PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT:
A CASE STUDY OF *UGATUZI NA KAZI* PROJECT IN GARISSA COUNTY, KENYA

BY:

ABDIFATAH SHEIKH ISMAIL

Q51/69136/2013

A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULLFILMENT FOR THE AWARD
OF THE DEGREE IN MASTER OF ARTS IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF
POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

NOVEMBER, 2016

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been presented for a degree award in this or any other University.

Candidate Name: Abdifatah Sheikh Ismail

Signature…………………………….. Date …………………………………………

This research project has been submitted for examination with our approval as University Supervisors:

Prof. Lawrence Ikamari

Signature ……………………   Date……….…………

Dr. Andrew Mutuku

Signature ………………   Date…….….………

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this study to my lovely aunt, Fatuma Muhumed Jire for having introduced me to school and supported me in my entire education and my former boss Bashir Ali Hussein who despite me not earning much would allow me to take advance sometimes of 3-4 months' salary just to be able to pay university fees in my both degrees.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

Participatory monitoring and evaluation improves ownership and enhances accountability in development programmes. This study's general objective was to establish how beneficiary youths were participating in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects'. Specific objectives for the study were to explore the levels of youth participation in the implementation stage and establish their participation in the monitoring and evaluation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects'. The source of data for the study came from documents review,12 focus group discussions (FDGs) held with beneficiary youths as majority, and 11 key informant interviews (KIIs) with stakeholders such members of the county assembly (MCA's), project staff, ward administrators and sub-county administrator all totalling to 137. Content analysis was applied to categorise the resulting qualitative data into thematic areas to answer the research questions.

The key findings with respect to the study objectives show that beneficiary youths in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project participation was highest at the implementation stage as providers of unskilled labour to project activities but not as decision makers. They were mostly attracted by salaries offered by the project except for few beneficiaries who were attracted to other perceived benefits such as entrepreneurship and financial management training to be offered to beneficiaries in future. The project had no formal monitoring and evaluation mechanism in place at the time of this study. Monitoring of project activities was done casually by field supervisors with no standard indicators to measure progress. Majority of field supervisors did not involve beneficiaries in decisions regarding what/where project activities will be undertaken or work plans as that was solely a decision made by the field supervisors or at times a direct order coming from the sub-county administrators' office, thus top-down management approach was exercised.

The key implications of the study findings are that the County Government of Garissa put in place proper policies and guidelines that ensures all its key stakeholders fully participate in its development projects' life cycle stages, adopt a bottom-up approach to incorporate local community's needs into its development priorities from the community level and to put in place capacity building strategy to enhance participatory skills development for its stakeholders, projects' staff and, beneficiaries to create both demand and supply for participation in its developmental projects'. The county government should also have proper monitoring and evaluation systems for its development programmes and invite the community to participate to improve upward and downward accountability as well as sense of ownership in the county's development interventions from the general community.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study

Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) is one of the many development approaches that is practiced around the world. It calls for participation of key stakeholders in the development process with a principle aim of making local people active participants in development rather than only a source of information. It also builds the capacities of local people to be able to analyse and solve problems facing them (Rietbergen-mCcracken and Narayan, 1998). PM&E is important as it empowers citizens, improves their socio-economic development and has successfully been used in development programmes both in the developed and developing countries (Odongo, 2015).

PM&E as a development model calls on stakeholders from the bottom-up into development process for ownership, accountability and sustainability to be attained(World Bank,2010).There are several steps involved in implementing participatory monitoring and evaluation in development interventions according to Aubel (2004). The first step involves planning the PM&E process is to determine the objectives and indicators through consultation and collaborations with various stakeholders. Second step is reaching a decision on methods of data collection to be applied, followed by methods of data analysis to be utilised in the PM&E and giving each of the categories of stakeholders a chance to critically analyse data. Lastly, the results from analysed data must be shared among stakeholders and decisions taken thereafter be based on the findings of data.

Development policy has evolved over the years and placed a lot of emphasis on more participatory approaches. The main issues discussed in development policies include; empowerment, development from the grass-root level, strengthened civil society which enlightens the poor on the causes of their situations as well as increasing the call for transparency and accountability. Therefore, PM&E is not just an additional technique to be applied in projects stages but rather came as a result of the changing development environment that has questioned old ways of undertaking development initiatives. The major concerns in PM&E usually include; who initiates M&E, who should undertake it, who its results should benefit and how. As well as how best to make use of information gathered through M&E (Pasteur and Blauert, 2000).

In different quarters of the literature, there are different terms used to describe PM&E including; Participatory evaluation and monitoring (PE,PM), participatory impact monitoring (PIM), participatory assessment, monitoring and evaluation(PAME),process monitoring (proM), auto-evaluation, community monitoring or citizen monitoring(CM),self-evaluation(SE) and stakeholder based evaluation or assessment. PM&E can serve diverse purposes within the development spectrum. One such purpose is to assess impact of development intervention by objectives versus achievements. PM&E can also be applied in planning and managing projects, to understand and negotiate stakeholders' perspectives in development, for purposes of also public accountability and policy or for organisational strengthening and institutional learning among others (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998).

PM&E promotes the inclusion of different kinds of stakeholders who should be involved in development processes, planning and in monitoring changes as well as identifying indictors of success for an intervention. PM&E also emphasises on information sharing throughout the life of projects making adjustment and modifications possible in order to achieve objectives. However, sometimes it so happens that marginalised community members are completely excluded in the design, planning and in the implementation of PM&E process, while the elite and politically connected participants dominate PM&E process (PRIA, 2014; Estrella and Gaventa, 1998).

Even though PM&E is a new phenomenon in Kenya's development planning and programing history, there exist instances where the national government has made strides to include local people into the development processes. Formulating various development policy initiatives with the objective of giving a voice to the citizen as beneficiaries of its development interventions at the community level. The different development initiatives represented the gradual desires of the Kenyan government to oversee development that is more inclusive in its design, implementation and management (Wasilwa, 2015).

At independence Kenya bequeathed many of the structural setups of the colonial government which it has used without positively reforming them. Later on the state formulated several other development blue prints of its own making. The first and most celebrated being Sessional paper number 10 of 1965 on African socialism and the application of planning to Kenya (Republic of Kenya, 1965) .This policy document addressed pressing issues in the country by then such as; poverty, diseases and ignorance .But the same issues kept on recurring in almost all subsequent

plans from independence. The sessional paper also introduced decentralization aimed at devolving decision making powers to the grass-root levels. However, the proposals envisioned in the paper were not fully implemented neither were those in similar and subsequent ones (Mwenzwa and Misati, 2014; Oloo, 2006).

After sessional paper number 10 of 1965, came the District Focus for Rural Development (DFRD) of 1983 as another attempt at decentralized planning. In this document, local level development planning was to be spearheaded by the district commissioners, districts development officers and local political leaders as members of the implementation teams (GoK, 1983; Mapesa and Kibua 2006, Chitere and Ireri, 2004).This strategy of taking planning to the district levels was also faced with many management problems among them being-the top-down mentality emanating from the governments' public servants (Makokha, 1985).

The execution of various development strategies notwithstanding poverty and other related problems still existed in the country, necessitating the introduction National Poverty Eradication Plan 1999-2015 (Republic of Kenya, 1999) as specific strategy to pin down poverty among other ills in the country. Unfortunately this six year plan was also faulted as being over ambitious and on its practicality particularly in its concept of eradicating poverty thus leaving the masses with more doubt than enthusiasm in poverty eradication (Mwenzwa and Misati, 2014).The failure of its poverty eradication strategy made the government re-think its development approach and therefore in all the subsequent development blue prints had to be stakeholders driven and had to include key beneficiaries such as communities and their leaders at the grass-root levels, as this was believed to be the only way development projects will gain legitimacy and be ensured of sustainability (Mwenzwa and Kiswili, 2012).

At the early years of the new millennium, a new National Alliance Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government came to power. This new administration adapted multi-sectorial approach to development with the aim of repositioning the economy on a path of recovery. Beginning with the formulation of economic recovery strategy for wealth and employment creation (ERSWEC) 2003-2007 (Republic of Kenya 2003) which saw various successes in the country on its path to real recovery till the violence of 2007 elections and the chaos that ensued halted this growth (Mwenzwa and Misati, 2014).

Constituency Development Fund (CDF) was also introduced during the reins of NARC government in 2003, through which constituencies benefited from 7.5% of government revenues directed at promoting socio-economic development, reducing poverty, adversity and vulnerability especially among the marginalized regions in the country (Mwenzwa, 2007). The CDF was also another attempt in re-introducing a grass-root avenue for integrating local people into the development processes, as it initiated and implemented projects and programmes at the community level (Jackson and Mutua, 2014). However, CDF too didn't directly involve local communities in its projects decision making mechanism as politicians and the government officials still remained principal decision makers hijacking the process (Mwenzwa, 2007). ERSWEC was closely followed by Vision 2030 as a long term development plan that aims at making Kenya a newly industrialized, middle income country providing high quality of life to all its citizens .The Vision is implemented as five years mid-term plans with the first medium term plan beginning from 2008-2012. Each medium term plan has flagship projects identified in the vision as well as key national programmes to be implemented over the five year periods (Mwenzwa and Misati, 2014).

All those efforts by previous and continuing development plans culminated at the promulgation of a new constitution for the country (Mwenzwa, 2007). The Kenya 2010 Constitution envisioned devolution as another strategy to benefit and improve participation of development programmes at community level (Nyanjom, 2011). Article 174(c) of the constituency says that the objective of devolution is to "enhance the participation of people in the exercise of the powers of the State and in making decisions affecting them." Article 184(1) (c) further requires that mechanisms "for participation by residents" be included in national legislation to urban areas and cities governance and management. It's true that the Constitution improved representative participation by reserving slots for special interest groups like women, youth and people with disability for their increased participation politically in the decision making processes. However, participation of the common people including the youth in decision making platforms is still faced with challenges (Nyanjom, 2011).

For over the three decades plus, Kenya's central system of Governance development planning decisions were majorly undertaken at the Capital city for the whole country. This has made to a large extent most communities and their leaders at grass-root level play passive roles in decisions

and implementations of planned development projects (Mwenzwa and Misati, 2014). However, with a new constitution in 2010, the central system was set to change effective from the elections of 2013 marking the beginning of devolved system of Governance for the country with 47 semi-autonomous units known as County Governments (Nyanjom, 2011).

Residents and natives from the 47 units had great expectations for opportunities not only in terms of employment but also in getting involved and being at the centre of development processes, planning and decision making at these devolved units. As the old system of central planning has worked to isolate beneficiaries as mere on lookers (Mwenzwa, 2007). These early over expectations were reasonably understood considering citizens experiences with central system of governance that did not historically reduce much on the different economic and development inequalities that existed and still does in the different regions of the country. Critics often blamed these inequalities on the central government's blanket development blue prints for all regions and on its economic plans that focused primarily on traditionally productive regions overlooking arid and semi-arid areas 'fuelled' the call for devolution (Nyanjom, 2011). The birth of devolution, offered opportunities for residents to interact with government institutions and be integrated in the governance process which is the key to effective public administration and good governance as well as a facilitator to sustainable development at the grass-root levels (Mohammad, 2010).

With devolution, the challenge of drawing development plans at micro level and keeping up with the expectations for improved and increased consultations, negotiations, participations of local communities in the planning and execution of counties development projects is now with the 47 devolved units(Finch and Omolo, 2015) . To check on the successes of devolution on this front and to get an insight into how local communities are involved in counties development programmes, we have focused our study on Garissa County which was one of the marginalized regions under the central system of governance (Mwenzwa, 2007). The study has concentrated on the project stages of implementation and monitoring and evaluation of Garissa County's *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects and how beneficiaries are involved in the management and decisions at those stages to give us a general picture of the practice of beneficiary communities' participation that exists in the county for its development projects and programmes.

Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) becomes very relevant within the devolved governance structure currently spreading its roots in the country. As the shift from the central system towards devolved one calls for new forms of oversight at the community level to ensure efficiency, transparency and participation in development initiatives at the grass-root levels (Estrealla and Gaventa, 1998).

This study is therefore examining the application of PM&E development approach by Garissa County government in implementing its *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project in its Township sub-county.

1.1 Description of *Ugatuzi Na Kazi* Project
In an effort to include youth in the development programmes for the county and create new opportunities for them to earn a living, Garissa County leaders have initiated many projects targeting the youth as majority beneficiaries including one dubbed *UGATUZI NA KAZI* (which roughly translates to Devolution and work).

Ugatuzi na Kazi projects' goals and objectives include; improving forest cover, cleaning social amenities, clearing 'mathenge' ,creating employment for the youths in County by bringing them closer to the counties decision making platforms. *Ugatuzi na Kazi* started its implementation in April 2013.After every three months of implementation beneficiaries are given one month break from work with no pay and the cycle is repeated.

The project has three major activity components; the first and major one being a labour intensive and public works component where youth are employed to clear *prosopis juliflora* tree (locally known as Mathenge) that has encroached on roadways within town and has had negative effects on both livestock and indigenous plant species in Garissa County. Secondly is regular cleaning exercises in social amenities within town and the third activity for the beneficiaries is about planting new indigenous trees in areas where 'Mathenge' has been cleared . *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project has employed four hundred and twenty six (426) residents of Garissa sub-county which includes sixty per cent male and forty per cent female. It was first budgeted for in 2013/2014 financial year, in the current financial year 2016/2017 *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects in the county were allocated one hundred and sixty eight million six hundred and eight thousand shillings equivalent to 1,686,800 us dollars as per the current exchange rates.

At the Launch of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects, the Governor termed the programme a milestone in the community and said "the programme will help create jobs for a large number of unemployed youths in the region'' Women Representative from Garissa County also added,'' "the initiative was timely", and called on women in county to come out and register for the programme, while cautioning the officials tasked to oversee the programme, she said they should ensure ''fairness and shun all forms of corruption''. Forty percent of the jobs in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects' were set aside for women in the County and sixty percent for their male counterparts from the start according the County's official website (www.garissa.go.ke).

Table 1.1 *Ugatuzi na Kazi* beneficiaries from Garissa Township sub-county

Wards	Beneficiaries
Galbet ward	143
Township ward	141
Waberi ward	80
Iftin ward	62
	Total 426

Source: Garissa Sub-county administrator's office, 2015

Figure 1.1 Launch of *Ugatuzi na Kazi projects*

Source: www.Garissa.gov.co.ke.

1.2 Problem Statement

Contemporary monitoring and evaluation practice has been questioned as expert driven and exclusive of most program stakeholders (Verschuren and Zsolnai, 1998). It is also about outsiders coming to practice their expertise in measuring performance of programmes and policies by contrasting progress with pre-set indicators upon applying standardized procedures and tools. On the contrary participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) is geared towards placing primary stakeholders at the centre of its activities, and in so doing they offer new ways to assess and learn from change that is more inclusive, echoing the realities and hopes of those most directly affected in an intervention (World Bank,2010).

Communities are believed to realize their potential as robust and healthy places when youth are fully welcomed as participating members in development processes. Involving the youth in community development heralds a paradigm shift that sees and recognizes them as assets, problem-solvers and leaders who can serve their communities, be served as well which is possible with participatory approaches in development (Dumond et al., 2003).

Many governments and non -governmental organization across the globe have realized that the main reasons for failures in their developmental projects has been and may still be perhaps due to the lack of encouraging active, effective and a lasting participation space for beneficiaries intended for their interventions. As a result numerous agencies have started to advocate for the participation of people, especially for the disadvantage persons in their development interventions (Perera, 1998).Similarly the main reasons why projects in developing countries run into sustainability problems is attributed to lack of local level participation in the implementation and planning process for their interventions (Valentine et al.,2016).

Since the inception of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects in Garissa County, little is known about the levels of participation by the beneficiary youths in the implementation and monitoring and evaluation stages despite the fact that *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects are in their third year of implementation. The projects aimed to provide employment for the unskilled youths and bring them closer to decision making platforms at county level but no other studies are available on *Ugatuzi na Kazi* and its successes or otherwise on that front. It's therefore important to document how these youths and other local community beneficiaries are participating in decisions made at the different project life cycle stages.

1.3 Research Questions

The study sought to answer the following research questions;

1. How do the youth participate in the implementation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects'?

2. How are youth participating in monitoring and evaluation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects'?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study was to establish how beneficiaries were participating in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's.
The specific objectives were;

1. To explore the levels of youth participation in the implementation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects.

2. To establish the levels of youth participation in monitoring and evaluation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects.

1.5 Justification of the Study

Community participation in developmental programmes at the grass-root level has been a major area of concern in Kenya as indicated by Sessional paper number 10 of 1965(African socialism and its application to planning in Kenya) and in the District focus for rural development planning strategy (Nyanjom, 2011). As result of the promulgated constitution in 2010, devolved system of governance was born with new legal frameworks requisite for people participation at the grass-root levels. Ever since County governments' structures were actualized in the country little is known about Garissa County's commitments for participation in its developmental programmes with the youths who make up more than twenty eight of its population (Garissa county n.d).

The study findings will add to the existing knowledge pool for participatory monitoring and evaluation and implementation in development projects and can trigger both local level and national policy implications on how best beneficiaries and in particular the youths should be involved in implementation, monitoring and evaluating of community based development projects in newly formed county governments development programmes.

1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study covered Garissa township sub-county only, the youths working within the sub-county for *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects as beneficiaries, the project staff and members of county assembly in the same sub-county as the study subjects. The study aimed at assessing the participation levels of these beneficiaries in the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation stages of the project.

The study applied qualitative research techniques only, it therefore didn't produce quantitative predictions to be able to generalize its findings to other settings. The researcher was not able to gain access to project documents from the sub-county administrator's office and has also assumed that Garissa County government applies participatory development approaches throughout its developmental programmes processes.

1.7 Definition of Key Concepts

Ugatuzi na Kazi; is Swahili sentence that is translated as devolution and work, which is the name given the project under study by county government.

Participation; as used in this study refers to people's contribution in the form of their time, labour and ideas throughout the project management cycle (Identification, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation).

Youth; individuals of either gender falling under the age category of youths (18-35) as defined in the Kenyan constitution and are beneficiaries of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects in Garissa Township sub-county.

Community; the residents of Garissa Township sub-county who are beneficiaries of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. Within this study youths are assumed to be part of the community under study.

Participatory Monitoring; involving beneficiaries in the collections, recording, measurements, processing of data and communicating to help local development projects' workers and beneficiaries take part in decision making.

Participatory Evaluation; this is about collective examination and assessment of a project by stakeholders to assist in adjusting and redefining objectives.

Community based projects; these are projects with immediate or quick possibilities to overcome problems that affect the citizens/residents within a locality or region.

Participatory monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E); this is a process for various level stakeholder engagement in monitoring and evaluating of project(s), programme(s) or policies; share authority of contents, the processes and the results of the Monitoring and Evaluation activities; and eventually engage in identifying and implementing corrective actions. In the context of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project stakeholders are referred to the youths/community benefiting from the projects' implementation.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents literature reviewed on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) approach to development. Part one gives a brief background on PM&E theoretical issues, part two is on principles of PM&E approach, part three is on empirical literature on PM&E, followed by empirical literature on beneficiary participation in projects' implementation stages, a summary of literature, conceptual framework and, operationalization of the study respectively.

2.2 Theoretical Issues in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

The concept of Participation Monitoring and Evaluation draws its practice from over decades of participatory research history such as Participatory Action Research (PAR), Participatory Learning action among others (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998). PM&E has several benefits for stakeholders involved in its practice on the development arena which can be summarized into; improved autonomy for partners in development self-determine their own fate to better their lives, build up in public oversight for seeking fiscal and social responsibilities from those entrusted with public resources, and enhanced information provision leading to the ability to properly plan and strategize at different levels (Guijt, 1999).

Internationally, the interest in and for participatory research and development has been growing. Much of the interest in monitoring and evaluation initially came from donors, governments, NGO's and others, as a result of the changing patterns in management circles towards 'performance based accountability' and 'management by results'. Increasing scarcity in development resource has added the pressure to demonstrate results from funders, as well as the switch towards decentralization and devolution .This required new forms of oversight coupled with the improved capacity of NGO's and community based organizations as strong actors in development process. The adoption of results based management provides more opportunities to explore different approaches and methods with stakeholders directly to build sustainable results in development by actively participating in all the phases of project cycle, as Valentine et al., 2016, cites from Abraham et al., 2004 that stakeholders should be participating in the analysis, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluating development activities (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998; Coupal, 2001).

The main purpose of participatory processes in social development is about finding a way to involve socio-economically marginalized or removed people meaningfully into the decisions that impact on their lives (Guijt, 1999). The need for local communities participating in development has been fronted aggressively by international agencies including; World Bank, UNICEF and other development organizations, in development projects they fund by encouraging approaches like rapid rural appraisal (RRA), participatory rural appraisal (PRA), and most recently participatory learning for action (PLA).

Monitoring and Evaluation is important in measuring the impact of development programmes and their effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance. Through monitoring and evaluation lessons are learnt about what worked and what didn't in different previously undertaken initiatives, why do some programme activities produce desired(undesired) outcomes. Such questions are answered in an attempt to overcome hurdles for prospective interventions, to make evidence based decisions in policy making and project planning processes. At the same time it helps programme implementers to be accountable and demonstrate results for projects undertaken (Yumi and Beaudry, 2007). Despite the importance of Monitoring and evaluation in the development world, there are a number of challenges that confront its practice and thus the shift to Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation as the better alternative. PM&E builds development capacities of local actors, civil society groups and organizations (Adams and Garbutt, 2008). Thus it has quickly become relevant in development practice replacing conventional monitoring and evaluation.

2.3 Principles of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Approach
Participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) is seen as involvement of key stakeholders actively in the M&E process. Involving stakeholders ensures collective reflection, planning and management of the desired outcomes and impact. The nature of stakeholders' involvement in M&E process ranges from giving them a voice or consulting them in implementation and use of information (Rajalahti et al., 2005).

There are five basic principles of PM&E approaches in development, for which any intervention has to observe in its practice if it wanted to be truly participatory as cited by (Rossman, 2015).

The first is participation-which is about designing the processes and structures of inclusion for those directly affected by projects but are often left out and are powerless or voiceless in all stages of a project. Participation can be defined as the process through which stakeholders can influence resource allocation, implementation, decision making and control in development interventions (Thea and Guijt, 2006).

Second is negotiation- a promise to work through different opposing views with a possibility for conflicts and disagreements ,about what the evaluation should be focused on, how it should be conducted, utilized and to what action it should result. Negotiation helps project stakeholders to agree on what will be monitored or evaluated, when and how to go about analysing collected data, what collected data actually means or how to share findings from these data and what actions need to be taken among themselves or with project managers. PM&E is seen more as a social process to negotiate between people's expectations or world views (Estrella et al., 2000). Different stakeholders with interest in development interventions have varied aspirations and issues that are of concern to them. Which are informed by their social values as influenced by their different social realities in life. Therefore, by applying the principle of negotiation, PM&E participants can have improved understanding of their roles in the evaluation as well as the interests of their colleagues and theirs in the process. Including multiple stakeholders in the M&E process is perceived to contribute towards improved trust and change in perceptions, behaviours, and attitudes amidst stakeholders leading to better outcome for those affected by the project (Ondieki et al., 2013).

Third, participation processes can lead to learning opportunity for every participant involved, which as it circulates among participants can result to improvements and corrective actions for the project .Participatory evaluation(PE) can be an educational experience itself and instrumental in stepping up capacities of local participants (Estrella et al., 2000).PM&E is characterized as a process of individual and collective learning, where PE participants are able to recognize their weaknesses, strengths, visions, social realities, their viewpoints on development outcomes and act on them accordingly (Suarez- Herrera et al., 2009). Participation can also lead to an appreciation of the dynamics and the various factors that affect the projects successes, failures and potential solutions or alternative actions among participants (Estrella et al., 2000).

Participants develop skills which enable them plan, solve problems, and make decisions in their own life outside the project which is attributed to knowledge acquired during participatory processes. At the end of the process both beneficiaries and implementers increase their understanding of each other's strength and weakness and collaborate to complement each other (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998). The participating beneficiaries too get to sharpen their management and M&E skills as result of them interacting with managers and administrators of the projects, while at the same time the managers and administrators get a complete picture of beneficiaries' pressing issues in development and integrate them into their prospective plans and eventually attract their full attention into participation as beneficiaries (DFID, 2010).

PE also provides a learning cycle platform in which participants learn from each other's experience, learn new skills on how to evaluate their own needs, priorities, objectives and take action oriented planning (Jackson and Kassam, 1998). By consistently reflecting as partners in development to gauge the bearing of their intervention technique and understand their shortcomings or successes in the process, stakeholders become actively involved in the development process which results in them developing new insights to better comprehend their environment with projects beneficiaries (Ondieki et al., 2013).

The fourth principle is; as the people are involved, their skills, and circumstances evolve with the development process flexibility is exercised. The change in processes consequently calls for different approaches in strategy to attaining results and new understanding on how to affect sustainable interventions. Flexibility becomes essential with the changing numbers, roles, and competence of stakeholders, the environments they operate in and other circumstances change with time .Flexibility in the PM&E process deals with diverse and changing information needs which influences people's participation (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998).

The fifth principle is that PM&E is ''quintessentially methodologically eclectic''. With PM&E, practitioners will be able to draw from a wide variety of methods to generate information. Beneficiaries can also use local processes that are relevant or invent some of their own. However, PM&E is not just a bag of tricks or tools; it is rather a philosophy and an overall approach for organizational learning that fosters better involvement for those most directly affected (Rossman, 2015).

There are other experts in the field who also generalize PM&E principles in four categories. According to Anatole (2005), the principles are; participation, learning, negotiation and flexibility as they have gotten to be known through time and by experience .What differentiates PM&E from traditional monitoring and evaluation is its emphasis on the aspect of participation, where people are involved in the entire process of reaching decisions about how/what needs to be and monitor, analyse, evaluate, communicate and use of information generated. This is when PM&E can be said to have realized ''real partnership in development'' (Estrella and Gaventa, 1998).

According to Rossman (2015), key PM&E procedures involve from the onset and in collaboration with key stakeholders identifying primary objectives and outcomes that an intervention should be achieving, relevant indicators to record changes in specific condition to signal what progress is being made towards objectives, others include; collecting data that can measure or describe conditions to give evidence in progress, conditions at baseline and benchmarks of progress towards attainment of objective, analyse and interpret collectively gathered data, be able to draw conclusions based on interpretations and take corrective actions to be able to achieve objectives.

2.4 Empirical literature on Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

In all instances where participatory approaches in development apply, youths can participate in the development process either as beneficiaries, as partners or as leaders (Askar and Gero, 2012). Development projects take place under those three contexts for the youth. They could be beneficiaries that are consulted for their inputs and interest, or as partners putting forward the best strategies to undertake development intervention from a youth point of view, or could be giving directions as leaders in seeing a development agenda succeed, in any of three scenarios their perspectives should be valued. "Empowering Communities through participatory Monitoring and Evaluation" is a Study that employed PM&E on Katamata farmers group in Uganda Tororo's district who were groundnut farmers. It reached a conclusion that farmers were able to monitor and evaluate their own projects provided that they have been adequately capacity built and that community based PM&E(CB-PM&E) tool can empower and improve poor local farming communities livelihoods (Pali et al., 2005).

Naryan (1995), studied World Bank implemented projects for communities' participation in 121 rural water supply projects in 49 countries from African, Asia and in Latin America demonstrated that communities' involvements have contributed to effectiveness for the projects and a feeling of empowerment for the communities. The study also asserted that the people's involvement in project life cycle stages before implementation would influence their commitments to project, also the extent to which a community can organize itself can also effect both quality and levels of people's participation. The study also added that development agencies own responsiveness to people needs has an influence on stakeholders' participation.

In another study that applied participatory evaluation (PE) while investigating local peoples' perception of development intervention for the long term in Northern Ghana on various interventions in Bumboazio area asserts that the best projects in the eyes of the local communities were the ones that were most effective in achieving project objectives and at least allowed for moderate community participation levels and the projects that improved more than one livelihood capabilities for beneficiaries positively enhancing their lives (Alice, 2009). This study too confirms that the levels of beneficiary participation in project stages can impact on the success or otherwise in achieving set objectives for development initiatives.

In another study in Nigeria's River state by (Angba et al., 2009) had in its findings characteristics such as educational level and attitude of youths towards community development projects having a relationship. The study implied that youths with higher levels of education had higher attitude to participate in community development projects. In another study (Lawrence et. al., 2013) it was deduced that participation levels for the youths in various community development projects in the areas under study was average (62.55) resulting in the success for these projects thus confirming a relation between youth participation and successes for projects.

In practicing participation, institutions, Non-governmental organizations, and governments have begun to appreciate the role of the youth after practically seeing the benefits of youngsters taking part in their development activities. United Nations Children Fund Sierra Leone commissioned a partner civil society organization (Students Partnership Worldwide, Sierra Leone) in undertaking baseline study with young people as the investigators by department for international development(DFID) in 2010.The investigation focused on children interviewing their peers who were; school drop outs, those that never attended and those that went through non-formal school

programmes. As result of the collaboration guidelines for life skill programmes to be delivered in non-formal HIV and AIDS education programme was produced from the information collected by the youngsters. This practice was seen as cost effective in collecting information and since almost all life skill education programmes implemented by organizations in stopping HIV and AIDS infection spread is aimed at young people, 20 of them aged between18-22 received the skills and directly implemented research within the communities. By conducting FDGs, interviews and consultative meetings with beneficiaries in collecting data. The youths who were partnered with in this study developed skills and had greatly improved their experiences as out of school children had no difficulty in conversing with their peers about the research topic (DFID 2010).

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) also has experience in its youth department collaborating with youth from two districts in Nepal monitoring and evaluating its pilot project 'Breaking the poverty cycle'. The study didn't only report findings as the project having an impact on HIV and AIDS victims discussing their status, making decisions such volunteering on HIV and AIDS, other public health issues(such as sanitation, nutrition and fire risks) but also resulted in improved skills and knowledge in evaluation for the youths involved in the collaboration (Askar and Gero, 2012).

Poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP) of Vietnam was development by young people (Askar and Gero, 2012) when their government partnered with Save the Children in consultations with young children and the youths in urban poor neighbourhoods. This experience proved that children and the youth can effectively contribute towards national PRSPs development, the youngsters in the process of developing PRSP highlighted issues that were often overlooked by other actors leading to significant positive policy change, they also played important role later on in tracking progress by giving feedback on how policy was progressing (Askar and Gero, 2012). These aforementioned studies are clear indication of how when properly engaged youths can be the strengthening pillar at the centre of development process hence the success of interventions that engages them properly.

Understanding youth's motivations and the challenges they face in participatory development processes is also very important, because development practitioners will need to maximize on

such valuable lessons moving forward. That will happen when youth are ushered into community based organizations and civic obligations they have often been barred from to partake in decision making at local level. This kinds of partnerships with the youth can lead to a better skills enrichment, improved confidence levels and ownership as they transit to adulthood (Brennan et al, 2007)

Although much of the attention in building local capacities is often fixated on adults, young people have become increasingly visible and actively involved in their communities' developments endeavours. Such efforts contribute to the community as well as to psychological development of the youths involved. It is important to understand what influences youth, what motivates them, obstacles they face and feedback that they receive from the community so as to encourage their involvement (Brennan et al., 2007).With PM&E, youths motivations and challenges come to fore and when properly addressed, moves the development process forward.

There is plenty of evidence of localised studies in many parts of Kenya that have focused mostly at community participation in Community Development Funded(CDF) projects including those by; Wanja(2014), Nyaguthii and Oyugi (2014) among others which points out the existence of appreciation of the importance of participatory approaches of development in the country.

Wanja (2014) studied factors influencing participation of youth in community based youths projects in Nyeri County. Using descriptive survey design, questionnaires to collect data, adopting both quantitative and qualitative techniques to analyse data asserts that youths were not involved (participating) in monitoring and evaluating community based projects neither were their recommendations sought in decision making for the community based projects.

Also Nyaguthii and Oyugi (2013) in a similar study assessing the influence of community participation on successful implementation of constituency development funds in Kenya, Mwea constituency as their case study. Using descriptive research design, gathered data with structured questionnaires and document reviews. Analysed the resulting data descriptively using percentages, tables and pie charts, concludes that it is important for community members to participate whether influential or not for success to be realized in the CDF projects.

Maina (2013), studied influence of youth and performance of 'trees for job' project in Garbatulla district in Isiolo County. He also applied cross-sectional descriptive survey design, utilised questionnaires to generate data, used both quantitative and qualitative techniques in data analysis. Concluded among other things that low level youth participation in monitoring and evaluating the project has resulted to poor performance for the project.

2.5 Empirical literature on Beneficiary Participation in projects implementation stage

This is the execution stage where plans and strategies agreed upon by different actors will be realized. This is the phase where projects inputs are turned into outputs, putting into practice what was proposed in the project documents or transforming project intensions. Community participation may come in different forms at different project stages. In the design and needs assessment stage, participation comes in the form of consultation and information sharing. Participation at the implementation stage may also come in the forms labour, resources, time and indigenous knowledge provision .It is at this stage where participation can be used to achieve projects goals effectively and is easier to envisage (Michener 1998; Paul, 1987).

There are many pro beneficiary participation arguments at projects implementation stages, the major one being the economic gains. On this front public participation can be used to marshal greater resources to achieve more with the same project budget-line by inviting the public to participate in the implementation. Public participation at this stage can also bring about economic efficiency by tapping into under-utilized labour and natives knowledge so that it is possible to provide more services at a lesser cost (Wicklin and Finsterbusch, 1987).

At this stage of the project cycle majority of youth beneficiaries 'participate' and their participation is more visible. Here, youth participation in project implementation can take the form of labour provision as both skilled and unskilled to various projects activities and can be attracted by the incentives provided. This category falls under typology of participation known as Participation for material incentives. However, at this stage participants have no say stake in extending projects' activities once the incentives end (Duraippah et al., 2005).

In a study assessing factors affecting beneficiary participation in a project known as Fadama II in Nigeria's Niger Delta by Mohammed et al., (2011).in which the researchers used structured

questionnaires and KIIs methods to collect data that was analysed with descriptive statistics and logistics regression model, found out that the highest percentage of beneficiary participation in the project was at implementation stage, followed by problem identification. Directives to implement project activities can be bottom-up, top-down or a combination of both approaches. With the top down approach, implementation activities and procedures are laid down by top management with limited beneficiary involvements. While in the bottom up, beneficiaries have major stake in the realization of project outputs and the top management is only involved by giving resources and technical assistance to the beneficiary participants. When bottom up and top down approaches are combined, during implementation of project activities both the beneficiaries and implementing agencies collaborate to oversee the implementation process.

Also in study assessing participation and sustainability of Malawi's rural piped water scheme programme of 1968, Kleemeier (2000) opined that although the construction scheme initially intended to invite all participants to the programme activities in all stages, the involvement of participants was low in the implementation and design stages and because of that and lack of budgets to construct new schemes or renovate old ones the programme run into sustainability problems. This study did not only highlight the importance of finances to run projects but also the need to involve participants in project stages of design and implementation and how that can impact on projects.

2.6 Summary of Literature

It is clear from the literature reviewed that there exists enough evidence for beneficiaries' participation in many levels of a project from initiation, planning, implementation, to M&E of donor funder projects all over the world. That community member's participation in different levels of projects life cycle can empower, give new knowledge and insights on development processes and improve ownership in interventions among participants. It has also been established that there are number of studies that have focused on documenting community participation for CDF funded projects at the country level. However, the same cannot be found for County governments funded projects in Kenya, necessitating the need to look into county projects and how they have involved communities particularly the youth at the grass-root in their different developmental projects' life cycle stages.

PM&E has slowly been overtaking conventional monitoring and evaluation as it's proving to be an effective tool for social change. International institutions and organizations have also championed for PM&E by providing guidelines on its use and encouraging partners in development to adopt it in the field. This is largely due to PM&E's ability to empower stakeholders, improve both upward and down ward accountability and the sharing of information among development partners. It also offers inclusive and progressive ways to assessing as well as learning from change that is more alive to the rights and desires of those that are most directly affected by an intervention. Since PM&E methods of analysis are developed by negotiating with stakeholders on what needs to be assessed and measured so as to settle on the most appropriate methods.

Beneficiary community participation at implementation stage can also bring about a win-win situation for implementing agencies and target beneficiaries. Implementing agencies can invite beneficiaries to provide cheap labour, indigenous knowledge among other things in realizing their project's objectives with local resources. While beneficiaries also through their participation are rewarded with incentives that implementing agencies would have incurred as a cost elsewhere.

To avoid failures in county governments initiated development programmes where communities are reduced to only as passive on lookers of development projects, the county governments have to invite local youths who make-up a greater percentages of their populations not only as beneficiaries but as leaders and partners in their development initiatives which will help the youths to play active roles in taking part in the decisions made at different levels of development project's life cycle stages and improve both sustainability and accountability of their development programmes.

2.7 Conceptual Framework

Source: Lenses of participatory practices *DFID, 2010*

According to DFID, the three lenses approach is asset based approach to development that rejects the notion that young people are problematic and always in need but rather sees them as citizens with talents, strengths, and skills that can be mobilized for the greater good in developing their communities .Thus youth participation in the development process can be viewed through three lenses which are; involving youths as beneficiaries in development and having youths as partners and/or as leaders in development. Any one of these lenses or multiple of them can apply to youths who are beneficiaries of development. They can be beneficiaries of a development intervention and at the same time be partners in the same intervention and either way be participating in the development process. The ultimate aim of the three lenses model is to develop youth as partners, and leaders in development based on youth having an agency i.e., the capacity to act, skills and the abilities to change their own lives.

2.8 Operationalization of the study

In order operationalize the three lenses model for this study, we have looked at beneficiary youth's participation in the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects.

The ultimate goal of the three lenses model is to involve youth in development as partners and leaders based on the fact that they have an agency-skills and capabilities. What we were finding out in this study was the youth involvement in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects as beneficiaries in the decisions made from the design of the project, to implementation and monitoring and evaluation stages as leaders and partners of Garissa county's development project.

To understand the levels of beneficiary youth participation in the implementation stage, they were asked of their role in project implementation. Reasons for their participation at this stage? How they participated in the preparations of projects' work plans at field level? And, if they were consulted on decisions related to project activities in the field?

Similarly in monitoring and evaluation stage the study sought to find out how beneficiary youths were involved; in the routine monitoring of project activities undertaken at the field and in the production of project monitoring reports as well as in evaluating their own activities at field and generating reports on them.

The operationalization of this study was guided by PM&E principles focusing specifically on how and if the PM&E principles were applied in the different stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. Did the participation principle apply when the county designed the project; were the youths who are majority the beneficiaries involved in determining project objectives and goals from the beginning, was there also participation with regard to developing project work plans for activities at the field at implementation as well as in monitoring and evaluating the activities. How/where did the learning principle also apply? Did the beneficiaries get to learn new skills as a result of their participation in the project stages? How about the flexibility principle? Did the county government, or the *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project staff or beneficiaries ever have to change strategy as result of change in circumstances or environments. The opinions of the beneficiaries in the FDGs and KIIs participants formed the answers to the research questions.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology in the order of; Research design, study population, methods of data collection, procedures of data collection, target population, methods of data analysis, challenges encountered and ethical considerations respectively.

3.2 Research Design

The study applied exploratory research design which "tends to tackle new problems on which little or no previous research has been done" Brown (2006).Which is true particularly for the levels of community participation in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's stages of implementation, M&E and in general to the levels of community participation that exist in Counties all over the country.

Qualitative method allows participants as opposed to the researcher a greater role in directing the focus of the topics under discussion (Creswell, 2009). Furthermore, qualitative methods can be used with places, people or institutions that the researcher is familiar with (Flick, 2006; Brockington and Sluvian, 2003).This method was chosen for its utility in uncovering participants' daily life, Feelings, Knowledge and Practice.

Given that the research questions for the study were focusing on participation, a more interactive qualitative design has been chosen where participants were able to guide the data collection process over the extractive methods such as using semi-structured questionnaires and Survey designs as is the case with most of the qualitative research methods.

3.3 Study Population

The study had one hundred and thirty seven (137) respondents, they included one hundred and twenty six (126) *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project beneficiaries (youth as main respondents) who participated in 12 the FDGs and 11 KIIs. The KIIs respondents were; two(2) elected county assembly members, four(4) ward administrators, four (4) field supervisors, and one (1) sub-county administrator. The total number of respondents for this study were large enough considering 10% of target study population can be taken as sample for a study (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

Garissa town area was purposefully chosen for this study because it was more convenient in terms of time, resources and logistics as it required less time to travel for the researcher than other sub-counties in remote areas where the county was implementing the same projects.

3.4 Methods of data collection

This study utilized the following qualitative data collection techniques (Mugenda, 2013; Weare et al 2004); Focus Group Discussion (FDGs), Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), and Document Review to generate field data.

3.4.1 Focus Group Discussions (FDGs)

Focus groups are defined as "carefully planned series of discussions designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, nonthreatening environment." (Krueger & Casey 2009).

A focus group discussion is a qualitative data collection technique that is used to collect views from a group or individuals with similar characteristics. The discussions are usually planned in advance with usually 8-10 participants in each. FDGs are conducted with the aim of achieving interactive discussions with spontaneous responses and participation that centres on specific topic or areas that are abstract in nature with concepts that are often impossible to measure quantitatively (Mugenda, 2013).

Mugenda (2013) also adds that a researcher should limit discussions in an FDG to one topic at a time so that the participants have the energy and time to exhaust every topic in detail. FDGs should be held in an ideal environment with limited interruptions such as noise, sitting arrangements be made in such a way that all participants can see and hear each other, facilitators and note takers have to be seated among FDG participants with ground rules guiding the discussions agreed upon. It's the facilitator's responsibility to also assure the participants of confidentiality, privacy of information, seek consent and be clear about the method of recording the discussions. As data was collected and analysed, the researcher utilized what is referred to as members checking, where the researchers' interpretations of the data are continuously shared with the participants, and the Participants have the opportunity to discuss and clarify the interpretations, and contribute new or additional interpretation and perspectives of issues under study if it existed (Baxter and Jack, 2008).

Mugenda (2013) also talks about three phases in focus group discussions that are; introduction and warm up, where the facilitator opens the session introducing him/herself and the note taker, followed by main discussions where the facilitator begins the discussion with neutral topical questions to stimulate discussions before moving to general questions and finally the closure and wrap up phase where the facilitator reviews, summarises, answers possible questions from participants before formally closing sessions.

Guided by the literature on how focus group discussions are held, the numbers constituting each discussion and the environment they should be held. This study utilized 12 FDGs with project beneficiaries to answer the research questions. In total 126 beneficiaries from the four wards participated in the discussions that was facilitated by the researcher himself, recorded with mobile phone device with participants' consents and later on transcribed. The transcribed text coupled with field notes captured by a trained research assistant was what constituted field data.

3.4.2 Key informant interviews (KIIs)
 Kothari (2004) defines it as a method of collecting data involving presentation of oral-verbal stimuli and reply in terms of oral verbal responses. Classifies KIIs into personal face to face or through phone interview each with its own strength and weaknesses.

According to Mugenda (2013), key informant interviews are generally associated, though not exclusively, with qualitative research in which a researcher targets knowledgeable individuals with the goal of obtaining key information about a given topic or subject. Such in-depth information can be gathered in either repeated sets of structured or semi-structured interviews mostly conducted in natural or informal settings.

What sets apart key informant interviews from other interviews is the duration and intensity of the rapport developed between interview and interviewee as one that is very close and honest, where the interviewee extends the reach, illuminates for the researcher areas where he/she cannot be a direct observer. The researcher too assures the key informant of the confidentiality and privacy of information shared (Mugenda, 2013).

Mugenda (2013) also adds that what merits a person to be a key informant in a study is the role they play in the social set up being studied or the social influence they command in a community example as religious leaders or as other opinion shapers.

Out of the 15 key informant interviews targeted by this study, 11 were successfully conducted with the following participants; 2 members of the county assembly from Iftin and Township wards of the sub-county; 4 field supervisors and 4 ward administrators from the four wards and the sub-county administrator. All the successful key informant interviews discussions were conducted by the researcher himself and recorded on mobile phone with consent of the participants. The recordings were latter transcribed to form part of the field data.

3.4.3 Document review/analysis
Document review can also be used with qualitative research in which documents are interpreted by the researcher to give voice and meaning around an assessment topic. It includes going through official documents that may be historical or contemporary. The documents that can be targeted for review may include; annual report, minutes of meetings, letters, files, records, videos or photographs. Although documents are useful source of evidence they too have their own limitations as source of data. One such limitation is that we may not know how they came into being or who wrote them in the first place, Weare et al, (2004).

Mugenda, (2013) defines document analysis as a qualitative data collection technique, documents as written materials that can be read in a given language and used in historical research. Historical research involves the discovery and analysis of records of previous events, interpretation of trends and generalization from past events or human experiences that a researcher locates in order to establish facts and to be able to make generalizations.

The documents that were reviewed for this study included; the Garissa county government website (www.garissa.go.ke) . One other document that was reviewed was, a monthly report on *Ugatuzi na Kazi* Programme for the month of November 11to 11 December from the sub-county administrator's office. The year to which the report belonged was not quoted in the report itself.

2.5 Procedure of data collection
The procedure for collecting data from respondents in focus groups was. At the beginning of every discussion participants were asked whether they were willing to take part in the study.

When their consent was confirmed the researcher made it clear to them that his only interest was to get to know what their levels of participation was in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's life cycle stages as beneficiaries was. What their feelings and recommendations were about their levels of participation and ensured they understood as a researcher there was no way I would influence the subsequent nature of their participation in the project's cycle. But could only give recommendations at the end of my study that the County government was free to implement or ignore. This clarification was important as it kept uninformed expectations of participants about the study in check. Only when the researcher was sure of expectations were discussions for each group begun.

Twelve focus group discussions were held with project's beneficiaries purposefully sampled from the four wards within Garissa Township (Waberi, Galbet, Township and Iftin) as beneficiary population for the project. Individual participants in group discussions were also selected purposefully from each ward's list of beneficiaries. For Waberi and Iftin Wards beneficiaries selected for the group discussions consisted of nine (9) individuals in each FDG and twelve (12) individuals for Township and Galbet respectively. Study participants from Township and Galbet were more than those of Iftin and Waberi, because comparatively in these two wards there were more *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects' beneficiaries. After every focus group discussion session, participants were asked to take their time to confirm the accuracy of summarized information, after the summarised data was read to them to ensure that their perceptions and views were correctly and completely captured.

Each of the eleven key informant interview process was first started by telling the interviewee about the purpose and nature of the research and then permission was sought to conduct interviews. The same processes were repeated for all the interviews conducted.

Key informant interview participants were purposefully selected as individuals with adequate information about the project at the administrative, management and beneficiary levels. As sampling process involves reviewing and studying all cases that meet predetermined criterion of importance (Patton, 2002). In this case the predetermined criteria of importance was being a beneficiary or project supervisor, member of the county assembly, a manager and/or administrator.

Project's field supervisors and their sub-county administrators were interviewed as key informants with the assumption that their perspectives as project staff represented that of the project by virtue of their responsibilities in those interventions. Information was solicited from them on how and why the project was initiated and designed. What were the contributions from the beneficiaries and their level of participation in the project implementation, monitoring and evaluation cycles Information about the success and constraints faced in the implementation and M&E of the project and finally what needed to be improved. The goal was for the informants to provide insight into the policies, resources used and the mode of beneficiary participation in the project's processes.

3.6 The Target Population

The target population for the study was the *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project beneficiaries (mainly youth) within Garissa township sub-county. Total beneficiary population from the sub-county wards are four hundred and twenty six (426) individuals with youth and Women as majority.

3.7 Methods of Data Analysis

Qualitative research can generate voluminous amount of data that needs to be organized and carefully analysed to answer research questions (Mugenda, 2013).Data analysis in qualitative research is a process of bringing order, structure, and meaning to mass information collected from the field. Analysis of qualitative data seeks to make general statements on how categories and themes in data are related. Data collection and analysis go on simultaneously in qualitative research (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

One basic method of analysing qualitative data is by content analysis which this study has applied as it involves looking for; themes, categories, constructs, core problems, concepts among others within the data. The themes or categories must be clearly distinct from each other and coded systematically. There is also the use of ''voices'' as responses from respondents that the researcher quotes verbatim to support his or her interpretations or meanings. The researcher often uses voices in the report to make it "rich", ''real'' and "informative''   (Weare et al., 2004; Mugenda, 2013).

What distinguishes quantitative research data analysis from qualitative analysis is that the latter usually relies on inductive as opposed to deductive reasoning to processes, interpret and structure

meaning derived from its data. Usually inductive reasoning uses data to generate an idea whereas deductive reasoning begins with an idea and uses data to validate or negate it. Although there are various available computer programmes for data analysis, they can only help in sorting or organizing qualitative data and none of them are capable to contextualizing and conceptualizing processes to make meaningful findings in qualitative data which leaves the researchers mind as the alternative option in analysing data and how well he/she does the analysis will also depend on their intellectual grounding in qualitative research (Mugenda, 2013).

The analysed data was gathered through focus group discussions with beneficiaries of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project; that which was gathered by going over available project's documents; and by interviewing project's supervisors of respective Wards and their sub county administrator as Key informants were analysed using verbatim quotations as evidence; as explanation; as illustration; to deepen understanding; to give participants a voice, and to enhance readability of the study findings. To check in for validity for both FGDs and KIIs data, only data or information that was agreed to be true to the project by all participants in Focus Group Discussions and Key Informant Interviews or at least majority of either Focus Group Discussions or Key Informant Interview participants was considered for analysis and that ensured for content validity.

3.8 Challenges Encountered

One of the challenges encountered on the field during data collection was that some respondents often veered off topic under discussion and threw in a political angle into the discussions every time either in support of the county government's development truck record or accusing it of underperformance. This observation was particularly repetitive in the FDGs. The researcher countered this challenge by often reminding respondents about the study objectives and its bindings.

Some of the respondents also wrongly expected the researcher to ease some of the challenges they faced in the project in the forms of delayed salaries and inadequate equipment such as tools to better perform their activities in the field. The researcher had to often correct such misconceptions about his abilities while underlining the objectives of his visit and neutrality in such matters.

Not all of the Key informant targeted by study were available for an interview citing busy schedules and complete unavailability. Two MCA's, youth director and the national youth officer couldn't be reached for this study, although the national youth officer and director initially promised to take part in the study over phone. The sub-county administrator's office couldn't also provide projects' documents although the researcher made several request to review them.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

The entire research process was conducted with due respect for ethical consideration in research. Consents were obtained from participants in both Focus Group Discussants and Key Informant Interviews. The responses from both FDGs and KIIs were treated with utter-most confidentiality. To overcome fears of negative consequences in giving out sensitive information and pointing out project weakness areas during data collection for participants (both in FGDs and KIIs), sources for such sensitive data was kept anonymous. While quoting respondents the researcher only mentioning the gender, tool gathered with data (FDG/KII) and the ward participant was from.

CHAPTER FOUR: BENEFICIARIES' PARTICIPATION IN PROJECT

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents study results from 12 Focused Group Discussions conducted, 11 Key Informant interviews and a review of the available documents with an aim to realize the study objectives. The resultant findings from all the tools utilized are discussed under the following sub-headings; Community participation at the design of the project, local community participation in the project implementation stage, in monitoring and evaluation stage, empowerment theme/enlightenment and conclusion respectively.

4.2 Community participation at the design stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* the project

Community participation at the design stage of project is important in ensuring proper identification of local needs and also strengthening community ownership (Estrella et al., 2000). Results from the Focused Group discussions, Key informant interviews and reviewed document produced a mixed reaction on community participation in project design within the study area. Whereas some groups revealed that project target beneficiaries did not directly participate in the planning and design processes for *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project, some community leaders noted to have indirectly represented the views of the youth themselves in project design stage.

Focused Group discussion participants affirmed to have been indirectly involved in the design stage of the *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's as its evident in their quotations bellow. It's evident that their opinions, ideas and knowledge were not incorporated into the design phase of the project .They further stated that they have only started to participate once the project reached implementation stage, following major decisions by project heads and local leaders. Surprisingly though, some of the youth seemed to justify their absence at this important stage by simply saying it was not their wish not to participate in the design stages of the project as most of them were jobless and were busy searching for a source of livelihood in faraway places during project design phase or had other commitments therefore couldn't participate even if they were to be invited.

> *"Personally it wouldn't have been possible for me to participate during the design, because at that time I was a student and had other commitments, so even if the County government officials were to invite me to their offices for my inputs I*

would not have shown up, perhaps if they (county officials) came to our schools, may be then I would have had a chance to say about something.." Male FDG participant Waberi Ward, Garissa County.

"We were scattered all over before this project begun. Some of us were jobless and stayed at home while others were operating minor groceries and businesses in town. Others were deep in the bushes burning trees to get charcoal to sell in the markets. So, there was no way we would have been brought together like we are now and consulted at the start of the project. As a result, our leadership decided on our behalf for a project that best suited our needs and that is how Ugatuzi na Kazi project was born." Noted a female FDG participant from Township ward, Garissa County.

The same sentiments were collaborated by most of the Key Informants who were interviewed as that also confirmed that beneficiary participation in the design stages of the project was low from the beginning:

"At the initial design stages of Ugatuzi na Kazi projects' current beneficiaries were not directly consulted. However, their respective MCAs invited local village elders and religious leaders to represent the voices of the local community at the design stages of the project." noted Galbet Ward Administrators, Garissa County.

On the other hand, members of the County Assembly from Township Sub-County who are key stakeholders in the project argued that local community was involved in the initial stages of the project, though the current beneficiaries were not direct involved in the consultations at this stage.

"We specifically mobilized the local elders to inform us of the needs of local community at design stages of Ugatuzi na Kazi project. The response we got was that the project will help the community by providing employment, and improve security of the area." MCA Iftin Ward Garissa County.

''We have involved the community at the initial stages by calling leaders at the grass-root level to meetings with county leadership, listened to them for problems

facing the youth at the grass root level, there was consensus on what the greatest need was, unemployment topping the list and with challenge of terrorism and the so many idle youths, it was agreed that a project for unskilled youths had to be initiated .Ugatuzi na Kazi filled this gap for the community's need and County's development agenda. The skilled youths have county's other jobs at their disposal'' MCA Township Ward Garissa County.

Therefore, it was not possible to secure direct participation of all stakeholders in the design stages of the project. Only few selected village elders, religious leaders and the ward MCA's seemingly represented the needs and aspirations of majority beneficiaries who were not invited as members of the community to the planning stages of the project while identifying project objective and activities for implementation.

Paul (2010) states that development interventions and measures that are not relevant to the needs and aspirations of the people do not attract their full participation. Results of the various interviews held noted that there was insufficient evidence of consultation or collaborations with potential beneficiary youth during the project identification processes. And the beneficiaries did not play any role in identifying project objectives.

Mohammad et al (2011) had similar findings of low level participation of beneficiary community in the initial stages of Fadama II project Nigeria. Also Masanyiwa and Kinyashi (2008) Tanzania in their analysis of community participation in projects managed by non-governmental organizations noted that local communities generally did not actively participate in decision making at planning, monitoring and evaluation processes of local projects. Further, Wanja (2014) also pointed out the existence of low level participation of beneficiary youths in decision making at the initial stages of projects designed in Nyeri County. Alice (2009) too confirmed similar low level beneficiary participation in the planning and design stages for majority of the projects in her study from Northern Ghana. Similarly Nyaguthii (2013) also established a low level participation for community members in identification, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for CDF projects in Mwea Constituency in Kirinyaga County. Maina (2013) also adds that because of the passive and low participation of youth in the 'tree planting for jobs' project in Garbatulla, Isiolo County having resulted in the projects' poor performance.

4.3 Local community's participation in the implementation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project

Community participation in implementation stage leads to project sustainability and ownership. The various qualitative interviews produced varied results in relation to local community's participation in the implementation of the project. Results from some of the FDGs showed that majority of the local youth beneficiaries participated in project implementation stage by way of providing unskilled labour leading to the successful realization of project activities. Other participants said that despite providing unskilled labour, they did not take part in decisions regarding preparations of projects work plans and decisions regarding how and where project activities will be carried out and undertaken on the field.

4.3.1 Role of project beneficiaries at implementation stage

Generally, majority of the beneficiaries said they were only involved more in the project implementation stage as labourers. Their inputs or perspectives on how the project activies needed to be to be actualised at this stage was less sort:

> "*Our main task in the project is to provide labour to project activities on the field, we don't play any role in planning for these activities ourselves, and our project supervisor mostly does everything that pertains to planning for the activities*".
> Waberi ward, male FDG participant Garissa County.

Mohammad et al., (2013) in a similar study assessing beneficiary participation in different project stages found that beneficiary participation was highest at implementation stage (80%) compared to project evaluation stage (40%) for the Fadama II project in the Niger state of Nigeria but not as decision makers because they also found their participation in the decision making very low (20%).

Further, other participants also noted their absence from participating in meetings at the project implementation stage as beneficiaries. They said that failure to attend such meetings deprived them an opportunity to air their views in the project decision making process.

> "*We mainly participate at this stage of the project as providers of labour but are not invited in the meetings that are held with our supervisor by the ward administrator in the Sub-County Administrator's office.*" FDG participant, Township ward Garissa County.

36

Still, another participant from a different FGD also said that;

> *"We participate more in proving labour for project's field activities, than in meetings or discussions where decisions about the project activities are made. When it comes to decision making, we are not seen as good decision makers, yet that is what we do daily as heads of our families in our homes-we make decisions."* FGD participant, Iftin Ward, Garissa County.

Similarly another participant from the Galbet Ward noted that,

> "*We as beneficiaries only participate in the implementation stage of Ugatuzi na Kazi project in our ward by providing labour to project activities.*" FDG participant, Galbet ward, Garissa County.

The same views were also echoed by most of the Key Informants interviewed. Some of them confirming beneficiary youth participation mainly in the implementation stage more than any other phase of the project as providers of labour to project activities in the field:

> *"Majority of the beneficiaries take part in the implementation stage where they clear trees (mathenge) that have either encroached on roads or on public amenities, some of them are involved in planting back indigenous trees to areas where 'mathenge' has been cleared, while at times they all get together for cleaning exercise in town. As youth, they are involved mostly in this stage because this is where a lot of the project activities are carried out. Most of them are attracted by project incentives."* Waberi ward Administrator Garissa County.

Also, another key informant respondent added that;

> "*Mostly, beneficiaries participate in the implementation stage where they are providers of labour to project activities in the field.*" Ward admin for Iftin Garissa County.

Furthermore, a Key Informant from Galbeit Ward also said that;

> *"Beneficiaries of Ugatuzi na Kazi project participate at implementation stage by proving labour to the project, the supervisor oversees work done by participants*

on the field. This is the stage of the project where beneficiaries participate the most."

These findings from both KIIs and FDGs are in agreement with other studies. For example Wanja (2014) in his study on factors influencing youth participation in community based projects in Nyeri County findings pointed out to similar low level participation of beneficiaries in the project's decision makings processes. Maina (2013) concurs, reports the existence of more youth participation in non-technical areas of the project such in labour provision for projects activities to which he concludes can negatively impact on the project sustainability.

4.3.2 Reasons for increased participation at implementation stage

Majority of the participants agreed that the main reason for their high involvement at the implementation stage was because they are motivated by project's incentives in the form of salaries and other perceived benefits such as trainings, specialized entrepreneurial skills and access to financial services:

> *"Yes salary could be a motivating factor for some us but that can't be true across the board for everyone here. Personally I hope to get trainings from this project and gain skills that for instance would help me be an expert of my own in tree planting and be able to use that knowledge to start a nursery business in future."*
> Male FGD participant Garissa County.

> *…''I have a family to provide for and I am here almost every day cleaning or clearing Mathenge and I would be lying if I told you that the only thing that brings me here every morning, is to provide free community service because nobody does that every day of their life. The day they (County government) stop giving me my salary, I will go spend my energy and time elsewhere to provide sustenance to my wife and children…''* Male FDG participant from Iftin ward Garissa County

Also, another female participant agreed on the incentive bait as a factor by saying that;

> *"With savings I keep out of the end of the month salary, I have been able to start a clothing business with one of my siblings. In addition to my salary, I also desire*

to be trained on financial management, entrepreneurial skills to expand my business and increase my sources of income, as well as to get trained on how to access services from local financial institutions facilitated by the County Government with my employment as security." Female FGD participant from township ward, Garissa County.

An interview with a Field Supervisor were similar to those sentiments:

"*Local community workers are not volunteers; they get paid at end of every month which is what I think keeps them coming here every morning to the project site to work. Otherwise they will use their time elsewhere to earn a living because majority of them are poor.*"

From the above expressions by both local youth beneficiaries and the Key Informants, it is clear that incentives are a major attraction for participation at the implementation stage for most beneficiaries. However, there were small groups of beneficiary participants that did not only look up to the project for salaries, but hoped to get other benefits such as trainings, as a way of increasing their opportunities for success from the project. Yahaya (2003), in his study of rural Nigeria's change programs also found the existence of significant relationship between incentives and participation in change programmes. In his study, he found out that local people's participation in the project he was examining was as a result of their attraction to the free cocoa seedlings that were offered by the project, similarly we can assert that majority of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects' youth beneficiaries too are attracted by the salary offered.

4.3.3 Beneficiaries' participation in preparation of work plans

Majority of participants agreed that local community participation in preparations of project work plans was lacking. Preparation of detailed project work plans is an important component of the project implementation stage. However, *Ugatuzi na Kazi* Project lacked beneficiaries input at this level. Ideally projects' plans should not be conceived by project managers, supervisors and administrators alone without considering the inputs or ideas from the local people who carry out these activities in the field. As without participation, the concept of participatory approach in development by communities for self-initiation, to become self-reliant and self-sustaining on their own in development programmes can be compromised.

39

For *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project, beneficiary youths were not involved in developing project work plans except in one of the wards. Where the supervisor adopted a participatory approach to developing them by having one day of the week for consulting her beneficiaries in deciding on activity schedules for the week ahead.

> "*We have meetings every Friday where we deliberate on our plans for the coming week. Together with our supervisors, we decide on what work should be done where and by which group. As you can see right now, we are working here as a single group clearing trees, and we have other groups working in other sites with similar or different work plan.*" Male FGD participant Garissa County, Iftin Ward.

From the discussions, it emerged that the rest of the wards project's leadership had no clear guidelines on how to involve the beneficiary youth in the development of their field work plans. Majority of them either single handily decided on what was to be done in the field or the head office decided for them by providing instructions on how they had to work and on which area:

> "*I received a call and I was told this high school* (in whose compound they were working on) *administration has contacted our head office and asked for trees to be cleared in their compound fearing for the security of their students, so we had to come and clear this compound based on head office   instruction.*" Field Supervisor Township ward Garissa County.

Maina (2013) similarly found insufficient youth involvement in decisions made for projects' various activities, lack of youth participation in meetings where activities progress where deliberated at and asserted youth have played no role in this regard.

4.3.4 Beneficiaries and Consultations on decision making on project activities

With regards to carrying out consultations with project beneficiaries on the scope of activities, roles and responsibilities in the field. Majority of the respondents were of the view that their opinions and inputs as beneficiaries were not sought during field work. Majority agreed that for most of the time field supervisors made decisions solely regarding what project activities and targets were to be carried out by the beneficiaries:

"It's like there is no need for any of our inputs or ideas or suggestions. Because that is the impression we get, our supervisor has never invited us to discuss with him about field activities and how we think they should be carried out. It is he who decides what activities we should undertake where and when. Some other times the same is decided from the head office-sub-county administrator." Township female FDG participant and a male participant also from township added that;

"Our supervisor sets for us the field work activities and targets, we all follow whatever he sets us to do without any objections." Added a male FDG participant from Township ward Garissa County.

On the other hand most of the Key informant interview participants also agreed with this view. That was because majority of the project's field supervisors admitted to have not involved beneficiary youth in field on decisions regarding day to day setting of activities and targets for the project. Only one of the field supervisors admitted to sharing and consulting beneficiaries on decisions about project's daily activities and targets for field work in advance on every Friday although with some challenges she stated that;

"We conduct meetings every Friday and discuss among ourselves and plan for the week ahead for the kind of field activities we will undertake. We decide together, which group goes to work in what area and that is how I share decisions with them as participant beneficiaries. But at times when we have already decided among ourselves what to do, a phone call may come from the head office directing us to work in another area hence disrupting our work plans. We are then forced to shelve our own plans first and act on the directives from our head office." Female field supervisor, Iftin ward Garissa County.

The above sentiments all indicate that *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project decisions were either made from the head office or by the supervisors alone in relation to how field activities were undertaken. The local youths as beneficiary participants didn't play an active role in the project's decisions such as site selection and on activities to be carried out in the field. (Wanja 2014; Alice 2009) also found out low level participation of beneficiaries in the project's decision making processes

for projects they studied. Similarly local beneficiary youth of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project played no role in decisions making process of the project activities in relation to when, where and by whom among beneficiaries should activities be carried out as was the case for (Maina, 2013).

4.4 Participation of the local people in monitoring and evaluation stage of the projects

Local stakeholders' participation in the monitoring and evaluation of projects can take several forms, key among them; how they are involved in monitoring of projects activities and targets in the field, their participation in the project review meetings, and their participation in the preparations of projects monitoring and evaluation reports. Involvement of local people in the monitoring and evaluation processes does not only help shape the *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project but also ensures full incorporation of local community's feelings and sense of responsibility and decision making for the project.

When people know what they want to achieve in a project through their participation, they can identify what they need to monitor in order to track progress and ensure that everything is moving according to plan. Once target beneficiary community members have been directly involved in planning project activities, it's easy for them to take an active role in decisions regarding what needs to be monitored and evaluated and how that will be done.

4.4.1 Routine monitoring of project

In *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects routine monitoring was majorly carried out by field supervisors. The local community members did not participate in the monitoring of daily project's activities and targets. Majority of the participants reported that although they played a key role in the implementation of project's activities, they were not involved in the monitoring of project's field work achievements, target setting and actual monitoring processes of project outcomes.

> "…*We don't do any monitoring of the activities that we carry out in the field ourselves. We report to a work station every morning; we are as signed an activity in small groups by our supervisor. After we are done with those activities, we alert our supervisor who comes to check on the work done and if he is satisfied of the work, and we still have time left for the day, he gives us more work to do before the day ends.*" Female FDG participant, from Township ward Garissa County.

''None of us here does anything other than cutting trees or cleaning or planting seedling by some of our colleagues, following up what/how cleaning/cutting Mathenge/planting the seedling was done by each group is the work of our field supervisor…'' Male FDG participant from Galbet ward, Garissa County.

Similarly, it was also confirmed that local beneficiaries played no role in the monitoring of project's activities in the field by the supervisors and administrators themselves.

"*Monitoring of the project's activities carried out at the field level is mostly done by the field supervisor who has the responsibility in overseeing and ensuring everyday planned activities are undertaken according to schedule and are achieved.*" Galbet Ward Administrator, Garissa County.

"*No I do not involve beneficiaries while monitoring their activities in the field. I go round the field myself, to check on how every group or individual has carried out assigned number of activities. If I am satisfied of the work done, I move them to another area for a similar or different task for the day if we still have time and the cycle is repeated.*" Field supervisor, Township Garissa County

Project field activities are informally monitored by the field supervisors with no standard indicators or target objectives known to both the local community beneficiaries and project's staff for them to work towards its achievement. The decision to monitor lied with the supervisors with no standards of measurement. For example, there was one group of beneficiary participants that reported to have transferred 1000 seedlings from their nursery to the field and another group that reported to have transferred 450 seedlings and both groups seemed to have achieved their targets. Both the KIIs and FGDs participants pointed out that the beneficiary youths didn't participate in the generation of monitoring reports. They agreed that only the top level County officials prepared project's monitoring reports through their irregular visits to the field:

"*We don't participate when reports are generated for our work, it's only our supervisor who is called to the head office for meetings and we don't really know or get a chance to contribute on what is shared in those meetings.*" FGD participant Waberi ward, Garissa County.

4.4.2 Project Evaluation

Data from FGDs, KIIs and document analysis showed that *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project youth beneficiaries are not involved in the evaluation of project activities. Often times, field supervisors were called into meetings with senior officials in the Sub-county offices where supervisors gave verbal presentations of project progress and challenges faced during implementation:

> *"We are not yet there, the whole project is not even two years old, we hope to one day involve external evaluator to objectively look into what this project has achieved and give us a cost benefit analysis, but in the meantime I think field reports by project supervisors and their ward administrators can inform our decision making mechanism."* sub-county administrator Garissa County.

Also, supervisors confirmed that their projects were not evaluated. They only confirmed the existence of few monthly progress reports made about the project by the head office with the help of Ward Administrators:

> *"Well, the only reports I know of are those done by us with supervisors, in which we report about the challenges faced in the project implementation from the field''* Ward administrator Iftin ward, Garissa County.

Similarly document analysis showed there were no available project monitoring and evaluation reports. The study sought to find out whether any evaluation was done and if so, whether reports were available. The study found out that only one internal monitoring document was accessible in form of a partly handwritten progress report that quoted project field challenges as; ''....*delays in end month salaries for the beneficiary participants and lack of enough tools to undertake project activities in the field and reports success as ''most parts with Mathenge trees have been clear and trees planting in schools like Alfarouk and Yatrib Girls.''*

There were no local youth beneficiaries nor a representatives of them who participated in project's review meetings where project issues were discussed as indicated in most of the interviews. All the FGDs conducted revealed that it was only the projects field supervisors who were invited to take part in review meetings held in Sub County Administrator's office with Ward Administrators.

''It's only us ward administrators and the project field supervisors who participate in project review meetings held once or twice a month in the sub-county administrator's office''. Ward administrator, Galbet ward, Garissa County.

"*Inviting everybody into these review meetings is not possible, but we intent to invite in the near future representatives of beneficiary participants to increase their participation in the project's decision making.* " Sub-county administrators Garissa County.

Field supervisors and Ward Administrators also confirmed that they participated in the once or twice monthly review meetings held at the Sub county offices to deliberate on projects' progress, challenges and way forward for the *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. When probed further, one of the Sub-County Key Informant reasoned that it was not possible to accommodate all four hundred plus beneficiaries in those meetings logistically or resource- wise but they were planning to include representatives of unskilled youth labourers in the list of people to attend the regular meetings to broaden participation and offer feedback to beneficiaries as key stakeholders in *Ugatuzi na Kazi*:

"I always take part in meetings called on by our head office with fellow supervisors and ward administrators where each supervisors gives orally a brief of the progress, problems they have encountered and the challenges they face with beneficiary youth participant on the field dating back to our last meeting… at the end of these meetings the sub county admin and the ward administrators give a verbal advice on how we can overcome certain work related challenges on the field" Waberi Ward supervisor, Garissa County.

"All ward administrators, together with four respective field supervisors often participate in deliberation meetings with sub-county administrator at least once every month to review project progress." Ward administrator from Iftin ward, Garissa County.

Monitoring reports prepared by the Ward Administrators were also not shared with the local beneficiary youth to improve their performance on project activities and to provide evidence based decisions for the project.

"Every time these meetings are over, a report is generated mostly by ward administrators while liaising with the head office, but findings in these reports are never made public nor acted upon. For example we have always complained about lack of enough tools, but we are still facing the same challenge which means the findings on these reports never inform decisions made in the head office." Field supervisor Garissa County

Mohammed et al. (2011) findings while exploring people's participation in development process looking at factors shaping participation or non-participation also confirmed the same; evaluation as one of the areas where project beneficiaries least participated, Maina (2013), in a mixed method study reported a no participation at all for youth beneficiaries in 'trees for job' project and alludes since there was low youth involvement at the initial stage by the time of the project evaluation youth were contented as mere labour providers to the project with no any other role to play. On the same note Alice (2009), conducted an assessment of development intervention on the livelihood of local people on the long term as perceived by them. Using Participatory Rural Design approach involving focus group discussions, key informant interviews, documentary analysis and personal observations found low beneficiary participation in the monitoring and evaluation of the projects.

Masanyiwa and Kinyashi (2008), while investigating perception of local people in the participation of NGO development interventions. Took two of world vision's implemented projects as a case study, collected data from projects' staff, community committees among others using open ended questionnaires and FDGs. They found that projects' intended beneficiaries had a little contribution in the monitoring and evaluation activities.

4.5 Empowerment /Enlightenment theme
Although participation of the beneficiary youth was low in decision making plate forms, the project has improved participant level of awareness on pertinent issues such conservation, HIV/AIDS and improved livelihood with the end month salary to beneficiary youths that was previously lacking. For example, some beneficiaries gained the knowledge on how to successfully transfer seedlings from a nursery bed to the field and water them which they didn't have before. The project has also raised the level of awareness among beneficiary youth

participants especially on the importance of protecting and conserving forest and in particular of indigenous trees;

> *"We were told trees attract rain and conserve the environment, so if we can plant as many trees as possible then hopefully we will experience plenty of rains in our town."* FDG participant Garissa County

> *…"our lives revolve around livestock, and our livestock survival also depends on pasture and water which are both dependent amount of rain fail. Now if planting more trees can help about conserving pasture and brings rain then we should that not only do so because the County Government says so through Ugatuzi project but with this knowledge we know it in our own interest to conserve indigenous trees and plant of them every day"* Male FDG participant from Waberi ward Garissa County.

The project has also improved confidence levels of some participant youth helping them to develop negotiation skills with their seniors on issues affecting their work and lives. For example, in one of the FGDs held in one of the Wards, the supervisor and project's youth beneficiaries through consensus agreed that fellow beneficiaries who were HIV positive to be assigned the activities of tree planting than tree cutting. With the reasoning that the decision will reduce the chances of exposure to cuts and injuries for their colleagues and the possibility to cause more infections among beneficiary youth. Also, with the incentives from the project, some beneficiaries have invested and became financially stable and independent than their non-beneficiary youth peers although as personal initiatives of some beneficiary youth without any hand from the county government.

> *"Personally out my savings from Ugatuzi, I have bought a number of goats and employed a shepherd and today if the project comes to an end, I will be able sell off these animals if I want to and start investing in any venture and will be able to sustain myself and pay school fees for my kids."* Iftin ward field female FDG participant, Garissa County.

Further, majority of respondents opined that through their participation as beneficiaries in the project, the youth acquired skills in tree planting, while others become financially independent

through the investments they made from their end month salary savings. Others reported to have formed groups to pool resources together to start business ventures in future. Project field supervisors who were key informants also mentioned that financial independence and skills in tree planting had empowered the beneficiary youth. They said through these projects, the youths had become economically independent compared to their fellow peers who are not project beneficiaries:

> *"Before this project, no one would imagine that we could earn a living out of clearing bushes or cleaning the town or even planting trees in town. Now we all know we can make a living by operating a nursery bed in our homes and sell seedlings thanks to our participation in the project."* Female FGD participant from township ward Garissa County

4.6 Conclusion

The study concludes that mostly beneficiary youth of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project are involved more in the implementation stage as providers of labour to project's activities attracted by incentives in the form of salaries paid at end of every month worked. Very few of the youth beneficiaries are attracted by other perceived benefits such expected entrepreneurship trainings to be offered in future by the county government.

Youth as project beneficiaries are not also involved neither in the production of projects' activity work plans nor in deciding on where/what type of activities are to be undertaken in the field, as this is solely decided on by the field supervisors or directly from the sub-county's administrators office which makes the decision making mechanism at this stage a top-down affair.

Routine monitoring of activities for the project is informally undertaken by the field supervisors without involving beneficiaries with no common or standard indictors to measure progress, success or failures for the project activities known to both staff and beneficiary youth in all the four words in the sub-county. Resulting in different achievements within and between wards and with each group of beneficiaries believing to have performed well.

There are no clear guidelines on how project activities are evaluated and against what scale. Field supervisors verbally present progress and challenges while meeting with sub-county administrator in the head office. No evidence of evaluation is available now nor is there an indication of how or when the project will be evaluated for relevance and impact.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents summary, conclusions and recommendations based on the study.

5.2 Summary

The general objective of the study was to establish how youth beneficiaries participated in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's. Specifically, the study sought to explore the levels of youth participation in the implementation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project and also establish the levels of youth participation in monitoring and evaluation stage. Overall, local beneficiary youth participation at project design level elicited mixed responses. Some respondents were of the view that the youth did not adequately participate at initial stages of the project as depicted by both Key informant interviews and Focused Group Discussions. During project initiation, members of the County Assembly reported to have invited members of the community to participate in meetings with executive committee members of the County Government. Where they were consulted about the project initial objectives and identification of youth beneficiaries from their respective wards and since the current beneficiaries were not enlisted as beneficiaries then, it wasn't possible to reach them directly for their inputs.

The county assembly members passed on the responsibility of enlisting project beneficiaries to village elders, religious leaders and other associations within their respective wards. However, the oversight role of county assembly members ensured that different clans and other special groups within society equally benefited from the project. Although the youth were the majority beneficiaries there was no biasness or favouritism.

At the project implementation stage, majority of the youths participated in project activities by way of providing unskilled labour and were attracted by the incentives provided. The participation of the youths was also varied at this stage because of the nature of activities involved. The project activities that were labour intensive was pushed to the youthful participants. However, on participation in decision making on issues such where/what/how the same project activities will be undertaken, the management didn't seem to be interested in what

the youth inputs or perspectives on how best project's objective can be achieved was. Simply put, the youth are not involved in decisions at this stage.

Interactions with participants also revealed that project monitoring and evaluation stages were not participatory as beneficiary youth were not involved in daily monitoring or in setting up of project's daily targets in the field. They also did not participate in routine monitoring of activities in the field nor in evaluating the work done against set objectives and targets. The structure of decision making for the project at the monitoring stage was hierarchical , field supervisors decided on work related actions and the same applied for the field supervisors whose almost every course of action was also decided by their seniors from the head office with little or no prior consultations.

Generally, the lack of proper consultations made the project not to incorporate local knowledge, practices and skills and denied the beneficiaries more opportunities of self-growth and confidence in expressing themselves in public. It also denied the youth opportunities to express their views and concerns, learn from group dynamics, experiences, negotiations and exchange of ideas with the leadership. As a result, they did not gain leadership and organizational skills from the daily interaction with different stakeholders.

5.3 Conclusion.
Based on the study findings we draw the following conclusions.

To begin with, general beneficiary community participation was low in the design and monitoring and evaluation stages. Participation for beneficiaries was highest in the implementation stage of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project where beneficiaries contributed unskilled labour to the project and where in return paid salaries at end of every month worked, albeit a challenge of not paying salaries on time was also reported.

They should create enabling environment for participation in project for socio-economic development of the community and ensure collective responsibility to enhance sustainability of projects and empowerment for the community.

The obstacles that hinder participation of beneficiaries in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's life cycle stages as well as those that enhance it should be understood by all stakeholders in order to

overcome them, because participation in essence entails responsibilities for the whole community to do their best in support of each other on the efficient use of county's resources for the common good.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the research findings the following recommendations for policy and for further research were made.

5.4.1 Recommendations for Policy

The study based on its findings recommends that the county government of Garissa takes the following policy action to urgently remedy the situation for *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project;

Participation at the design of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project was generally a representative participation. The local village elders, religious leaders and the MCAs participated in meetings where the projects' goals and priorities were identified. Representative participation limits the space for direct beneficiary's contribution to projects goals and objectives identification processes as was the case in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project from inception. Therefore the county government of Garissa should put in place policies and guidelines that ensures its developmental projects beneficiaries properly participate in all the stages of project's life cycle. Because the youths are an important category of stakeholders in its development agenda and their participation will inculcate ownership and accountability for its projects from the local community.

The extent of participation of the community in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's implementation stage is currently limited to labour provision for project activities on the field only. Community beneficiaries do not play any role in; preparing project work plans at the field, decisions such as where/when/how project activities will be identified and carried out at the field. Beneficiary Community is only attracted by the project's incentives and don't own projects objectives as well its decisions. Therefore, *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project faces sustainability issues in future, unless Garissa county government re-orients the project to properly involve the community in its implementation processes.

As of now, the community as key stakeholder is not fully involved in monitoring and evaluation of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. The beneficiaries are not also involved in project's review meetings at the sub-county administrator's office and do not get feedback on their field activities to track

progress on project objectives. The Project doesn't also have standardized indicators to help measure and report on different project activities progress. As that will improve accountability, measure performance and achievements of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project to warrant its continuation for funding from the county's resources. The county should put in place proper monitoring and evaluation system for its developmental programmes and integrate the community into the monitoring and evaluating its development interventions.

The county government of Garissa should adopt bottom up development approach to properly capture the communities needs in its development agenda or at least try mixed method approach (mix bottom up and top-down approaches) to balance the communities needs and limitations of resources and time while implementing its development blue print for the county.

The county government of Garissa should put in place capacity building strategy for stakeholders, the project staff and the beneficiary youth to enhance skills to enable stakeholders create the right environment and understand of the importance for participation for its development success, ownership, and accountability not only in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's but make it a culture for the development initiatives in the county.

Lastly the county should adopt open data policy on its developmental projects and programmes reports and documents. In order to give researchers an opportunity to analyse the county governments projects/programmes and for evidence based decision making to be realised.

5.4.2 Recommendations for further Research

On the basis of the study conclusions the following recommendations were made for further research on the topic.

A mixed method research on assessing the levels of beneficiary youth participation in the project stages of implementation and monitoring and evaluation for *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project of Garissa County can be undertaken to further broaden the findings of this study.

The similar studies to be carried out in other Garissa County's developmental projects stages to find out whether the low participation of beneficiary community in the project stages are unique to this project only or cuts across for all of the county's development projects.

References

Rietbergen-McCracken, J., & Narayan, D. (1998). *Participation Social Assessments: Tools and Techniques.* Washinton Dc: World Bank.

Adams, J., & Garbutt, A. (2008, february 2). *Praxis paper 21.Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation in Practice:Lessons learnt from Central Asia.* Retrieved 2016, from intrac for civil society: http://intract.org/data/files/resources/420/praxis-paper-21-PME in practice.pdf

Alice, L. M. (2009). *Participatory Evaluation: Perceptions of Local People on Long-Term Impact of Development Interventions in Northern Ghana.* University of Amsterdam,Thesis. Unpublished.

Anatole, S. (2005). *Public Involvement through Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.* CURA.

Angba, A. o., Adescope, O. M., & Aboh, C. L. (2009). Effect of socioeconomic characteristics of rural youths on their attitudes towards participation in community development projects. *International NGO Journal, Vol. 4*(8), 348-351. Retrieved from http://www.academicjournals

Asker, S., & Gero, A. (2012). The role of child and youth participation in development effectiveness a literature review. Surrey Hills: Child Fund Australia. Retrieved from www.unicef.org/adolescence/copyguide/files/Role_of_Child_and_Youth_Participation_i n_D

Aubel, J. (2004). *Strategic Report 9, Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation for Hygiene Improvement, Beyond the Toolbox: What else is required for effective PM&E? A literature Review.* Washinton Dc: USAID.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544-559. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol13/iss4/2

Brennan, M., Barnett, R., & Baugh, E. (2007). Youth involvement in Community Development: Implications and possibilities for extension. *Journal of Extention, 45*(4). Retrieved from https://joe.org/joe/2007august/a3.php

Brockington, D., & Sullivian, S. (2003). *Qualitative research. In R. Scheyvens & D.Storey (Eds.), development fieldwork: A practical guide.* London: Sage publications Ltd.

Brown, R. (2006). *Doing Your Dissertation in Business and Management. The Reality of Research and Writing.* Oxford: Sage Publications.

Chitere, O. P., & Ireri., O. N. (2004). *District Focus for Rural Development in Kenya: Its Limitation as a Decentralization and Participatory Planning Strategy and Prospects for the Future.* Nairobi: Institute for Policy Analysis and Research.

Coupal, F. (2001). *Results-Based Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.* Ottawa: Mosaic.net international. Retrieved from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan032495.pdf.

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (3rd Ed).* SAGE Publications.

DFID. (2010). Youth Participation in Development. A Guide for Development Agencies and Policy. London: DFID–CSO Youth Working Group.

Dumond C., WarnerA., & Langlois M. (2003). *Voices from Youth Teams: How to Create Successful Partnerships for Community Action.* Heartwood Institute, Halifax NS. Retrieved from http://youthcore.ca/download.php?id=78

Duraippah, A. K., Roddy, P., & Parry, J.-E. (2005). *Have Participatory Approaches Increased Capabilities .* Winnipeg: International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD).

Estrella, M., & Gaventa, J. (1998). *Who Counts Reality? Participation Monitoring & Evaluation, A Literature Review, IDS working paper 70.* Institute of Development Studies. Brighton: IDS. Retrieved from http://www.ids.ac.uk/go/idspublication/who-counts-reality-participatory-monitoring-and-evaluation-a-literature-review

Estrella, M., Bluert, J., Campilan, D., Gaventa, J., Gonsalves, J., Guijt, I., . . . Roger, R. (2000). Learning From Change: Issues And Experiences In Participatory Monitoring And Evaluation. In D. C. With Jutta Blauert (Ed.). London: Intermediate Technology Publications. Retrieved from http://www.gsdrc.org/document-library/learning-from-change-issues-and-experiences-in-participatory-monitoring-and-evaluation

Finch, C., & Omolo, A. (2015). *Building Public Participation in Kenya's Devolved Government.* Kenya School of Government-Center for Devolution Studies. Nairobi: World Bank. Retrieved Novermber 2016, from https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/21663/94497.pdf

Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to Qualitative research.* London: Sage publications Ltd. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?as_vis=0&q=Flick,+U.+(2006).An+introduction+to+Qualitative+research+.London:+Sage+publications+Ltd.&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5

Garissa County. (2015, June 13). Retrieved from Garissa County Government: http://garissa.go.ke/

Garissa county. (n.d.). Garissa County Government;county Integrated Developement Plan. Garissa. Retrieved November 2016, from cog.go.ke/images/stories/CIDPs/Garissa.pdf

Guijt, I. (1999). *Participatory monitoring and evaluation for natural resource management and research.Soci0-economic Methodologies for Natural Reseources Research.* Chatham, UK: Natural esources Inatitute. Retrieved from www.fsnnetwork.org/sites/default/files/participatory_monitoring_and_evaluation.pdf

Jackson, E. T., & Kassam, Y. (1998). *, Knowledge shared: Participatory evaluation in development cooperation. , .* West Hartford CT:: Kumarian Press. Retrieved from https://www.idrc.ca/sites/default/files/openebooks/868-6/index.html

Jackson, M., & Mutua, S. (2014). Determinants of community participation in constituency development fund. *Prime journal of social sciences , 3*(8), 842-849.

Kenya. (1965). *Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965 on African Socialism and its Application to Kenya.* Nairobi: Ministry of Planning and Economic Development.

Kenya. (1983). *The District Focus for Rural Development Strategy.* Nairobi: Government Press.

Kenya. (1999). *National Poverty Eradication Plan 1999-2015.* Nairobi: Department of Development Coordination.

Kenya. (2003). *Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation 2003-2007.* Nairobi: Ministry of Planning and National Development.

Kleemeier, E. (2000). The impact of participation on sustainability. An analysis of Malawi rural piped scheme program . *World development, 28*(5), 929-944.

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology-Methods and Techniques.* New Delhi: New age international (p) limited publishers.

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research (3rd Ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications,Inc.

Lawrence, U. O., Daasi, G., Sira, E. D., & Sira, Z. (2013). Youth Participation in Community Development (CD) Programmes in Cross River State: Implications for Sustainable Youth Development in Nigeria. *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS), 13*(5), 61-67. Retrieved from www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol13-issue5/L01356167.pdf

Maina, K. J. (2013). *Influence of youth participation on performance of 'trees for jobs' in arid and semi arid areas: a case of Garbatulla district.* Nairobi university,MA project. Nairobi: unpublished.

Makokha, J. (1985). *The District Focus: Conceptual and Management Problems.* Nairobi: East African Research Bureau.

Mapesa, B., & Kibua, T. N. (2006). *An Assessment of the management and Utilization of the Constituencies Development Fund in Kenya.* Nairobi: Institute of Policy Analysis and Research.

Masanyiwa, Z. S., & Kinyashi, G. F. (2008). *Analysis of Community Participation in Projects Managed by Non-Governmental Organizations: A Case of World Vision in Central Tanzania, UK:.* Institute of Development Studies. Retrieved from www.eldis.org/vfile/.../1/.../Analysis%20of%20community%20participation.doc

Michener, V. (1998). The Participatory Approach: Contradiction and Co-option in Burkina Faso. *26*, 2105-2118.

Mohammad, H. U., Umar, B. F., Abubakar, B. Z., & Abdullahi, A. S. (2011). Assessment of Factors Influencing Beneficiary Participation in Fadama II Project in Niger State, Nigeria; Nigerian Journal of Basic and Applied Science (2011), available at http://www.ajol.info/index.php/njbas/in. *19* (2), 248-252.

Mohammad, S. N. (2010). *Peoples' Participation in Development Projects at Grass root level:A case study of Alampur and Jagannathpur union Parishad.* North South University,MA project. Dhaka: unpublished.

Mugenda, A. G. (2013). *Qualitative Research Method.* Nairobi: Arts Press.

Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2013). *Research Methods:Quantitative& Qualitative Approaches.* Nairobi: Acts Press.

Mwenzwa, E. M. (2007). From Centre to Margin: An Appraisal of the ConstituenciesDevelopment Fund as a Decentralization Strategy in Kenya. *4*(1). Retrieved from www.aijcrnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_1_January_2014/24.pd

Mwenzwa, E. M., & Kiswili, K. (2012). Nepad from below: towards intra-country peer mechanism (iprm) in Kenya. *Elixir Soc. Sci., 42* (2012), 6394-6399. Retrieved from www.elixirpublishers.com (Elixir International Journal)

Mwenzwa, E. M., & Misati, J. A. (2014). Kenya's Social Development proposals and Challenges:Review of Kenya's Vision 2030 First Medium -term plan(2008-2012). *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 4*(1).

Narayan, D. (1995). *The Contribution of People's Participation: Evidence from 121 Rural WaterSupply Projects. Environmentally Sustainable Occasional Paper Series NO 1.* Washington, D.C: The World Bank Publications.

Nyaguthii, E., & Oyugi, L. A. (2013). Influence of Communities participation in successful implementation of constituency development fund projects in Kenya: a case study of Mwea constituency. *International journal of Education and Research, 1*(8).

Nyanjom, O. (2011). *Devolution in Kenya's new constitution. Constitution working paper no 4.* Nairobi: Society for International Development. Retrieved from http://www.constitutionnet.org/vl/item/devolution-kenyas-new-constitution

Odongo, K. O. (2015). *Mediating the Role of Citizen Empowerment in the Relationship Between Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation and social Susteinability. A case of Karemo Area Development Programmes Siaya County,Kenya.* Nairobi: Unpublished MA Thesis,Nairobi University.

Oloo, A. (2006). *Devolution and Democratic Governance: Options for Kenya.* Nairobi: Institute for Public Policy Analysis.

Ondieki, George, M., Matonda, & Emmah, N. (2013). Influence of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Approaches on the Practice of Quality Assurance in Kenya Secondary schools,. *Intedisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 5*(3).

Pali, P. N., Nalukwago, G., Kaaria, S., Sanginga, P., & Kankwatsa, P. (2005). *Empowering Communities through Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.* Kampala: African Crop Science Conference Proceedings. Retrieved from ciat-library.ciat.cgiar.org/articulos_ciat/pali2005_article.pdf

Pasteur, K., & Blauert, J. (2000). *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation in Latin America.* Briton Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.).* housand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Paul, C. (2010). Strategies and Techniques for Enhancing Participation in Rural Development. *International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development, 1*(1), 143-144.

Paul, S. (1987). *Community participation in development projects.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Perera, K. (1998). Participatory Rural Development beyond Micro-Scale prepared for the Regional Review Meeting on Participatory Rural Development, organized by the UN Inter-Agency Committee on Integrated Rural Development for Asia and the Pacific. Dhaka.

Powers, J., & Tiffany, J. (2006). Engaging Youth in Participatory Research and Evaluation. *Journal of Public Health Management & Practice, 12*(6-suplement), S79 - S87.

PRIA. (2014). *International perspectives in monitoring and evaluation.* Delhi: PRIA.

Rajalahti, R., Woelcke, J., & Pehu, E. (2005). *Monitoring and Evaluation for World Bank agricultural Research and extension projects: a good practice note.* Washington DC: World Bank.

Rossman, G. B. (2015). *Participatory monitoring &evaluation.* University of Massachusetts, The Center for International Education, Amherst. Retrieved from http://www. umass. edu/cie/Themes/participatory_evaluation. htm.

Suarez-Herrera, j. C., Springett, J., & Kagan, C. (2009). Critical Connections between Participatory Evaluation,Organizational Learning and International Change in Pluralistic Organizations.

Thea, H., & Guijt, I. (2006). *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A process to Support Governance and Empowerment at the local Level.* Amsterdam: World Bank. Retrieved from http://www.bibalex.org/Search4Dev/files/282315/114599.pdf

Valentine, G. I., Shukla, J., & Eugene, N. (2016, April - June). Effect of Beneficiaries Participation In Project Monitoring and Evaluation on Project Success. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 4*(2), 334-349. Retrieved November 4, 2016, from www.researchpublish.com

Verschuren, P. J., & Zsolnai, L. (1998). Norms, Goals and Stakeholders in Program Evaluation. *Human Systems Management, 17*, 155-160.

Wanja, W. C. (2014). *Factors effecting participation of Youth in Community based Youth projects in Nyeri County.* Nairobi University, MA project. Nairobi: unpublished.

Wasilwa, C. (2015). Effect of Community Participation on Sustainability of Community Based Development Projects in Kenya. Retrieved November 2016, from https://www.linkedin.com/.../effect-community-participation-sustainability-based-cale.

Weare, K., Bryant, I., Paul, M., Woollard, J., Ratcliffe, M., Swann, J., & Prosser, J. S. (2004). *Research Methods.* (J. Swann, Ed.) University of Southampton. Retrieved from www.pgce.soton.ac.uk/IT/Research/EdReMe/ResearchMethodsHandbook.pdf

Wicklin, V. W., & Finsterbusch, K. (1987). The contribution of beneficiary participation to Development Effectiveness. *Public administration and development , 7*, 1-23 .

World Bank. (2010). *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation,in Topics:Community Driven Development.* Washington DC: Word Bank.

Yahaya, M. K. (2003). Determinants of Youth Participation in Change Programmes in Rural Nigeria. *Anthropologist, 5*(1), 101-106 .

Yumi, S., & Beaudry, S. (2007). *Monitoring & Evaluation Tips for Strengthening Organizational Capacity.* world Bank. Retrieved August 2015, from htpp:www.siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBELARUS/Resources/M&E.pdf

APPENDICES: INTERVIEW GUIDES

KIIs guide for project's field supervisors

Hi, my name is ……., and I am here today to talk to you about levels of beneficiary youth participation in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project. Since you are the key person to consult, I would like to hear your thoughts, feelings, observations, and experiences. Your answers will help us in understanding the practice of participatory approach to development in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project. It is important to keep in mind that this is not a test, and there are no rights or wrong answers. Your name will not be recorded with your answers, and everything you say will be kept secret. The most important thing is that you answer honestly on what you really think or feel. If there are questions that you do not want to answer, that is ok. If you do not understand the questions and need more clarifications, please feel free to ask.

Questions

1. How were the young people involved in the early stages of this project for example planning and design stages?

2. What stages of this project are majority of the youth involved and why?

3. What benefits are the young people getting as a result of their participation in these projects?

4. Is the youths opinion, or input on how to go about implementing project activities and targets in the field sought? If so, who usually seeks their opinion?

5. How are youth involved in monitoring and evaluation of this project?

6. How do you involve the youth in monitoring daily project activities and targets in the field?

7. How do the youth participate in the preparation of this project's monitoring and evaluation reports?

8. Has this project ever been evaluation? Yes or no, if yes *prob*e, how were youth involved?

9. In your own opinion are youth consulted about this project in all its stages from needs assessment, planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

10. What is your recommendation on how best to involve the youth in implementation and monitoring evaluation stages of the project?

 Thank you for your time!

FDGs guide for beneficiaries of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* in the fields.

Hi, my name is ……., and I am here today to talk to you about levels of young people participation in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. Since you are the key persons to consult, I would like to hear your thoughts, feelings, observations, and experiences. Your answers will help us in understanding the practice of participatory approach to development in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. It is important to keep in mind that this is not a test, and there are no rights or wrong answers. Your names will not be recorded with your answers, and everything you say will be kept secret. The most important thing is that you answer honestly on what you really think or feel. If there are questions that you do not want to answer, that is ok. If you do not understand the questions and need more clarifications, please feel free to ask.

Discussion questions

1. What development projects are being undertaken at your ward that you know of?

2. How are the local people involved in the initiations, planning, designs, administration and managements of those projects?

3. How were young people involved in the early stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects eg planning and design stages?

4. What stages of this project are you as young people mostly involved and why?

5. How have you as young people benefited from this project as participants?

6. How are you as young people involved in the development work plans for *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects?

7. How do you participate and lead decisions in the field on how to go about implementing project activities or targets?

8. How are you involved in decisions regarding the monitoring of projects daily activities and targets in the field?

9. How are you involved as young people in gathering information about the project, its analysis and reporting?

10. In your own opinions were the youth adequately consulted about this project and do they participate in all its stages from needs assessment, planning, design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation?

11. What are your recommendations on how best to involve the youth in implementation and monitoring evaluation stages of the project?

Thank you for your time!

KII guide for MCA's

Hi, my name is ……., and I am here today to talk to you about levels of beneficiary participation in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects in your ward. Since you are a key person to consult, I would like to hear your thoughts, feelings, observations, and experiences. Your answers will help us in understanding the practice of participatory approach to development in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. It is important to keep in mind that this is not a test, and there are no rights or wrong answers. Your name will not be recorded with your answers, and everything you say will be kept secret. The most important thing is that you answer honestly on what you really think or feel. If there are questions that you do not want to answer, that is ok. If you do not understand the questions and need more clarifications, please feel free to ask

KII questions

1. How are the local people from your ward involved in the development activities in general?

2. How do MCA's identify the people to work in the different development projects in their areas?

3. What development plans do you have for the youths in your ward?

4. What are your roles as an MCA in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects in your ward?

5. How were the young people in your ward involved at the initial stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project?

6. What stages of the *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects' are majority of young people in your ward participating and why?

7. How do the beneficiary youth participate in the day to day management of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project in your ward?

8. How are beneficiary youth involved in review meetings for project's activity and target progress?

9. What benefits have the beneficiary youth gotten as results of their participation in *Ugatuzi na kazi project* in your ward?

10. What are the challenges you face in involving the youth in development projects from your ward?

11. In your own opinion how would you suggest young people in your ward participate in this project's stages of implementation and monitoring and evaluation?

12. What is you recommendation on how best beneficiary youth should be involved in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project in your area?

Thank you for your time!

KII guide for Ward administrators

Hi, my name is ……., and I am here today to talk to you about levels of beneficiary participation in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project. Since you are a key person to consult, I would like to hear your thoughts, feelings, observations, and experiences. Your answers will help us in understanding the practice of participatory approach to development in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project. It is important to keep in mind that this is not a test, and there are no rights or wrong answers. Your name will not be recorded with your answers, and everything you say will be kept secret. The most important thing is that you answer honestly on what you really think or feel. If there are questions that you do not want to answer, that is ok. If you do not understand the questions and need more clarifications, please feel free to ask

KII questions

1. How do local people from your ward generally take part in development initiatives in your area?

2. How are the local people who should participate in development initiatives in your ward identified?

3. How were the young people in your ward involved at the initial stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project?

4. Other than employment creation, what other benefit has this project brought to the participating youth?

5. What stages of this project are majority of young people in your ward participating and why?

6. How do young people who are beneficiaries of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project in your ward participate in project's activities review meetings?

7. How do the young people in your ward contribute and share influence on *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects outcomes?

8. In your own opinion how would you suggest young people in your ward participate in the project's stages of implementation and monitoring and evaluation better?

9. What are your recommendations on how best to involve beneficiary youth in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project in your area?

Thank you for your time!

COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Hi, my name is ……., and I am here today to talk to you about levels of beneficiary participation in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project. Since you are a key persons to consult, I would like to hear your thoughts, feelings, observations, and experiences. Your answers will help us in understanding the practice of participatory approach to development in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. It is important to keep in mind that this is not a test, and there are no rights or wrong answers. Your name will not be recorded with your answers, and everything you say will be kept secret. The most important thing is that you answer honestly on what you really think or feel. If there are questions that you do not want to answer, that is ok. If you do not understand the questions and need more clarifications, please feel free to ask

KII questions

1. What is the county government policy for the youth participation in development at the county level?
2. What development programs has the county government undertaken for the youth so far?
3. What are the budgetary allocations for youth development activities in the county government?
4. How did *Ugatuzi na Kazi* development projects by the county came about?
5. How were the youth involved in the early stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project?
6. How are *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects being implemented?
7. How do the youth participate in the decision making with regard to *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project's implementation activities?
8. What are the challenges of implementing this project from a perspective youth involvement?
9. What are your suggestions/opinions on how best to involve the youths in the development programs that target them as beneficiaries at the county level?

Thank you for your time!

National Youths affairs officer

Hi, my name is ……., and I am here today to talk to you about levels of beneficiary participation in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project. Since you are a key persons to consult, I would like to hear your thoughts, feelings, observations, and experiences. Your answers will help us in understanding the practice of participatory approach to development in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. It is important to keep in mind that this is not a test, and there are no rights or wrong answers. Your name will not be recorded with your answers, and everything you say will be kept secret. The most important thing is that you answer honestly on what you really think or feel. If there are questions that you do not want to answer, that is ok. If you do not understand the questions and need more clarifications, please feel free to ask

KII Questions

1. What is the National government policy on youth involvement in development?

2. What are the key national government programs in this county that target the youth?

3. How do the youth take part in the decision making platforms of the national government development programs at the county level?

4. How do the youth participate in the implementation of the national government programs at the local county level?

5. How do you involve the youths in reviews meetings for development programs activities and in evaluations?

6. What are benefits of involving the youth in the national government development programs as stakeholders at the local level to their programs and the youth themselves?

7. What challenges do you face while involving the local youth in the national government development programs in the field?

8. What are your suggestions/opinions on how best to involve the youth in the development programs that target them as beneficiaries at the local level?

Thank you for your time!

GARISSA SUB_COUNTY ADMIN

Hi, my name is ……., and I am here today to talk to you about levels of beneficiary participation in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project. Since you are a key person to consult, I would like to hear your thoughts, feelings, observations, and experiences. Your answers will help us in understanding the practice of participatory approach to development in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects. It is important to keep in mind that this is not a test, and there are no rights or wrong answers. Your name will not be recorded with your answers, and everything you say will be kept secret. The most important thing is that you answer honestly on what you really think or feel. If there are questions that you do not want to answer, that is ok. If you do not understand the questions and need more clarifications, please feel free to ask

KII Questions

1. What development programs are currently taking place in Garissa sub-county?

2. Which of those development programs target the youth as key beneficiaries?

3. How were the youth involved in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* development projects at beginning from initiation, planning and design?

4. How do young people participate in developing work plans for *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects' activities?

5. What do young people contribute to *Ugatuzi na Kazi* outcomes.

6. What stages of *Ugatuzi na Kazi* project do majority of young people participate and why?

7. What benefits are participating youth getting from *Ugatuzi na kazi* projects?

8. How do the participating youth take part in decisions about daily project managements?

9. How are the beneficiary young people involved in gathering information about Ugatuzi na Kazi project activities, analysis of information gathered and reporting?

10. How are beneficiary youths involved in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* the review meetings for activities progress?

11. What is your opinion on how best to the youths in *Ugatuzi na Kazi* projects phases of implementation, Monitoring and evaluation as beneficiaries of these projects?

Thank you for your Time!