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ABSTRACT
Kenya is pursuing economic development towards achievement of vision 2030 and, in order to accelerate the achievement of MDG 4, the Government launched a Child Survival and Development Strategy that was budgeted in 2009 as an effort to accelerate child survival and provide a framework to improve indicators for children. The strategy is guided by the National Health Sector Strategic Plan II (NHSSP II) and the Vision 2030 Medium Term Plan. Its aim is to reduce inequalities in the health care services and improve on the child health indicators. For this to be achieved effective M&E of child rescue projects is very important. This research sought to investigate the factors influencing the effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue project at SJCC Pumwani. The research had five guiding objectives, these were: to determine the influence of level of training, budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and institutional frameworks on effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects. The significance of the study being to provide useful information to the project members and other stakeholders on what positively or negatively impacts on the progress and future of this project. A descriptive survey research design was used for the study. Structured questionnaires were used to collect primary data. No sampling was done has all the SJCC child rescue staff were to participate. The respondents consisted of project managers, project officers, monitoring and evaluation officers, children support officers, field officers and clerks. Data was analyzed descriptively using descriptive statistics and tables as appropriate. The results agreed with other similar studies done previously. The research established that there were several factors affecting effective monitoring and evaluation of Child Rescue Projects. These included training of those tasked with monitoring and evaluation activities and clear institutional framework for conducting the same. Other factors included incorporating monitoring and evaluation budget into project budgets, and involvement of primary stakeholders in the M&E process. SJCC recognizes the importance of employee participation in M&E budget planning and this ensures that evaluation of SJCC projects are clearly and adequately financed in terms of monitoring and evaluation activities. The study also established that SJCC staff possesses academic qualifications and professional skills 71% of SJCC child rescue staff hand an undergraduate degree, 9% post-graduate degree and 20% tertiary training, this shows that they have ability and experience required for effective monitoring and evaluation child rescue projects. These are being enhanced through in-house M&E training by SJCC. The study results also indicated the existence of a clear institutional framework for doing monitoring and evaluation in SJCC, 36% of the respondents indicating that SJCC organizational policy promotes use of M&E to a large extent. SJCC also has appropriate institutional guidelines and an M&E policy for effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects. The involvement of staff in policy and implementation guidelines formulations has empowered them in M&E activities, 51% of the respondents indicating they are involved in M&E policy development to a large extent. Further, other stakeholders’ participation in M&E report presentations and the M&E process, reports and implementation is well supported by all the relevant parties in SJCC. The researcher recommends SJCC should institute projects in addition to the workshops and seminars to enhance the technical capacity majority stated having attendant only one training in the last twelve months of the entire organization in conducting evaluations, the value and participation of its human resources in the policymaking process, and their motivation. SJCC must control and manage stakeholders’ participation to avoid cases of undue influence on the evaluation.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The last three decades have witnessed global dramatic growth in the number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) involved in development and humanitarian aid in both the developed and developing countries. Globally, the amount of public funds being channeled through NGOs has also grown significantly and the proportion of aid going through NGOs relative to bilateral or multilateral agencies has also increased. The European Union (EU) funding for international NGOs in the mid-1970s had a budget of USD $3.2 million which by 1995 reached an estimated USD $1 billion; accounting for somewhere between 15-20% of all EU foreign aid (Carlsson et al., 2004). Related to this growth has been an increasing concern about the efficiencies of NGO, policies, guidelines and practices (Hatry and Lampkin, 2009). The changing environment of donors and the recent emphasis on the quality of funds management resulted in several NGOs adopting processes that contribute to increased transparency monitoring and evaluation. Some of the processes that evolved to address these concerns include the development of codes of conduct, benchmarks and standards that enhance operations (Brabent, 2007). In addition, the increasing demand on NGOs to provide more services with a higher level of competition for funds has created challenges for the organizations pushing them to find ways to become more effective and provide greater social and economic impact.

Throughout Africa, the resilience of people and willingness to bring positive impact on others is reflected in an extraordinary proliferation of community initiatives, faith based organizations and
NGOs to deal child mortality rates. Over the past decade, thousands of groups have recognized the increasing vulnerability of children and are responding with ingenuity. Such attempts to provide support for orphans and vulnerable children are hardly known outside their immediate locale. They have been little studied or documented. Few external organizations have sought to partner grassroots associations or provide them with additional resources, and few networks exist to support their development. Most community initiatives grow out of the concern of a few motivated individuals who work together to support vulnerable children. They spring from a sense of obligation to care for those in need, in a context characterized by inadequate or non-existent public services. Associations are started informally, by families, neighbors and church groups. Actions are spontaneous, informal responses driven by seeing or knowing about a situation requiring attention. In fact, most activities are carried out by concerned charitable women, widows and mothers. For those interested in grassroots development, this proliferation of community-led activities to support vulnerable children is not surprising. On other concerns, and in many places, communities have developed processes to cope with similarly difficult situations. Even the poorest and most vulnerable people have set up resilient and ingenious coping mechanisms such as self-help groups, burial associations, grain loan schemes and rotating credit and loan clubs (Lwihula and Over, 1995).

Plantz (2010) found that the nonprofit sector has been measuring certain aspects of performance for several decades including financial accountability, inputs, cost, program products or outputs, adherence to quality in service delivery and client satisfaction. They suggested while these measures yield critical information about the services provided by NGOs, they seldom reveal whether the NGO’s efforts make a difference. They also advise that NGOs should engage in
effective planning and management by systematic assessments of past activities and their results and utilizing the learning for informed decision-making. According to Light (2006), strengthening organizational capacity for monitoring and evaluation and learning systems continue to be growing concerns. Today, NGOs have to make strategic allocation of resources to learning.

Monitoring and evaluation of projects are critical for building a strong, global evidence base around humanitarian projects and for assessing the wide, diverse range of interventions being implemented to address challenges faced by these groups. At the global level, it is a tool for identifying and documenting successful programs and approaches and tracking progress toward common indicators across related projects (McCoy, Ngari P & Krumpe 2005). Monitoring and evaluation forms the basis of strengthening understanding around the many multi-layered factors underlying humanitarian projects, experiences, and the effective the response at the service provider, community, national and international level (UNICEF 2006).

Effective monitoring and evaluation is thus critically important because while the global evidence base on the proportion of vulnerable people having ever experienced various forms of abuse is strong, evidence on what kinds of strategies are effective in preventing such suffering and offering adequate support to victims and survivors is still weak. This is especially relevant in resource poor areas, where difficult decisions need to be made with respect to funding priorities (McCoy, Ngari & Krumpe 2005). At the project level, the purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to track implementation and outputs systematically, and measure the effective these projects. It also helps determine exactly when a project is on track and when changes may be needed.
Monitoring and evaluation forms the basis for modification of interventions and assessing the quality of activities being conducted (Jackson and Cecile 1997).

Monitoring and evaluation can be used to demonstrate that projects efforts have had a measurable impact on expected outcomes and have been implemented effectively. It is essential in helping managers, planners, implementers, policy makers and donors acquire the information and understanding they need to make informed decisions about program operations. Monitoring and evaluation helps with identifying the most valuable and efficient use of resources. It is critical for developing objective conclusions regarding the extent to which programs can be judged a “success”. Monitoring and evaluation together provide the necessary data to guide strategic planning, to design and implement programs and projects, and to allocate, and reallocate resources in better ways. (Adapted from Hatry and Lampkin 2009, Kelly and Magongo 2007).

Numerous reasons are attributed to non-use of M&E findings by donor agencies ranging from inept and badly conducted monitoring and evaluations to a deliberate attempt by the key decision makers in NGOs to ignore findings and recommendations as it may undercut their program plans (Riddell, 2007). Other key deficiencies lie in the methodological set-up of evaluations, data collection methods, limited attention for cross cutting issues and broader lessons learned are not well addressed. The absence of formal, structured follow-up procedures when the evaluation report is completed, it falls into the organizational abyss: low priority, neglect and indifference among the potential users (Murray, 2010).
In Kenya in order to accelerate the achievement of MDG 4, in relation towards achievement of vision 2030, which is to Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, Under-five mortality rate. The Government launched a Child Survival and development Strategy that is budgeted in 2009 as an effort to accelerate child survival and provide a framework to improve indicators for children. The strategy is guided by the National Health Sector Strategic Plan II (NHSSP II) and the Vision 2030 Medium Term Plan that aim to reduce inequalities in the health care services and improve on the child health indicators (UNICEF, 2006a). For this to be achieved effective M&E of child rescue projects is very important.

The Malezi Bora Strategy initiated in 2007 has provided a comprehensive package of services that includes child immunization, Vitamin A supplementation, de-worming of under-fives and pregnant women, treatment of childhood illnesses, HIV Counseling & Testing, ITNs use in Malaria prevention and improved ANC & FP Services. Malezi Bora provides an opportunity to provide children with a comprehensive and integrated package of services (UNICEF, 2006a). Other Government efforts towards reduction in child mortality and in line with attainment of the MDG 4 target are Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses which includes immunization, one of the most effective primary health interventions in reducing child mortality. Under this, the Ministry of Health continues to strengthen immunization activities throughout the country under the Kenya Expanded Project on Immunization (KEPI) as well as management of childhood. Also many NGOs and faith based organizations have been brought to board in the fight to reduce child mortality (UNICEF, 2006a).
While the literature of program evaluation has made significant advances in identifying the factors that influence its use, very little of their recommendations have crossed over and been applied into NGO practice (Hatry and Lampkin, 2009). The primary reason for this study is to provide an insight of the M&E challenges faced by NGOs so as to provide a simple, practical framework that guides NGOs towards effective and efficient utilization of M&E.

St Johns Community Center has a rich history spanning for over 50 years. Church Missionary Society (CMS) started the Center in 1957 with a purpose of providing social welfare and psychological support to the immigrants from the rural areas who had settled in Pumwani area of Nairobi. The Centre is one of the institutions of Anglican Church of Kenya which is under Nairobi Diocese (ICPHER, 2011).

SJCC has been a key player in facilitating social development work in Pumwani area since its inception. Over the years, the approaches and scope of social development work has been changing positively in transforming lives through an empowerment approach. Indeed SJCC has transformed from itself from a welfare and relief organization to a facilitator of sustainable development beyond Pumwani area. Programming approaches and institutional development have been continuously informed through studies and assessments carried out over the years. The Centre has developed wealth of experiences and competencies in facilitating social development work for vulnerable groups hence, in 2005 KNH one of its development partners entrusted the Centre with a responsibility of facilitating an OVC Project in support of community based organizations responding to HIV/AIDS challenge in the country. Midterm evaluation of this
project rated the center highly in its facilitation. Evidently, SJCC has proved to be an effective facilitator of social development in urban and rural areas. (ICPHER 2011).

The social development work has been focusing on three sectoral areas i.e. Health, Education, and Training and Economic empowerment. Programs emerging from these sectors include HIV/AIDS, Economic empowerment, Non-formal education, Community health and education, youth development, information empowerment, Child Rescue and OVC small community project. These projects aim to uplift the spiritual, social, economic and other human conditions of vulnerable groups guided by the Christian spirit of “bearing one another’s’ burden (ICPHER 2011).

In Pumwani informal settlements, SJCC operates in six villages namely: Majengo, Kitui, Motherland, Kanuku, Kinyago, and Kiambiyu. Pumwani area is residence to low-income population that lives below the poverty line. In these settlements, unemployment is high and most households are women headed (SJCC, 2013). Additionally, there is high prevalence of social evils that have continued to undermine social and economic wellbeing of the people. They include crime, alcoholism, prostitution, conflicts, and substance abuse. Further, people live in deplorable environmental conditions characterized by poor housing, inadequate sanitation and water. The poor environment and rampant poverty are causes of high prevalence of diseases that only worsens their lives. Children are highly affected as they lack access to proper care and support resulting to lack of basic needs, parental care, and access to education (ICPHER 2011) SJCC programming work has focused on positive transformation of Pumwani community by empowering them to deal with the challenges.
The Child Rescue Project was started in the year 2007 as an additional project in SJCC. The project targets children of 5 years of age and below through identification and rescuing the sick whose lives were at immediate risk of death, independent of the cause. The children are diagnosed, either referrals made to the existing network of healthcare facilities for medical attention, or transferred to emergency care partners, rescue centers. The main aim of the Program is the sustainable and measureable reduction of child mortality through the implementation of a cost-efficient rescue system for the poorest population (SJCC, 2013).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Worldwide, the number of children under age 18 who have lost one or both parents to AIDS stands at more than 14.3 million (UNAIDS, UNICEF & USAID, 2004). The percentage of children orphaned or otherwise considered vulnerable and in need of assistance has been growing fast and this has made Kenya one of the countries hard hit by this scourge (UNICEF, 2006).

Kenya is facing one of its greatest development challenges of an orphaned and vulnerable children (OVC) pandemic of immense proportions. An estimated 12 million children aged 17 or younger have lost one or both parents to AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa (UNICEF, 2006). UNICEF, 2006 report also says that in Kenya, 73 children out of 1,000 births die before age five. Comparatively, Uganda with a child mortality rate of 69/1,000 is ranked 39, while Rwanda at 55/1,000 comes in at position 50. At position 51, Tanzania is the best place in the EAC for a child to be born, with 54 children out of 1,000 births likely to die before they are five — about half the number in Burundi.
Due to this problem a lot of resources from government, private companies, international donor agencies, and civil society have been channeled to projects (interventions) to respond to the challenge of fighting this pandemic. M&E is an integral part in implementation of these child rescue projects as effective monitoring and evaluation are important for success of these projects (McCoy, Ngari & Krumpe 2005). However, Queries have been raised about its execution and there has been a lot of criticism as to whether the M&E of these projects is done effectively (UNICEF, 2006).

Child rescue projects are unique projects dealing with a delicate matter of young children and experience major hurdles in execution of monitoring and evaluation effectively, this is because evaluations that do include children are largely carried out in the domain of psychology and psychiatry and tend to pathologize and individualize (Kusek, 2004) It is against this background that it becomes necessary to investigate level of training, budgetary allocation, Stakeholders participation and institutional frameworks as challenges facing effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue project at ST. John’s Community Centre Pumwani, in Nairobi County. This study, therefore sought to investigate the factors influencing effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects at ST John’s community centre.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the factors influencing effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue project at SJCC Pumwani.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

1) To determine the influence of the level of training of child rescue project staff on effective Monitoring and Evaluation of child rescue project at SJCC, Pumwani.

2) To assess the influence of level of budgetary allocation on M&E on effective Monitoring and Evaluation of child rescue project at SJCC, Pumwani.

3) To establish the influence of stakeholder participation on effective Monitoring and Evaluation of child rescue project at SJCC, Pumwani.

4) To determine the influence institutional frameworks on effective Monitoring and Evaluation of child rescue project at SJCC, Pumwani.

1.5 Research Questions

1) How does the level of training of child rescue project staff influence effective Monitoring and Evaluation of child rescue project at SJCC, Pumwani?

2) How does the level of budgetary allocation influence effective Monitoring and Evaluation in child rescue project at SJCC Pumwani?

3) To what extent does a stakeholder involvement influence effective Monitoring and Evaluation in child rescue project at SJCC Pumwani?

4) How do institutional frameworks influence effective Monitoring and Evaluation of child rescue projects in child rescue project at SJCC Pumwani?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The study examined the four factors influencing effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue project at St John’s rescues center so that project members and other stakeholders are
aware of what positively impacts on the progress and future of their projects. Recommendations from the study will help in improving M&E of child rescue projects, for sustainability and realization of the goal of improving the socio-economic status of community members.

The study also provides useful information to donors about factors influencing monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects to enable them address them effectiveness for improvement and sustainability. It also provides relevant information to government officials responsible for development of policies, guidelines and implementation frameworks for child rescue projects. This study hopes to contribute to the existing knowledge, address and provide the background information to research organizations, individual researchers and scholars who want to carry out further research in this area.

1.7 Delimitations of the Study

The study covered only 140 staff for one child rescue project at St John’s community Centre in Nairobi County, it was also limited to four independent variables which are level of training, level of budget allocation, stakeholder involvement and institutional frameworks and one dependent variable effective monitoring and evaluation.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

Key limitations of the study was to get all the SJCC staff to fill the questioner. The researcher also required to make several trips to the center to administer the questionnaire.to avoid unnecessary trips the researcher incorporated email as a means of communication and delivery of the questionnaires to the respondents.
1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that respondents were available for the study and that they would give correct and valid information that would assist in getting valid data.

1.10 Definitions of significant terms used in the study

Budgetary allocation: Amount of resources allocate to a specific activity. In this case, we will be referring to amount of money budgeted for M&E of the child rescue project.

Child rescue project: Institutions put across to address the problem of needy children. ST. Johns Community center is one of the child rescue centers in Nairobi County.

In the various aspects of the project especially in the process of M&E child rescue project at

Institutional frameworks: these are the systems of formal laws, regulations, and procedures, and informal conventions, customs, and norms that shape socioeconomic activity and behavior, they define the organizations culture and way of doing things in this study these will be measured through, frequency of M&E, M&E system in place and whether there is presence of M&E team

Level of training: The extent to which an employee is well versed with a particular skill

Monitoring and evaluation: The process of collecting data in the course and at the end of an intervention to ascertain its effectiveness.

SJCC, Pumwani.

Stakeholder’s participation: Active involvement in various people affected of involved in any
1.11 Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One is introduction consisting of the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, significance of the study, limitations, delimitations, basic assumptions of the study and the organization of the study.

Chapter Two, literature is reviewed in the following order; a general review of influence of level of training on M&E in child rescue projects, the influence of budgetary allocations for M&E on child rescue projects, influence of stakeholders’ participation in monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects and influence of internal politics on M&E. The chapter also presents a theoretical and conceptual framework showing the variables and the various indicators.

Chapter Three outlines the research methodology used in the study and included research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques, sample size, sampling techniques, research instruments, questionnaires, validity of the instruments, reliability of the instruments, and finally piloting of the research instruments. The study presents the Operationalization of variables table.

Chapter Four present analysis, presentation and interpretation of data while chapter Five entails summary of findings, discussions of findings, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a broader context of the study subject in terms of past scholarly works and what other author have written about monitoring and evaluation of projects. Projects are aimed at solving social problems and the beneficiaries are key stakeholders. This review of literature looks at the need for monitoring and evaluation with respect to projects. It largely dwells on factors influencing effective monitoring and evaluation process. It also covers theoretical and conceptual framework.

2.2 Concepts Monitoring and Evaluation

Projects are aimed at solving social problems and the beneficiaries are key stakeholders. Monitoring and evaluation can help an organization to extract, from past and on-going activities, relevant information that can subsequently be used as the basis for programmatic fine-tuning, reorientation and planning. Without monitoring and evaluation, it would be impossible to judge if work was going in the right direction, whether progress and success could be claimed, and how future efforts might be improved (UNDP, 2002) Precisely, the overall purpose of monitoring and evaluation is the measurement and assessment of performance in order to more effectiveness manage the outcomes and outputs known as development results. Monitoring and evaluation are intimately linked project management functions and as a result there is a lot confusion in trying to make them work on projects (Crawford and Bryce, 2003) Monitoring and Evaluation are distinct but complementary (Passia, 2004). Casley and Kumar (1986) as quoted by Crawford and Bryce (2003) disprove the use the acronym M&E (Monitoring and evaluation) as it suggest that
we are looking at a single function without making a clear distinction between the two.
Monitoring ensures that implementation is moving according to plans and if not, the project
manager takes corrective action. Monitoring enhances project management decision making
during the implementation thereby increasing the chances of good project performance
(Crawford and Bryce, 2003; Gyorkos, 2003). It also facilitates transparency and accountability of
the resources to the stakeholders including donors, project beneficiaries and the wider
community in which the project is implemented. Monitoring tracks and documents resources use
throughout the implementation of the project (Passia, 2004; Uitto, 2004) Evaluation assesses
project effectachieving its goals and in determining the relevance and sustainability of an
ongoing project (McCoy, 2005). It compares the project impact with what was set to be achieved
in the project plan (Shapiro, 2004).

Evaluations are mainly of two types depending on when they take place. These are formative and
summative evaluations. Formative Evaluation is concerned more with efficient use of resources
to produce outputs and focuses on strengths, weakness, and challenges of the project and whether
the continued project plan will be able to deliver the project objectives or it needs redesigning
(Passia, 2004). Formative evaluations are sometimes called interim or midterm evaluations.
Summative evaluations are carried out at the end of the project and aims at determining how the
project progressed, what went right and wrong and capture any lessons learned (Shapiro, 2004).
Wellings and Macdowall (2000) identify two types of summative evaluation is geared towards
guiding future projects by facilitating organizational learning by documenting good practices and
mistakes. Outcome evaluation is concerned with extent to which the set objectives were achieved
and how we can attribute the role of project to the outcomes In order to carry out monitoring
evaluation effectively; there are some critical factors that must be taken into account. These include use of relevant skills, sound methods, adequate resources and transparency, in order to be a quality (Jones. 2009). The resources here include skilled personnel and financial resources. Rogers (2008) suggests the use of multi-stakeholders’ dialogs in data collection, hypothesis testing and in the intervention, in order to allow greater participation and recognize the differences that may arise. All these must be done within a supportive institutional framework while being cognizant of political influence.

2.3 Level of Training and Effective Monitoring and Evaluation.

Nabris (2002) asserts that M&E carried out by untrained and inexperienced people is bound to be time consuming, costly and the results generated could be impractical and irrelevant. This impacts on the success of the project. Kusek (2004) further adds that capacity building in the work force is needed in order to develop, support and sustain a results based monitoring and evaluation system. Officials need to be trained in modern data collection and analysis method. The technical capacity of the organization in conducting evaluations, the value and participation of its human resources in the policymaking process, and their motivation to impact decisions, can be huge determinants of how the evaluation’s lessons are produced, communicated and perceived (Vanessa and Gala, 2011).

Human resources on the project should be given clear job allocation and designation befitting their expertise, if they are inadequate then training for the requisite skills should be arranged. For projects with staff that are sent out in the field to carry out project activities on their own there is need for constant and intensive on-site support to the outfield staff (Reijer et al, 2002). One of
the larger aspects of developing employee’s skills and abilities is the actual organizational focus on the employee to become better, either as a person or as a contributor to the organization. The attention by the organization coupled with increased expectations following the opportunity can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of enhanced output by the employee (Pearce and Robinson, 2004). Foresti (2007) argues this means not just training, but a whole suite of learning approaches: from seconding to research institutes and opportunities to work on impact evaluations within the organization or elsewhere, to time spent by program staff in evaluation departments and equally, time spent by evaluators in the field.

Evaluation must also be independent and relevant. Independence is achieved when it is carried out by entities and persons free of the control of those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention (OECD, 2002). Research shows that it is vital to determine what methods are appropriate to the users’ needs the given context and issues of data, baseline and indicators (Hulme, 2000). The technical capacity of the organization in conducting evaluations, the value and participation of its human resources in the policymaking process, and their motivation to impact decisions, can be huge determinants of how the evaluation’s lessons are produced, communicated and perceived (Vanessa and Gala, 2011). Human resources on the project should be given clear job allocation and designation befitting their expertise, if they are inadequate then training for the requisite skills should be arranged. For projects with staff that are sent out in the field to carry out project activities on their own there is need for constant and intensive onsite support to the outfield staff (Ramesh, 2002; Reijer et al., 2002) One if the larger aspects of developing employee’s skills and abilities is the actual organizational focus on the employee to become better, either as a person or as a contributor to the organization. The
attention by the organization coupled with increased expectations following the opportunity can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of enhanced output by the employee (Pearce and Robinson, 2004).

**2.4 Budgetary Allocation and Effective Monitoring and Evaluation.**

The project budget should provide a clear and adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation activities. A monitoring and evaluation budget should be about 5 to 10 percent of the total budget, Kelly and Magongo, (2004), IFRC, (2001) and AIDS Alliance, (2006) A key function of planning for M&E is to estimate the costs, staff, and other resources that are needed for M&E work. It is important for M&E specialists to weigh in on M&E budget needs at the project design stage so that funds are allocated specifically to M&E and are available to implement key M&E tasks. Program managers often ask what proportion of a project’s budget should be allocated to M&E. According to Nina Frankel & Anastasia (2007) there is no set formula; various donors and organizations recommend that between 3 to 10 percent of a project’s budget be allocated to M&E. A general rule of thumb is that the M&E budget should not be so small as to compromise the accuracy and credibility of results, but neither should it divert project resources to the extent that programming is impaired.

Quite often money to undertake M&E is not factored in implementation of many projects. One in four countries with a national M&E plan has not calculated the budgetary requirements (Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic, 2008). M&E activities tend to be pushed to the periphery in the allocation of funds for project activities. In more than half of counties 54%, M&E activities are exclusively financed through external sources (Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic 2008). The
report further adds that only one in ten countries report financing of HIV monitoring exclusively through domestic funding and in most countries, M&E budget accounts for only 0.1% of national HIV expenditure.

In Kenya the constitution of Kenya provides to ensure all implementing agencies at national and devolved levels have M&E budget for each project/projects by making sure that State and non-state actors set aside at least 5 percent of all development budget for M&E. with 2.5% allocated for M&E operational and capacity building costs and 2.5 percent for M&E technical infrastructure. To ensure efficiency and avoid duplication M&E technical infrastructure should use the same integrated platform as NIMES wherever possible. National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) was conceptualized as the mechanism for the Government of Kenya to monitor the Implementation of the Economic Recovery Strategy. NIMES was officially launched for implementation in September 2007. (National Monitoring & Evaluation Policy, 2012).

The overarching goal of the NIMES is to: provide the government with reliable mechanisms to measure the efficiency and effective public projects and policies; provide the government with the needed policy implementation feedback to efficiently allocate its resources over time; set the basis for a transparent process by which the government and the international donor community can undertake a shared appraisal of results; and create smooth release of external support, including budgetary support.
According to a research done on factors influencing monitoring & evaluation of CDF projects at Changamwe Constituency, only 38.1% (which is very low below average) indicated their projects were completed within budget. Some respondents indicated it is the contractors who knew the answer on the budgetary allocation. This is a clear show of how major stakeholders are not involvement in some aspects of M&E. One of the informant stated, “Some projects are not completed within budget due to unforeseen costs on land ownership and fluctuation of cost of materials (Musumba, 2012) this confirms the existence of a problem on allocation of funds to M&E hence the need to investigate if this is case with child rescue projects at SJCC.

### 2.5 Stakeholder Participation and Effective Monitoring and Evaluation.

Engaging stakeholders in discussions about the what, how, and why, of program activities is often empowering for them and additionally, promotes inclusions and facilities meaningful participation by diverse stakeholder groups (Donaldson, 2003). Stakeholder participation means empowering development beneficiaries in terms of resources and needs identification, planning on the use of resources and the actual implementation of development initiatives (Chambers, 1997; Chitere, 1994). Hence, a project manager must identify all stakeholders at a very early stage of the project, and document their requirements, interests, involvement, expectations, type of influence, power, possible impact, and communication requirements in the stakeholder register.

It should be noted that some of these stakeholders will have minimum interest, or influence on the project; however, the project manager has to take care of them as well because no one knows
when they will become the dominant stakeholders. Best practice example demonstrates that a central factor facilitating update of evaluations is stakeholder involvement. This involvement must be brought in at the early stages of the Evaluation process, include the support of high-profile champions and attract political agents interested in learning or using instruments to demonstrate effective M&E. Proudlock (2009) found that the whole process of impact evaluation and particularly the analysis and interpretation of results can be greatly improved by the participation of intended beneficiaries, who are after all the primary stakeholders in their own development and the best judges of their own situation. However, Stakeholders engagement needs to be managed with care. Too much stakeholder’s involvement could lead to undue influence on the evaluation, and too little could lead to evaluators dominate the process (Patton, 2008). The choice regarding the purpose and scope of impact evaluations are political and has important implications for the selection of appropriate methodologies, the kinds of knowledge and conclusions generated, and follow-up and use of these. It is crucial therefore, that adequate time is factored in for the meaningful participation of all stakeholders in defining the purpose and scope of impact evaluations, Patton, (2008); Sandison, (2006); Proudlock, (2009). The key issue is whether the question being posed in the impact evaluation are relevant to these needs. If they are not, then there is a high like hood the evaluation will not see.

The growing interest within the international aid community in participatory approaches to development programming emanates from lessons learned in the past. It was found that participation of the project stakeholders, central level decision makers, local level implementers, and communities affected by the project, in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, improves project quality and helps address local development needs. It increases the
sense of national and local ownership of project activities and ultimately promotes the likelihood that the project activities and their impact being a success (UNFPA 2004). The introduction in UNFPA of the results-based approach to project management calls for strengthening partnerships, participation and teamwork at all levels and stages of the project process. Therefore, efforts should be made to move away from the conventional to more participatory approaches to M&E. However, the extent to which different project stakeholders are involved in M&E varies according to the purpose of M&E and the general institutional receptiveness to the use of participatory approaches. In each instance, project managers must decide which group of stakeholders should be involved, to what extent and how.

The extent of stakeholder participation in evaluation, however, depends on the evaluation questions and circumstances. Participatory evaluations are particularly useful when there are questions about implementation difficulties or project effects on different stakeholders or when information is wanted on stakeholders’ knowledge of project goals or their view of progress. A conventional approach to evaluation may be more suitable when there is a need for independent outside judgment and when specialized information is needed that only technical experts can provide. Such an approach is also more appropriate when key stakeholders don’t have time to participate, or when such serious lack of agreement exists among stakeholders that a collaborative approach is likely to fail (Nina Frankel&Anastasia 2007).

Although the SJCC Child Rescue Project allows its staff to participate in most of monitoring and evaluation process it’s difficult to tell their level of competency in determining what is beneficial in the long run or how to integrate the projects within neighbors’ locations or beneficiaries’
maximum benefit. Whether the community participates in the identification of projects depends on how the organization shapes the boundaries of engagement. There are those who will be invited and those who will not be invited in the identification of projects. The projects identified by the donors and those in top management positions (ICPHER 2011).

2.6 Institutional Frameworks for effective Monitoring and Evaluation.

These are the systems of formal laws, regulations, and procedures, and informal conventions, customs, and norms, that shape socioeconomic activity and behavior, they define the organizations culture and way of doing things. A clear framework is essential to guide monitoring and evaluation (Nina Frankel & Anastasia 2007). According to (Brabent.K 2007) institutional framework should explain how the project is supposed to work by laying out the components of the initiative and the order or the steps needed to achieve the desired results. A framework increases understanding of the project’s goals and objectives, defines the relationships between factors key to implementation, and articulates the internal and external elements that could affect the project’s success. A well thought out institutions monitoring and evaluation framework can assist greatly with thinking through programmatic strategies, objectives and planned activities, and whether they are indeed the most appropriate (Crawford, P and Bryce 2003). The institution’s framework should assist in understanding and analyzing a project, help to develop sound monitoring and evaluation plans and implementation of monitoring and evaluation activities, articulate project goals and measurable short, medium and long-term objectives help to define relationships among inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact and clarify the relationship between project activities and external factors and finally
demonstrate how activities will lead to desired outcomes and impacts, especially when resources are not available to conduct rigorous impact evaluations (UNDP 2006).

An effective M&E system is more than a statistical task or an external obligation. Thus, it must be planned, managed, and provided with adequate resources. Managing health projects for impact implies that the M&E system must be linked to all overall project operations, as well as with outputs, outcomes, and impact normally summarized in the project Log frame. The instruments necessary to build up a good M&E are: the use of a logical framework, the set of monitor able indicators, effective training and the data analysis and processing. (Wellings and Macdowall, 2000).

A critical initial task in the design of an M&E system is to identify the information needs of stakeholders. This guides project strategy, ensure effective operations and meet external reporting requirements. Research managers have to decide on how to gather and analyze the information as well as document a plan for an M&E system. Setting up an M&E system in a participatory way is desirable because its helps to build stakeholders’ understanding of the project and creates a learning environment by sharing understanding of terminology and action, develop a framework, approach or system that is designed within the institutional context, standardize data collection to ensure that results are valid and comparable (Monitoring and Evaluation frameworks UN).
2.7 Project Staff Attitude and Monitoring and Evaluation

Marelize and Kusek (2009) posit that management attitudes towards M&E in an organization are of critical importance. Leaders should champion execution of M&E through planning and management processes. If leadership is negative and does not clearly understand the benefits of M&E it will reflect on levels of funding and determine establishment of an M&E office in the organizational structure. Attitude of the management trickles down the rank and employees may develop negative resistance.

M&E can be influenced a great deal by attitudes of professional evaluators as well as the stakeholders especially where participatory evaluation is concerned. Mulwa (2008) asserts that participatory evaluation calls for a new set of values and attitudes among the professional evaluator. It calls for recognition and respect for local knowledge and experience and their ability to evaluate their own development.

2.8 Theoretical Framework.

The study is based on Evaluation Theory which consists of Social Science Theory and Program Theory. Social Science Theory plays several important roles in evaluation practice. Such theory and prior research can be very informative for initial needs assessment and program design. A careful examination of available literature, including primary studies, may turn up knowledge about effective strategies for dealing with the problems of concern, lessons are learned about what does not work which may save program designers and evaluators’ time and resources (Donaldson Lipsey, 2004).
Program Theory on the other hand will guide the researcher by identifying key program elements and articulating how these elements are expected to relate to each other. Data collection plans are then made within the framework in order to measure the extent and nature of each element’s occurrence. Once collected, the data will be analyzed within the framework. This kind of casual model helps the evaluator identify the variable to include in the evaluation, discover where in the chain of events the sequence breaks down, and stay attuned to changes in program implementation that may affect the pattern depicted in the model.

Rossi et al. (2004) describes program theory as consisting of the organizational plan which deals with how to garner, configure, and deploy resources, and how to organize program activities so that the intended service system is developed and maintained. The theory also deals with the service utilization plan which looks at how the intended target population receives the intended amount of the intended intervention through interaction with the programs service delivery system. Finally, it looks at how the intended intervention for the specified target population brings about the desired social benefits (impacts).

This theory is the best for this research as it provides for, review of available secondary data during literature review, which helps the researcher to identify the factors that are going to be investigated, thus, the effect of level of training, level of budgetary allocation. Influence of stakeholder participation and effect of institution’s frameworks on effective M&E of child rescue project at SJCC. It also provides for collection of primary data using structured questionnaires and that what the researcher intends to use and evaluation of such this data within the frameworks set and its interpretation.
2.9 Conceptual Framework

The Conceptual Framework gives a depiction on how the variables relate. The variables defined here are the independent, dependent and moderating variable. An independent variable influences and determines the effect of another variable (Mugenda 1998). The independent variables in this study were level of staff training, budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and institutional frameworks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Moderating variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Training</td>
<td>Government Politics</td>
<td>Effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accurate M&amp;E reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilization of Reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Verifiable indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Traceable progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Conceptual Framework**
Figure 1, shows how the four independent variables, level of training, budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and institutional frameworks influence the independent variable Effective M&E. It also includes a moderating variable, political influence and an intervening variable, project staff and management attitude towards M&E.

2.10 Research Gap

There was therefore concern about the organizational and management structure of the child rescue projects since these four factors that is budgetary allocation, level of training, stakeholder involvement and institutional frameworks influence the effective M&E of these projects. This essentially meant that there was a likelihood of influence by some stakeholders on what aspects of a project are to be monitored and what information is to be shared with other stakeholders. Child rescue projects are unique projects dealing with a delicate matter of young children and experience major hurdles in execution of effective monitoring and evaluation, this is because evaluations that include children are largely carried out in the domain of psychology and psychiatry and tend to pathologize and individualize (Kusek 2004). The four independent variables had high propensity of influencing effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue project at St John’s community Centre, Nairobi Kenya. The study focused on establishing this influence and hence the reason for undertaking this research.

2.11 Summary

This section defined the concept of monitoring and evaluation in child rescue projects. It also looked at what other researchers said on factors influencing M&E. It covers influence of level of training on M&E, influence of budgetary allocation, stakeholder participation and monitoring
and evaluation, institutional frameworks, staff attitude and politics as factors influencing monitoring and evaluation of projects. In theoretical framework, the study adopted evaluation theory which consists of Program and Social Science sub-theories and their interrelationships as described. The section also presents the Conceptual Framework diagram.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the research methodology of the study. Research methodology is the procedural plan that is adopted by the researcher to validly, objectively, economically and accurately answer the research questions. It is a detailed explanation of the procedures and techniques that will be used while collecting processing and analyzing data. This section of the study therefore describes the research design, target population, sampling technique, data collection instruments, procedures, analysis management and the ethical considerations that the study used.

3.2 Research Design
Research design refers to the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in the procedure (Babbie, 2002). A research design is a plan and structure of investigating in order to obtain answers to research questions (Kothari, 2007). This study adopted a descriptive survey to examine factors influencing effective of M&E in SJCC’s Child Rescue Projects in Pumwani. The descriptive survey method was used by the researcher as the appropriate method for the research at hand because it was the most appropriate in collecting data about the characteristics of this population in terms of being cost effective and within the constraints of time available. Moreover, the questionnaire employed as the main tool for data collection, Harrison and Clock, (2004), and Kelly et al. (2002). It produced data based on real world observation which makes
the data empirical. Descriptive data are typically collected through a questionnaire survey, interview or by observation, Mugenda and Mugenda (1999).

### 3.3 Target Population

According to Creswell (1994), a study population encompasses the entire groups of individuals, objects, items, cases, articles, or things with common characteristics existing in space at a particular point of time. The study population was the projects M&E personnel and managers because they were best placed to provide the required information. Table 3.1 provides the summary of the population.

#### Table 3.1: Study Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Officers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation Officers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children support officers</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field officers</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data from SJCC human resource manager

### 3.4 Sample Size.

The study sample was all the 140 SJCC child rescue project staff.

#### 3.4.1 Sampling Procedure

Sampling refers to the selection of a subset of individuals from within a statistical population to estimate characteristics of the whole population. Census was done due to the limited manageable
number of Staff. According to Dempsey (2003) a sample of the range of 50-100% is found to be
a representative of a population of not less than 150 samples and not more than 400 samples.

Table 3.2 shows the sample population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Managers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Officers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children support officers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field officers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data from SJCC human resource manager

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

The study used primary data that will be collected using structured questionnaire. The technique
is ideal for this study because it produces and analyzes textual data while allowing for more in
depth analysis of social, political, and economic aspects of variables (Cooper and Schindler,
2006; Kothari 2007). Structured questionnaires have advantages such as the reliability of the
information being high, it gives in-depth information about particular cases, it is systematic, it is
time saving, it is comprehensive, besides the data collected being quantifiable

3.5.1. Validity.

Validity as noted by Robinson (2002) is the degree to which result obtained from the analysis of
the data actually represents the phenomenon under study. It is used to ensure that the study
actually measures what it intends to measure from the beginning. To ensure validity of the
instruments, the researcher considered both the face and content validity of the questionnaire (Kothari, 2007). Face validity - a sense that the questionnaire looks like it measures what it was intended to measure – was realized by having all the questions phrased appropriately as well as the options for responding. Content validity was ensured by having the questionnaire undergo peer preview by a scholar in the study area

3.5.2 Pilot testing
According to Travers, (1989), pilot testing is important in the research process because it reveals vague questions and unclear instructions in the instrument. It also captures important comments and suggestions from the respondents that enable the researcher to improve efficiency of the instrument, adjust strategies and approaches to maximize the response rate. Pretesting was conducted by administering ten questionnaires in Child rescue Hope center in Roysambu Kasarani. The researcher used that information to adjust the instrument as found necessary.

3.5.3 Reliability of Research Instrument
Reliability refers to a measure of the degree to which the responses to the questionnaire are consistent and therefore yield consistent results (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The researcher ensured reliability of the instruments in two aspects; that similar results will be obtained if the questionnaire was used again soon afterwards with the same respondents and that all the answers to be fairly consistent. The researcher achieved this by administering half of the questionnaires to each strata of respondents and repeating the process for the other half after one week to correlate the scores for both testing periods. According to Kathuri and Pals, 1993, reliability of at least
0.70 is accepted as reliable in research. Cronbach’s alpha test of reliability was used and a score of 0.845 achieved.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

After successful defense of the project and subsequent obtaining a letter of identification. The researcher proceeded to collect data from SJCC Staff. Since she had already created a rapport with the SJCC child rescue project manager when she was writing the proposal, she visited the project to explain to the respondents the nature of the study and created rapport prior to the collecting of data. Drop and pick method was used to collect primary data. The self-administered questionnaires was dropped and later picked from the respondents through the secretary. Structured questions were used in an effort to conserve time and money as well as to facilitate in easier analysis as they are in immediate usable form.

In order to improve response rates, the researcher maintained telephone contacts with the head teachers to follow up on data collection.

3.7 Data Analysis

The researcher was guided by a research assistant through the process of data coding and editing using computer software known as statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics means, percentages and standard deviation were used to make inferences from sample statistics to population parameters and generalize the findings from the sample to the target population for the quantitative data. The results were presented in tables.
3.8 Ethical Considerations

Ethics refer to norms governing human conduct which have a significant impact on human welfare (Minja, 2009). In this study, confidentiality was of concern in view of the fact that information relevant to the study will be of strategic importance. In this regard, the names of the respondents were disclosed in the study will be held in confidence. In addition, where a response was attributed to specific individuals, the said information was maintained in strict confidence.
### 3.9 Operationalization of Variables

**Table 3.3: operationalization of variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Measurement of Indicator</th>
<th>Measure Scale</th>
<th>Data collection method</th>
<th>Data analysis Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To determine the effect of staff level of training on effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects.</td>
<td>Level of training</td>
<td>Duration of training</td>
<td>- Training on M&amp;E&lt;br&gt;- Understanding of M&amp;E process&lt;br&gt;- Formulation of accurate reports</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To assess the extent to which budgetary allocation for M&amp;E impacts on effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects.</td>
<td>Budgetary allocation for M&amp;E</td>
<td>Budget size</td>
<td>- Prepared budgets&lt;br&gt;- Procedures of funds disbursements&lt;br&gt;- Level of members involvement</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sources of funds Consistency of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish the influence of stakeholder participation on effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects.</td>
<td>Stakeholders participation</td>
<td>Involvement in M&amp;E activities.</td>
<td>- Adherence to rules and regulation pertaining M&amp;E&lt;br&gt;- Easiness in data provision by staffs</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision M&amp;E reports and dissemination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine the influence of institutional frameworks on effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects</td>
<td>Institutional frameworks on M&amp;E</td>
<td>Frequency of M&amp;E</td>
<td>- Policies on M&amp;E&lt;br&gt;- Formation of M&amp;E team&lt;br&gt;- Timelines</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E System in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of M&amp;E team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective M&amp;E</td>
<td>Accurate M&amp;E reports.</td>
<td>- Reviewed plans and objectives&lt;br&gt;- Verifiable indicators&lt;br&gt;- Traceable progress&lt;br&gt;- Improve service delivery</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter covers the data analysis, presentations, interpretations and discussion of the study.

The study sought to examine the factors influencing effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue project at SJCC. The presentation of the data analysis, presentations, interpretations and discussion is based on the sequence of questions in the questionnaire.

4.2 Response Rate

The researcher targeted 140 employees working in various positions in SJCC including program Managers, Program Officers, Monitoring and Evaluation Officers, Children support officers, Field officers, Clerks. As shown in Table 4.1,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not responded</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 140 questionnaires that were administered, 110 filled questionnaires were collected. This translated to 79% return rate which is satisfactory according to Babbie (2002) who argues that any response of 50% and above is adequate for analysis. This response rate was made possible after several personal calls were made and visits to remind the respondents to fill in and return the questionnaires. It also included explaining the importance of their participation in this...
study. This high response rate largely demonstrates a willingness of the respondents to participate in the study.

4.3 Background Information

In order to get the background information, the demographic data of the respondents was investigated in the first section of the questionnaire. They are presented in this section under gender, age, the years of experience in SJCC and level of education. Table 4.2 shows a summary of the findings.

4.3.1 Gender of Respondents

From the study, majority of the respondents were male staffs, shown by 59.0%, while 41.0% of them comprised of female staffs.

Table 4.2: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the findings show that the SJCC had both male and female employees; majority of them being males. This implies that the views expressed in these findings are gender sensitive and can be taken as representative of the opinions of both genders as regards to SJCC’s effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects in Kenya.
4.3.2 Age of Respondents

On the age of the respondents, majority were aged between 30 and 39 years.

*Table 4.3: Age of respondents.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 21 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that 30% of the respondents, aged below 21 years were 11%, aged between 21 and 29 years(22%), aged between 40 and 49 years(19%),aged between 50 and 59 years(16%),while 2% of the respondents were aged 60 years above. The study findings show that the SJCC staffs are well distributed in age and that majority of them are in their prime productivity age and hence can contribute constructively in this study.

4.3.3 Length of Experience of Respondents

The length of experience in an organization determines the extent to which one is aware of the issues sought by the study. The study findings on the length of time that the respondents had been working in SJCC were as shown in table 4.4:

*Table 4.4: Length of experience of SJCC staff.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 shows that 36% of the respondents unanimously indicated that they had worked for a period of 1-3 years; 30% of them had been working for 4-6 years, 20% of them had been working for less than one year whereas 14% of them had worked in SJCC for a period of more than 6 years. This implies that most of the staffs participating in this study had been operating for an ample time thus they were conversant of the information that the study sought pertaining to the effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya.

4.3.4 Academic qualifications of Respondents

The study sought to establish the highest academic qualifications attained by the respondents. As depicted in table 4.5,

*Table 4.5: Academic qualifications of SJCC staff.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALIFICATIONS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bachelor’s or undergraduate degrees level of education took the majority (71%) of the respondents, 20% of the respondents had acquired tertiary education (college certificates or diplomas), and 9% of them indicated that they had acquired post graduate level. These findings show that most of the respondents had at least an undergraduate degree and hence understood the information sought by this study. In addition, the findings imply that all the respondents were academically qualified and also familiar with their duties and could dispense them effective terms of professional work ability and performance.
4.3.5 Implementation of M&E practices

The respondents were further required to rate the extent to which various M&E practices were being implemented in SJCC. A scale of 1 to 5 was provided where 1= not at all, 2= little extent, 3= moderate, 4= large extent and 5 is to a very large extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M&amp;E Procedure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>stad.dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning for M&amp;E</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Monitoring project expenditure</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring project schedules</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Disseminating project information</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td>Documenting lessons learnt</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Using logical framework analysis</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.6, majority of the respondents reiterated that needs assessment, planning for M&E and monitoring project expenditure practices have been implemented at SJCC to great extents as shown by mean scores of 3.7, 3.6 and 3.5 respectively. On the other hand the respondents recapped that monitoring project schedules, disseminating project information, documenting lessons learnt and using logical framework analysis have been implemented by SJCC to moderate extents as shown by mean scores of 3.33, 3.33, 3.29 and 3.22 in that order. This is a clear indication that SJCC child rescue project acknowledges that the level of training of its staff, level of budget allocation for M&E activities, stakeholder participation and proper institutional frameworks are necessary for effective M&E. It’s also clear that are several M&E practices that affect effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya.
4.4 Budgetary Allocation and effective M&E at SJCC Child Rescue Project.

The study sought to establish the extent to which the respondents were involved in budget planning for M&E. Table 4.7 shows a summary of the findings:

*Table 4.4: Extent of Staff Involvement in M&E Budget Planning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Little Extent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Great Extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the extent of staff involvement in forming M&E budget, 50 out of 110 respondents (46%) of the respondents unanimously indicated that SJCC staffs are involved in M&E budget planning to a moderate extent, 30% (33 respondents) indicated to be involved in a great extent, while 7% reiterated that the staff had been involved to a very great extent. Another 17% of the population studied believed that they are involved in M&E budget planning to a very little extent. With a total of 83% of the respondents indicating being involved from moderate extent to very great extent is shows that the SJCC child rescue staff are satisfied in their involvement in budgeting.

On the adequacy of M&E budget, the study sought to establish how adequate the M&E budget is at SJCC. According to the study findings as shown in Table 4.8:

*Table 4.8: Adequacy of M&E Budget*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quite inadequate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately adequate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite adequate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very adequate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority of the respondents (41%) indicated that the M&E budget at SJCC is moderately adequate, 36% showed that the budget is quite adequate while 14% indicated that the budget is very adequate. Only 9% of the respondents reiterated that the M&E budget at SJCC was quite inadequate. With a total percentage of 91% showing satisfaction it’s clear that SJCC child rescue project M&E activities are well funded. Further, the study assessed the extent to which funding affects M&E operations in SJCC. According to the study findings in Table 4.9,

Table 4.9 How funding affects M&E operation in SJCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Little Extent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Great Extent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority 73% representing 80 respondents out of 110, indicated that M&E funding affects effective M&E activities. This is (40%)indicating the effects as great extend and (33%) of the respondents stated that funding affects M&E operations in SJCC to a great extent, while 23% said that funding affects M&E operations in SJCC to a moderate extent. According to 4% of the respondents, funding affects M&E operations in SJCC to a little extent. These results indicate that funding affects M&E operations in SJCC to a great extent as shown by majority of the respondents.

4.5 Level of Training and effective M&E at SJCC Child Rescue Project.

Capacity building is a major factor affecting the success of M&E implementation. The study sought to establish whether the respondents had attended any professional training in M&E. Table 4.9 shows a summary of the findings.
Table 4.10: M&E Training Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E Training Attended</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most (74%) of the respondents had attended professional training in M&E while 26% had not. The staffs at SJCC therefore possess the required professional skills, abilities and experience for effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya. According to Jones et al. (2009), M&E needs to be carried on with the relevant skills. The possession of the required professional skills in M&E largely determines the effective monitoring and evaluation.

Table 4.11; show the findings on the level of training the respondents have received.

Table 4.5: Level of Training of SJCC staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop/Seminar</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (33%) of the respondents indicated that to have attended M&E workshops and seminars, 31% had Diplomas in M&E, 21% had Certificates in M&E while only 14% indicated to possess M&E degrees. These finding show that SJCC staff possess the required academic qualification for M&E of projects.

Further, the study sought to establish the number of trainings that had been undertaken within SJCC in the previous one year. As shown in Table 4.11,
**Table 4.12: Number of Trainings Conducted (Last 12 Months)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most (75%) of the respondents indicated that trainings had been held once; 19% showed that two trainings had been conducted in the previous 12 months. Only 6% showed that M&E trainings had been done more than 3 times in the same period. This shows that SJCC Child rescue project has not conducted enough training on M&E as an institution.

The study also assessed if the level of training influenced their ability to perform M&E effectively, 90% of the respondents said yes and on the level of satisfaction with their knowledge of M&E the results are as shown in table 4.13;

**Table 4.13: Level of Satisfaction with Knowledge of M&E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the respondents, 74% (82 out of 110 respondents) indicated satisfaction in their knowledge on M&E. that is 40% are satisfied with their knowledge of M&E; 34% are very satisfied while only 6% expressed dissatisfaction with their knowledge of M&E. This implies that SJCC child rescue project has a well verse group of staff when it comes to M&E however
there is need for SJCC to focus on the larger aspects of developing the staffs’ skills and abilities to make them better, either as a person or as a contributor to the organization

### 4.6 Institutional Frameworks and effective M&E at SJCC Child Rescue Project.

The study sought to establish the level of respondents’ satisfaction with SJCC’s implementation of M&E guidelines. According to the results shown in Table 4.1:

**Table 4.7: Level of Satisfaction with SJCC’s Implementation of M&E Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that 44% of the respondents were satisfied with the implementation of M&E guidelines, 37% were extremely satisfied with the implementation of M&E guidelines while a significant number of the respondents equivalent to 13% were dissatisfied satisfied with implementation of M&E guidelines in SJCC. Only 6% remained neutral. With a majority of 90 out of 110 (81%) of the respondents showing satisfaction with how SJCC child rescue project implements its M&E Guidelines its evident that SJCC has well laid down institutional frameworks/guidelines on how they conduct their M&E activities.

Further, the respondents were required to indicate their level of involvement in SJCC’s M&E policy development. As shown in Table 4.15:
Table 4.8: Staff Involvement in M&E Policy Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Extent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large extent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large extent</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that SJCC involves its staff in M&E policy development. 51% of the respondents unanimously indicated that they had been involved in M&E policy development to a large extent; 26% had been involved to a great extent; 17% had been involved to a moderate extent. Only 4% indicated that they had been involved in M&E policy development to a little extent while 1% had not been involved at all.

On how M&E functions are conducted especially evaluations the researcher sought to know whether the evaluations are done by internal or external evaluators, the results were as shown in table 4.16

Table 4.9: M&E Functions in SJCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Facilitators</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the findings in Table 4.16, the M&E functions in SJCC are mostly undertaken by the project facilitators as shown by 89% of the respondents. Only on a few occasions are the M&E functions undertaken by external evaluators. The minimal involvement of external evaluators in M&E functions can be attributed to the fact that SJCC has appropriate institutional
guidelines for effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya. As shown in Table 4.17, 54% of the respondents indicated their commitment to the use of M&E tools.

Table 4.10: SJCC Staff Commitment to the Use of M&E Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.17 81 respondents (83%), showed commitment to the use of M&E tools at SJCC child rescue project. With 54% showing ‘Good’, 29% of the respondents showed that their commitment is ‘Very good’ while 17% indicated that their commitment was ‘Fair’. This implies that SJCC child rescue project as a dedicated and committed team on ensuring effective monitoring and evaluation of the project.

The respondents were then required to indicate their level of agreement that M&E is a cumbersome, time consuming and expensive exercise. According to the study findings in Table 4.18;

Table 4.11: Is M&E a Cumbersome, Time Consuming and Expensive Exercise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On this, 37% of the respondents agreed that M&E is a cumbersome, time consuming and expensive exercise; 24% strongly agreed; 17% disagreed while 10% strongly disagreed. A significant number of the respondents represented by 11% neither agreed nor disagreed that M&E is a cumbersome, time consuming and expensive exercise.

According to the summary of the findings on whether SJCC organizations policy promotes use of M&E findings the results are as shown in Table 4.19;

Table 4.12: Organizational Policy Promotes Use of M&E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Extent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large extent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large extent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SJCC organizational policy promotes use of M&E results, 36% of the respondents showed that organizational policy promotes use of M&E findings in decision making to large extent, 33% indicated that organizational policy promotes use of M&E findings in decision making to a moderate extent while 19% perceived that organizational policy promotes use of M&E findings in decision making to a very large extent. Only 13% of the respondents showed that organizational policy promotes use of M&E findings in decision making to a little extent.

The respondents were further required to rate the extent to which M&E results are used in decision making in project decision, budget allocation and staff appraisal of SJCC. The responses are as presented in Table 4.20.
Table 4.13: Extent of M&E Results Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Redesign</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Allocation</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Appraisal</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the study, majority of the respondents indicated that M&E results are used in decision making in project redesign and budget allocation in SJCC to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.61, 3.58 respectively. However, the M&E results are used in decision making in staff appraisal to a moderate extent as shown by a mean score of 3.36. These study results imply that clear institutional framework for doing monitoring exists at SJCC.

4.7 Stakeholder Participation for effective M&E at SJCC Child Rescue Project.

On a 5-point Liker scale where 1-1.49 not at all, 1.50 - 2.49 was little extent; 2.50 - 3.49 was moderate extent; 3.50 - 4.49 was large extent and 4.50 - 5.00 was very large extent, the respondents were requested to indicate to what extent they were involved in planning, conducting and reporting in M&E activities. Table 4.21 shows a summary of the findings.

Table 4:21: Extent of SJCC Staff Involvement in M&E Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Planning for M&amp;E</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conducting M&amp;E</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Reporting</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the results shown in Table 4.21, SJCC staffs are involved in all the M&E activities from planning for, conducting and reporting on M&E to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.75, 3.695 and 3.55 respectively. This implies that SJCC child rescue staff are involved in the above M&E activities in above average.
The respondents were then required to indicate the extent to which they respond to involvement in a number of evaluation methods. A scale of 1-5 was provided such that 1 = Not at all and 5 = Very great extent. Table 4.22 shows a summary of the findings.

_Table 4.14: Extent of SJCC Staff Respond to Involvement in M&E Methods_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Interviews</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Questionnaire and surveys</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Document reviews</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Literature research</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents unanimously indicated that they responded to involvement in interviews, questionnaires and surveys as well as document reviews as methods of evaluation to a great extent as shown by the mean scores of 3.75, 3.725 and 3.625 respectively. Their response to literature research as a method of evaluation was found to be moderate (mean score of 3.4845).

The study sought to find out the level of stakeholders’ participation in M&E report presentations. As shown in Table 4.23:

_Table 4.15: Level of Stakeholders’ Participation in M&E Report Presentations_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SJCC a good stakeholder involvement policy in M&E activities, 44% of the respondents indicated that stakeholders’ participation was good; 30% of the respondents showed that stakeholders’ participation was fair while 26% perceived that stakeholders’ participation in M&E report presentation was very good. With a total of 77 respondents (74%) indicating above
average, it’s clear that SJCC has a satisfactory stakeholder involvement in its M&E activities.

Further, the respondents were required to indicate the extent to which stakeholders’ participation impacts on the successful M&E processes. As shown in Table 4.24,

*Table 4.16: Extent of Stakeholders’ Participation Impact on the effective M&E*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Extent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Extent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Extent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very great Extent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents indicated that stakeholder participation impacts on the effective M&E activities, 41% of the respondents unanimously indicated that stakeholders’ participation impacts on M&E process success to a great extent; 33% of the respondents showed that stakeholders’ participation impacts on M&E process success to a very great extent; 19% of the respondents indicated that stakeholders’ participation impacts on M&E process success to a moderate extent while 7% said that stakeholders’ participation impacts on M&E process success to a little extent.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter covers summary of the study, conclusion and recommendations. The summary of the study entails an outline of how the study was conducted and findings. The conclusions and recommendations of the study are based on the study findings.

5.1 Summary of the Findings.

The following are a summary of the main findings.

5.1.1 M&E Practices for M&E effectiveness at SJCC.

The findings show needs assessment, planning for M&E and monitoring project expenditure practices have been implemented at SJCC to great extent. However, monitoring project schedules, disseminating project information, documenting lessons learnt and using logical framework analysis have been implemented by SJCC to moderate extents. This is a clear indication that there are several M&E practices that need to be improved for effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya.

5.1.2 Budget Allocation and M&E Effectiveness.

The findings imply that M&E budget influences effective M&E of the child rescue project at SJCC in a great extent.(73%) indicated the influence as above great extent.41% of the respondents indicated the M&E budget foe SJCC as being moderately adequate and 36%
indicating quite adequate. This implies that SJCC M&E is adequately funded. Therefore SJCC projects are clearly and adequately financed in terms of monitoring and evaluation activities. Gyorkos (2003) recommended that monitoring and evaluation budgets should be clearly delineated within the overall project budget to give the monitoring and evaluation function the due recognition it plays in project management.

The findings show a moderate level of employee involvement in M&E budget planning at SJCC. 46% of the respondents indicated that SJCC staffs are involved in M&E budget planning to a moderate extent, 30% indicated to a great extent, while 7% reiterated that the staff had been involved to a very great extent. Another 17% of the population studied believed that they are involved in M&E budget planning to a very little extent. From the data, it is clear that there has been a moderate level of employee involvement in M&E budget planning at SJCC from the 83% staring they are involved from moderate to very great extent in forming M&E budgets. SJCC therefore needs to fully engage most of the staff in M&E budget planning. Employees’ participation is equally necessary as it ensure that their interests are well addressed in terms of funding of M&E activities.

5.1.3 Training Needs for Effective M&E.

The possession of the required professional skills in M&E largely determines the effective monitoring and evaluation. On the level of training, 74% of SJCC Child rescue staff indicated having attained a professional training while 74% indicated satisfaction in their knowledge in conducting M&E activities. 75% of the respondents indicated that trainings had been held only once in a year. The trainings need to be conducted periodically and frequently. ; 34% are very
satisfied while only 6% expressed dissatisfaction with their knowledge of M&E. This implies that SJCC child rescue project has a well-versed group of staff when it comes to M&E however there is need for SJCC to focus on the larger aspects of developing the staffs’ skills and abilities to make them better, either as a person or as a contributor to the organization.

5.1.4 Institutional Frameworks and M&E Effectiveness.

The study results indicated the existence of a clear institutional framework for doing monitoring and evaluation in SJCC. This implies that the choice regarding the purpose and scope of impact evaluations are institutional and has important implications for the selection of ideal methodologies, the kinds of knowledge and conclusions generated and their use. 44% of the respondents were satisfied with the implementation of M&E guidelines, 37% were extremely satisfied with the implementation of M&E guidelines this shows high approval of the existing framework. The minimal involvement of external evaluators in M&E functions can be attributed to the fact that SJCC has appropriate institutional guidelines for effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya. The guidelines are enshrined in SJCC’s M&E policy which was found to promote the use of M&E findings in decision making to large extent particularly in decision making for project redesign and budget allocation in SJCC to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.60, 3.58 respectively, this is above average which is 2.49.

83% of SJCC child rescue staff indicated commitment in the use of the M&E guidelines provided in the institution, also they indicated that SJCC organizations policy promotes the use
of M&E tools in a moderate extent (88%) of the respondents indicated from moderate extent to very great extent.

5.1.5 Stakeholder involvement and M&E effectiveness.
SJCC staffs were found to involve in all the M&E activities from planning, conducting and reporting on M&E to a great extent the scale being 3.500 - 4.499 out of a maximum of 5.0. the staff indicated involvement in M&E activities in above average extent, planning mean of 3.75 out of a max of 5.00 with a standard deviation of 1.18, in conducting M&E a mean of 3.65/5.00 with a standard deviation of 1.25 and in reporting achieving a mean of 3.55/5.00 and an standard deviation of 1.18.

On the level of involvement of other key stakeholders in M&E the respondents indicated (70%) more than good. This shows that SJCC as a well-organized stakeholder involvement plan on its M&E activities. The results also showed a great impact of influence of stakeholder involvement in the effective M&E with only 7% indicating the impact as little extent.

5.2 Discussions.
The following is further insight to the research findings with relation to other studies that are covered in literature review.

5.2.1 Budget allocation and M&E Effectiveness.
The findings imply that the level of M&E budget influence the effective M&E activities in a great extent and that SJCC M&E budget is adequately funded. Therefore the evaluation of SJCC projects are clearly and adequately financed in terms of monitoring and evaluation activities.
Gyorkos (2003) recommended that monitoring and evaluation budgets should be clearly delineated within the overall project budget to give the monitoring and evaluation function the due recognition it plays in project management. This finding agrees with that Kelly K and Magongo that the budget for a project should provide a clear and adequate provision for monitoring and evaluation activities. It also agrees with research done on factors influencing monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects at Changamwe Constituency that M&E budgetary allocation is very key in ensuring effective monitoring and evaluation of projects (Musumba.2012).

5.2.2 Staff Training and Effective M&E.

The study agrees with other previous studies on other projects that the level of staff training influences on the effective an activity. 74% of the respondents had attended professional training on M&E which is a good indicator of proper qualification. In addition to their academic qualifications, the staffs at SJCC were found to possess the required professional skills, abilities and experience for effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya. This qualifies Kusek (2004) findings that capacity building in the work force is needed in order to develop, support and sustain a results based monitoring and evaluation system. It also supports (Pearce and Robinson (2004) that attention by the organization coupled with increased expectations following the opportunity can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of enhanced output by employees.

On whether the respondents find M&E a cumbersome, time consuming and expensive exercise 37% of the respondents agreed that M&E is a cumbersome, time consuming and
expensive exercise; 24% strongly agreed; 17% disagreed while 10% strongly disagree. A significant number of the respondents represented by 11% neither agreed nor disagreed that M&E is a cumbersome, time consuming and expensive exercise. This finding agrees with that of Nabris (2002) that M&E carried out by untrained and inexperienced people is bound to be time consuming, costly and the results generated could be impractical and irrelevant. This impacts on the success of the project.

SJCC needs to conduct more M&E trainings for all staffs periodically so as to enhance their skills for effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya. The findings are consistent with the suggestions of Jones et al. (2009); that personnel involved in M&E should be well and frequently trained to enhance their efficiency and effective in M&E. The attention by the organization coupled with increased expectations following the opportunity can lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy of enhanced output by the employee (Pearce and Robinson, 2004).

5.2.3. Institutional Frameworks and M&E Effectiveness.

SJCC’s M&E policy which was found to promotes use the of M&E findings in decision making to large extent particularly in decision making for project redesign and budget allocation in SJCC to a great extent as shown by a mean score of 3.60 3.58 respectively.

These findings show that M&E process for SJCC projects are well guided and supported relevant frameworks and guidelines. The choice regarding the purpose and scope of impact evaluations are institutional and has important implications for the selection of ideal
methodologies, the kinds of knowledge and conclusions generated and their use. It is crucial therefore, that M&E processes are undertaken under well formulated guidelines (Proudlock, 2009).

The minimal involvement of external evaluators in M&E functions can be attributed to the fact that SJCC has appropriate institutional guidelines for effective monitoring and evaluation of SJCC’s child rescue projects in Kenya.

5.2.4 Stakeholder Involvement for Effective M&E.

According to (Chambers 1997) Stakeholder participation means empowering development beneficiaries in terms of resources and needs identification, planning on the use of resources and the actual implementation of development initiatives.

SJCC staffs were found to involve in all the M&E activities from planning, conducting and reporting on M&E to a great extent the scale being 3.500 - 4.499. The staff are therefore well empowered in M&E activities and discussions and are included and facilitated in all M&E related activities with SJCC. Proudlock (2009) found that the whole process of impact evaluation and particularly the analysis and interpretation of results can be greatly improved by the participation of intended beneficiaries, who are after all the primary stakeholders in their own development and the best judges of their own situation. Further, other stakeholders’ participation in M&E report presentations is good meaning that the M&E process, reports and implementation is well supported by all the relevant parties in SJCC. It also implies that recommendations and decisions made based on M&E reports maybe be readily supported for implementation.
Involving staff in M&E activities and discussions about the what, how, and why, of program activities is often empowering for them and additionally, promotes inclusions and facilities meaningful participation by diverse stakeholder groups (Donaldson, 2003). Stakeholder participation implies that the M&E process, reports and implementation is well supported by all the relevant parties in SJCC. It also implies that recommendations and decisions made based on M&E reports maybe be readily supported for implementation.

Stakeholder participation means empowering development beneficiaries in terms of resources and needs identification, planning on the use of resources and the actual implementation of development project.

The findings show that stakeholder participation impacts on the successful M&E processes. It is empirical evident that one of the best practice in M&E is stakeholder involvement especially if incorporated in the early stages of the evaluation process (Jones, 2008). According to Proudlock (2009), the whole process of impact evaluation and particularly the analysis and interpretation of results can be greatly improved by the participation of intended beneficiaries, who are after all the primary stakeholders in their own development and the best judges of their own situation. But, stakeholders’ participation must be managed to avoid cases of undue influence on the evaluation (Patton, 2008).

SJCC therefore needs to fully engage most of the staff in M&E budget planning. Employees’ participation is equally necessary as it ensure that their interests are well addressed in terms of funding of M&E activities. In addition, the M&E budget is adequately funded and therefore the
evaluation of SJCC projects are clearly and adequately financed in terms of monitoring and evaluation activities.

5.3 Recommendations

It is evident that several factors influence effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects in Kenya particularly in SJCC. SJCC has done a good job in trying to ensure that these factors that is, having a well-trained M&E team, ensuring that M&E activities are adequately funded, putting in place institutional frameworks that support effective M&E of the child rescue project and finally involving stakeholders in majority of its M&E activities.

However there are a number of weaknesses, which if not addressed will seriously undermine the success of its projects. These include limited capacity building in M&E for its staff, low consideration of M&E results in staff appraisal decisions, and uncontrolled stakeholder participation in the monitoring and evaluation of projects being implemented.

The researcher has the following recommendations to make with regard to monitoring and valuation of in SJCC. Under training, the findings found a critical lack of expertise in monitoring and evaluation of projects implemented by the SJCC which 26% of the respondents having not been professionally trained in monitoring and evaluation. SJCC should institute projects in addition to the workshops and seminars to enhance the technical capacity of the entire organization in conducting evaluations, the value and participation of its human resources in the policymaking process, and their motivation to impact decisions. Given that the primary
beneficiaries need to be included even at project implementation stages, SJCC must control and manage stakeholders’ participation to avoid cases of undue influence on the evaluation.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

It is noted that this research was confined to factors influencing effective monitoring and evaluation of child rescue projects of St. John’s Community Centre Pumwani, Nairobi County in Kenya. It would be interesting for future researchers to conduct similar studies.

The following areas are recommended for further research:

i) A study to establish challenges in monitoring and evaluation of NGO projects in Kenya.

ii) As the research was confined to Nairobi County, longitudinal studies focusing on the factors influencing effective M&E in all the provinces in Kenya.

iii) Further research needs to be carried out to establish how other NGO projects in the humanitarian sector are being monitored and evaluated.

iv) Other researchers could also look at how to strengthen primary stakeholders in CDF projects particularly how to ensure the beneficiaries can participate effectively in monitoring and evaluating their projects.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Letter of transmittal of questionnaire

Abigale Muinde,
P.O. Box 14685-00100,
Nairobi.

The Respondent,

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE OF FILLING RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRES

I am a Postgraduate student pursuing a Master of Arts degree in Project Planning and Management at the University of Nairobi. My research project topic is “Challenges Facing Effective Monitoring and Evaluation of Child Rescue Projects in Nairobi County: A Case of St. John’s Community”

You have been selected to form part of those to provide the necessary data needed for this study. You are therefore kindly requested to assist by granting an opportunity for the filling in of the attached questionnaire at your convenience when contacted for an appointment.

The information you provide will be treated in strict confidence and is purely for academic purpose. In no way will your name appear in the final research report. Your assistance and cooperation will be highly appreciated. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Ms. Muinde Abigael Mukeli
Appendix II: Questionnaire

Dear Sir/Madam

You are invited to participate in the above mentioned research project. The survey should only take 10 – 15 minutes to complete. To ensure confidentiality of all responses, you are not obliged to provide your name. The information you give in response to this survey will be purely used for academic purpose.

Section A: Background Information

1. Respondents gender
   a) Male [ * ]
   b) Female [ ]

2. Age of the respondent
   a) Below 21 years [ ]
   b) 21-29 years [ ]
   c) 30-39 years [ * ]
   d) 40-49 years [ ]
   e) 50-59 years [ ]
   f) 60 years and above [ ]

3. How long have you worked in SJCC?
   a) Less than 1 year [ ]
   b) 1 – 3 years [ * ]
   c) 4 – 6 years [ ]
   d) More than 6 years [ ]

4. What is your level education?
   a) Primary level [ ]
   b) Secondary level [ ]
   c) Tertiary [ ]
   d) University [ * ]
   e) Post University [ ]
5. What is the level of implementation of M&E best practices in below cited activities (Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = least extent, 3 = little extent, 4 = Great extent, 5 = very great extent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring project expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring project schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating project information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting lessons learnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using logical framework analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B: Budgetary Allocation for M&E

6. To what extent are you involved in budget planning for M&E
   a) Not at all           [   ]
   b) Very little extent  [   ]
   c) Moderately          [   ]
   d) Great extent        [ *  ]
   e) Very great extent   [   ]

7. How adequate is the size of M&E budget?
   a) Very inadequate      [   ]
   b) Quite inadequate     [   ]
   c) Adequate             [ *  ]
   d) Quite adequate       [   ]
   e) Very adequate        [   ]

8. To what extent do funding affect M&E operations in SJCC?
   a) Not at all           [   ]
   b) Very little extent  [   ]
   c) Moderately          [   ]
   d) Great extent        [   ]
   e) Very great extent   [ *  ]

Section C: M&E Training

9. Have you had any professional training in M&E?
   a) Yes                 [ *  ]
   b) No                  [   ]
   If yes, at what level were you trained?
   a) Certificate         [   ]
   b) Diploma             [   ]
   c) Degree              [ *  ]
   d) Workshop/seminar    [   ]

10. How many trainings on M&E have happened within the last one year?
11. Do your level of training influence your ability to perform M&E effectively (yes *).(no) if yes to what extent are you satisfied with your knowledge of M&E.
   a) Extremely dissatisfied [   ]
   b) Dissatisfied [   ]
   c) Neutral [   ]
   d) Satisfied [ * ]
   e) Extremely satisfied [   ]

Section D: Institutional frameworks towards M&E
12. To what extent are you satisfied with implementation of M&E guidelines at SJCC
   a) Extremely dissatisfied [   ]
   b) Dissatisfied [   ]
   c) Neutral [   ]
   d) Satisfied [ * ]
   e) Extremely satisfied [   ]
13. To what extent are you involved in the development of M&E policy?
   a) Not at all [   ]
   b) Very little extent [   ]
   c) Moderate extent [   ]
   d) Great extent [ * ]
   e) Very great extent [   ]
14. Who undertakes the M&E functions in child rescue project?
   a) Project facilitators [ * ]
   b) External evaluators [   ]
15. Rate your commitment to the use of M&E tools?
   a) Very poor [   ]
   b) Poor [   ]
   c) Fair [   ]
   d) Good [   ]
   e) Very good [ * ]
16. Rate your level of agreement that M&E is a cumbersome, time consuming and expensive exercise.
   a) Strongly disagree [   ]
   b) Disagree [   ]
   c) Neither agree nor disagree [   ]
   d) Agree [ * ]
   e) Strongly agree [   ]
17. To what extent does the organizational policy promote use of M&E findings in decision making?
18. How are M&E results used in decision making
   a) Project redesign [ * ]
   b) Budget allocation [ * ]
   c) Staff appraisal [ * ]

Section E: Stakeholders Participation

19. To what extent are you involved in below listed M&E activities (Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = least extent, 3 = little extent, 4 = Great extent, 5 = very great extent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning for M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. To what extent do you respond to involvement in evaluation methods as listed below (Key: 1 = Not at all, 2 = least extent, 3 = little extent, 4 = Great extent, 5 = very great extent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire and surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How do you describe stakeholders’ participation in M&E report presentations?
   a) Very Good [ ]
   b) Good [ * ]
   c) Fair [ ]
   d) Poor [ ]
   e) Very Poor [ ]

22. To what extent does Stakeholders’ participation impact on successful M&E processes
   a) Not at all [ ]
   b) Least extent [ ]
   c) Little Extent [ ]
   d) Great Extent [ * ]
   e) Very Great Extent [ ]

Thank you for your participation and contribution.
APPENDIX III: RELIABILITY STATISTICS

RELIABILITY STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.845</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>