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ABSTRACT

Monitoring and evaluation systems allow for project activities to be measured and analyzed. There is a gap in the design of M&E systems to generate information during the process of monitoring and evaluation and use of this information in future designs. The purpose of the study was to establish the factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations in the governance sector of Nairobi, Kenya. The study was guided by the following research objectives: to examine how data quality influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations; to assess how human capacity influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations; to establish how the use of the logical framework influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems; and to determine how utilization of monitoring and evaluation information influences performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations. The research design used was a survey. The study targeted forty programme officers and five programme managers. All programme officers were interviewed while systematic sampling method was employed to sample programme managers. The data collection instruments included a questionnaire and an interview guide. Data analysis was descriptive in the form of frequencies and percentage. From the study findings, data collection was regular with data analysis carried mainly through software. However, the use of software for data analysis was faced with challenges of storage and processing. Moreover, programme officers had the training and experience working with monitoring and evaluation systems. Lastly, the choice of quantitative indicators compared to qualitative indicators was high while baseline surveys were conducted before project implementation. The study recommends that non-governmental organizations should ensure routine data audit, conduct preliminary assessment of impacts by conducting case studies and to combine the use of the logical framework with outcome mapping.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are essential components of results based management (Rist, Boily & Martin, 2011). Results-based management involves deliberately gathering empirical evidence in order to know the extent to which intended results are being achieved so that modifications to the design and delivery of activities can be made to improve and account for performance in achieving intended outcome. Furthermore, organizations successfully adopting RBM will need to have appropriate systems and procedures in place that collectively constitute an RBM regime (Mayne, 2007).

The increased level of emphasis given to results (outcomes), as opposed to activities and output, has also brought some major changes in the focus, approach and application of monitoring and evaluation systems whereby as focus of management changes from activities to results, focus of M&E also changes from the traditional M&E system, which focuses on assessing inputs and implementation process (progress monitoring) to results-based M&E system, which emphasizes assessment of the contributions of interventions to development outcomes (Gebremedhin et al, 2010). Building and sustaining a result based monitoring and evaluation system is admittedly not an easy task for it requires continuous commitment, champions, time, effort, and resources. In addition, it may take several attempts before the system can be tailored to suit a given governmental or organizational policy, program, or project; but it is doable (Kusek, 2004).

According to an IFAD (2008) annual report on results and impact, recurrent criticisms against M&E systems include: limited scope, complexity, low data quality, inadequate resources, weak institutional capacity, lack of baseline surveys and lack of use. Moreover, the most frequent criticism of M&E systems in IFAD projects relates to the type of information included in the system. Most of the IFAD projects collect and process information on the project activities. However, the average IFAD project did not provide information on results achieved at the purpose or impact level. The M&E system of the Tafilalet and Dades Rural Development project in Morocco for example only focused on financial operations and could not be used for impact
assessment. In the Pakistan IFAD Country Programme Evaluation, cases were reported of contradictory logical frameworks combined with arbitrary and irrelevant indicators while in Belize, two different logical frameworks were generated which increased confusion and complexity. The Ethiopia IFAD Country Programme Evaluation found that project appraisal documents made limited provision for systematic baseline and subsequent beneficiaries surveys. For example in one project in Ethiopia, the baseline survey was carried out 2-3 years after projects start-up.

In a study report of an Australian NGO conducted by Spooner and Dermott (2008), staff reported that, as WAYS evolved over time, they were unsure about what works in the current system of monitoring and evaluation. Additionally, resources had not been dedicated to data analysis; and the data was rarely analyzed. A further problem found with data analysis was that the responsibility of doing the analysis lied with program managers, who had little time to analyze data that was not required by funding bodies. Some of the staff stated that they are required to collect information and analyze it, but that their analysis is hampered because they have minimal research skills. Finally, some staff reported that there was no feedback loop built into the current system so, while staff report on their activities to the management, they do not know what happens to the information once it is reported.

The Canadian M&E system has invested heavily in both evaluation and performance monitoring as key tools to support accountability and results-based management. Additionally, the current state of the M&E system has evolved over time, as the central designers have recognized that the development and implementation of M&E is long term and iterative therefore putting emphasis on the “process” of implementation as an important mechanism in itself in developing an “evaluation culture” or “results culture” in an organization and across the entire system (Lahey, 2009).

A problem in African countries, and perhaps in some other regions, is that while sector ministries collect a range of performance information, the quality of data is often poor. This is partly because the burden of data collection falls on over-worked officials at the facility level, who are
tasked with providing the data for other officials in district offices and the capital, but who rarely receive any feedback on how the data are actually being used, if at all. This leads to another problem: data are poor partly because they aren’t being used; and they’re not used partly because their quality is poor therefore, in such countries there is too much data, not enough information (Mackay, 2006).

The CLEAR (2012) report notes that the M&E mechanism of Benin relies on the national statistics system for measurement and data. The Benin system employees have considerable basic training, but there are not many of them and their knowledge is not regularly updated. Furthermore, access to data and information remains a great challenge, particularly access to data to be collected, but also with regard to data already processed. Finally, the CLEAR report argues that the information gathered through the Benin M&E system is not sufficiently taken into account.

In Ghana, after several years of implementing the national M&E system, significant progress has been made (CLEAR, 2012). However, challenges include severe financial constraints; institutional, operational and technical capacity constraints; fragmented and uncoordinated information, particularly at the sector level. To address these challenges the CLEAR report argues that the current institutional arrangements will have to be reinforced with adequate capacity to support and sustain effective monitoring and evaluation, and existing M&E mechanisms must be strengthened, harmonized and effectively coordinated.

Despite the numerous achievements that have been made under NIMES, Kenya’s M&E system still faces challenges in the implementation namely: human capital, financial and infrastructural challenges (CLEAR, 2012). In its’ progress report UNDP Amkeni Wakenya highlights some of the challenges that it faced in monitoring and evaluation of CSO activities in its grant making and capacity development mandates (Amkeni Wakenya, 2009). The narrative and financial reports from the UNDP partner CSOs were not consistent in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness. Additionally, most partner CSOs had limited monitoring and evaluation skills.
A nationwide survey by the Kenya NGO Coordination Board (2009), found that some NGOs mainly depended on the founder members or the chief executives for sustainability and their survival relied on individuals and not institutional systems, thereby affecting their performance. For instance, it was observed that some organizations employed relatives regardless of minimum qualification required in certain jobs thereby compromising professionalism in the management of NGOs while some NGO officials used projects funds for personal gains at the expense of the beneficiaries.

1.2 Statement of the problem

It is a frequently expressed concern that the information provided by monitoring and evaluation neither influence decision-making during project implementation nor planning of ongoing project development and new initiatives. What this gap represents is often the absence of mechanisms for learning in the design of M&E systems. Even when learning mechanisms exist, they are often of a lower priority than accountability mechanisms, so the gap may remain and important opportunities for learning from experience and using this learning are missed (Britton, 2009).

The mechanisms of accountability (with respect to performance based reporting) seek to measure performance, aiming to quantify or narrate it in annual reports, project reports, logical frameworks, and so on. However, a common complaint about such accountability mechanisms is that they often reflect the interests of funders or donors, in that the metrics tend to be easily quantifiable and designed to be more useful to donors as part of their annual budget cycles (in showing that they have funded “success”) than they are of use to nonprofit managers for purposes of strategic decision making (Ebrahimm, 2006).

A further challenge is ensuring that the NGO has the necessary competence to analyze and make use of the information that emerges from its monitoring and evaluation systems (Britton, 2009). The scarcity of M&E skills has been exacerbated by high turnover of M&E staff with experience showing that, as soon as a person has been trained in M&E, these highly marketable skills lead to other job opportunities (Gorgens & Kusek, 2010). According to the coordinator (2010), many
Kenyan NGOs lack the capacity to employ both monitoring and evaluation professionals and in-house ICT staff who are well skilled to understand monitoring and evaluation and develop appropriate tools. This has led to the development of inferior monitoring and evaluation systems that do not meet internal and donor requirements.

National NGOs in Kenya working in the governance sector engaged in advocacy, familiar with acceptable monitoring and evaluation practices emphasized by their donors, tend to avoid assessments of their effectiveness altogether and focus their limited evaluation budgets instead on methods that assess only whether they have implemented the plan promised to donors, an approach that does not advance their understanding of the advocacy work. This study therefore, seeks to establish the factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the study
The purpose of this study was to establish the factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations in the governance sector of Nairobi.

1.4 Objectives of the study
The study objectives were:

i. To examine how data quality influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.

ii. To assess how human capacity influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.

iii. To establish how the use of the logical framework influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.

iv. To determine how utilization of monitoring and evaluation information influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.
1.5 Research Questions
The study sought to answer the following research questions:

i. How does data quality influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya?

ii. How does human capacity influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya?

iii. How does the use of the logical framework influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya?

iv. In what way does utilization of monitoring and evaluation information influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya?

1.6 Significance of the study
It is hoped that the study will be of significance to organizations by contributing to a better understanding and knowledge of strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems. NIMES may use the study to provide a framework for strengthening existing monitoring and evaluation systems. The study is hoped will benefit researchers and scholars who may use its’ findings as a reference and to enrich M &E literature.

1.7 Assumptions of the study
The study was conducted under the assumption that the respondents would be available and also that they would give honest responses. This study also assumed that respondents had a good understanding of the factors that influence the performance of monitoring and evaluation systems.

1.8 Limitations of the study
The limitation of the study was in the cost incurred due to the vastness of the area which required significant amount of time to collect adequate data, which the study had no control over. To overcome this limitation, the researcher contracted a research assistant. This ensured that the targeted population was reached.
1.9 Delimitations of the study
The study was delimited to 40 programme officers and 5 programme managers who manage non-governmental organizations registered with the NGO Coordination Board under the governance sector and had filed their returns for the 2012 financial year.

1.10 Definition of Significant Terms
Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: Performance of monitoring and evaluation systems is the ability of measured project activities to provide users of the system access to quality and accurate information that can be used for organizational learning and decision making.

Data Quality: Data collection that influence the monitoring and evaluation system while satisfying the information needs of users. Quality data is dependent on the duration of monitoring and evaluation, data sources and data analysis.

Human Capacity: This is defined as the capabilities of employees in an organization to perform their monitoring and evaluation duties efficiently, effectively and sustainably to support the M&E system. For the system to perform employees should have the skills and experience.

Use of the Logical Framework: This is defined as the application of the matrix and its’ accuracy during the process of monitoring and evaluation. Usage is determined through the choice of indicators and the understanding of users as they refer to the tool during the process of monitoring and evaluation.

Utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation Information: This is putting monitoring and evaluation results to use. The use of monitoring and evaluation findings for decision making and project control ensure that there is a baseline against which to undertake new measurements.

1.11 Organization of the study
The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One consists of the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research objectives, research questions, significance of the study, limitations, delimitation, assumptions, conceptual definition of terms used and organization of the study. Chapter Two looks at available literature done on factors
influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems by scholars who have studied the subject in other monitoring and evaluation contexts. The chapter provides a conceptual framework which outlines the relationship between the dependent and independent variables identified in the subject of study. Chapter Three constitutes the research methodology, which is divided into research design, target population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instrument, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations in research. Chapter Four covers data analysis, presentation and interpretation. Chapter Five covers the summary and discussion of findings, conclusion, recommendations and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter reviews the literature related to the study from the global, African and local perspective. The chapter also presents a conceptual framework reflecting the relationship between the identified dependent and independent variables.

2.2 Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems
The structural arrangements of an M&E system are important from a number of perspectives; one is the need to ensure the objectivity, credibility and rigor of the M&E information that the system produces (Mackay, 2006). Khan (2003), concurs that the conceptual design of an M&E system is supposed to address issues with regard to the objectives of the system, competent authority, credibility of information, its management, dissemination and recycling into the planning process with special emphasis on community participation. M&E systems should be built in such a way that there is a demand for results information at every level that data are collected and analyzed. Furthermore, clear roles, responsibilities, formal organizational and political lines of authority must be established (Kusek & Rist, 2004).

There is often a need for some structural support for M&E, such as a separate evaluation unit which at the very least needs one person who is the internal champion identified to make sure the system is implemented and develops. Moreover, the systems must be consistent with the values at the heart of the organization and work in support of the strategy (Rick, 2001). There are twelve components of a functional monitoring and evaluation namely: structure and organizational alignment for M and E systems; Human capacity for M and E systems; M and E partnerships; M and E plans; Costed M and E work plans; Advocacy, communication and culture for M&E systems; Routine monitoring; periodic surveys; Databases useful to M&E systems; Supportive supervision and data auditing; Evaluation and research; and using information to improve results (UNAIDS, 2008).

Taut (2007) study, ‘self- evaluation capacity building in a large international development organization’, indicate low organizational readiness for learning from evaluation. Moreover,
interviewees similarly described a lack of open, transparent, and critical intra-organizational dialogue and a lack of formal structures and processes to encourage reflection and learning as an organizational habit. At the same time, there was rather high awareness of the potential for evaluation to be used as a tool for learning and demand voiced for such evaluations.

2.2.1 Concept of Monitoring and Evaluation systems
Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are tools employed to assess the relationships of intentions versus actions, actions versus outcomes, and outcomes versus impacts. However, the most important, yet quite often the most neglected aspect of monitoring and evaluation is feedback. It is the feedback of lessons learned through M&E that assists correction of current mistakes and improvement of future decisions (Khan, 1998). A results-based M&E system is essentially a feedback system; it is a management tool to measure and evaluate outcomes, providing information for governance and decision making (Gorgens & Kusek, 2010). A results-based system, whilst not neglecting the monitoring of inputs and outputs, attaches the highest importance to providing feedback on results at the level of outcomes and goals (Edmunds & Marchant, 2008).

Kelly et al. (2008), argues that good M&E systems for civil society programs as ones which are: dynamic, participative, reflective and evolving. First, dynamic systems encourage ‘learning by doing’ and are promoting regular ways of seeking dynamic feedback from multiple sources about the benefits, problems and impacts of the intervention. Secondly, participative and gender sensitive systems actively seek to overcome barriers of gender, age, power, culture and other issues which limit the participation of all stakeholders in the monitoring and assessment process. Thirdly, reflective systems encourage staff, partners and stakeholders to create regular space and time for analyzing information and reflecting back on the underlying assumptions or ‘theories of change’ which underpin the interventions. Fourthly, evolving systems are adapting and changing in order to keep them as light and simple as possible while providing ‘real time’ information which informs on-going improvement of the intervention.

2.3 Data Quality
The source of performance data is important to the credibility of reported results hence, it is
important to incorporate data from a variety of sources to validate findings. Furthermore, while primary data are collected directly by the M&E system for M&E purpose, secondary data are those collected by other organizations for purposes different from M&E (Gebremedhin, Getachew & Amha, 2010). In the design of an M&E system, the objective is to collect indicator data from various sources, including the target population for monitoring project progress (Barton, 1997). The methods of data collection for M&E system include discussion/conversation with concerned individuals, community/group interviews, field visits, review of records, key informant interviews, participant observation, focus group interviews, direct observation, questionnaire, one-time surveys, panel surveys, census, and field experiments. Moreover, developing key indicators to monitor outcomes enables managers to assess the degree to which intended or promised outcomes are being achieved (Kusek & Rist, 2004).

Frequent data collection means more data points; more data points enable managers to track trends and understand intervention dynamics hence the more often measurements are taken, the less guess work there will be regarding what happened between specific measurement intervals. But, the more time that passes between measurements, the greater the chances that events and changes in the system might happen that may be missed (Gebremedhin et al., 2010). Guijt (1999) concurs that to be useful, information needs to be collected at optimal moments and with a certain frequency. Moreover, unless negotiated indicators are genuinely understood by all involved and everyone’s timetable is consulted, optimal moments for collection and analysis will be difficult to identify.

According to Cornielje, Velema and Finkenflugel (2008), only when the monitoring system is owned by the users the system is it likely to generate valid and reliable information. However, all too often the very same users may be overwhelmed by the amount of daily work which in their view is seen as more important than collecting data and subsequently the system may become corrupted. They conclude that it is of extreme importance that the front-line workers are both involved in monitoring and evaluation and informed about the status of the services and activities they largely provide in interaction with other stakeholder and beneficiaries.
Singh et al. (2009), study, ‘the numeric paper forms for NGOs’, expressed concern regarding
data collection namely: cost, time, training, data accuracy and consistency, storage, and means of
data analysis. Additionally, those NGOs who had experimented with electronic systems
highlighted difficulties with infrastructure and maintenance. Among the key findings of the study
was that data collection and form-filling are important activities for many NGOs; cost and ease-
of-use are major concerns, often preventing technology-heavy systems; and digitized data is
desired, but digitizing data was the bottleneck for data-collection efforts. A system of data
collection should be self-organizing and evolving as it gathers information from the environment
where the staff would then generate the information in the course of their daily activities (Innes
& Booher, 1999: 415). In a report of strengthening the M&E system of HIV and AIDS projects
in Childfund Uganda, Ediau (2012) found that data was not routinely collected, compiled, stored,
analyzed and shared by ChildFund Uganda and project stakeholders. As a result such data was
not effectively utilized to track and measure performance as well as inform program
improvement and learning.

Obure (2008) in a study of RBM in Northern Ghana indicates a problem associated with post
collection data management. As confessed by many field officers, the storage, processing and
interpretation of data was ineffectively handled. Results from the study strongly point to a
weakness in the system arising from the inability of stakeholders to handle and process data in a
meaningful way. He concludes that this challenge could seriously lead to mere collection of large
volumes of data which eventually might not be used in a helpful way. Data must be collected and
analyzed regularly on the objectives and intermediate results. Furthermore, the PME&R system
allows for three levels of information by project, activity and organization where the data for all
organizations involved in a specific activity can be averaged up to the activity level, and the data
for all activities can be averaged up to the project level (Booth, Ebrahim & Morin, 1998).

2.4 Human Capacity
The M&E system cannot function without skilled people who effectively execute the M&E tasks
for which they are responsible. Therefore, understanding the skills needed and the capacity of
people involved in the M&E system (undertaking human capacity assessments) and addressing
capacity gaps (through structured capacity development programs) is at the heart of the M&E system (Gorgens & Kusek, 2010). In its’ framework for a functional M&E system, UNAIDS (2008) notes that, not only is it necessary to have dedicated and adequate numbers of M&E staff, it is essential for this staff to have the right skills for the work. Moreover, M&E human capacity building requires a wide range of activities, including formal training, in-service training, mentorship, coaching and internships. Lastly, M&E capacity building should focus not only on the technical aspects of M&E, but also address skills in leadership, financial management, facilitation, supervision, advocacy and communication.

Building an adequate supply of human resource capacity is critical for the sustainability of the M&E system and generally is an ongoing issue. Furthermore, it needs to be recognized that “growing” evaluators requires far more technically oriented M&E training and development than can usually be obtained with one or two workshops. Both formal training and on-the-job experience are important in developing evaluators with various options for training and development opportunities which include: the public sector, the private sector, universities, professional associations, job assignment, and mentoring programs (Acevedo et al., 2010).

Monitoring and evaluation carried out by untrained and inexperienced people is bound to be time consuming, costly and the results generated could be impractical and irrelevant. Therefore, this will definitely impact the success of projects (Nabris, 2002). In assessment of CSOs in the Pacific, UNDP (2011) discusses some of the challenges of organizational development as having inadequate monitoring and evaluation systems. Additionally, the lack of capabilities and opportunities to train staff in technical skills in this area is clearly a factor to be considered. During the consultation processes, there was consensus among CSOs that their lack of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and skills was a major systemic gap across the region. Furthermore, while there is no need for CSOs to possess extraordinarily complex monitoring and evaluation systems, there is certainly a need for them to possess a rudimentary knowledge of, and ability to utilize reporting, monitoring, and evaluating systems.
There is a constant demand for training in planning, monitoring, review, evaluation and impact assessment for both program staff and partners in projects (Gosling & Edwards, 2003). Skills for numeracy, literacy, interviewing and monitoring in qualitative and quantitative methods, for management information systems are necessary for participatory monitoring and evaluation (Adan, 2012). Staff need to be trained not only on collecting descriptive information about a program, product, or any other entity but also on using something called “values” to determine what information and to draw explicitly evaluation inferences from the data, that is inferences that say something about the quality, value or importance of something (Davidson, 2004).

Players in the field of project management like project and programme managers, M and E officers, project staff and external evaluators will require specialized training not just in project management and M and E; but specifically in areas like Participatory monitoring and evaluation and results based monitoring and evaluation (Murunga, 2011).

In a study by White (2013) on monitoring and evaluation best practices in development INGOs, indicate that INGOs encounter a number of challenges when implementing or managing M&E activities one being insufficient M&E capacity where M&E staff usually advises more than one project at a time, and have a regional or sectoral assignment with a vast portfolio. Furthermore, taking on the M&E work of too many individual projects overextends limited M&E capacity and leads to rapid burnout of M&E staff whereby high burnout and turnover rates make recruitment of skilled M&E staff difficult, and limits the organizational expertise available to support M&E development. Mibey (2011) study on factors affecting implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs in kazi kwa kijana project, recommends that capacity building should be added as a major component of the project across the country (Kenya), and this calls for enhanced investment in training and human resource development in the crucial technical area of monitoring and evaluation.

2.5 Use of the Logical framework
Among South African NGOs, there was widespread adherence to the logical framework as a foundation for evaluation and reporting with its’ use as a planning tool locking organizations into established timeframes and specified outputs. These rigid timeframes of project funding and
LFA does not accord well with the complex uneven nature of development work. Furthermore, quantitative rather than qualitative indicators could be used to advantage as they were easily measured to demonstrate success while qualitative measures of how much was understood or subsequently used were largely avoided (Bornstein, 2006).

The task of monitoring and evaluation becomes significantly more challenging as one moves up the log frame and emphasis shifts from performance monitoring to results measurement. Moreover, working at the top end of the results chain is a question less of monitoring indicators than of systematic analysis of available evidence which can be a very data-intensive exercise, especially since such higher-level indicators become increasingly costly to collect and complex to analyze (Edmunds & Marchant, 2008). Bakewell and Garbutt (2005) in their study noted that, ‘where the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) is used for monitoring and evaluation the focus is often the logical framework; to look at the expected achievements laid out in the matrix, rather than the work itself’. In theory, Bakewell and Garbutt argue, that the logical framework can be revised through the programme cycle and changes made, at least to the output level; however, in practice this rarely happens. In the study one donor representative claimed that they encourage NGO partners to review their logical frameworks, but the same person thought that a well-designed framework would not need changing.

In the Ugandan Rwenzori region a study by Busiinge (2010) found that donors rarely operate outside the log frame approach where they are boxed in results that are put in the project log frame, and yet sometimes the situation on the ground might affect the achievement of some of the results hence requiring some aspects of the project to be changed. Therefore, any suggested changes by the implementing organizations had to go through prolonged to and fro communication over the changes. A critique to this argument however, is that the log frame brings significant benefits for a range of stakeholders while their longevity suggests that, to a great extent, they meet the needs of powerful decision-makers in development organizations (Jacobs, Barnett & Ponsford, 2010). Furthermore, they simplify complex social situations and
make them relatively easy to understand, linking budgets to actions and expected results while also providing a tool for setting measurable goals, the basis for assessing performance towards them and for holding implementing organizations or staff to account.

NGOs adapt to the variety of log frames as well as templates for the narrative/technical and financial reports used by funding agencies which is an added complexity to the use of the log frame. Moreover, the variety of log frames used and disseminated by international agencies, require that counterparts learn not only how to work with a particular type of log frame but how to work with the various types of log frames (Martinez, 2011). The choice of appropriate indicators is an art that requires experience and skill involving a thorough understanding of the information needs of project management and information users at different levels. Furthermore, choosing indicators requires knowledge of how best to obtain (and analyze) the data for the indicators, and of the limits imposed by both costs and techniques. Input and output indicators are easier to assess than effect or impact indicators, but the ‘lower’ level indicators only provide an indirect measure of the success of a project (Barton, 1997). With reference to the standards, the worth of an indicator (or a set of them) is to facilitate systematic inquiry through collection, analysis and interpretation of accurate and relevant data. Irrelevant or inadequate indicators often compromise validity of the data collected (Bamberger, et al., 2006).

According to Grove and Zwi (2008), the log frame contains a natural bias towards quantification in that the matrix demands ‘objectively verifiable indicators’, forcing projects to consider how they will measure progress towards intended outcomes; while setting clear objectives and identifying ways of measuring these from the outset helps management and other stakeholders to identify where the project is succeeding or failing, this emphasis on the ‘measurable’ also represents a crucial weakness. In particular, Grove and Zwi argue that relationships between people (both internal and external to the project) and process issues (how the project is undertaken) are likely to be neglected, with attention focused on the most tangible outputs, such as clinics built or vaccinations administered.
In most of the cases, regular progress reporting is conducted for donor purposes that gives an account of activities undertaken and immediate outputs, but misses out on qualitative information as to whether the objectives of the program are being achieved or fall short at the end of the project (Khan, 2003). In order to reassure back donors that their money has been well-spent and has made a measurable difference, quantitative indicators are required. Furthermore, an over-reliance on quantitative data may mean that the real essence of change is not recorded or understood thus there is a considerable challenge in providing the aid system with the numbers it needs, but also ensuring that these numbers are both meaningful and practical to collect (Hailey & James, 2003).

The classic mantra for M&E has been to develop Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Reliable and Time bound (SMART) indicators. Therefore, the drive for setting up M&E systems based only on easily measurable quantitative indicators has perhaps been one of the key reasons for the failure of M&E systems to contribute useful information for the management of development initiatives. Hence both qualitative and quantitative information are critical, yet an indicator driven approach to M&E often drives systems in the direction of quantitative information, yet it is often the qualitative information that is required for explanation, analysis and sound decision making (Woodhill, 2005). While quantitative analysis of the success and impact of community-based projects is appreciated as an objective and empirical method of assessment, there is need to go beyond numbers to monitor, capture, evaluate, report and record successes and impact. Additionally, there are ways to capture the impact of workshops and community dialogues in qualitative ways (USAID KENYA, 2010).

2.6 Utilization of M&E Information
The utilization of M&E information is central to the performance and sustainability of an M&E system and depends on the nature and strength of demand for M&E information (Mackay, 2007). Utility requires that commissioners and evaluators undertake the evaluation with the intention to use its results; that they undertake the evaluation at a time when the results can meaningfully inform decision making processes; and that evaluations be accessible (Rist, Boily & Martin, 2011). Otieno (2012) study indicates that the majority of the respondents were involved in
utilization of the monitoring and evaluation results in ways such as involvement in decision making of the project, redesigning of the project, strengthening/improvement, advocacy for additional resources, program intervention of the project and project control. However, the low involvement of project members in project control after the offset of the implementing agency contributed to the immense negative impact of the current low degree of sustainability of the project performance.

Incentives need to be introduced to encourage the use of performance information meaning that success needs to be acknowledged and rewarded, problems need to be addressed, messengers must not be punished, organizational learning is valued, and budget savings are shared (Kusek & Rist, 2004). The external demand for specific information on outcomes and impacts plays a key role in promoting measurement of those aspects of development work and in keeping the system honest overall. However, where external or internal demand is lacking, or where performance information is not linked to the reward system, the incentives for generating and using performance information are deficient and, not surprisingly, M&E systems are weak (Thomas, 2010).

AusAID (2000) report, indicates that feedback during project implementation from local project staff and the opportunity for beneficiaries to influence appropriate revisions to project activities contributed to the quality of monitoring information in projects. Additionally, to improve performance information good baseline data combined with ongoing consultation with beneficiaries provides a firm basis upon which to make judgements about appropriate and timely interventions, and later about the achievement of major development objectives. Baseline data and needs assessments provide the information you need against which to assess improvements caused by project implementation over time thus in order to evaluate the impact your project has on the lives of beneficiaries, you have to be familiar with the situation of the beneficiaries before project implementation (Hunter, 2009).

A baseline study will be necessary for most activities as it is important to find out what
information is already available. If baseline information will not be used (or subsequently replicated) to improve the quality of activity implementation or to measure development results, then the reason for collecting the data should be seriously questioned (USAID, 2002). Baseline data should provide only the minimum information required to assess the key aspects of quality of the activity delivery and measure the development results (including the eventual impacts). Anything more than this is likely to be a waste time, effort and resources and risks making the baseline study not replicable (UNDP, 2002).

Rogito (2010) study on the influence of monitoring and evaluation on project’s performance found that a project implemented without the baseline study faced serious challenges on tracking its’ progress effectively on indicators. According to Rogito, for best practice a baseline needs to be planned and done a year earlier to get full information on the project to undertake which was largely not done from the study findings. He concludes that youth projects were poorly performing as baseline survey study was minimally done hence it was hard to achieve project goals. He recommends that baseline study need to be properly timed before project implementation and the findings kept properly and used to monitor progress of projects.
2.7 Conceptual Framework

Figure 1 shows the identified independent variables and the existing relationship between them and the dependent variable.

**Independent variables**

- **Data Quality**
  - Duration of M&E
  - Data source
  - Data analysis

- **Human capacity**
  - M & E skills acquired
  - Experience with M&E
  - Adequate numbers

- **Use of the Logical Framework**
  - Choice of indicators
  - Understanding usage

- **Utilization of monitoring and evaluation findings**
  - Decision making
  - Project control

**Moderating variable**

- Stakeholder Participation
- Funding

**Dependent Variable**

- Performance of Monitoring and evaluation systems
  - Provision of accurate and quality information
  - Access to information

- Donor priority

**Extraneous variable**

Fig 1. Conceptual Framework
The diagrammatic presentation in Fig.1 explains the relationship between the independent, moderating, extraneous and dependent variables. In this study an attempt was made to find out how the independent variables, that is data quality, human capacity, use of the logical framework, utilization of monitoring and evaluation systems influence performance of Monitoring and Evaluation systems. Stakeholder participation and funding are presented as moderating variables. Donor priority is also presented as an extraneous variable.

2.8 Summary
This chapter has reviewed existing literature on factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems globally, regionally and locally. The concept of good monitoring and evaluation systems and quality information attributes is looked at. These concepts form the basis of the theoretical framework.

The chapter also presents a conceptual framework reflecting the relationship between the independent variable (factors influencing) and dependent variable (performance of monitoring and evaluation systems) in selected non-governmental organizations.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter outlines the methodology used in undertaking the research. The chapter details the target population, research design, data collection methods, instruments and analysis employed in the research. It also presents a table on operationalization of variables.

3.2 Research Design
To develop an understanding of performance of monitoring and evaluation systems, survey study design was employed. The study used qualitative and quantitative approaches. Although the two paradigms have appeared to be on opposing sides, Cameron, (2009: 140) argues that the mixed methodologies approach that is advanced by pragmatists recognizes the strengths and weaknesses of each of the approach and seeks to compensate for such by their use in gathering and analyzing data.

According to Nachmias and Nachmias (1996), a personal interview is a face to face, interpersonal role situation in which an interviewer asks respondents questions designed to elicit answers pertinent to the research hypotheses. In this study, personal interviews were used to ensure instant responses were obtained.

3.3 Target Population
A total of 40 organizations were registered under the governance sector in Nairobi by the NGO Coordination Board. The study population was 40 programme officers working for NGOs registered with the NGO coordination board in Nairobi County. The programme officers were targeted because they are familiar with the operations of monitoring and evaluation systems. To enhance the study 5 programme managers working in these NGOs were also targeted for interviews.

3.4 Sampling Procedure
Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), recommends that where the target population is so small, that a selected sample would be meaningless; the whole population should be studied. A total of 40
programme officers from the 40 NGOs were surveyed. Additionally, five programme managers were identified using the systematic random sampling technique. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), in systematic sampling every \( k^{th} \) case in the population frame is selected for inclusion in the sample with the rule of the thumb when deciding the sampling interval being to divide the total population (N) by the sample size (n). Systematic sampling was conducted by sampling every \( 8^{th} \) NGO after randomizing the list obtained from the NGO Coordination Board 2012 governance register. The \( 7^{th} \) NGO on the list was the first to be sampled.

3.5 Research Instruments
The data collection instruments in this study were: questionnaire and interview guide. The use of more than one method for gathering data was to ensure methodological triangulation as distinguished by Denzin, as cited in Alan (2003). The questionnaire consisted of items applying the likert scale with the responses ranging from strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree and strongly disagree on a 1,2,3,4,5 rating scale. The likert scale tested the attitude of the respondents. The questionnaire consisted of both open-ended and closed ended questions to offer opportunities for comments, suggestions and areas of improvement that would make a positive difference when using monitoring and evaluation systems.

3.6. Validity of Instrument
According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), validity is a measure of relevance and correctness. It is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences which are based on the research results. Data collection techniques must yield information that is not only relevant to the research questions but also correct. To enhance the validity of the instrument, pretesting was done to determine whether the questions were acceptable, answerable and well understood.

Pilot testing of research instruments is important because it reveals vague questions, unclear instructions and enables the researcher to improve the efficiency of the instruments (Nachmias & Nachmias, 2007). The research instruments were piloted in Nairobi using NGOs in other sectors. This involved administering the same questionnaire twice to a group of five programme officers and two programme managers two weeks prior to the actual study. This enabled the researcher to
check for any ambiguities and unclear questions. Additionally, the researcher consulted a monitoring and evaluation expert and the university supervisor.

3.7 Reliability of the Instrument
Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Data collected from the test retest was used to calculate the reliability coefficient to indicate the relationship between the two sets of data, and a Pearson correlation result of 0.82 was obtained using SPSS. Mugenda (2008) says that a reliability coefficient of 0.80 or more implies that there is a high degree of reliability of the data.

3.8 Data Collection Procedures
The researcher administered questionnaires by interviewing respondents. To complement the questionnaire distributed, the researcher interviewed programme managers in the sampled NGOs to get additional information on monitoring and evaluation systems.

The researcher sought approval for this study from the University of Nairobi. As soon as permission was granted and an introduction letter obtained by the researcher, the study proceeded in the following chronology: recruitment of one research assistant; conducting briefing for the assistant on the study objectives, data collection process and study instrument administration; pilot testing; revising of the data collection instruments after the pilot study; reproduction of required copies for data collection; administering instruments via interview; assessment of filled questionnaires through serialization and coding for analysis; data analysis and discussion; preparation of the conclusion and recommendations.

3.9 Methods of Data Analysis
Descriptive data collected was analyzed, interpreted and inferred through triangulation of information. The identified independent variables were analyzed through review of questionnaires and feedback from the target population interviewed.

Before processing the responses, the completed questionnaires were checked for completeness
and comprehensibility to ensure consistency. The data was then summarized, coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 for analysis to enable the responses to be grouped into various categories.

Descriptive statistics entailing frequency distribution was used to analyze the data. Data presentation was done by the use of percentages and frequency tables. This ensured that the gathered information was clearly understood.

3.10 Ethical considerations
The researcher relied on ethical issues as identified by Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), while undertaking this study. The research followed the three principles of ethics which include: respect, beneficence and justice. The participants were informed of the purpose of the study before the information was sought from them thus conforming to the principle of voluntary and informed consent. Further, the identity of the respondents was protected by reporting data as a block and not highlighting individual cases.

3.11 Operationalisation of Variables
This section identifies indicators that were used to measure the dependent and independent variables. This study used qualitative and quantitative indicators to measure the relation between the dependent and independent variables. Analysis of the relationship using the identified indicators was objective.
Table 3.1: Operationalisation of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Type of variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Level of Scale</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To examine how data quality influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.</td>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>Data quality</td>
<td>• Frequency of data collection&lt;br&gt;• How data is collected&lt;br&gt;• How data is analyzed</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of data collection&lt;br&gt;Data sources&lt;br&gt;Data Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess how human capacity influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya.</td>
<td>Independent variable</td>
<td>Human capacity</td>
<td>• Level of monitoring and evaluation training&lt;br&gt;• Number of years working with monitoring and evaluation&lt;br&gt;• Number of projects staff monitor and evaluate</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation skills acquired&lt;br&gt;Experience with monitoring and evaluation&lt;br&gt;Adequate number of staff for monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish how the use of the logical framework influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya</td>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
<td>Use of the Logical Framework&lt;br&gt;Understanding usage</td>
<td>a) Indicator type&lt;br&gt;• Quantitative/Qualitative&lt;br&gt;b) Knowledge of components</td>
<td>Nominal and Ordinal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choice of indicators&lt;br&gt;Understanding usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


To determine how utilization of monitoring and evaluation information influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of governance non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Decision making</th>
<th>Use of M&amp;E findings</th>
<th>Ordinal and Nominal</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation Information</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Use of M&amp;E findings</td>
<td>Ordinal and Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Information</td>
<td>Use of baseline information</td>
<td>Use of baseline information</td>
<td>Ordinal and Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To establish factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems in non-governmental organizations in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Provision of quality and accurate information</th>
<th>Self reported score on perceived access and provision of quality and accurate information</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance of monitoring and evaluation systems</td>
<td>Provision of quality and accurate information</td>
<td>Self reported score on perceived access and provision of quality and accurate information</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings of the survey data analyzed and interpreted in line with the study objectives. The findings are presented in the form of tables showing frequencies and percentages.

4.2 Questionnaire response rate

The study used questionnaires and interview guide as tools for data collection. The researcher targeted 40 programme officers where 30 were able to respond to the questionnaire items. Additionally, 3 out of the 5 programme managers granted the researcher an opportunity to interview them. Therefore, out of the 40 questionnaires, 30 were filled and analyzed by the researcher. This represented a response rate of 75%. The response rate was good when compared to the recommended response rates to verify consistency of measurements required for analysis (for example over 60%, based on Kothari, 2005). 9 programme officers denied the researcher an opportunity to administer the questionnaire. 1 NGO is not located in Nairobi as had been indicated in the list obtained from the NGO coordination board.

4.3 Profile of respondents

The background information of the respondents included: gender, highest level of education and how long they had worked for the organization. Profiles of the respondents who participated in this study are shown in the Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Profiles of the respondents during the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of Education</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years worked in organization</td>
<td>&lt;2years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents were female at 53% as compared to 47% who were male. This shows that both genders were adequately represented in the study. Additionally, majority of the respondents (97%) had university level of education while the rest had college level education. This indicates that the programme officers were highly educated. Out of the 30 programme officers interviewed, 67% had worked in these organizations for over two years while the rest had worked for less than two years. This indicates that a majority of the respondents understood the results based management adopted by their organizations.

4.4 Influence of data quality on performance of monitoring and evaluation systems

The study sought to examine how data quality influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems. The results of the opinion of the respondents are presented in Table 4.2 to Table 4.8.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they collect data on project activities. The responses are presented in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2: Data collection on project activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents (100%) indicated that they collect data on project activities. This shows that there is data readily available for use by project staff during the life of a project.

The respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which data is collected on project activities. The responses are shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Frequency of data collection on project activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of data collection</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only when required by organizations/donors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents (93%) indicated that they collect data on a regular basis. This indicates organizations track any changes on project activities as they occur. Furthermore, regular data collection ensures that timely and accurate data is captured and thus ensuring information provided is of good quality.

Respondents were also asked to indicate the sources from which they collect data. The responses are indicated in Table 4.4.
Table 4.4: Source of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both primary and secondary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of programme officers (70%) said that data collection was from both primary and secondary sources. This indicates data collection from a variety of sources ensuring that all important information about the project is captured.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether the data source influence the quality of data collected. The responses are shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Data source influence on quality of data collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents (100%) agreed that the source of data influence the quality of data collected. This indicates that NGOs are keen on the source of data they use to collect information about project activities.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they analyze data collected from project activities. The responses are shown in Table 4.6.
Table 4.6: Data analysis of project activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents (100%) agreed that they analyze data obtained from their project activities. This indicates that data collected is analyzed by organizations in order to obtain meaningful information.

The respondents were asked to indicate how they analyze the data they collect. The results are presented in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: How data analysis is done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both software and manually</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority (73%) indicated that they use software for data analysis. This indicates that the information obtained is likely to be accurate and timely. Additionally, respondents indicated they experience challenges from the storage and processing of data using software.

The respondents were asked to rate data analysis for their project activities. The responses are shown in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Rating data analysis of project activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents (90%) rated data analysis of project activities above moderate. This indicates that adequate data analysis of project activity implementation is carried out by organizations.

4.5. Human capacity influence on performance of monitoring and evaluation systems

The study sought to assess the influence of human capacity on the performance of monitoring and evaluation systems. The results of the opinion of the respondents are presented in Table 4.9 to Table 4.14.

Respondents were asked to indicate what monitoring and evaluation training they had. The responses are shown in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Monitoring and evaluation training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal training only</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Formal and in-service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear from Table 4.9, all the respondents had been trained in monitoring and evaluation either formally or through in-service training. This indicates they had the technical knowledge to
operate monitoring and evaluation systems.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not training in monitoring and evaluation influence provision of quality information. The responses are shown in Table 4.10.

**Table 4.10: Training influence on provision of quality information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents (100%) agreed that their monitoring and evaluation training helped them provide the organization with quality information. This indicates the importance of ensuring that staff operating monitoring and evaluation systems are trained and the need to ensure continuous improvement of their M&E knowledge so as to ensure that there are no information gaps.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they had monitoring and evaluation experience. The responses are shown in Table 4.11.

**Table 4.11: Monitoring and evaluation experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the respondents (93%) indicated that they had monitoring and evaluation experience. This shows that the programme officers understand the designed monitoring and evaluation systems of the projects undertaken by NGOs.

The respondents were asked to indicate how many years of monitoring and evaluation experience they had. The responses are shown in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12: Years of Monitoring and Evaluation Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of monitoring and evaluation experience</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear from Table 4.12, 61% of the programme officers had over 4 years experience while 39% had less than 3 years experience. This shows that majority of the respondents interviewed had operated monitoring and evaluation systems for a while and thus had developed an understanding of handling the system.

The respondents were asked to indicate the number of projects they were in charge of monitoring and evaluating for the 2013 financial year. The responses are shown in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13: Number of projects in-charge of monitoring and evaluating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of projects monitored and evaluated</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 projects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 projects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 projects and above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents (60%) indicated they monitor up-to four projects while the rest were in-charge of five projects and above. This finding indicates that most programme officers are responsible for overseeing few projects and thus it can be argued that they are not overworked.
The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they were able to collect information from the projects they were in charge of monitoring and evaluating. The responses are shown in Table 4.14.

**Table 4.14: Ability to collect information from projects on time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 30 programme officers interviewed, 23 (77%) agreed that they are able to collect information from the projects they are in charge of monitoring and evaluating on time. This shows that the number of programme officers in organizations is adequate given there is efficient provision of information.

**4.6 Use of the logical framework influence on performance of monitoring and evaluation systems**

The study sought to establish the influence of the use of the logical framework on performance of monitoring and evaluation systems. The results of the opinion of the respondents are as presented in Table 4.15 to Table 4.22.

The respondents were asked whether or not they used the logical framework in their organizations. The responses are shown in Table 4.15.

**Table 4.15: Use of the logical framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents (93%) indicated that they used the logical framework as a planning, monitoring and evaluation tool while the rest did not. This shows the popularity in use of the tool in the NGO sector.

Respondents were asked to indicate how often they use the logical framework. The responses are shown in Table 4.16.

**Table 4.16: How often the Logical Framework is used**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often the Logical Framework is used</th>
<th>Frequency (n= 28)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only when monitoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only when evaluating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 indicates that majority of the respondents (68%) rely on the log frame during both monitoring and evaluating. This shows that the logical framework is used throughout the project life cycle when tracking and reviewing projects or activity implementation.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not how often they refer to the logical framework influence provision of quality information. The responses are shown in Table 4.17.

**Table 4.17: Influence of how often the logical framework is referred to**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents (93%) agreed that how often the logical framework is referred to influence provision of quality information while the rest did not. This shows the importance of referring to the logical framework frequently during the process of monitoring and evaluation.

Respondents were asked to rate the choice of quantitative indicators compared to qualitative
indicators for their projects. The responses are shown on Table 4.18.

### Table 4.18: Rate the choice of Quantitative Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate choice of quantitative indicators</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents (61%) rated the choice of quantitative indicators high showing that organizations tend to use more quantitative indicators for their project activities. This is similar to the views held by programme managers that project activities tend to use more quantitative indicators than qualitative indicators. This indicates presents a gap in the design of projects to measure qualitative aspects of projects.

Respondents were asked to indicate on a likert scale whether project activities should use more quantitative indicators than qualitative indicators. The responses are shown on Table 4.19.

### Table 4.19: Use of quantitative versus qualitative indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert score</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19 indicates that 61% of the respondents disagreed that project activities should use more quantitative than qualitative indicators. This indicates that respondents felt organizations should not only quantify their results but consider other project factors that are qualitative.
The respondents were asked to use the likert scale to rate the statement that the choice of indicators in setting up monitoring and evaluation systems influence their performance. The responses are shown on Table 4.20.

Table 4.20: Choice of indicators when designing monitoring and evaluation systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert score</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 4.20 shows that 96% programme officers agreed that the choice of indicators in setting up monitoring and evaluation systems influence their performance. This indicates that the design of monitoring and evaluation systems should include the right indicators as indicators provide critical information on performance of projects.

Respondents were asked to use a likert scale to rate whether their knowledge of impacts, outcomes, outputs and inputs influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems. The responses are shown in Table 4.21.

Table 4.21: Knowledge of logical framework components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert score</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents (96%) agreed that their knowledge of impacts, outcome, outputs and inputs influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems. This indicates that programme officers know that they need to understand various components of the log frame.
Respondents were asked to use the likert scale to rate whether they experience challenges when measuring results in the upper levels of the log frame. The responses are shown in Table 4.22.

Table 4.22: Task of monitoring and evaluation challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert score</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of the respondents (93%) agreed that they experience challenges when measuring results in the upper levels of the logical framework. This indicates that programme officers have difficulty measuring impacts while using the logical framework.

4.7 Influence of utilization of monitoring and evaluation information on performance of monitoring and evaluation systems

The study sought to explore how utilization of monitoring and evaluation information influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems. The responses are presented in Table 4.23 to Table 4.30.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they utilize monitoring and evaluation findings. The responses are shown in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23: Utilization of monitoring and evaluation findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 30 programme officers interviewed, 29 (97%) admitted to utilizing monitoring and
evaluation findings. This indicates that NGOs are keen on using previous monitoring and evaluation information to improve project implementation and learn from tracking activities.

Respondents were asked to indicate how frequent they utilize monitoring and evaluation findings. The responses are indicated in Table 4.24.

**Table 4.24: Frequency of utilization of monitoring and evaluation findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency (n=29)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of respondents (65%) said that they utilize monitoring and evaluation findings frequently. This indicates that programme officers refer to previous monitoring and evaluation findings regularly during project planning and implementation.

The programme officers and programme managers were asked whether or not they conduct baseline surveys for their organization. The responses are shown in Table 4.25.

**Table 4.25: Conducting baseline surveys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency (n=33)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear from Table 4.25, 94% of the respondents agreed that they conduct baseline surveys. This indicates that organizations have important information that they can use to assess any changes as they implement planned project activities.
Respondents were asked to indicate when they conduct baseline surveys. The responses are shown on Table 4.26.

**Table 4.26: Timing of baseline surveys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before project implementation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During project implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After project implementation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before and after project implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of organizations (79%) conduct baseline surveys before project implementation. This indicates that organizations can track the progress of project activities against baseline information.

Respondents were asked to rate the use of baseline information for their project activities. The responses are presented in Table 4.27.

**Table 4.27: Rating baseline information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear from Table 4.27, all the respondents indicated that the use of baseline information was satisfactory. This shows that programme officers find their use of baseline information to be adequate.

Respondents were asked to use a likert scale to rate whether utilizing monitoring and evaluation
findings improves the quality of information. Their responses are shown in Table 4.28.

**Table 4.28: Utilization of monitoring and evaluation findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 4.28 shows that all the respondents agreed that utilizing monitoring and evaluation findings improves the quality of information. This indicates the importance of using information from progress monitoring and evaluation to improve on information provided.

Respondents were asked to use the likert scale to indicate whether the use of baseline information improves the quality of information. The responses are shown in Table 4.29.

**Table 4.29: Use of baseline information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likert score</th>
<th>Frequency (n=28)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.29 shows that all the respondents (100%) agreed that the use of baseline information improves the quality of information. This indicates that there is need to use baseline information after carrying out a baseline study to improve on information provided by project implementation.

Using the likert scale, respondents were asked to rate whether the timing of baseline surveys influence the quality of information provided. The responses are shown in Table 4.30.
From Table 4.30, 89% of the programme officers agreed that the timing of baseline surveys influence the quality of information provided. This indicates that the period when organizations conduct baseline surveys will determine whether they can use the baseline information obtained for project implementation.

### 4.8 Measurement of performance of monitoring and evaluation systems

The respondents were asked questions regarding the performance of monitoring and evaluation systems in their organizations. The data collected was tabulated in Table 4.31.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.31: Likert-type scale showing opinion on performance of monitoring and evaluation systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Accessibility of monitoring and evaluation information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Getting feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Monitoring and evaluation systems meet information needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

$\sum f$ - summation of frequency
\[ \sum f_w \] - summation of product of frequency and weights

\[ \sum f_w / \sum f \] - mean weight which is the summation of the products of the various frequencies & weight divided by the summation of the frequencies

From the likert Table 4.31, respondents agreed that monitoring and evaluation information is accessible to all staff of the organization indicated by a mean weight of 3.6. The same applied to their ability to get feedback after measurement of project activities which had a mean weight of 3.8. Moreover, respondents were of the opinion that overall monitoring and evaluation systems meet the information needs of staff as indicated by the mean weight of 3.7.

The data analyzed thus shows that performance of monitoring and evaluation systems is satisfactory given that information is accessible to organizational staff, feedback after measurement of project activities is received and the information needs of staff are met.

**4.9 Summary**

This chapter has outlined and interpreted the findings of the study under the themes of data quality, human capacity, use of the logical framework and utilization of monitoring and evaluation information. In the final part, the performance of monitoring and evaluation systems has been tabulated.
5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and discusses briefly the summary of findings, then offers a conclusion and recommendations, and finally gives suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of findings

The purpose of the study was to establish the factors influencing performance of monitoring and evaluation systems of selected non-governmental organizations in Nairobi, Kenya. The research objectives were used to guide the collection of required data from the respondents.

5.2.1 Influence of Data Quality

NGOs were able to collect regular quality and relevant data from both primary and secondary sources. Data analysis of the project activities was adequate carried out mainly through the use of software. However, the use of software for data analysis was faced with challenges of storage and processing.

5.2.2 Influence of Human Capacity

Programme officers working in these NGOs had received the necessary training in monitoring and evaluation either formally or through in-service training besides having several years of experience working with monitoring and evaluation systems. Moreover, these programme officers were in-charge of few projects from which they were able to provide timely information.

5.2.3 Influence of Use of the logical framework

The logical framework was found to be popular as a monitoring and evaluation tool relied on throughout the stages of the project life cycle. Programme officers had the knowledge of terminologies used in the logical framework. However, the choice of quantitative indicators for projects was shown to be high compared to qualitative indicators.
Moreover, results measurement at upper levels of the logical framework was challenging for programme officers.

5.2.4 Influence of Utilization of monitoring and evaluation information

The utility of monitoring and evaluation findings was regular. In addition, baseline surveys were conducted before project implementation where the use of baseline information was satisfactory. The utilization of monitoring and evaluation findings, use of baseline information and timing of baseline surveys were found to improve on the quality of information provided.

5.3 Discussion of the findings

The results are discussed in relation to the existing literature on findings of related studies.

5.3.1 Influence of Data quality

NGOs were able to collect data on a regular basis from both primary and secondary sources. Moreover, data analysis of the project activities was adequate carried out mainly through the use of software. However, the use of software for data analysis was faced with challenges of storage and processing.

This finding is in agreement with the views of Gebremedhin et al. (2010), who said that the more often measurements are taken, the less guess work there will be regarding what happened between specific measurement intervals with the source of performance data being important to the credibility of reported results hence, it is important to incorporate data from a variety of sources to validate findings. Moreover, Barton (1997) argues that in the design of a monitoring and evaluation system, the objective is to collect indicator data from various sources, including the target population for monitoring project progress.

Additionally, this finding is similar to study observations of Singh et al. (2009) where NGOs expressed concern regarding data collection namely: cost, time, training, data accuracy and consistency, storage, and means of data analysis. Those NGOs who had experimented with electronic systems highlighted difficulties with infrastructure and maintenance.
Obure (2008) identified post collection data management weakness in the system arising from the inability of stakeholders to handle and process data in a meaningful way with the storage, processing and interpretation of data being ineffectively handled.

5.3.2 Influence of Human capacity

The programme officers working in these NGOs had received the necessary training in monitoring and evaluation either formally or through in-service training besides having several years of experience working with monitoring and evaluation systems. Moreover, these programme officers were in-charge of few projects from which they were able to provide timely information.

This finding reflects the expression of UNDP (2011), who argue that though CSOs need not have complex monitoring and evaluation systems there is need to possess a rudimentary knowledge of, and ability to utilize reporting, monitoring and evaluation system. Furthermore, Acevedo et al. (2010), observes that both formal training and on the job experience are important in developing evaluators.

Additionally, Murunga (2011) is of the view that players in the field of project management like project and programme managers, M&E officers, project staff and external evaluators will require specialized training not just in project management and M&E; but specifically in areas like Participatory monitoring and evaluation and results based monitoring and evaluation. UNAIDS (2008) notes that, not only is it necessary to have dedicated and adequate numbers of M&E staff, it is essential for this staff to have the right skills for the work while Nabris (2000), avers that monitoring and evaluation carried out by untrained and inexperienced people is bound to be time consuming, costly and the results generated could be impractical and irrelevant.

5.3.3 Influence of the Use of the logical framework

The logical framework was found to be popular as a monitoring and evaluation tool relied on throughout stages of the project life cycle. Programme officers had the knowledge of terms
applying to the logical framework. However, the choice of quantitative indicators for projects was shown to be high compared to qualitative indicators. Moreover, results measurement at upper levels of the logical framework became challenging for programme officers.

This finding obeys the views expressed by Woodhill (2005), who asserts that both qualitative and quantitative information are critical, yet an indicator driven approach to monitoring and evaluation often drives systems in the direction of quantitative information, yet it is often the qualitative information that is required for explanation, analysis and sound decision making. Furthermore, it concurs with the study findings of South African NGOs where there was widespread adherence to the logical framework as a foundation for evaluation and reporting with quantitative rather than qualitative indicators used to advantage as they were easily measured to demonstrate success while qualitative measures of how much was understood or subsequently used were largely avoided (Bornstein, 2006).

The difficulty in results measurement is in agreement with the views of Barton (1997), who argues that input and output indicators are easier to assess than effect or impact indicators, but the ‘lower’ level indicators only provide an indirect measure of the success of a project. In addition, Edmunds & Marchant (2008), observe that working at the top end of the results chain can be a very data-intensive exercise, especially since such higher-level indicators become increasingly costly to collect and complex to analyze.

5.3.4 Influence of Utilization of monitoring and evaluation information

The utility of monitoring and evaluation findings was regular. In addition, baseline surveys were conducted before project implementation where the use of baseline information was shown as satisfactory. The utilization of monitoring and evaluation findings, use of baseline information and timing of baseline surveys were found to improve the quality of information provided.

This finding reflects the views expressed by (Rist, Boily & Martin, 2011), who said that utility requires that commissioners and evaluators undertake the evaluation with the intention to use its results; that they undertake the evaluation at a time when the results can meaningfully inform decision making processes; and that evaluations be accessible. Moreover, USAID (2002), asserts
that if baseline information will not be used (or subsequently) to improve the quality of activity implementation or to measure development results, then the reason for collecting the data should be seriously questioned while Rogito (2010), avers that a baseline study needs to be properly timed before project implementation and the findings kept properly and used to monitor progress of projects.

5.4 Conclusion
Data quality, human capacity, use of the logical framework and utilization of monitoring and evaluation information improve the accuracy, quality and access of information provided by the monitoring and evaluation system. Programme officers had monitoring and evaluation experience and training, utilized monitoring and evaluation information adequately and carried out regular data collection from various sources. Furthermore, the performance of monitoring and evaluation systems was satisfactory given information was accessible to organizational staff, feedback after measurement of project activities was received and the information needs of staff were met.

However, challenges faced with the storage and processing of data, results measurement in upper levels of the logical framework and the low choice of qualitative indicators for project activities influence project success. This presents an absence of learning from the design of monitoring and evaluation systems. Therefore, NGOs need to overcome these challenges in order to provide quality information for those in need of it.

5.5 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study and the conclusion made, the study makes the following recommendations for policy action by NGOs given that their monitoring and evaluation systems have a bearing on the kind of information they provide:

1. There is need for data audit. This should entail the review of monitoring and evaluation systems to address arising needs in the use of software for analysis and allow for adjustments of the monitoring and evaluation plan when the approach changes.
2. It is appropriate to make preliminary assessments of the direction and nature of impacts by doing case studies of the target population within the lifetime of the project. This should entail studying a sample of the targeted beneficiaries.

3. There is need to combine the use of the logical framework with outcome mapping. Outcome mapping lies in the shift away from assessing the development impact of a programme and toward changes in the behaviour, relationships, actions or activities of the people, groups, and organizations with whom a development programme is working directly and seeking to influence.

5.6 Suggestions for further research

The following areas are suggested for further research:

i) The role of ICT support to project management

ii) Influence of monitoring and evaluation systems on effectiveness of project implementation
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APPENDIX 1

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Nancy Mulandi
Mobile; 0724-628969
Nairobi- Kenya.
26th May, 2013

Dear Sir/Madam,


I am a graduate student of the University of Nairobi. I am conducting a research on the aforementioned subject. This is in fulfillment of the degree in Masters of Arts in Project Planning and Management. You have been selected to participate in this study. The findings of this study will be of value in strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems of non-governmental organizations. I would appreciate it if you kindly assist me by responding to all the items attached in the questionnaire.

Your name and that of your organization need not to appear anywhere in the questionnaire unless you so wish. The information you provide is confidential and will be used for academic research purposes only. Where possible upon request, I will make available to you the findings of the study. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Nancy Mulandi,
L50/68583/2011.
APPENDIX 2

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

FACTORS INFLUENCING PERFORMANCE OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS OF SELECTED NON GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS BASED IN NAIROBI, KENYA.

Are you willing to participate in the exercise and thereby respond to the questions I will put to you? A. Yes  B. No

✓ If Yes, please put a tick to the correct answer or give details as appropriate in the following questions

Part 1: General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Optional): ____________________  ____________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:  ☐ Male  ☐ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Qualification:  ☐ Secondary  ☐ College  ☐ University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you worked for the organization?  ☐ &lt;2 years  ☐ 2-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2: Data Quality

1. Do you collect data on project activities for your organization?
   A. Yes  
   B. No  

2. How often do you collect data on project activities?
   A. Daily  
   B. Weekly  
   C. Monthly  
   D. Quarterly  
   E. Only when required by donors/organization

3. What is the source of data collected?
   A. Primary Sources (e.g individuals, groups, organizations)
B. Secondary sources (e.g documents)
C. Both Primary and Secondary sources

4. Do the sources of data influence the quality of data collected?
   A. Yes
   B. No

5. Do you analyze data obtained from project activities?
   A. Yes
   B. No

6. How is data analyzed in your organization?
   A. Using a Software (Access, Excel, SPSS, STATA)
   B. Manually
   C. Both software and manually

7. If data analysis is done using software, what challenges if any, do you encounter?
   A. Storage
   B. Processing
   C. Other (specify) ______________

8. How would you rate data analysis in your organization?
   A. High
   B. Moderate
   C. Low

Part 3: Human Capacity

9. What monitoring and evaluation training do you possess?
   A. Formal training only
   B. In-service training only
   C. Formal and in-service
   D. Other (specify) ______________

10. Does your training help you provide quality information to the organization?
    A. Yes
    B. No

11. Do you have any monitoring and evaluation experience?
    A. Yes
    B. No

12. If Yes to 11, how many years of monitoring and evaluation experience?
    A. Less than 1 year
    B. 2 years
    C. 3 years
    D. Over 4 years

13. How many projects are you in-charge of monitoring and evaluating for this financial year?
    A. 1-2 projects
    B. 3-4 projects
    C. 5-6 projects
    D. 6 projects and above
14. a) Are you able to collect information from the projects above on time?
   
   A. Yes
   
   B. No

b) If No to 14, why? __________________________________________________________

Part 4: Use of the Logical Framework

15. a) Do you use the logical framework?

   A. Yes
   
   B. No

b) If No, which planning tool do you use? ________________________________

c) If Yes, which other planning tools if any, do you use? ________________________________

16. How often do you make use of the logical framework?
   
   A. Only when monitoring
   
   B. Only when evaluating
   
   C. Both monitoring and evaluation

17. Do you think how often you refer to the logical framework is key to quality information?

   A. Yes
   
   B. No

18. How would you rate the choice of quantitative indicators compared to qualitative indicators for the organizations projects?

   A. High
   
   B. Moderate
   
   C. Low

19. Please tick next to the appropriate column in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project activities should use more quantitative indicators than qualitative indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The choice of indicator in setting up monitoring and evaluation systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
influence their performance

My knowledge of impacts, outcome, outputs and inputs influence performance of monitoring and evaluation systems

I experience challenges when measuring results in the upper levels of the logical framework

Part 5: Utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation Information

20. Do you utilize monitoring and evaluation findings?
   A. Yes
   B. No
b) If No, what do you do with the findings? __________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

21. a) How often do you utilize monitoring and evaluation findings?
   A. Always
   B. Frequently
   C. Occasionally
22. Does your organization conduct baseline surveys?
   A. Yes
   B. No
b) If No, which data do you rely on before starting a project? __________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

23. If Yes to 23, when do you conduct baseline surveys?
   A. Before project implementation
   B. During project implementation
   C. After project implementation
   D. Before and after project implementation
24. How would you rate the use of baseline information during project implementation?
   A. Unsatisfactory
   B. Satisfactory
   C. Very satisfactory

25. Please tick next to the appropriate column in the table.
Utilizing monitoring and evaluation findings improves the quality of project information

Use of baseline information improves the quality of project information

The timing of baseline survey determines the quality of project information

Part 6: Performance of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

26. Please tick next to the appropriate column in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation information is accessible to all staff of the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff get feedback after measurement of project activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall monitoring and evaluation systems meet the information needs of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Do you have additional information as regards;

A. Data Quality __________________________________________________________

B. Human Capacity ______________________________________________________

C. Use of the logical framework __________________________________________

65
D. Utilization of monitoring and evaluation information

28. What recommendations/suggestions would you give that could improve performance of monitoring and evaluation systems?

THANK YOU!
INTERVIEW GUIDE

Programme Managers

1. What human capacity development policy strategy does your organization have to operate monitoring and evaluation systems?

2. Do you use the logical framework?

3. Do you use more quantitative indicators than qualitative indicators for your project activities?

4. Does your organization conduct baseline surveys?

5. Do employees of the organization obtain feedback after carrying out project activities?

6. What challenges are faced from operating monitoring and evaluation systems?

7. What recommendations would you give to improve on the performance of monitoring and evaluation systems?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>NGO Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>African Women Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Caring for environment for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Centre for research communication and gender in early childhood education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>World radiance international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Development knowledge link-Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Centre for health, advocacy, gender and education initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Social ministry research network centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Multi-sectoral development programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sub - Saharan Africa research and policy institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Transformational leadership in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Help child/mother Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Value addition and cottage industry development initiative Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>The world student christian federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Noble charity homes for destitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Mazingira institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Tausa development programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Youth initiatives-Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Senior women citizen for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Horn relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tender hands initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Western community health and development programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Rescue vulnerable and orphaned children international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Forest action network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Kenya association for the intellectually handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>National democratic institute for international affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Global forces support programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Community research and development network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Social transformation and empowerment project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Uzima foundation Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Kenya poverty elimination networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td><strong>Environmental research mapping and information system in Africa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Tears of hope project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Centre for budget and policy analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Citizens awareness network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Spigo institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Kenya women and youth league</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Centre for peace and democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Academy for educational development- Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td><strong>Mercy corps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Pamoja resources for transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>