The selective implementation of projects was blamed on members of parliament who took projects to areas where their political support was strong and denies areas purported to belong to their political opponents. CDF projects initiated during the tenure of the previous MP were often abandoned. This was reinforced by Baskin (2010) who stated that it was necessary to address the politicized nature of CDF projects as many times than not, whenever we had a new MP, the projects started by the previous MPs were abandoned for political reasons. This resulted in objectives of the initial project being left unattained and hence leaving a big gap unfilled. The MP appoints the CDFC members who are in charge of the implementation of CDF at the constituency level. This deception of responsibilities makes CDF a de-facto “MP’s kitty” without considering their competence in development planning and implementation, and also does not provide adequate checks and balances to avoid abuse.
High levels of engagement of users, clients and stakeholders in projects are imperative to project success and sustainability (UNDP, 2009). In his study, Juma Malala (2010), notes that several people believe that CDF has not lessened corruption or discrimination as imagined in the past. It has escalated graft and political manipulation instead. The absence of accountability structures make it vulnerable to misappropriation and embezzlement. Not any evidence suggests that CDF has resulted in the betterment of people’s lives at the grassroots, however this is an essential component to the economic performance of a country and development blue print contained in the Kenya Vision 2030 document. Poor governance and improper management of initiatives like CDF have resulted in this existing mess (Tome, 2009). CDF has only been effective in constituencies where the MPs don’t inhibit the CDF Committee activities and decisions. MPS are given too much power in the CDF management structure. They legislate CDF laws, appoint the CDF Committee members who manage the CDF in the constituencies, and act as their chairpersons. The parliamentary committee responsibility in finance is known to manage implementation of the CDF and as well has powers to decide the given out funds, develop policy, and actually has the ultimate say on matters regarding implementation of CDF (G.Kamau & G. Muturi, 2015)

Musa (2002), points out that through participation, the community members gain practical skills for collective action, maintenance and sustenance of project activities. Murray (2011) recommends that the best answer to accountability and conflict of interest problems in CDF is to do away with MPs completely from the management of initiatives including the selection of initiatives. The Constituency Development Committees are responsible for steering and monitoring the undertakings and ensure that all the initiatives that are started are successful. The Constituency Development Committee that is the Center of decision making is characterized
by political benefaction. Majority of individuals in the CDF implementation committee are persons who are stable social economically compared to the genuine beneficiaries. This hence means that whether these programs realize the visions and objectives or not, it doesn’t matter to them provided that they are enjoying allowances. Poor commitment by the CDF Management Committee towards project implementation is thus a problem. Proper governance free of political interference, urgently need re-engineering so as to be geared towards attaining value for money by enhancing performance of CDF funded projects (Kibebe & Mwirigi, 2014).

2.5 Project monitoring and evaluation and completion of CDF projects
Monitoring is the continuous assessment of project/ program implementation through verification of activities against set targets while evaluation on the other hand is defined as a periodic exercise that attempts to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and impact of ongoing and completed projects and other management initiatives (NIMES, 2008). Monitoring is usually done as the project is being implemented to evaluate the progress of the program based on the objectives as formulated in the project cycle. Monitoring of the project helps in taking corrective measures in case of an error in implementing the project. Evaluation on the other hand is done at the completion of the initiative to evaluate the impact of the initiative to its intended clients. This helps to know whether the project has met its intended goals.

The Constituency Development Fund Act 2003 envisages that the projects being implemented under the fund shall be subjected to monitoring and evaluation (M & E) on a regular basis. Section 30(4) stipulates that the CDFC shall be responsible for monitoring and evaluation and may select a sub-committee, a location committee or a project committee whose role is to monitor an on-going initiative. Monitoring and assessment of ongoing initiatives and capacity
building of numerous operatives may be considered as a development initiatives on condition
that less than three per centum shall be apportioned for this objective (CDF Act, 2015).

Although 3% of CDF funds disbursed to each constituency are set aside for use in monitoring
and evaluation, the exercise is seldom done in the right manner due to existing capacity gaps
among the implementers. Many projects implemented by CDF lack documented objectives, work
plans, predetermined total project costs; which are key to any meaningful M & E exercise. Many
of these flaws occur at the planning phase where monitoring indicators are not formulated early
enough making it difficult to monitor progress later on (Malala, 2010). This lack of involvement
of experts in Monitoring and assessment in implementation of CDF initiatives leads to dragging
of projects, poor quality work and non-utilization of completed projects. Effective
implementation and sustenance of CDF initiatives can be achieved, through strong monitoring
and evaluation practices by the management. This will enable them to know the condition of the
programs, identify challenges within the initiatives and community in general so as to create a
favorable environment for sustenance of the programs (Kibebe & Mwirigi, 2014).

The enlightened society of this century has constantly demanded proper governance, appropriate
monitoring and assessment of public initiatives (and therefore funds) and total compliance to the
law by officer with the task managing public funds as found in a report by National Tax Payers
Association (NTPA, 2010). International Governance Institute (IGI Kenya, 2010) as well as
Monitoring and Evaluation as pointed out by NIMES (2009/2010) report points that it is difficult
for one to effectively determine whether or not M & E of CDF projects is done as expected of an
M & E exercise. The effect of these factors is that various CDF projects, nearly 60 %, remain
behind schedule or abandoned (Mutunga, 2009).
It is worth noting that if monitoring and assessment is not properly conducted on initiatives, they will not effectively meet their intended goals. Every citizen in a constituency is required to be actively involved in the implementation of every endorsed program to ensure that goals of the program are realized using funds set aside for them in a given time period. Furthermore, the Act gave technical department and CDFC mandate to monitor the programs (Ngugi, 2014).

2.6 Theoretical framework
A theory is a body of knowledge which has been constructed based on certain observations. These observations may be based on certain general or universal observations (Mutea Rukwaru, 2015). A theory is used to describe interpretation of ideas and observation. Theorizing is a process of creating ideas that enable us to understand and describe empirical observations. The justification for using theories is that it provides anchors for thinking and guidelines for examining data (Bengston et al, 2009).

2.6.1 Theory of effective Project Implementation
Implementation is a sequence of steps taken by appropriate organizational agents to design change process to bring about compliance necessary to set up changes. Implementation is a process overseen by a manager to set up planned changes in a firm. There is a common agreement that managers are the main process actors and that the purpose of implementation is to set up planned transformations, whether new or routine. Managers use implementation to make planned transformations in companies by forming environments where changes can last and be rooted. Nevertheless, routine implementation steps have been challenging to stipulate since implementation is everywhere (Nutt, 2006).
To effectively implement a program is generally hard and complicated. The project manager has to dedicate more energy and time on financial, technical and human variables as the essentials to the fulfillment of program implementation. Changes in governments, inefficient project finance arrangements, funds available and allocation, increase in scale of the program, alteration in pre-contract consultants for instance architects, change in the original design, political considerations and insufficient working capital are some of the determinants capable of affecting project implementation (Slevin & Pinto, 1987). Several essential success aspects in program implementation are emphasized in the project implementation theory. Schultz and Slevin (1975) noted that management backing for a project has been believed to be of significance in differentiating between their eventual success and failure. Client involvement in project implementation is a very key element for a program to succeed. This is because the client is the consumer of the end product of the project. Anyanwu (2003) viewed client consultant as the initial stage of a program to implement change and is necessary during the initiative’s life cycle. Schultz, Pinto and Slevin (1987) warns of the dangers of assuming that since client consultant was acceptable at an initial stage, this activity could be overlooked for the remainder of the initiative hence need for monitoring of the project at all stages of the project cycle.

Another critical factor is personnel. This is because the building up and efficiency of any organization depends largely upon what manner effective human resources are employed (Nwachukwu, 1988). A disastrous circumstance could however develop as Pinto and Slevin (1988) noted that in numerous situations, employees for the program team are selected with less than full honor for the skills required to enthusiastically contribute to the success of the implementation of the project. Project implementation theory also emphasizes monitoring and feedback as being among the determinants of the success rate of the project. Though it is not
possible to foresee every problem arising from organizational environment, each team ought to acquire individuals who are technically competent with the particular assignment to manage problems when and whenever they occur and to predict and perhaps forestall likely trouble parts in the implementation process.

A number of factors that influence the success of a program as brought out in the implementation theory are inherent to CDF funded projects. Such factors include: change in governments, fund allocation, monitoring and evaluation and client consultation. Akin to the emphasis of project implementation theory, there are critical success factors that should be looked into regarding implementation of CDF funded projects. The legislator should support the projects, there should be a project schedule plan, the public ought to be consulted and engaged in the project implementation, there is need to monitor the project at every stage, the CDF committee should be composed of members with skills in project management and there should be effective project finance arrangements.

2.6.2 Program Theory
In program theory, the term program refers to any intervention: a policy, a strategy, a project, a funding initiative. It includes involvements that are carried out by a particular organization, for instance a direct service delivery program and those that are carried out by numerous organizations for instance an entire of government policy. It refers to preplanned as well as tightly specified interventions and largely outlined emergent interventions. Program theory is unclear theory or model of how an intervention results in a number of particular outcomes through a sequence of in-between results. This theory can be used in planning, controlling, monitoring and assessment and synthesis of policy based on evidence and planning (Funnel, S.C and Patricia J. Rodgers, 2011).
Program theory can be used for preplanning an intervention by carrying out a situation analysis, planning how an intervention will deal with certain needs, and planning how various components of a huge program are planned to work together. A need analysis identifies the needs or challenges in a community or organization while a situation analysis goes further than this insufficiency focus to also identify strengths or opportunities. A program theory development should begin with a systematic situation analysis. Program theory evaluates whether an initiative is designed so that it can attain its projected outcome. It shows the capacity of an initiative to address particular problems that should be reviewed within initiatives. It further gives guidance on areas that need to be given emphasis to on throughout the assessment process (Donaldson, 2012).

Using program theory to pose direct questions concerning what the intervention is trying to do and what sign indicates that this is probably going to be successful, can help to combine existing information or single out gaps in existing knowledge. Developing a program theory increases the probability that all components have been considered, that they have the potential to work together as a cohesive whole, and that all important factors that are likely to affect performance (people, systems, resources, and organizational and extraneous factors) have been addressed. This planning can be done before an intervention starts or as part of reviewing and revising an intervention. The use of program theory gives the advantage of providing information that could bring about extra explanations concerning the problem, the solutions and the alternative actions to be undertaken so as to obtain the projected results. Further, it can be used to improve the decision making and enlarge formations of solutions to any initiative problem (Mc Clittock, 1990).
Program theory can support the management of intervention directly as well as indirectly, through monitoring and assessment. This ensures that implementation is going in line with plans, otherwise corrective action has to be taken to enhance good initiative performance (Crawford and Bryce, 2003). It can help different stakeholders formulate a mutual understanding of the initiative or recognize disagreements in what they value and what they believe happens. This makes desperate individuals feel part of a combined endeavor. A program theory is a useful communication tool in that it gives a schematic overview of what the program is trying to achieve and how various short-term objectives and achievements will contribute to higher order results. The ability to recognize results and anticipate means of assessing them offers all initiative participants with a distinct map of the path ahead (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 2004).

Program theory can be used to influence different types of monitoring and assessment, including process assessment, performance monitoring, result and effect assessment, and cost benefit as well as cost effectiveness assessment. Program theory can also be used to design an assessment framework that covers the range of monitoring and evaluation that will be undertaken during the life of the intervention. This enhances transparency as well as accountability of the resources to the stakeholders for instance benefactors, program beneficiaries and the broader public in which the initiative is implemented. Examining tracks and documents resources used during the implementation of the program (Passia, 2004).

This theory is however limited by its methods since it needs too much dependence on a collection of data to guide in the assessment procedure. It is also expensive for programs that are working under fixed budgetary allocations. This theory plays a very important role in evaluation and can be relevant to CDF funded projects where monitoring and assessment is crucial for the success of an initiative.
2.7 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework illustrates the interaction of the study variables; mainly the independent, moderating and dependent variables. The framework is summarized in a schematic diagram that presents the variables and their relationship. Independent variable affects and establishes the influence of another variable (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008). The independent Variables in this study are: Project identification, fund allocation, political interest as well as monitoring and evaluation. Dependent variable is a factor which is noted and assessed to establish the effect of the independent variable. The dependent variable in this study is successful project completion.

The moderating variable is evaluated and manipulated to find out whether or not it changes the connection between the independent and dependent variable. Government policy is recognized as the moderating variable in this study. Conceptual framework helps to keep the research work on the objective of the study. The objective of the conceptual model is to enable the reader to immediately understand the suggested relationships (Orodho, 2008).
Conceptual framework

**Project identification**
- No. of feasibility studies
- No. of assessments
- No. of people involved in carrying out feasibility study

**Fund allocation**
- Amount of fund allocated
- No. of audits
- Budgets

**Stakeholders’ involvement**
- No. of community members involved
- No. of sessions held
- No. of reports

**Government policy**
- Change in policies governing CDF

**Project completion**
- No. of Community members involved in project selection
- No. of complete projects
- No. of project beneficiaries
- No. of project reports

**Monitoring and evaluation**
- No. of evaluations
- No. of regular visits to project sites
- No. of schedules for tracking timelines
- No. of project reports

Independent variables | moderating variable | dependent variable
2.8 Interpretation of the Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework above shows the connection between the four independent variables and the dependent variable. The study will seek to establish the extent to which project identification, fund allocation, stakeholders’ involvement and monitoring and assessment influence successful completion of CDF funded programs. It shows the indicators to be used to measure the variables.

Project identification should be done with involvement of CDFC. The politicians who are the members of parliament for particular constituencies should put down their political interests when carrying out the CDF projects to ensure that the projects carried out are not to benefit only those who support them politically but all residents. All stakeholders should be involved to ensure that only the most beneficial projects are given priority. Stakeholder participation plays a major role since they are the people who may be affected by activities. Outputs, outcomes and decisions made about a project can influence the implementation and operations of a project. Funds allocated for the projects should be enough to carry out the project to completion. Allocation should be timely to ensure that activities are carried out as scheduled. Monitoring and assessment is paramount for the successful completion of initiatives. It is therefore necessary for projects to be monitored at all stages and evaluation done at the end of the initiative to find out whether the program has met the goals.

2.9 Knowledge gaps
Constituency Development Fund is an area that has continued to receive interest from scholars. CDF as a Tool for Decentralized Development (Baskin, 2010), Efficiency and Efficacy of Kenya’s CDF (Kimenyi, 2005), Poverty Reduction Through CDF (Ochanda, 2010) factors affecting effective implementation of CDF projects in Machakos Town
Constituency (Ngugi, 2014). These are among some of the researches that have been reviewed on CDF. However, there is still a gap to be filled on project completion. Delays in completion of CDF funded projects as well as abandonment of projects needs to be dealt with to ensure timely provision of services. Few studies carried out regarding CDF gives emphasis on community involvement in initiative launch and implementation and also on the difficulties that are encountered when carrying out monitoring and assessment that can have an impact on the effectiveness of the exercise. This study put focus on the factors that influence ongoing and terminal evaluation of CDF programs with the aim of filling the knowledge gaps.

2.10 Summary of literature review
From the above literature review, it is clear that research has been reviewed on the factors influencing implementation of CDF programs. However, even though areas of CDF have continued to receive interest from scholars, there is still a gap to be filled in the areas of project implementation. Delays in completion of CDF funded projects need to be dealt with so that this becomes a thing of the past which will go a long way in ensuring that the tax-payer gets value for money through timely services provision by CDF.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the research methodology to be used in conducting the study. It is organized into the following: research design, target population, sampling design, research instruments, validity and reliability of the instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis technique and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research design
In this study, descriptive survey research design was used. Descriptive survey design refers to a method of collecting information by administering questionnaires or interviewing to a representative sample of individuals (Orodho, 2004). A descriptive survey research design allows for an in-depth analysis and understanding of a certain phenomenon as it exists in the present condition. Descriptive research studies are used to explain phenomena related with a subject population or to assess fractions of the population that have particular characteristics (Cooper & Schindler, 2008). In descriptive survey research design, the objectives are prearranged allowing data collection appropriate and adequate to the study problem (Kothari, 2004).

3.3 Target population
A population is an entire group of individuals’ cases or objects with some general observable features (Mwituria, 2012). Target population refers to the aggregate number of subjects or the whole environment of concentration to the research (Oso & Onen, 2011). The target population in the study constituted 10 members of Lari CDF management committee, 10 contractors who were involved in CDF projects between 2011/1012 and 2015/2016 financial years since they are key informant and the residents from each of the five wards in Lari sub-county who are direct
beneficiaries of the projects. Lari sub-county has total population of 123,895 residents according to 2009 census and 43% of population in Kenya fall below the age of 15 years(KBS, 2009).

3.4 Sampling Design
Stratified random sampling was used study. In a stratified sample, the sampling frame is split into non-overlapping sets or strata such as geographical areas, genders and age-groups. A sample is drawn from every stratum, also when this is simple random it is termed as stratified random sampling (Mwituria, 2012). The residents of Lari sub-county were stratified into age and location that is the five wards in the sub-county. They were then picked randomly in their strata proportionately. In this study, residents from all the five wards in the sub-county were picked. An aggregate of 381 adult residents of Lari sub-county were picked, 10 contractors and 10 members of the CDFC.

3.5 Sample size and sampling procedure
A sample is a portion of the target population that has been procedurally picked to represent the population ( Osu & Onen, 2011). Researchers should collect data from a smaller number of participants who are portion of the large group or population and that smaller number is what is termed as a sample. For the sample to correctly represent the population, Cooper & Schindler (2000) recommended that the researcher must distinctly define the characteristic of the population, establish the appropriate sample size and select the best method for picking members of the sample from the larger population.

The following Krejcie & Morgan formula will be used to determine sample size:

$$ S = \frac{X^2NP (1-P)}{\sigma^2 (N-1) + X^2P (1-P)} $$

Where:
S = Required Sample size

X = Z value (e.g. 1.96 for 95% confidence level)

N = Population Size

P = Population Proportion (expressed as decimal) (assumed to be 0.5 (50%)

d = Degree of accuracy (5%), expressed as a proportion (.05); It is margin of error

The above formula is simplified using a table (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970).

### Table 3.1: Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDF Committee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lari residents (Age 15 years)</td>
<td>70,620</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,0640</strong></td>
<td><strong>401</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (KBS, 2009)

### 3.6 Data Collection

A self-designed questionnaire which is a modification of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used to collect primary data. The selection of a questionnaire to be used in this study was guided by the nature of data to be collected. Questionnaires are suitable for studies because they collect information that is not be observed directly as they find out about
feelings, attitudes, motivations, accomplishments and of individuals ‘experiences (Mellenberg, 2008). Closed and open-ended questions were used. The questionnaire was designed in so as to capture brief demographic information of the respondents and more importantly all the study variables. The questionnaire was written using simple English so that the respondents understand the questions in order for them to give the correct information. Saunders (2009) stated that a questionnaire is important in getting objective data since participants are not subject to manipulation.

3.7 Pilot study
A pilot study constituting 10 respondents was carried out to help establish any potential weaknesses of the research instrument by testing their reliability and validity. Mugenda & Mugenda (2008) asserts that a fairly small sample of 10 to 20 respondents can be picked from the population in the course of piloting. Piloting the questionnaire means that a test to demonstrate to oneself whether the questionnaire is getting the results necessary for the study to draw conclusions (Mwituria, 2012). The respondents participating in the pilot study were excluded from the main study.

3.8 Instrument validity
According to Orodho(2004) validity is the degree to which results attained from the data analysis in fact represents the phenomenon being investigated. In a test with high validity the items will be closely linked to the test’s intended focus. For this particular study, content validity is the extent to which the test can stand by itself as an adequate measure of what it is supposed to measure. According to Kimberlin & Winterstein (2005), validity necessitates that an instrument is reliable but an instrument can be reliable even if it is not valid. There is no statistical test to ascertain whether a measure sufficiently encompasses a content area or sufficiently represents a
construct. Validity of content therefore depends on the judgment of the expert in the relevant field. The questions were formulated under the guidance of the researcher’s supervisor to ensure content validity. Content validity produces a logical judgment with regard to whether the instrument encompasses what it is supposed to encompass.

3.9 Instrument Reliability

Reliability of measurement is the extent to which a specific procedure provides the same results over several repeated tests (Orodho, 2004). To ensure reliability in the study, test-retest method was applied. 5 respondents who did not participate in the study were selected at random and questionnaires distributed to them for completion. The questionnaires were scored manually. After duration of 10 days similar questionnaires were administered to the similar respondents. Their scores were done and a comparison formulated between the first and second scores.

The Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Formula for the test-retest was used to compute the coefficient so as to measure the degree of consistency of contents of the questionnaire in eliciting the same responses each time the questionnaire was administered. The Correlation Coefficient \( r \) ranges from -1 to +1 depending on whether two variables move together or in opposite direction. Zero signifies no correlation at all; a positive one signifies a direct linear relationship whereas a negative one indicates an inverse linear relationship. A positive (+) Correlation Coefficient will be acceptable for a strong relationship to judge the reliability. Orodho (2004) explains that a correlation co-efficient of approximately 0.8 is high enough that it can ascertain the instruments as reliable for the study.

3.10 Research Procedure

After the approval of the research proposal by the academic supervisors, authorization to undertake the study was obtained from the National Commission for Science, Technology and
Innovation (NACOSTI). A pre visit was made to the CDF management committees, contractors involved as well as the members of the community of the intended research. A date to administer the instruments was organized. The questionnaires were personally administered by the researcher to CDF management committee members, contractors and the selected residents of the Lari sub-county to ensure big fraction of practical responses and a high return rate. The researcher then left the questionnaires to be filled by the respondents and collected them personally after two days to avoid low return rates.

3.11 Data Analysis
Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to analyze data. Mugenda & Mugenda Explain how these were done Primary data from the field was edited to remove errors made by respondents. Coding was done to translate question responses into particular categories and this was expected to organize and condense the data into summaries that are manageable. The data was compiled, organized and analyzed through the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) which is ideal for its accuracy and speed processing.

Descriptive data analysis was used to determine the frequencies and percentages. Measures of variability and central tendencies as well as regression analysis were employed to facilitate drawing of conclusions pertinent to the study objectives. Analyzed data was presented using charts and tables. The researcher further conducted inferential statistics so as to establish the relationship between the dependent and the dependent variables respectively. The researcher applied the correlation and multiple regression models to explain the strength and relationship of each dependent variable.
3.12 Ethical considerations

This research dealt with people hence the researcher considered ethical issues. Respondents were assured of their confidentiality at all times in that their names were neither included anywhere in the questionnaire nor disclosed at any time. The researcher got permission from all relevant authorities and subjects participating in the study because participation was of their own free will. The researcher also ensured that the study was impartial and totally independent so as to ensure that results were not influenced in any way.
Table 3.1: Operationalization of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurement Scale</th>
<th>Analysis Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variables</strong></td>
<td>Project identification in completion if CDF projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of feasibility studies</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of impact assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of feasibility studies</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of impact assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of budgets</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of audits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of community members involved</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of sessions held</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of project reports</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of audits undertaken</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of project beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of projects funded by CDF</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variable</strong></td>
<td>Completion of CDF projects</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of complete CDF projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of project beneficiaries</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of projects funded by CDF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction
The chapter focuses on the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data collected in the study using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequencies, percentages, mean, standard deviation and multiple regressions were employed to explain the responses to the questionnaires and presented data in tables, charts and cross tabulations. Conclusions and recommendations were made based on the analyzed data.

4.2 Response Rate
From the data collected, out of the 401 questionnaires administered, 200 of them were filled and given back, which represents response rate of 50%. This response rate is deemed adequate to draw conclusions for the study. Mugenda & Mugenda (2003) noted that a response rate of 50% is sufficient, 60% and over good, whereas 70% rated very good. This works together with Bailey (2000) assertion that a 50% response rate is sufficient, whereas a response rate above 70% is very good. This indicates that on the basis of this assertion, the response rate of 50% in this instance is therefore adequate. The noted high response rate can be as a result of the data collection procedures, where the researcher notified the potential participants of the intended survey earlier, employed a self-administered questionnaire where the respondents filled and these were picked afterwards and organized follow up calls to explain queries as well as encourage the respondents to fill the questionnaires given to them.

4.3 Background Information
The researcher began by a general analysis on the demographic data obtained from the respondents which consisted of; - respondents ward, gender, level of education and age group.
4.3.1 Project Area

The researcher decided to look into the ward where the participants of the study come from in order to ensure that all the regions within lari sub-county were well represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kinale</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kijabe</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyanduma</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamburu</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirenga</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study revealed that most of the respondents were from Kinale ward with 30% of the respondent followed by Kijabe ward with 24%. Kamburu had 20% and Kirenga 14%. The least represented ward was Nyanduma having 12% of the respondents hence there is no much disparities in data collection since all the five wards in Lari constituency were well represented.

4.3.2: Respondents’ gender

In any community projects both gender gets involved in and it was significant to ensure that opinion of both gender were catered for.
Table 4.3.2: Respondent’s gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study found out that the most of the respondents were male with 53% while 47% were female, hence there was no much gender disparity in data collection. The two third gender rule was observed in data collection.

4.3.3: Level of Education

In order to come up with the quality data, level of education plays an important role and that was the reason why the researcher decided to check the education level of the respondents.

Table 4.3.3: Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>frequency</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary education</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary education</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 indicates the education levels of the respondents in the arrangement of primary level, secondary level and college level respectively. The results indicated that most of the respondents have secondary level with 54% followed by college level with 30% while only 16% of the respondents had primary level certificate.
4.3.4: Age

This section discussed about the age of the respondent excluding those below the age of 18 as they were treated as the minor according to Kenya constitution.

Table 4.3.4: Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-35yrs</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-56yrs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-77yrs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 77yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 above illustrates the classes of the age of the respondents in a class interval of twenty years (20years). The findings showed that 35% of the respondents pointed out that they were between the ages of 36-56 years while 27% were between 57-77 years. On the other hand 36% were between 15-35 years while 2% were over 77yrs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 4.1: Is there an incomplete CDF project? (N=200)

When the respondents were asked whether there were incomplete CDF projects in their ward, majority of the respondents 64% says YES that there were incomplete projects in their respective
wards while 36% of the respondents says NO. This clearly shows that majority of the CDF initiatives in Lari constituency were not finished to the satisfaction of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dining hall</th>
<th>water</th>
<th>classroom</th>
<th>hospital</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig 4.2: Types of incomplete CDF projects (N=200)**

From the study 64% of the respondents who agreed that there were incomplete projects in Lari constituency (refer to fig 4.1), 44% of them indicated classroom as one of the projects which are incomplete, followed by hospital with 19% and water project with 9% while only 6% of the respondents indicated dining hall projects.

**4.4 Influence of Project Identification**

This section deals with objective one of the study: to determine the effect of project identification on completion of CDF programs in Lari constituency and mostly seeking the opinion of the respondents in a four point Likert scale of 1(low), 2 (moderate), 3(high), 4 (very high).

**Table 4.4.1: Influence of Project Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F%</td>
<td>F%</td>
<td>F%</td>
<td>F%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate budget estimates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well defined scope and activity scheduling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking need analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study shows that 49% of the respondents rated accurate budget estimate at very high in a way which it influence the project completion while 10% of respondent rated moderate and 41% rated high. On the other hand 51 % of the respondents rated well defined scope and activity schedule high in a way it influence the project completion while 36% of the respondents rated it very high in influencing completion of the CDF project and only 13% of the respondents rated it moderately. Further 57% of the respondents rated undertaking need analysis on the influence in completion of CDF project high while 2% rated low. However from the mean of 3.390 and 3.230 is a clear indication that accurate budget estimates and well defined scope and activity scheduling were highly rated variables of project identification.

4.5 Allocation of Funds

This section discusses the second objective which is to evaluate the influence of fund allocation on completion of CDF initiatives in Lari constituency. The respondents were requested to indicate the degree in which fund allocation influences CDF project completion. A four point Likert scale of 1(low), 2 (moderate), 3(high), 4 (very high) was used.

Table 4.5.1: Fund allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund allocation</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misallocation of the funds meant for the project</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underfunding; amount of fund released is inadequate to complete the project</td>
<td>- 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in availing funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Misallocation of the funds meant for the project                              | 3.750| .500     |       |           |      |     |
| Underfunding; amount of fund released is inadequate to complete the project   | 3.720| .494     |       |           |      |     |
| Delays in availing funds                                                    | 3.700| .460     |       |           |      |     |
From table 4.5.1 it indicates that 74% of the respondents rated misallocation of the funds meant for the project very high in a way which it influence the project completion while 24% of respondent rated high and only 2% rated moderate. On the other hand 70 % of the respondents rated underfunding; amount of funds issues is inadequate to complete the project very high in a way it influence the project completion while 30% of the respondents rated it high in influencing completion of the CDF project. Further 78% of the respondents rated delays in availing fund very high as one of the factors influencing project completion, 19% rated high while 3% rated low. However from the mean all the variables of fund allocation averagely scored very high mean average, with misallocation of the fund meant for the project leading with a mean of 3.750, followed by underfunding with a mean of 3.720 while delays in availing funds had a mean of 3.700.

4.7: Stakeholder Involvement
This section discusses the second objective which is to assess the effect of stakeholders on completion of CDF programs in Lari constituency. The respondents were requested to point out the degree in which stakeholders influence CDF project completion. A four point Likert scale of 1(low), 2 (moderate), 3(high), 4 (very high) was used.
Table 4.7.1: Stakeholders Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community representation in</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constituency development fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community involvement in</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders involvement in</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice of priority projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders participation in</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project site selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.7.1 most of the variables have been rated high above the mean of 2 (moderate extent) while only one variable score below mean of 3. However according to percentage, 61% of the respondents indicated that community representation in constituency development fund was to a very high extent while 37% percentage stated that community involvement in decision making was also to very high extent. Further 78% rated to a very high extent that stakeholders participation in a project site selection influence project completion.
4.8: Project Monitoring and Evaluation

This section discusses the fourth objective which is to measure the effect of monitoring and evaluation on completion of CDF programs in Lari constituency. The respondents were requested to point out the degree in which M&E influence CDF project completion. A four point Likert scale of 1(low), 2 (moderate), 3(high), 4 (very high) was used.

Table 4.8.1: Project Monitoring and Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular visit to project sites by experts in M&amp;E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules developed to tract timelines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of an effective monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting and reporting of project activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.8.1 most of the variables have been rated high above the mean of 3 (high extent) while only one variable score below mean of 3. However according to percentage, 61% of the respondents indicated that regular visit to project sites by experts in M&E was to very high extent while 37% percentage stated that schedules developed to tract timelines was also to very high extent. Further 78% were very high extent that documenting and reporting of project activities in monitor and evaluation influence project completion.
Figure 4.3: Department Responsible for M&E (N=200)

From figure 4.3, the majority which is 74% affirmed that the CDF office was responsible for the monitoring and assessment of the CDF programs while 26% thought the area MP was responsible for the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>CDF Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: decider of the type of CDF projects to be implemented (N=200)

From the figure 4.4 above, most of the respondents (65%) thought that the area MP was the one who was responsible for deciding the type of projects to be implemented in the area while 35% thought that it was the CDF committee that was responsible for the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>CDF Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5: decider of the location or site of the CDF project (N=200)
From figure 4.5, the majority (72%) thought that it was the CDF committee that was responsible for deciding the location of a CDF project while 28% thought that it was the area MP that was responsible for the same.

4.9 Statistical Analysis
In this section, we used both correlation to understand the correlation between the independent variable and dependent variable, also between the independents variables themselves. We also came up with multiple regression model, model summary and ANOVA and also test for normality

4.9.1 Test for normality

Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project identification</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of CDF project</td>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction
### Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund allocation</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of CDF project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Lilliefors Significance Correction*

### Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring &amp; evaluation</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of CDF project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Lilliefors Significance Correction*
**Test of Normality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder involvement</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov(^a)</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion of constituency</td>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development Fund project</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Lilliefors Significance Correction

The table above exhibits the results from two common tests of normality, specifically the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and the Shapiro-Wilk Test. We Shapiro-Wilk Test is more suitable for sample sizes that are small (< 50 samples) nonetheless can as well manage sample sizes as large as 2000. Hence, we will use the Shapiro-Wilk test as our numerical way of evaluating normality. As indicated in the table above that for the "strongly disagree", "disagree" neutral "agree" and strongly agree of independent variable was deviated significantly it is not distributed normally since the value of the Shapiro-Wilk Test is below 0.05.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project completion</th>
<th>Project Identification</th>
<th>Fund allocation</th>
<th>Stakeholder involvement</th>
<th>Monitor &amp; Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project completion</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Identification</strong></td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund allocation</strong></td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder involvement</strong></td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitor &amp; Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.9.2 Correlation

From the Table 4.9.2 there was a positive correlation between the independent variable, Project identification 0.271, fund allocation 0.228, stakeholder involvement 0.229 and Monitor & Evaluation 0.287) and dependent variable CDF project completion. Also there is a positive correlation between the independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Identification</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fund allocation        | Pearson Correlation | .228 | .238 | 1 | .291 | .209 |
|                        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .001 | .008 | .009 | .007 |
|                        | N                   | 200  | 200  | 200  | 200  |

| Stakeholder involvement | Pearson Correlation | .229 | .255 | .291 | 1 | .289 |
|                        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .009 | .003 | .009 | .002 |
|                        | N                   | 200  | 200  | 200  | 200  |

| Monitor & Evaluation | Pearson Correlation | .287 | .214 | .209 | .289 | 1 |
|                      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .009 | .004 | .007 | .000 |
|                      | N                   | 200  | 200  | 200  | 200  |

### 4.9.3 Multiple Regression

The following regression model was applied to measure variables in regard to factors influencing CDF project completion in Lari constituency.
The regression model was as follows:

\[ y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon \]

**Where:**

\( Y \) = project completion  
\( \beta_0 \) = Constant Term  
\( \beta_1 \) = Beta coefficients  
\( X_1 \) = project identification  
\( X_2 \) = fund allocation  
\( X_3 \) = stakeholders  
\( X_4 \) = monitoring and evaluation
Table 4.9: Regression Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project identification</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund allocation</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>1.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>1.601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Dependent Variable: project completion

The following regression analysis was obtained:

\[ Y = 1.191 + 0.119X_1 + 0.206X_2 + 0.432X_3 + 0.372X_4 \]

The model illustrates that when all variables are held at zero (constant), the value project completion would be 1.191. Conversely, holding other factors constant, a unit increase in project identification, would lead to a 0.119 increase in project completion, a unit increase in fund allocation would result in a 0.206 increase in project completion. Conversely, a unit increase in stakeholder involvement would lead to a 0.432 increase in project completion while a unit
increase in monitoring and evaluation would result in a 0.372 increase in project completion. This suggests that project identification, increase in fund allocation, involvement of stakeholder and monitoring and evaluation would increase the project completion.

The study further indicates that there is a significant correlation between project completion and project identification (p=0.003), fund allocation (p=0.046), stakeholder involvement (p=0.041) and Monitoring and Evaluation (p=0.057).

**Table 4.10 Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>F Change</td>
<td>Sig. F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 above illustrates a model summary of regression analysis between independent variables. The value of R (correlation value) is 86.4%, which shows high positive relationship between the independents variables (project identification, fund allocation, stakeholder involvement and monitoring and evaluation) and dependent variable (project completion) the value of coefficient of determinant (R²) is 74.6%. This a perfect model since it is capable of explaining 74.6% of the variability in value(Y). Most models that can explain more than 40% of the variability can be taken as a useful model. This is an indication that the model is a very good predictor overall since R² > 70%.
Table 4.18 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>8.472</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>.001a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>75.016</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.490</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), project identification, fund allocation, stakeholder involvement, monitoring and evaluation.

b Dependent Variable: project completion

The study used ANOVA to determine the significance of the regression model from which an f-significance value of p<0.001 was determined. This indicates that the regression model has a less than 0.001 likelihood (probability) of providing an incorrect prediction.

4.12 Summary of the finding

From the research findings it is clear that participation in initiation, participation in planning, participation in implementation and participation had a positive and significant effect on completion of CDF projects. Most notably participation in project initiation activities such as identification and selection is the most critical as it is at this stage were stakeholder can have the highest influences. However, project identification in the initiation of the CDF project is equally important. Accurate budget estimates, well defined scope and activity scheduling and undertaking need analysis all score moderate rating in influencing completion of CDF project.

The study also concludes that early adequate fund allocation greatly contribute to completion of constituency development fund project in the area, however misappropriation of fund which was
supposed to be used in the CDF project negatively effects the completion of CDF project. In general fund allocation significantly influence completion of CDF project in Lari sub county. This aspect came out from the findings of the study where respondents cited they can influence outcome of CDF project if they are involved effectively.

Related to this finding is that respondent ranked highly monitoring and evaluation aspect as factor influencing CDF project completion, with aspects like regular visit to project sites by experts in M&E, schedules developed to tract timelines and availability of an effective monitoring and evaluation system score higher rating from the respondents. Results from inferential statistics imply that among other factors, stakeholder participation in project initiation, fund allocation, monitoring and evaluation and project identification are strong positive correlation and significant determinants of completion of CDF projects in Lari constituency.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents a summary of the findings, conclusions and recommendations. The discussions of the findings are summarized in line with the study objectives which include: Project identification in project completion, fund allocation in project completion, stakeholder involvement in project completion and M&E and project completion. These independent variables were studied against the dependent variable which is completion of CDF funded projects in Lari sub-county, Kenya.

5.2 Summary of the Findings
The following is a summary of the research findings at which the conclusion and recommendations of the study were drawn. The study was guided by specific objectives and it is on this basis that data analysis was done. The findings in relation to each of these objectives were as follows.

5.2.1 Influence of Project Identification on Completion of the CDF Funded
The study shows that majority (49%) of the respondents rated accurate budget estimation very high with overall mean of 3.197 (moderate). On the other hand a small number (2%) were not satisfied with the way project analysis were undertaken with a mean of 2.9, however most of the variables of project identification were moderately rated, ie project identification moderately influenced completion of the CDF funded project.

5.2.2 Relationship between funds allocation and completion of CDF project
It was evident that majority indicated that most variables under fund allocation greatly influenced completion of CDF project, misallocation of the funds meant for the project,
underfunding; amount of funds issues is inadequate to complete the project and delays in
availing funds at a mean of 3.75, 3.72 and 3.7 respectively. However fund allocation and CDF
project completion has significant relationship with p=0.046.

5.2.3 Effect of stakeholders involvement on completion of CDF funded projects
Majority of the respondents (78%) indicated that stakeholders involvement in project site
selection with overall mean of 2.9 while (61%) stated that community representation in
constituency development fund committee with mean of 3.5 (moderate), community involvement
in decision making with a mean of 3.19 and Stakeholders involvement in choice of priority
projects with a mean of 3.05However overall rating of all variables under stakeholder
involvements was to moderate extent with a significant relationship of p=0.041.

5.2.4 Influence of Monitoring and evaluation on completion of CDF funded project
The findings shows that most of the respondents (61%) rated very high regular visit to project
sites by experts in monitoring and assessment of completion of CDF financed project with a
mean of 3.300 (moderate) while (78%) of the respondents rated documenting and reporting of
project activities very high with a mean of 2.96, however monitoring and evaluation were
moderately rated as a factors influencing completion of CDF funded project with significant
relationship of p= 0.041.

5.3 Conclusion
5.3.1 Conclusion on project identification and completion of CDF projects
The study established that project identification highly influenced completion of CDF funded
projects. Accurate budget estimate Is very high in influencing project completion. Most
respondents said well-defined scope and activity scheduling highly influence project completion.
A further, undertaking need analysis rated as having high influence on project completion. It was
notable that in the respondents’ opinion, there was need to broadly need to ensure an accurate budget estimate, well defined scope and activity scheduling as well as undertaking need analysis before embarking on a project.

5.3.2 Conclusion on fund allocation and completion of CDF projects
The data analysis for CDF funded Projects in Lari constituency shows that failure in completion of projects is occasioned by Challenges associated with project funding. The elements of project funding i.e. misallocation of funds, underfunding and delays in availing funds had responses in agreement that they affect project completion to a very high extent. Based on the available results the study thus concluded that CDF financed projects in Lari constituency are constrained in completion by fund allocation. This confirms that funding contributes positively to the success of the project and should be reflected in both planning and implementation (Magano, 2000).

5.2.3 Conclusion on Stakeholder involvement and completion of CDF projects
Based on the study findings it was determined that stakeholder involvement played an effective role in project completion. The vast majority of response indicating that stakeholder involvement in project site selection and Community representation in CDF have a very high influence on project completion respectively. Only a minority felt that community involvement in decision making did have a low effect on project completion. Thus the study unequivocally found out that effective community participation was crucial incompletion of CDF projects. The study concluded thus stakeholder involvement played a positive role in enhancing the well-timed completion of the CDF financed programs.

The study findings are in tandem with previous studies A research by International Budget Partnership (IBS, 2010), the Kenyan CDF allude to low or lack of participation by local communities in identification and selection initiatives as one of the major challenges of the CDF.
This is demonstrated by data from the NACCSC (National Anti-Corruption Campaign Steering Committee) report that indicated low levels of public involvement: approximately 60 percent of Kenyans don’t have the opportunity to participate selection or prioritization initiative (NACCSC, 2008)

5.3.4 Conclusion on M&E and project completion

Results based on the study revealed that most of respondents affirmed that Monitoring and Evaluation affects project completion. Majority of respondents indicated that regular visits to project sites by experts’ affects project completion to a very extent. Further a greater majority of responses at agreed that documenting and reporting activities has a very high effect on project completion. While moderate number of respondents indicated availability of M$E system and schedules to track timelines affect project completion to a high extent respectively.

The study thus determined that Monitoring and Evaluation had a positive effect on project completion revealed by results of the study. Majority of the respondents at indicated that the Member of Parliament was responsible for monitoring and evaluation of the CDF projects with only few mentioning CDF office as being responsible.

Effective M&E system is crucial. Effectiveness which in essence attributes to the correlation between outputs and outcomes is very important in project completion. From the study findings, it has been shown that Monitoring and Evaluation highly influences completion of Constituency Development Funded Projects. Considering that development effectiveness is seen as the how of development, and is about the elements and circumstances that help realize results and eventually greater impact the needy people’s lives (UNDP, 2003). Monitoring systems need to cater for the social spaces and interactions necessary to enable information sharing and interpretation that leads to collective insights about action-sense-making (Guijt, 2008).
5.4 Recommendations

5.4.1 Recommendations for Improvements
On the basis of the findings obtained, this study recommends that a feasibility study should be carried out before embarking on implementing a project. The systems for tracking costs against progress should be put in place to ensure that each activity during the project implementation consumes not more than what it was allocated in the budget. This will ensure that the projects are completed within the budget estimate.

There is need to broadly provide sufficient fund for the CDF project at the right time for proper implementation and timely completion of the project. Funds allocation and management is a critical function in all projects since it influences completion of the projects. Project leaders need to emphasize and undertake training on proper management of funds.

Since community participation is significant to project completion, project leaders should strive to sensitize community on participation in CDF projects. Members of the public should be involved in identifying development projects that needs to be funded using CDF kitty. It is recommended that the members of the National Assembly should only play an oversight role in CDF projects. Projects and politics should never be mixed for the sake of completion of CDF projects. Political cronies should never be part of CDF Committees in order to eliminate any vested political interests in CDF.

A considerable amount of commitment should be directed towards monitoring and evaluation so as to ensure completion of CDF programs. Finally, from the research findings, it is clear that programs should focus on efficiency in service provision and monitoring processes so as to achieve better performances. Constituencies should prepare a time schedule of implementation of each project stating explicitly the date due and the times when various deliverables and
milestones are expected. This will provide standards against which progress can be measured. External evaluators should be engaged after a project is completed to carry out audits on the implementation of the project. This will provide unbiased information which can be of use in the improvement of future project managing activities.

5.4.2 Recommendations for Further Research
Based on what has been found out from this study, the researcher presents the following suggestions for further research. One a study be undertaken to find out the influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on completion of development programs in Kenya. A detailed study of the projects funded by county governments could give a clearer relationship between these variables. Two, a study be undertaken to investigate why stakeholders fail to participate in CDF funded projects.
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APPENDIX 1

LETTER OF TRANSMISAL OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

The University of Nairobi

P.O Box 30192

Nairobi.

5 January, 2017

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: COLLECTION OF DATA ON FACTORS INFLUENCING SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF CDF PROJECTS

I am a postgraduate student in the University of Nairobi undertaking a Master of Arts degree in Project Planning and Management. Currently I am undertaking a research on factors that influence successful completion of CDF funded projects in Lari Sub-County, Kiambu County.

I kindly request you to participate in this research by responding to the questions in the questionnaire administered to you. I wish to assure you that the information you give is purely for research purpose and your identity will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Your participation is highly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Elizabeth Murothi
Appendix II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR KEY INFORMANTS
FACTORS INFLUENCING COMPLETION OF CDF FUNDED PROJECTS IN LARI
SUB-COUNTY, KIAMBU COUNTY

This questionnaire is designed for purposes of collecting data on the factors influencing successful completion of CDF funded projects in Lari Sub-County, Kiambu County. It is supposed to be filled in by the residents of Lari and relevant authorities involved in implementation of CDF projects in the Sub-County. Information filled in this questionnaire is confidential and will be used only for the purposes of this research.

Instructions for respondents

You need not to indicate your name anywhere on the questionnaire

Please tick the correct answer in the boxes provided alongside each question

Please be accurate and as brief as possible where explanation is needed

SECTION A: RESPONDENT’S DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Please indicate your ward: Kinale ( ) Kijabe ( ) Nyanduma ( )Kamburu( ) Kirenga( )

2. Please indicate your village ..................

3. Please indicate your gender Female ( ) Male ( )

4. What is your level of education?
   College ( )
   Secondary education ( )
   Primary education ( )

5. Indicate your age group
Age group in years | Please tick here
---|---
15 – 35 | 
36 – 56 | 
57 – 77 | 
Above 77 | 

6. Is there an incomplete CDF project in your ward? Yes ( ) No ( )

7. If yes specify the type of project e.g. a classroom, a water storage facility, etc. ..........

SECTION B: INFLUENCE OF PROJECT IDENTIFICATION ON SUCCESSFUL COMPEITION OF CDF PROJECTS

To what extend do the following aspects of project identification influence successful completion of CDF projects? Rate indicator as having low, moderate, high or very high influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking need analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate budget estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well defined scope and activity scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C: INFLUENCE OF FUND ALLOCATION ON COMPLETION OF CDF FUNDED PROJECTS

To what extent do the following funding indicators affect successful completion of CDF projects. Rate the indicator as having low, moderate, high or very high effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underfunding: amount of funds issues is inadequate to complete the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in availing funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misallocation of the funds meant for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION D: INFLUENCE OF STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVEMENT ON COMPLETION OF CDF FUNDED PROJECTS

To what extent do the following aspects of political interests affect successful completion of CDF projects? Rate the indicator as having low, moderate, high or very high effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders involvement in choice of priority projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders participation in project site selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community involvement in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community representation in Constituency Development Fund Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: INFLUENCE OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION ON COMPLETION OF CDF FUNDED PROJECTS

To what extend do the following Monitoring and Evaluation indicators affect successful completion CDF projects. Rate the indicators as having low, moderate, high or very high effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of an effective monitoring and evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular visit to project sites by experts in M $ E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules developed to track timelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting and reporting of project activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Which office or department is responsible for monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects?
2. Is the local community involved in the selection of CDFC?
3. Is the community fully represented in project committees?
4. Who decides on the type of CDF project to be implemented?
5. Who decides on the location or site of the CDF project?

..................THANK YOU......................
# Appendix III

## TIME FRAME FOR THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>November 2016-February 2017</th>
<th>March 2017</th>
<th>April and May 2017</th>
<th>June 2017</th>
<th>July 2017</th>
<th>August 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal writing and presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing of instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV

BUDGET ESTIMATE FOR THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit cost in ksh.</th>
<th>Estimated amount in ksh.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>8reams of printing papers at ksh.500 each</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 toner cartridge</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 flash disc</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing materials</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Binding cost</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Travel expenses</td>
<td>Travelling to: the library</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting lecturer</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Lari sub-county</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>1 research assistant in data collection for 10 days</td>
<td>500.00 per day</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Consultancy(data analysis)</td>
<td>Consultation on data analysis using SPSS</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Research permit</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1% of total budget</td>
<td>5,600.00</td>
<td>5,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

RE: MUROTHI ELIZABETH - REG NO L50/76291/2014

This is to confirm that the above named is a student at the University of Nairobi College of Education and External Studies, School of Continuing and Distance Education, Department of Extra-Mural Studies pursuing Masters of Art in Project Planning and Management.

He is proceeding for research entitled “factors influence completion development funded projects in Lari Sub-County, Kenya.”

Any assistance given to her will be highly appreciated.

CAREN AWILLY
CENTRE ORGANIZER
NAIROBI EXTRA-MURAL CENTRE
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Date: 7th July, 2017
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University of Nairobi
P.O. Box 30197-00100
NAIROBI.

RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION
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