Data Dissemination and Use and Performance of Educational Building Infrastructural Projects: A Case of Bungoma County, Kenya

Beryl Mutekhele[1], Charles Rambo[2], Omollo Ongati[3], Dr. Raphael Nyonje[4]

[1, 4]University of Nairobi, Kenya

[2, 3]Professor, University of Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract: *Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are at the center of sound governance arrangements globally, regionally, nationally and locally as well. They are necessary for the achievement of evidence-based policy making, budget decisions, management, and accountability. However, there is limited focus on utilization of M&E systems and performance of educational building infrastructural projects in Bungoma County. The purpose of this study was to examine utilization of Data Dissemination and use and performance of educational building infrastructural projects. To achieve this purpose, the study endeavored to determine the influence of data dissemination and use on performance of educational building infrastructural projects in Bungoma County. This study is grounded in the theory of project management and guided by pragmatism paradigm. The study used descriptive survey research design and correlation research design. The target population consisted of 20 implementation committee members at the county level, 120 NG-CDF implementation committee members, 6 implementation committee members from the national ministry of education making the target population of 152. The sample size consisted of 110 respondents sampled by sampling each of the targeted strata. The study used questionnaires and interview schedules as research instruments. Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analyzed. Quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation and regression analysis. While qualitative data was analyzed using patterns features and themes. F- test was used to test the hypothesis. Analysis showed that performance of educational building infrastructural projects positively correlates with data dissemination and use (r = 0.166, p< 0.05). The statistic F (1, 102) = 1.94, p > 0.05 failed to reject the H0 and the study concluded that Data Dissemination and use has no significant influence on performance of educational building infrastructural projects in Bungoma county. The study recommended that implementation committees to consist of more youthful minds for purposes of innovations and use of new technologies and more focus be put on building their capacity for M&E function.*

Keywords: Data Dissemination and use, Monitoring and Evaluation systems, performance of educational building infrastructural project

1. Introduction

Monitoring and evaluation is progressively receiving awareness and appreciation globally due to its increasing role in ensuring transparency and accountability in governance and administration.

Most Latin America and Caribbean Countries(LAC)have increased their understanding of the importance of monitoring and evaluation (M & E) to enable both governments and donors understand which public interventions work well and which ones do not, and the justification (Troyey, 2010). In Sri Lanka, the government embraced the concept of having a system of monitoring and evaluation after realizing the need for effective and efficient service delivery. In Africa, Ghana developed a commission known as the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) with the sole purpose of regulating and assimilating a monitoring and evaluation culture in governance (Ogboune, 2013). In Kenya the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) was institutionalized in Kenya in the year 2004 and later launched during the London investment summit 2012.

2. Objective of the Study

The study was guided by the following objective;
To determine the extent to which data dissemination and use, influence performance of educational building infrastructural projects in Bungoma County.

Research Hypothesis
The study sought to test the following research hypothesis There is a growing realization of the importance of utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in educational building infrastructural projects across the globe (Williams, 2007). This arises from widespread displeasure with the performance of educational infrastructural projects in Kenya, Africa and the world at large with the evidence of increasing poverty levels. In Bungoma county for example, the expected delivery of various educational infrastructural projects and programs has not been attained. Even those educational building infrastructural projects with the right technologies and adequate resources still do badly (Jamerson, 2012). This could be attributed to neglect of utilization of monitoring and evaluation systems, especially limited appreciation of data dissemination and use.

The need for an effective and efficient means of managing and sharing data that takes full advantage of the benefits of data sharing has arisen within the construction industry (Giffels, 2010). This underscores the importance of data

dissemination and use to performance of educational building infrastructural projects.

In a study commissioned by Institute of Economic Affairs (I.E.A) in the year 2014 among 25counties to determine the impact of Community Empowerment Projects on the target community, it was revealed that only 38.7% of the counties have structured monitoring and evaluation systems in place(Institute of Economic Affairs, 2014).Poor resource absorption in the implementation of projects was observed. This was attributable to the approach adapted by M & E committees.

H_1: Data dissemination and use significantly influences performance of educational building infrastructural projects in Bungoma County.

3. Literature Review

The Concept of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems
The importance of monitoring and evaluation has kept on growing among governments with the purpose of inculcating transparency and accountability in governance. An M&E system is made up of twelve (12) components namely, Human capacity for M&E, organizational structure with M&E functions, Partnerships and planning, coordinating and managing the M&E system, M&E frameworks, M&E work plan and costs, Communication, advocacy and culture for M&E, Routine programme monitoring, Surveys and Surveillance, National and local databases, Supportive supervision and Data Auditing, Evaluation and Research and Data dissemination and use. This study focused on Data dissemination and use because of the advancing technology in the construction industry which necessitates data dissemination platforms.

Data Dissemination and Use and Performance of Infrastructural Projects
The need to promote the sharing of research data is something that needs to be embraced by all stakeholders to a project. One of the key merits for dissemination is its ability to enhance research. Sharing research data enables researchers to collaborate and build on each other's research findings rather than duplication (Fischer and Zigmond, 2010). Use of the same findings also creates a level ground for different researchers to test and evaluate their propositions. This enables to create synergy among them for the betterment of the research industry.

There are a number of constraints facing research data dissemination with the main issue being lack of widely recognized data-sharing approaches which poses serious challenges towards the data production and dissemination chain (Axelsson and Schroeder, 2009). All of these technical data management demands require funds, time, and personnel. Since the role of data dissemination currently falls on the researcher, his/her inability in terms of finances to share data affects the entire industry. An approach that encourages research data dissemination without definite compensation makes researchers to use others' research work instead (Fischer and Zigmond,2010). This defeats the purpose of sharing data, since progress would slow without new research data collections. The need for an effective and efficient means of managing and sharing data that takes full advantage of the benefits of data sharing has arisen within the construction industry. To date, few widely used data sharing models have been developed. The two most commonly used systems are; web-based collaboration and web-based sharepoint (Giffels,2010).

While studying on the influence of data dissemination systems on performance of government agencies, Sayyed(2012) undertook an empirical survey and analyzed data by descriptive analytical methods. A sample size of 97 employees was selected by simple random. In the study, questionnaires were used for data collection and structural equation modeling was used for data analysis. The results of the study by Sayyed showed that all effects were adopted with the theoretical framework. Therefore, the variable of data dissemination influences performance of infrastructural building projects in education sector. The findings by Sayyed(2012) concur with a study carried out by Mohan(2001) indicating that an effective monitoring and evaluation system ought to have effective data dissemination and approach. Sayyed(2012)noted the influence of data dissemination on performance of educational infrastructural projects confirm findings from a study on the influence of reliable data on performance by Aronson and Wilson(2006). Sayyed(2012) attests the findings of Harnell *et al.,* (2011) that linked performance of projects to proper data systems.

In a study on reporting System, Yujing(2003) investigated whether a performance- based system appreciates data dissemination as a crucial component for effective monitoring and evaluation activities. The data was collected from the Maine Addiction Treatment System(MATS) standardized admission and discharge data provided by the Maine Office of Substance Abuse (OSA)for fiscal years 1991–1995. The data provided demographic, reporting templates, systems and routine monitoring as key variables for effective systems (Yujing, 2003).

Performance of Educational Building Infrastructural Projects
From the square of time, cost, quality, and satisfaction proposed by (Baker, 1974/1988) project performance becomes a hexagon of time, cost, quality, and achievement of strategic objectives of the client organization that initiated the project, satisfaction of users and other stakeholders. County Government-funded building projects have a project cycle consisting of concept, design, tendering, initiation, and implementation and commissioning stages. Management of the projects is normally in a tri-party form with the government as the financier, a project manager to administer resources and activities, and the implementing entity in form of a contractor (Uher, 2009). Scope and quality specify what is to be achieved, the time aspect is established with specified start and end dates, whereas the cost element is in regard to the limited financial resources to be expended. These factors determine project performance. Although all these elements are interrelated, it is important to note that for building projects, delay has a major impact on a project's cost.

A study carried out in Kenya by Mohan (2001) indicated that "the organizations' projects had adequate number of supervising staff and that project teams used work schedules and plans to monitor project implementation". The study also concluded that supervision capacity has a significant influence on the successful completion of projects. This study corroborates with the other studies that monitoring and evaluation is critical to project success even in Kenya. According to a research by Ika *et al.,* (2010) projects in Africa face problems which can be categorized into any of the four traps namely: "the one-size-fits-all technical trap, the accountability-for-results trap, the lack-of-project-management- capacity trap, and the cultural trap".

The study suggests increase in supervision and monitoring efforts as one of the actions that should be taken to avoid some of the traps. This implies that the projects in Africa often fail due to lack of effective monitoring and evaluation.

Several legislations in Kenya such as the Public Service Commission Act, the Public Procurement and Disposal Act, and the Constitution of Kenya2010 create demand for M & E and emphasizes on accountability and transparency from public institutions. Entrenching monitoring and evaluation in the law attempts to make it mandatory for all the public projects. The main question is whether the mandatory M &E is working effectively given a number of white elephants in the country in the recent past. Creation of the 47 counties, responsible of their own development and projects financing, has indeed increased the need for Monitoring and evaluation and Project Management services at the county level.

Kontinen and Robinson (2010) identified lack of monitoring tools, difficulty in defining performance indicators and short time allocation to M & E as some of the challenges that constantly face the project monitoring function. When M & E faces various challenges, its effectiveness is at stake hence impacting on the project success. Monitoring and evaluation exercise involves data collection and processing. An effective monitoring and evaluation activity is one that identifies deviations in a timely manner and provides feedback appropriately; hence enhancing the chances of project success. In Kenya M & E is not automated. This may lead to delays in data collection and analysis (Kontinen and Robinson. 2010).Further studies have been carried out to explore the possibilities of improving the productivity of projects by automating project monitoring and control. This will enable automatic data capturing and processing based on the actual project performance. Nonetheless, the studies also indicate that certain manually obtained data is still important in addition to the automatically collected data. Since full automation of M & E process may not be practically possible, it may be difficult to fully eliminate the problem of delays in detecting the variances (Yames, 2013). Effective monitoring and evaluation helps in providing timely information on the project progress which in turn leads to increase in technical capacity and project success. Ineffective monitoring and evaluation leads to wastage of resources and has a negative effect on the project success.The traditionally-accepted measure of project performance is the basic cost-quality-time triangle. However, there are differences between various types of projects in determination of performance since measurement is carried out against pre-determined success factors (Hendrickson, 2008). For building projects, there have been studies carried out and attempts made towards development of evaluation models aimed at determining performance factors. However, there is no universally accepted basis due to the differing complexity, inherent nature and unique characteristics of such projects There is need for effective monitoring and evaluation of projects as this is increasingly recognized as an indispensable tool of both project and portfolio management. Monitoring and evaluation also provides a basis for accountability in the abuse of development resources (World Bank Group, 1998).

4. Methodology

The paradigm used in this study was pragmatism because both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analyzed. It therefore called for a mixed approach. The researcher employed descriptive survey and correlation research designs. Descriptive survey design was suitable because it allows for both qualitative and quantitative surveys. On the other hand, correlation design enabled the researcher to determine whether or not any two variables were correlated.

The target population in this study consisted of twenty (20)County implementation committee members, one hundred and twenty six (126) implementation committee members at the NG-CDF level from the nine constituencies, 14 officers per constituency and six(6) officers from the National Ministry of Education giving a total of one hundred and fifty two(152)as target population.
This was tabulated as follows;

Table 3.1: Target Population matrix

The strata	Target population
County implementation committee	20
CDF implementation committee	126
MoE officials	6
Total	152

The study sample was 110 respondents drawn from a target population of 152 using the Yamane (1967) formula, thus:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

$= 152/1+152(0.05)^2$

$= 110$

Where n = required sample size
N = targeted population (152 respondents)
e^2= error limit (0.05)

The number of respondents was selected proportionally to get the sample size from each strata as shown in table 3.2

Table 3.2: Sampling Procedure

The strata	Target population	Sample size
County implementation committee	20	15
CDF implementation committee	126	91
MOE officials	6	4
Total	**152**	**110**

The selection of a sample from each stratum was based on proportionate method to ensure representation according to each stratum strength as shown in table 3.2.

The sampling technique used in selecting the sample strata was purposive sampling. Simple random sampling was employed in picking the sample size from each stratum.

The study's main instruments of data collection were questionnaires for the M & E committee members and interview schedules for key informants. The questionnaires helped in collecting quantitative data while the interview guides helped in gathering qualitative data.

This study used frequencies and percentages because of their ease in showing the research findings. Inferential statistics in form of Pearson's product moment coefficient, Analysis of variance, coefficient of determination and multiple regression analysis were used in this study to analyze quantitative data.

The hypothesis was tested at a level of confidence of 95%.

5. Results

Demographic Information of respondents

The respondents who participated in the study were asked to state, their gender, age, academic qualifications and whether they had ever attended any course in M&E to establish whether these had any implication on performance of educational building infrastructural projects.. The results are presented in table 4.2 for each category of demographic in focus.

Table 4.2: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Categories	Frequency(f))	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	65	62.5
	Female	39	37.5
	Total	**104**	**100.0**
Age	26 to 35 years	35	33.7
	36 to 45 years	43	41.3
	Above 46 years	26	25.0
	Total	**104**	**100.0**
Level of	O – level	17	16.3
education	A level	10	9.6
	Certificate/ diploma	44	42.3
	Graduate	25	24.0
	Total	**104**	**100.0**
Attended M&E Course	No	67	64.4
	Yes	37	35.6
	Total	**104**	**100.0**

On age, the study established that 35(33.7%) were in the age bracket of 26 to 35 years, 43(41.3%) in the 36 to 45 years and 26(25%) in 46 years and above. This implies that majority committee members are not youths and this could lead to lack of innovation to ensure modern infrastructure.

On gender, 65(62.5%) were male while 39(37.5%) were female. This shows that more men are considered in the formation of project committees as compared to women implying that building infrastructural projects remains a male domain.

As for the level of education, 17(16.3%) were 0' Level, 10(9.6%) were A' Level, 44(42.3%) were diploma holders, 25(24%) were graduates and none was post graduate. This implies that majority were holders of diploma and above and hence level of education was not wanting in building infrastructural projects.

Lastly on having attended M&E course or not, 37(35.6%) had attended an M&E Course while 67(64.4%) had not attended any M&E course. Majority of the committee members had not attended any course in M&E implying that committee members lacked the capacity for M&E hence poor performance of educational building infrastructural projects.

4.5. Data Dissemination and Use and Performance of Educational Building Infrastructural Projects

Indicators on Data dissemination and use were, dissemination system in place, information disseminated to key stakeholders, timely distribution of information and stakeholder data dissemination and validation workshop. The sub-variables were tested using 5 items and results of responses summarized as shown in table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics for Data Dissemination and Use

Variable		SD	D	U	A	SA	Tot.	Mean	SD
The act of sharing information about the project to stakeholders increases their ownership and appreciation of the project	F	0	3	7	10	84	104	4.68	.728
	%	0	2.9	6.7	9.6	80.3	100		
Making public project information increases transparency and accountability in a project	F	71	3	4	26	0	104	4.58	.705
	%	68.3	2.9	3.8	25	0	100		
Timely distribution of information to stakeholders helps in managing their expectations towards the project	F	0	3	8	40	53	104	4.37	.753
	%	0	2.9	7.7	38.5	51.0	100		
Stakeholder data dissemination and validation workshop should not be held during implementation	F	2	23	9	53	17	104	3.58	1.07
	%	1.9	22.1	8.7	51	16.3	100		
Composite mean and Standard Deviation								4.305	0.566

On act of sharing information, 84(80.3%) strongly agreed, 10(9.6%) agreed, 7(6.7%) were not sure, while 3(2.9%) disagreed, giving a mean of 4.6827 and standard deviation of 0.728. This meant majority agreed that sharing information about the project to stakeholders increases their ownership and appreciation of the project.

On timely distribution of information to stakeholders, 53(51%) strongly agreed, 40 (38.5%) agreed, 8(7.7%) were not sure while 3 (2.9%) did not agree, giving a mean of 4.3750 and standard deviation of 0.753. This meant that majority were in agreement that, timely distribution of information to stakeholders helps in managing their

expectations towards the project implying that timely distribution of information to stakeholders influences performance of projects.

On the issue of stakeholder data dissemination and validation workshop, 17(16.3%) strongly agreed, 53(51%) agreed, 9(8.7%) were not sure, 23(22.1%) disagreed, while 2(1.9%) strongly disagreed, giving a mean of 3.5769 and standard deviation of 1.07. This meant that majority agreed with the assertion that stakeholder data dissemination and validation workshop should not be held during project implementation suggesting that stakeholder data dissemination and validation workshop does not influence performance of educational building infrastructural projects.

The above findings are supported by the qualitative analysis demonstrated by the statement:

> *"We are appointed to represent the people and all our working is centered on involving the people because once the people feel we are involving them in planning and implementation, they will embrace our projects" (Kimilili CDF Committee Chair, 2017).*

This means that stakeholder involvement in project implementation enhances performance of projects.

This observation supports a study by Sayyed (2012) that linked performance of projects to proper data systems stating that allowing project stakeholders access information enhances their appreciation of the project.

Inferential statistical analysis showed that a positive correlation of (r=0.166, p< 0.05) exists between Data dissemination and use and performance of educational building infrastructural projects while regression showed that regression model is not statistically significant in predicting performance. The statistic F (1, 102) = 1.94, p> 0.05 failed to reject the null hypothesis and it was concluded that Data dissemination and use has no significant influence on performance of educational building infrastructural projects. This means that Data dissemination and use has no influence on performance of educational building infrastructural projects in Bungoma county.

Performance of educational building Infrastructural Projects

Indicators on performance of educational building infrastructural projects were; adherence to manual design specifications, quality of materials used, buildings completion rates and number of new buildings completed. The sub- variables were tested using 5 items in the research instrument and results of responses are summarized in table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics for Performance of Infrastructural Projects

Variable		SD	D	U	A	SA	Tot.	Mean	SD
Institutions that adhere to building specifications as stipulated in the school safety guidelines manual are less likely to encounter legal issues	F	0	3	0	29	72	104	4.634	.6394
	%	0	2.9	0	27.9	69.2	100		
Cheap construction material are more sustainable than quality material	F	15	13	6	51	19	104	3.442	1.321
	%	14.4	12.5	5.8	49.0	18.3	100		
It's not a must for buildings to conform to guidelines stipulated in the school safety manual	F	15	13	6	51	19	104	3.442	1.320
	%	14.4	12.5	5.8	49.0	18.3	100		
Projects that don't aim at solving the local needs of a targeted population rarely find ownership from the community	F	0	9	6	47	42	104	4.173	.8862
	%	0	8.7	5.8	45.2	40.5	100		
Delaying the completion of a project is denying the targeted beneficiaries their rights	F	3	6	0	34	61	104	4.385	.9685
	%	2.9	5.8	0	32.7	58.7	100		
Composite mean and std deviation								**4.015**	**0.674**

On the issue of institutions adhering to building specifications, 72(69.2%) strongly agreed, 29(27.9%) agreed, 3(2.9%) disagreed, giving a mean of 4.634 and standard deviation of 0.6394. Meaning majority agreed that institutions that adhere to building specifications as stipulated in the schools' safety guidelines manual, are less likely to encounter legal issues. This implies that adherence to school safety guidelines manual enhances performance of building infrastructural projects.

On the issue of cheap construction materials, 19(18.3%) strongly agreed, 51(49%) agreed, 6(5.8%) were not sure, 13(12.5%) disagreed and 15(14.4%) strongly disagreed, giving a mean of 3.442 and standard deviation of 1.321. Majority agreed that cheap construction materials are more sustainable than quality materials. This means that quality materials do not influence performance of educational building infrastructural projects.

As for projects that don't aim at solving the local needs, 42(40.5%) strongly agreed, 47(45.7%) agreed, 6(5.8%)

were not sure, 9(8.7%) disagreed while none strongly disagreed, giving a mean of 4.173 and standard deviation of 0.8862. Majority were in agreement with the assertion that projects that don't aim at solving the local needs of a targeted population rarely find ownership from the community.

This means that projects that don't aim at solving local needs influence overall performance.

As for delaying the completion of a project, 61(58.7%) strongly agreed, 34(32.7%) agreed, 6(5.8%) disagreed while 3(2.9%) strongly disagreed, giving a mean of 4.385 and standard deviation of 0.9685. Majority agreed that delaying the completion of a project is denying the targeted beneficiaries their rights. This means that delaying completion of a project affects performance of the project. The interviews brought out similar sentiments as one respondent had this to say;

"Our committee tries to consider Monitoring and Evaluation, even though at a basic level in every of its operations to ensure that we enhance the performance of our educational building infrastructural projects. It's a practice we advise all other CDF committees to do so". (Bumula CDF, Project Manager, 2017)

These findings are supported by a study done by Baker (2011) on Performance of Government projects using descriptive survey design and found out that project performance is a hexagon of time, cost, quality, and achievement of strategic objectives of the client organization that initiated the project, satisfaction of users and other stakeholders.

6. Conclusion

Descriptive analysis showed that Data dissemination and use has no influence on performance of educational building infrastructural projects. Inferential statistics indicated that a positive correlation of 0.166 exists between Data dissemination and use and performance of building infrastructural projects in Bungoma. The statistic $F_{(1, 102)} = 1.94$, $p > 0.05$ failed to reject the Null hypothesis and it was concluded that Data dissemination and use has no significant influence on performance of building infrastructural projects. Interviews revealed that involving stakeholders in the implementation of projects enhances their performance. It is therefore concluded that performance of educational building infrastructural projects in Bungoma, Kenya is not influenced by Data dissemination and use due to lack of capacity for M&E by implementing committees and failure to embrace new technologies and innovations in infrastructural projects as a result of lack of youthful minds on committees.

7. Recommendations

The study showed that Data dissemination and use as a component of monitoring and evaluation systems does not influence performance of building infrastructural projects in Bungoma. It is therefore recommended that, for delivery of successful building infrastructural projects, implementing committees should be balanced in gender, involve more youths for purposes of embracing new technologies and innovations and be capacity built to carry out the M&E function effectively.

8. Limitations of the Study

Inadequate finances would have negatively affected the research process. However, to minimize on the cost of the study, a representative sample of the target population was picked. As for time constraint due to the magnitude of the research, the researcher devoted extra hours in order to accomplish the task, and the fact that county governments are new entities, M & E policy may not have been quite clear to the implementers and the researcher ensured that the research instruments captured any M&E system being utilized in Bungoma County.

References

[1] Aronson & Wilson, (2006). Social psychology (6th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ : Pearson Prentice Hall.

[2] Axelsson, A., &Schroeder, R. (2009). "Making it open and keeping it safe: *Enabled Data sharing in Sweden*." Acta Sociological, 52(3), 213 226.

[3] Baker, (2011) Factors Affecting Project Success in: Cleland DI, King WR, editors. Project management handbook. (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley.

[4] Baker, e*t al* (1974/1988) Factors Affecting Project Success in: Cleland DI, King WR, editors. Project management handbook. (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley.

[5] Fischer, B. A., & Zigmond, M. J. (2010). "The essential nature of sharing in science."

[6] Giffels, J., Vollmer, S. H., and Bird, S. J. (2010). "Editors' overview: Topics in the

[7] Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). "Organizational Culture and Organizational Effectiveness: A Meta-Analytic Investigation of the Competing Values Framework's Theoretical Suppositions." Journal of Applied Psychology (online publication)

[8] Hendrickson, J.K. (2008). Performance of Educational Infrastructural projects). American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

[9] Ika LA, Diallo A, Thuillier D (2009) Critical success factors for World Bank projects: an empirical investigation. International Journal of Project Management, 30(1):105-116.

[10] Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) (2014)- IEA Kenya www.ieakenya.or.ke accessed May 2014m`. *Inter-organizational competitive advantage.*

[11] Jamerson, (2012). utilization of monitoring a devaluation systems and technology. Journal of Technology and Evaluation. USIU University. Vo 2(23)34-56 Accessed December 2013

[12] Kontinen T, Robinson-Moncada S (2010) Towards New Practices of Monitoring in World Vision Finland: Pathways of Empowerment.

[13] Mohan, G. (2001). Participatory Development. In Desai, Vandana and Potter, Rob eds. The Arnold Companion to development studies. London, UK: Hodder.

[14] NIMES (National Integrated Management Evaluation System). (2009). Ministry of National Planning and Vision 2030, Government of Kenya.

[15] Ogboune, (2013). National Development Planning Commission(NDPC). Report from an Academic Study. M&E in Ghana.

[16] Sayyed Mohsen Allameh. (2012). The Influence of Employees' Involvement in Performance Assessment System on Employees' Creativity. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences November 2012, Vol. 2, No. 11 ISSN: 2222-6990 310

[17] *Sci. Eng. Ethics*, 16(4), 783–799.

[18] Troyey, (2010).M&E in Latin America and Caribbean Countries (LAC).Volume 38, Issue 2, pages 535–552, DOI: 10.1111/1475-6773.00132

[19] Uher (2009). The Memorandum of Understanding and Performance of Central PSEs, occasional paper no.1, MOU Division, Department of Public Enterprises, Ministry of Industry, Government of India, New Delhi, 1997

[20] Williams, C., & Mitchell, W. (2004). Focusing firm evolution: The impact of information

[21] World Bank. (1998). *World development report 1994: Infrastructure for development*.

[22] Yames, (2013). A disappointing Search for Excellence. Harvard Business Review, 6(6), p78-88.

[23] Yujing (2003). Selection Incentives in a Performance-Based Contracting System, Health Services Research Volume 38, Issue 2, pages 535–552, DOI: 10.1111/1475-6773.0013.