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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to Investigate the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation results as a broad based approach involving local community in coming up with the ideal project to benefit them. This is due to an increased recognition that monitory and evaluation should be participatory. Therefore, this research project report presents a literature review of experience in participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) from around the world, used in differing context and involving all kinds of stakeholders; NGOs, Donors, Research institutions, Government, Peoples organizations, and communities. The study was guided by three objectives; To investigate how participatory monitory and evaluation results enhances project Accountability, To investigate how participatory monitory and evaluation results enhances project quality and To investigate how participatory monitory and evaluation results enhances project ownership. The scope of the study was Bobasi Sub County-Kisii County; which has two districts and eight wards. Eight county roads projects were purposively identified from each ward; funded by the Bobasi Sub County-Kisii County government. A total of 32 Road Projects whose cost exceeds one million shillings each were considered for sampling from eight wards for the period of four years since 2013. A total of 174 population was targeted which comprised of, 12 Engineers and road supervisors; 3 procurement Officers, 64 Contractors, 9 CDF Members, 14 SDC Members, 49 Chiefs and Sub Chiefs, 8 MCAs, 9 Sub county and Ward Administrators, 6 Sub County Quality Assurance Officers. The data was collected by questionnaire, and scheduled interviews. This research project used census sampling method whereby the whole target population of was sampled. A total of 174 respondents were targeted of which 157 respondents availed their data. Data was analyzed descriptively and use of SPSS and Microsoft office matching set. The findings showed that participatory monitory and evaluation results promotes and increases recognition of road projects in Bobasi Sub County. The study recommended that PM&E results should be implemented to avoid future challenges which are of concern to project performance in Bobasi Sub County-Kisii County. Assembly committee of finance should ensure that all projects are subjected to public participation such that the PM&E results are integrated in the project design process to enhance project accountability, ownership and quality as well as project performance.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study
Participatory monitory and evaluation (PM&E) is part of a wider historical process which has emerged over the last 20 years of use. PM&E draws from various participatory research traditions, including participatory action research (PAR) spearheaded by the work of Paolo Freire (1972), Fals-Borda (1985) and others. Participatory learning and action (including Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) and later Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) drawing on the work of Robert Chambers (1997) and many others; and forming systems research (FSR) or farming participatory research (FPR), developed by Amanor (1990), Farrington and Martin 1988 and others.
Since 1980s, concept of participatory monitory and evaluation has entered the policy making domain of large donor agencies and development organizations, most notably the food and agricultural organization (FAO), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Danish international development agency (DANIDA), the UK department for international development (DFID), the Swedish international development authority (SIDA), the Norwegian agency for international development (NORAD), and the world bank (Homes 1992).
Different countries have adopted aspects of this approach. For example China; insights for south-west China who used participatory monitory and evaluation (PM&E) to strengthen their development research, particularly in the area of natural resource management (NRM). The efforts analyzed here represent one of the first
example of a complete cycle of PM&E practice in China, although the concept of PM&E is not new there (Li Xiaoyun 2001).

By participatory, various types and degrees of involvement on control of decisions making in a activity or a research process helps to get the local community views and hence improving the project ownership. It can encompass a wide range of approaches, methods and tools and debates about it abound in the literature (Chambers 1997, Pound et al 2003). The rationale for using a participatory process is to increase the relevance and effectiveness of the research to stakeholders (Pretty 1995). Another reason is to empower or social transformation to the local people. Participation is a means and an end to strengthen peoples capacity to make decisions and their ability to create an environment for change. Often participation has both functional and empowering aspects, and the types and degree of participation can change during the project cycle or research process.

PM&E results has emerged to be of value because of the recognition of the limitations of conventional monitoring and evaluation (M&E) results which mainly serves the need of project implementers and donors ignoring the interest of other groups involved in decision making.

PM&E results are most valuable as they are an integral component of project ingredients and if closely woven into the whole project cycle, will enrich the project value through providing information that can be fed back into the project immediately to improve subsequent performance, Datton (1997). As such PM&E results can increase the project accountability of all the people involved when practiced skillfully, PM&E results can also be a key component of a broader process
of rural process for development and political change. It has an important role to play in decentralization and more downward oriented accountability systems and processes (Xu and Ribot 2004).

The effects of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) results have enabled the Kenyan Government to improve on service delivery through regular appraisal to revise its work plan to integrate the emerging issues from previous projects monitoring and evaluation results, however, with limited uptake (Muriungi T.M 2015). Of late, participatory Monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) results has taken on a centre stage in organizational project development. It provides an organization with a powerful tool that improves effectiveness in resource utilization during implementation of programs and execution of development activities as they were planned through continuous and periodic M & E (chikati, 2010).

In Kenya, PM & E results has demonstrated accountability by organization (Muriungi T.M 2015). According to Ewaso Ng’iro North development authority (ENNDA, 2012), there exists an M & E department designated in ensuring projects are frequently monitored in-order to promote PM&E results in improving project accountability and transparency in resource utilization and attainment of project objectives. Therefore, participatory monitoring and evaluation results has a role in the improvement of effectiveness on projects among government corporations, especially Ewaso Ng’iro North Development Authority. Nuguti (2009) observes that participatory monitoring and evaluation results in organizations is very important since it ensures that the project activities are timely, focused, objectives and evidence based at all levels.
The authority had made important strides in initiating M & E policies and strategies in project development. During the time of the study, ENNDA was serving ten counties with an estimated population of over 2.5 million people (ENNDA, 2012), thus generating over 2,000 Jobs directly and about 10,000 jobs indirectly. In as much as ENNDA had achieved much, there seemed little or no records available indicating how monitoring and evaluation results had improved its achievements. Therefore, Bobasi Sub County being a government agency; there is need for it to implement the PM&E results so that it up-scales its projects objectives and make them more effective. Since most of the projects were designed and implemented without taking into consideration the PM&E results, it is important that Bobasi Sub County make a work plan to enhance the chances of project accountability, ownership and quality as observed by Matsiliza (2012). Matsiliza notes that PM&E results promoted accountability, measured project performance and efficiency, and promoted the ability to address and identify resource gaps. The process had worked in South Africa and Rwanda where though e-government, public meetings (barazas) and panel discussions, the government was able to exchange ideas with the public (Matsiliza, 2012).

1.2 Statement of the problem

The county government structure of governance in Kenya was established through the enactment of the new constitution in 2010. The aim was to involve the local communities in decision making process to spring up economic development at the grass root levels hence result into the overall national social-economic development growth. Being a requirement for project selection and prioritization, most
development projects carried out in Bobasi Sub County lack sound participatory monitoring and evaluation process.

Wabwire (2010) observes that the implementation of the devolved government system to county level in Kenya as stipulated in the new constitution 2010, has strengthened the strategic role of county government to the benefit of the local community. In spite of the foregone there has been a lot of challenges in the implementation of the devolved structures which have negated the benefits of county Government operations. Whereas there is proper and adequate public participation in M&E process, the non-use of the M&E results in decision making has assisted the performance of county road projects.

In most cases, the element of participatory monitoring and evaluation results is not and has not been evidently used hence the need to establish a process that will enhance how participatory monitoring and evaluation results in Kisii County will improve project accountability, quality and ownership of project outcomes. The study therefore endeavored to explore the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation results for the performance of county road projects.

Since it is a constitutional requirement for any project to involve PM&E results, this research project report sort to establish the extent to which the participatory monitoring and evaluation results influences project performance. (Kenya new constitution, 2010 cap 11; section 174 ).
1.3 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of this study is to determine the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation results on the performance of County funded road projects.

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
This study was guided by the following objectives:

i. To establish the extent to which the use of participatory monitoring and evaluation results enhance project accountability;

ii. To establish the extent to which the use of participatory monitoring and evaluation results enhance project stakeholders ownership;

iii. To establish the extent to which the use of participatory monitoring and evaluation results enhance project quality outcome;

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS
The following research study questions were used to collect data from the respondents:

i. To what extent does the use of participatory M&E results enhance project development accountability in Bobasi sub county-Kisii County?

ii. To what extent does the use of participatory M&E results enhance quality of project outcome in Kisii County?

iii. To what extent does the use of participatory M&E results enhance stakeholders ownership in County projects?
1.5.1 Research hypotheses
In order to answer the research questions, the study tested for the following hypotheses

1. Ho: The application of accountability does not influence Project Participatory monitoring and evaluation results.

   \[H_1:\text{application of accountability the influence Project Participatory monitoring and evaluation results.}\]

2. Ho: application of public awareness does not influence the project participatory M&E results.

   \[H_1:\text{application of public awareness influences the project participatory M&E results.}\]

3. Ho: ownership of the project has no influence of project participatory M&E results.

   \[H_1:\text{Project ownership has influence on project participatory M&E results.}\]

1.6 Significance of the study

The output of the study will assist the formulation of a vibrant and systematic process of applying participatory M&E results in Bobasi Sub County-Kisii County road projects so that public’s interest and need will have significance impact on the socio-economic development to the community. Through this study, better understanding of the influence of PM&E results and their impact on performance of sub-county road projects will assist the office concerned to clearly make good use of
the results to improve on its objectives. In addition, it will result into cohesive ownership and reduce resistance of policy formulation in the very area of the project planning, implementation and performance. Finally, it will also contribute to scientific knowledge base in planning, implementation and sustainability at regional, national and international level.

1.7 Delimitation of the study

This study was designed to investigate the influence of use of participatory monitoring and evaluation results on the performance of county road projects in Kisii county, Kenya. Study utilized community road projects, transport network and public offices like Members of County Assembly (MCA),

1.8 Limitations of the study

There were no standards for the participatory M&E results formulation for project development across the county; consequently, the research was liberty to adopt whatever was suitable since Bobasi sub county-Kisii county is an expansive sub county and highly populated hence coverage of all the eight wards in the sub county could be difficult. In addition, the empirically documented data on the county government development record was scanty especially on PM&E results of the road project as few studies have been carried out in the area.
1.9. Assumptions of study

A number of assumptions were made, these includes: use of PM&E results enhance project accountability, co-operation improves project quality; PM&E has been carried out and results are not utilized; some factors like policy changes hinders PM&E results in project performance, road projects were implemented and still exists, the respondents filled the questionnaire with honesty and integrity which enabled collection of data.

1.10 Definitions of Significant Terms.

**Evaluation**: involve assessing the strength and weakness of project, policies and personnel products and organizations to improve their effectiveness association.

**Level of project performance**: refers to the extent to which the project satisfies the needs of the user and stakeholders with reference to the project objectives and goals.

**Monitoring**: intermittent regular or irregular series of observation in time, carried out to show the extent of compliance with a formulated standard or degree of deviation from expected norm (hellawel.1996)

**Participatory monitoring and evaluation**: A social enterprise of public discourse and interaction, engaging in various stakeholders with diverse interests in negotiating and achieving their objectives, De Raedt (1997).

**Performance**: this is the outcome of impressed growth or measure of how well or poorly the project is doing against its major objectives and goals.
Stakeholders: any person or company involved in a particular project or system especially if they have invested money in it for example, stakeholders’ economy invested by government or any organization.

Stakeholder-based evaluation: an ongoing dialogue and negotiation among stakeholders.

Strategic management: strategic management is the set of analyses decisions and actions an organization undertakes in order to create and sustain its competitive advantage.

1.1 Organization of the Study.

This research project report was divided into five chapters. Chapter one was the introduction and dealt with the background and the problem of the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research objectives, research question, research hypothesis, Significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, assumption of the study, and definitions of the significant terms. Chapter two dealt with literature review and it was organized in terms of concept of participatory monitoring and evaluation results, theoretical framework and conceptual framework. Chapter three described the study methodology along research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques, research instruments, validity and reliability of research instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis techniques, and operational definition of variables. Chapter four dealt with the data analysis and interpretation and it was divided into the sections corresponding to the objectives of the study. Chapter five was on
conclusions and recommendations of the study. There was also a section of references and appendices of the study.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter presents information on discussing the literature review of the objective of the study and the conceptual framework applied to the study. It will contain information from what other researchers and scholars have already done in order to be able to facilitate the study.

2.2 The Concept of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

Mulwa and Nguluu (2003) assert that PM&E results is considered as an integral component that shifts from conventional M&E results in project management in the world today. The trend is attributed to the growing need to remain accountable and transparent in order to meet desired objectives. The author is however in the concurrent with Mulwa (2008) who assert that the shift from the traditional M&E result of checking financial spending is inherent as there is a need to also focus on output and outcome of the development projects based on the participatory monitoring and evaluation results.

Countries like Canada, United Kingdom and United States are major donors that support the developing countries and have made it a mandatory requirement for new projects to assess the PM&E results of similar projects done earlier. In the United States there exists an American Evaluation Association (AEA) which is tasked with monitoring and evaluation exercise and how best the results are integrated to enhance project efficiency. The World Bank (2009) argues that the need for good governance, sustainability and rapid development in Africa, most project
implementing agencies must recognize need of participatory monitoring and evaluation results as a mean that led to the formation of the first African Monitoring and evaluation association in 1998 -Africa Evaluation Association, AfrEA (Naidoo, 2010).

According to the World Bank, “ putting up an effective M&E system is of enormous value for it makes processes more transparent a well as providing clear regulatory frameworks to achieving results” (World Bank, 2012).

These associations just as the professional engineering bodies in the construction industry the evaluation bodies bring together evaluation professionals to share ideas and knowledge. The bodies improves capacity building, promotes ethics in the profession and sharing of new insights in the discipline. They as well ensure that the five principles of evaluation are adhered to by professionals. The principles include; systematic inquiry, competency, integrity/honesty, respect for people and responsibility for general and public welfare. PM&E result ensures correct, systematic and relevant data is collected for planning and decision making (Burke, 2004).

South Africa being one of the African countries that are practicing PM&E in government and local NGO’s has borrowed best practices from developed countries like Canada, United Kingdom and United States among others. This was done by creating the department of monitoring and evaluation with the full support of the government. This has improved service delivery to the people with various check points in loop holes that includes impromptu visits on the government ministries at service delivery points e.g. health facilities and police station, training of staff on
M&E as well as the creation of an hotline by the president for public to allow citizens to log their complaints and queries regarding service delivery Naidoo (2010). During the monitoring visits, the teams interview users and staff as well ask for their view on system performance and to which extent its results improve workplan (World Bank, 2012).

In Kenya, there is an Evaluation Society of Kenya (ESK), which was founded in 2010, the society aims at bringing the evaluators together, formation of a vibrant evaluation team and international academic Journals to assist in doing follow –ups on government funded projects through networking to help in strengthening of monitoring and evaluation skills through capacity building initiatives. There exists Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (MED) which is part of the Ministry of Devolution and planning in Kenya. It is a major policy instrument conceptualized in 2003 to monitor progress of the Economics Recovery Strategy (ERS) (GOK, 2009).

The Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (MED) is charged with the responsibility of operationalizing the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation system (NIMES). According to GOK (2011), NIMES is an instrument of governance under the Results Based Management System designed to show transparency in the execution of government, civil society, private sector and donor programs and projects. It is a central tracking, reporting and evaluating system for all developments, inputs, outputs and outcomes as well as resource utilization.

Borrowing a leaf from South African Government, the Kenyan government has also started ministry contacting method where each ministry outlines what they would want to do, indicators and expected outcomes. The Kenyan government has also
developed long term national development plan, Vision 2030 blueprint which was approved 2006 by the third president of Kenya H.E. Mwai Kibaki (GoK, 2008).

According to Mulwa (2008), the use of conventional monitoring and evaluation results has been on the rise as institutions and organizations set their own indicators and standards on what will be said to meet the required standards. The author goes to explain the importance of shifting from the Conventional Monitoring and evaluation method to participatory. Monitoring and evaluation method which improves inclusivity. In his argument, PM&E is not a method of soliciting information from the stakeholders but part and parcel of the project. In this, the stakeholders are able to share experiences and come up with the way forward on the progress of their project. On the other hand, PM&E results offers new ways of learning hence promoting project ownership and more so the aspect of the project sustainability. According to Naidoo, (2010), PM&E results empowers the marginalized, promotes project ownership, improves chances of project sustainability and above all open the doors wide for transparency and accountability in Government corporation.

According to McCarthy (2004), “for participatory development to succeed, people must be free to make autonomous choices so that they can improve their control over resources, determine their own agenda and make their own decisions.” This would be a good model for Bobasi sub county -Kisii Count. If such models are followed, then the question of ownership will be fully embraced.

In the context of this study, World Bank (2011) asserts that PM&E results creates a good environment for interaction between stakeholders and bring on board resources available and formulates policies on how its results will be used to improve project
life span as well monitor and evaluate impact brought by the PM&E results. In this case, all stakeholders are able to improve on mitigation factors by engaging in development matters with the government participatory resource audit in the identification of gaps and suggesting the way forward.

In the same breadth Chitere (1994) argues that, “people’s participation in development is warranted has people tend to resist development ideas imposed on them by outsiders”. On the other hand, Macamo (2005) argues that people participation enables mobilization of the resources for development purposes, capacity building and appreciating them as part of change. According to the author, participatory monitoring and evaluation results promotes cohesion and inclusion of all ideas of the community as the drivers of change and prudent development.

### 2.2.1 Project Accountability and Performance of County Funded Road Projects

According to Naidoo (2010), participatory monitoring in South Africa focuses on empowering the beneficiaries, bringing on board the popular, enhancing transparency and accountability. The author argues that participatory Monitoring and Evaluation results is very vital and important in promoting development and democracy.

Rimberia (2012) on the other hand opines that, people’s participation through community involvement is one of the strategies organizations can adopt to enable the community to contribute resources and also monitor how the resources are being utilized, hence promoting transparency and equity. Rimberia (2012) and Rubin (1992) argue that community participation increases communities’ understanding of projects hence improved ownership and project sustainability.
According to Mulwa (2008), monitoring and evaluation results is a system that should be spelt out by the leader with the participation of the stakeholders’ in-order to enhance transparency and accountability. Macamo (2005) asserts that politics has been used in many instances to undermine or to manipulate reports so as to give credibility to poor projects or to solicit for more funds for the continuity of a project. Therefore, the leaders having an upper hand in accessing resources should the help in mobilizing the community and create awareness on the importance of community beneficiaries’ involvement in project monitoring and evaluation (Valadez & Bamberger, 2000). In South Africa for example, the M&E results and particularly participatory monitoring and evaluation results was curtailed by politics until 2010 when the directorate saw the light of the day.

The constitutionally enshrined principles of openness and transparency should enable the government to effectively perform its mandate by interacting with the citizens. Formations of commissions and various oversight authorities enable the citizens to put the government into check on matters of economy, job creation and policy formulation Naidoo, (2010, p.131).

The Naidoo continues to argue that, “The public service needs to execute its policy through an administration that supports the transformation of society along political, socio, economic, spatial and racial lines.” Thus it is clear that PM&E results remains a very important component in the government’s development that assures equity and efficiency in policy implementation (Riley, 2002).
2.2.2 Project quality and Performance of County Funded Road Projects

As indicated in IFAD’S guide for project Monitoring and Evaluation, capacity is the, ability of individuals and organizations to perform functions effectively, efficiently and in a sustainable manner “The failure to have enough skilled and knowledgeable M&E officers in organizations has led to poor development of the systems that mainly capture and develop too many indicators, focus on operations rather than the strategy to use to get better outcomes. In critiquing the development approach World Bank (2012) identifies PM&E results as a major tool to promote project quality and performance.

According to AMREF (2010), there is much attention on Monitoring; procurement processes, disbursement of resources and financial use but little attention on capacity development. Karuoro (2010) presumes that good development depends on much more than good financial management. It is therefore apparent that, there is a need to improve the quality of the people too.

Hill and Jones [2008] illustrate a strategy as a set of related actions that manages take to increase their organizational performance. In this regard, the key intention of a strategy is to improve performance. Monitoring and evaluation results aim at improving efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery. The world bank [2009] asserts that PM&E results adds value to the effectiveness of process and regulatory frameworks particularly with regard to achieving results in order to a achieve a desired outcome of an organization.
According to world bank [2012], PM&E results will help reduce redundancy in reporting, reinventing the wheel, improved political support and stimulation of discussions on lessons as they emerge.

2.2.3 Stakeholders Ownership of Project Outcomes and Performance of County Funded Road Projects

Chambers (1983) on the other hand argues that PM&E results offers new ways of learning hence promoting project ownership and more so the aspect of the project sustainability. According to Naidoo, (2010), PM&E results empowers the marginalized, promotes project ownership, improves chances of project sustainability and above all open the doors wide for transparency and accountability in Government corporation i.e Bobasi sub-county -Kisii county.

The Participatory and Monitoring Evaluation results has been very effective in many social-economic development projects in Africa and the world at large. Bayer and Bayer (2002) in their study in West Africa and Kenya reveal the importance of PM&E results in enhancing sustainability and project impact to beneficiaries. According to the authors, a project run by GTZ in Marsabit- Marsabit Development Project (MDP), the need for PM&E results was highly emphasized so as to promote capacity building and accountability. In many instances as reported by Bayer and Bayer (2002), lack of community of PM&E results in major projects hinders project performance and quality as key issues which affects project efficiency are not looked into.

According to Chikati (2010), participatory monitoring encourages continuous monitoring of projects by the community members with aim of collecting analyzing and communicating information in-order to put measures in area of interest.
Participatory monitoring and evaluation results aim at drawing lessons that can be used in future projects to make them relatively more efficient. As reported by Bayer and Bayer (2002) a lesson can be learnt from Marsabit development project where local community was involved in developing and implementing sustainable resource plan. The key strategy here is to evoke the beneficiaries to participate in development projects by appreciating their skills and sharing of knowledge hence enabling them to give information on how they would want things done (Mulwa, 2009).

In this case, the principles of PM&E cautions that development should be inclusive and not where the Outsiders develop M&E tools; initialize indicators and standards without involving the local beneficiaries (Julie, 2004).

On the other hand, Mulwa (2008) points out that illiteracy is a key hindrance to participatory Monitoring and Evaluation hence calling for capacity building to validate its results. The aspects of PM&E results is said to empower people in such areas hence promoting sharing and learning among stakeholders thus ensuring indigenous knowledge is brought on board (McCarthy, 2004). Moseley (2003) points out that increased human resource is a result of involving people as partners in decision making hence enabling the beneficiaries to move on their own in future projects. It is apparent that participation improves capacity building thus promoting sustainable development.
2.3 Theoretical Framework

According to Kombo and Tromp (2006) research must be guided and grilled on existing theory. For this research to be effective various theories were explored. These theories included; Project management body of knowledge (PMBOK) theory, development model and participatory development model.

2.3.1 Project management body of knowledge (PMBOK) Theory

Project management body of knowledge is an inclusive term that, “describes the sum of the knowledge within the project management profession” (Duncan, 1996) some of the knowledge areas listed by Duncan include; project integration, project scope management, project time management, project cost management and project quality management. Bobasi sub county ascribes to project management practices similar to those in PMBOK as they are useful and of value to their projects. The model is characterized by five project management characteristics that are key to every project i.e: initializing, planning executing, monitoring and closing (Kerzner, 2009). All the above phases are crucial in project effectiveness.

According to kerzner, the project life-cycle is important as it provides a methodology for uniformity in project planning. Project life-cycle enables the project manager, sponsors, senior management and the client exercise control of the project activities before moving to the next phase. At every stage, participatory monitoring and evaluation is eminent and its results are plugged into the project design to make it more cost-effective as well as creates an opportunity to critique the current phase and document lessons learnt for the next phase. Kerzner further asserts that a life-cycle is
also critical in ensuring resources for the next phases are availed on time. Stakeholders’ involvement in project development should be done as early as project conceptualization (Mulwa, 2008). Bobasi sub county being one of the well managed government agency, there is need for it to use the project management body of knowledge theory in road projects to improve its performance.

### 2.3.2 Development Model

According to Abugah (2011), the development model is characterized by top-down development approach where all decisions are made by the government and implemented by it without involving the local people. The approach was a backlash to the government as projects stalled or some failed to be utilized by the locals after their completion. However the model is highly taunted on saving time hence minimizing project cost and reduced project completion period (World Bank, 2010). The critics of the development model term it as hostile and undemocratic style used by dictators. According to world bank, the model should not be part of 21st century agenda as it violates human rights off participation in development agenda. Abugah (2011) posts that the model experience serious challenges that include: poor outcomes and lack of project sustainable strategies hence frequent breakdown. He further allude that the model ignores the plight of using the PM&E results as they are dynamic and needs urgent response to correct the mistakes hence consultations may derail the project hence time wasting.
2.3.3 Participatory development model

The participatory development model aims at bringing on board and involving all stakeholders in development initiatives. It is a bottom-up approach that involves extensive stakeholder dialogues, capacity building and decision making. Since its emergence in 1970’s the approach has been used by various development partners to bring on board the primary beneficiaries in development projects World Bank (2010). There are various principles that guide the participatory model and they include: participation, negotiation, learning and flexibility. The author further adds that participation of the poor and marginalized people in development initiatives intended to benefit them is important for development and assist plug the PM&E results into the project progress.

In addition, the author observes that popular participation is a strategy which can be adopted to improve project ownership and sustainable development. According to Malcolm (2003), stakeholders include: local people, project managers, project staff and other people with interest in the project. The author argues that all people with interest should be involved in project development and given a platform to make decisions on project resources utilization and accountability.

The model has been highly effective due to the art of community inclusivity in the development agenda as active partners and not passive partners hence promoting capacity building; i.e Participatory Rural Approval (PRA), Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and Participatory Action Research (PAR). PRA methods seek to observe and document phenomenon being observed as they occur. Tools such as maps and diagrams are used with the support of a trained facilitator. On the other hand PAR
acknowledges people through involving them in carrying out research in order to make informed decisions (Brock & Pettit, 2007).

The participatory model, though highly effective, it is seen as slow and time consuming since all people must be brought on board before any development initiative is undertaken. According to Kerzner (2009), time is a critical component of any project as it determines among other things; project cost and project completion period. The model is also said to be too expensive as people must be engaged in all processes. Due to this factor some of the people may withdrawal from the process feeling their inputs are not relevant or biasness in engagement in stakeholders.
2.6 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework consists of theories relevant to the phenomena being studied which can inform or influence the research (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2002).

The conceptual framework for this research study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Project Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of functioning projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tendering procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project efficiency &amp; effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Project Stakeholders Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local people involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Annual routine maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of road users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Quality of Project Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lifespan of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognition and Stability of the companies involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quality of material used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderating Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of county funded roads projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Policy changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1: Conceptual framework
Independent variables are represented by the PM&E results objectives that are Accountability, Quality and Stakeholder Ownership. The dependent variable is performance of county funded road projects. Moderating variable; policy changes has an impact on project objectives i.e. conditional grants Interferes with the project execution procedures hence ignoring the participatory M&E results of the project as anticipated in the program.

2.7 Knowledge Gap

Compared to conventional M&E results, There is a great difference between M&E results initiated projects and PM&E results one in Bobasi sub County. Project which is thoroughly subjected to PM&E results enhances strong stakeholders’ involvement as well as improves project accountability. Stakeholders’ engagement enhances project quality and improve local community ownership of the project. (Guijt & Gaventa, 1998) hints, “PM&E results involves stakeholders including local people in deciding how progress should be measured, in defining critical phases for success and in determining how results should be acted upon”.

Participatory M&E results strives to be an internal learning process that enables people to be reflect on the past experience, examine present realities, revisit objectives and defines future strategies by recognizing differential stakeholders’ priorities and negotiating their diverse claims and interests (Estrella et al., 2000). In this processes, the local people are involved in developing indicators to measure change, in collecting and analyzing the data, and making decision as to how to adjust the activities.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the methodological procedure for the project research. The research process includes: research design, target population, sampling. Research instruments, methods of data collection, methods of data analysis and ethical issues.

3.2 Research design
The study employed a descriptive survey design. The descriptive survey design was used because according to Best et al (2003) this design enables one to capture all pertinent aspects of a situation while employing a unit study and investigation.

3.3 Target population
The study was conducted in Bobasi sub County and the following was the target population:
Table 3.1 Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET POPULATION</th>
<th>TARGET POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineers/ Road supervisors</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Officers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF Committee Members</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC Members (Sameta and Nyamache District)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs and Sub Chiefs</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub County and Ward Administrators</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub County quality assurance officers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sub county planning office (Nyamache and Sameta); 2017
3.4 Sample size and Sampling Techniques

The study used Census sampling whereby all the target population was taken for the study comprised of the following: the Contractors, technical /Engineers, procurement staffs, Chiefs/ sub chiefs, members of CDF, Sub county and ward administrators, Sub-County Development Committee members, Members of County Assembly and Sub county Quality Assurance Officers

3.5 Research Instruments

This research study used the following research instruments to collect data:

3.5.1 Questionnaires

The study employed the use of questionnaires as the main tool of data collection. A questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of a series of questions and other prompts for the purpose of gathering information from respondents (Newman, 2006). The questionnaire is the most appropriate research tool as it allows the researcher to collect information from a large population (respondents), the findings remains confidential, saves time and limits chances of biasness. The data gathered using the questionnaires was coded for easy analysis.

3.6 Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments

The study employed the following to test its instruments:

3.6.1 Instrument validity.

Validity refers to whether the questionnaire or survey measures what it intends to measure. As nearly as possible, the data gathering should match the
decisions you need to make. This means if you need to make a priority-focused decision. In ensuring questionnaires validity, the researcher gave a copy to the supervisor who determined whether it suits the study or not. The questionnaires would help to collect the needed information for they were valid, (Hopkins 2000). The following measures were taken to ensure validity: survey questions were taken to ensure validity and questionnaires were pre-tested on a pilot survey and amendments made to make them more clear to respondents.

3.6.2 Instrument Reliability

In various areas of study, the accurate dimension of hypothesized variables posed a test by itself. Therefore, reliability and item analysis was used to construct reliable measurement scales, to improve existing scales, and to assess the reliability of scales already in use. Specifically, reliability aids in the design and evaluation of sum scales, that is, scales that are made up of multiple individual measurements. The measurement of scale reliability was based on the correlations between the individual items and measurement scale relative to the variances of the items, (Kombo, 2006).

The questionnaire was tested for reliability by using Cronbach coefficient; alpha to determine the internal consistency of the items. This is a method of estimating reliability of test scores by the use of a single administration of a test. Consequently, it provides good measures of reliability because holding other factors constant, the more similar the reliability (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999).
3.6 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection procedures refer to the series of events followed during the data collection process. In this research study, the researcher first acquired the transmittal letter from the University of Nairobi and booked an appointment with respondents before making a formal visit on the respective day of the appointment. The researcher made a request to be allowed to conduct the study in the selected Department located in Bobasi Sub County- Kisii County. Upon visiting, on the day of the study, the researcher picked the sample of respondents and issued them with the questionnaires for them to fill after which the questionnaires were collected back after four days. Where the respondents had difficulties in responding to the questionnaires, the researcher guided them on what was expected before collecting the questionnaires.

3.7 Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis is the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the information collected (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Data was edited and the mean, variance, and standard deviation computed. Descriptive statistics techniques were employed whereby the results of the study were presented in frequency tables and percentages. Numerical values was assigned to responses in the questionnaires to represent measurement of variables, the data was then analyzed and presented in form of tables, frequencies and percentages. The raw data was analysed using statistical package for social sciences (S.P.S.S) and MS-Excel. The researcher used descriptive statistics to analyze the data into meaningful information that was used to make conclusions and
recommendations. The descriptive statistics uses measures of central tendency such as mean, median, and mode to describe a group of subjects. The researcher used graphic presentation such as tables and frequency tables to present the data.

**3.8 Operational Definition of Variables**

To achieve the objective of the study, the researcher investigated the factors influencing Participatory monitoring and evaluation results on the performance of county funded road projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>DATA ANALYSIS</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To establish the extent to which the use of participatory monitoring and evaluation results enhances the project accountability</td>
<td>Performance of county funded road projects</td>
<td>Tendering procedures; Number of functioning road projects; Project efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>Descriptive analysis correlation</td>
<td>Ordinal Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish the extent to which the use of participatory monitoring and evaluation results enhances the project stakeholders ownership</td>
<td>Performance of county funded road projects</td>
<td>Local people involvement; Annual routine maintenance; Number of road users</td>
<td>Descriptive Analysis Correlation</td>
<td>Ordinal Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish the extent to which the use of participatory monitoring and evaluation results enhances quality of project outcome</td>
<td>Performance of county funded road projects</td>
<td>Lifespan of the project; Recognition and stability of the company involved; Quality of materials used</td>
<td>Descriptive analysis correlation</td>
<td>Ordinal Ratio Proportion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION, INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the results and discussions of the analysis of the study. It is divided into two major sections. It covers the following topics:

The demographic characteristics of the respondents, work experience, marital status of the respondents, educational and training levels. The second section of the chapter provides results and discussing when were based on the three major research questions of the study. For the purposes of their preliminary analysis, descriptive statistics was frequently used to describe the general characteristics of the data collection.

4.2 Response Rate

The researcher issued 174 questionnaires targeting all respondents out of which only 157 questionnaires were filled meaning that the study had a 90% response rate.

Table 4.1 Response Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dispatched</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 4.1, Response return rate was 157 (95%).
According to Nachimias and Nachimias (1958), 80% to 90% return rate is good enough for a research study.

4.3 Background information of the respondents

The researcher assessed the background information of the respondents in an effort to ensure that questionnaires was effectively done under the following themes.

4.3.1 Marital status of the respondents

The researcher sought to establish the marital status of the respondents since the findings would assist categorize the respondents based on marital status, the findings are as presented in table 4.2

**Table 4.2 Respondents Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 indicates that a majority of the respondents (55%) were married, (28%) were Unmarried, (14%) were Widowed and (3%) Divorced. This was interpreted to mean that most respondents involved in the study in Bobasi sub county- Kisii County were either married or unmarried holding 83% of the total respondents.
4.3.2 Respondents work experience

The researcher sought to establish the respondents’ work experience since the findings would assist categorize the respondents based on years of experience. The findings are as presented in table 4.3

**Table 4.3 Respondent’s Work Experience.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 20-30 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10-20 years</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.3 majority of the respondents (54%) had work experience of between 10 and 20 years, 28% had work experience of less than 10 years, 11% had work experience of between 20 and 30 years and 7% had work experience more than 30 years. This was interpreted to mean that a majority of respondents in Bobasi sub county-Kisii County had enough work experience.
4.3.3 Respondents level of education and training

The researcher sought to establish the respondent’s level of education and training.

Table 4.4 Respondents Level of Education and Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSE O’level</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCPE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 shows that a majority of the respondents (32%) were Diploma holders, (28%) were KCSE O’level, (17%) were KCPE, (15%) were Bachelor Degree, (7%) were Master Degree and (01%) were Doctorate Degree. This was interpreted to mean that most respondents for PM & E in Bobasi sub county - Kisii County; they had basic knowledge to participate in the study.

4.4 Project accountability and performance of county funded road projects

The study sought to determine the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation results in project accountability in Bobasi sub county - Kisii County. The respondents were asked to rank the various statements as per their level of agreement to the listed statements.
Table 4.5 Project Accountability and Performance of County Funded Road Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>S.A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory monitoring and evaluation results Improves project accountability</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of PM&amp;E results leads to project inefficiency</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project overrun is as a result of lack of guidelines on how to use PM&amp;E results in new projects.</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.5 it can be deduced that majority of the respondents (95%) were of the opinion that PM&E results improves project accountability, (95%) said that without PM&E results, project may not be efficient as expected. This was interpreted to mean that most successful project in Bobasi Sub county-Kisii County embraced the principle of project participatory monitoring and evaluation results to improve its accountability. This confirmed with Mulwa 2008, participatory monitoring and evaluation results is a system that should be spelt out by the leader with the participation of the stakeholders in order to enhance transparency and accountability.

4.4.1 Hypothesis Testing

Respondents participated in filling the questionnaires and a scheduled interview whereby they gave their views and rating of project accountability and performance
of county funded road projects. The findings from respondents were used to test hypothesis on how PM & E results influences project accountability as follows:

\( H_0 \): The application of PM & E results had no influence on the level of project accountability.

\( H_1 \). The application of PM & E results had an influence on the level of project accountability.

Chi-square test was used to test correlation. Using the chi-square test of the statistics availed results in table 4.5.

**Table 4.6 - Project Accountability and Performance of County Funded Road Project.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed (N)</th>
<th>Expected (N)</th>
<th>Residual (d)</th>
<th>( d^2 )</th>
<th>( d^2/50 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>46.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>38.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>157</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>134.83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( F=n-1-1=5-1=4 \)

Where \( F \) is degree of freedom

At 5% level 9.488

Calculated value =134.82

\[ X^2 = \sum (O_i - E_i)^2 \] = \sum \frac{d^2}{N} = \frac{2304}{50} + \frac{1936}{50} + \frac{1}{50} + \frac{2500}{50} = 134.83

The standard table of \( X^2 \) gives a value of 9.488 at 5% level with 4 degrees of freedom. Yet the calculated value is 134.83 which is much higher than the table value. The results shows the correlation is significance hence the
alternative hypothesis is accepted. This implies that he PM & E had a positive influence on project accountability

4.5 Project quality and Performance of County Funded Road Projects

The study also sought to establish how PM&E results influences the project quality in Bobasi Sub county; Kisii County.

Table 4.7 project quality and Performance of County Funded Road Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>S.A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E results influences project quality</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-performing project is a result of minimal integration of PM&amp;E results</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalled projects are as a result of non-involving stakeholders ideas pm&amp;e</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.6, the findings showed that majority of the respondent (95%) believed that the participatory monitoring and evaluation results influences the project quality. This finding is in agreement with World Bank (2012), which identifies PM&E results as a major tool to promote project quality and performance. Also World Bank (2009), asserts that M and E results add value to effectiveness of process and regulatory frameworks, particularly with regards to achieving results in order to adhere to desired outcomes.
4.5.1 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Key informants participated in a scheduled interview whereby they gave their views and rating of influence of PM&E results on project quality to enhance project performance. The findings from key informants were used to test hypothesis on how PM&E results influences project quality as follows:

**H₀**: The application of PM&E had no influence on the level of the project quality

**H₁**: the application of PM&E had an effect on the level of project quality

Chi-square test was also use to test correlation.

Using the chi-square test of the statistics availed the results in table 4.7.
Table 4.8- Project Quality and Performance of the County Road Projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed(N)</th>
<th>Expected(N)</th>
<th>residual(d)</th>
<th>d²</th>
<th>d²/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>34.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>30.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>42.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = n-1=5.1=4; where F is degree of freedom.

At 5% level=9.488

Calculated value=116.92

\[ X^2 = \sum (o_i-E_i)^2 / E_i = \sum d^2 / N = 1369/40 + 1225/40 + 441/40 + 1681/40 = 116.92 \]

The standard table of \( x^2 \) gives a value of 9.488 at 5% level with 4 degrees of freedom. Yet the calculated value is 116.92 which is much higher than the table value. The results shows that correlation is significance hence the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This reflects that the PM&E results influence the project quality.
4.6 Stakeholders ownership of project outcome and Performance of County Funded Road Projects

The study also sought to determine how participatory monitoring and evaluation results influences stakeholders ownership of the project outcome in Bobasi sub county-Kisii County. The table 4.7 below show study findings

**Table 4.9 Stakeholders ownership of project outcome and Performance of the county funded road projects.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>S.A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E results influences stakeholders ownership of project outcome</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E results makes stakeholders prioritize their needs</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians ignores PM&amp;E results highlighted from previous projects</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study results as illustrated on table 4.7, it can be deduced that majority of the respondents (81%) held that participatory monitoring and evaluation results influence stakeholders ownership of project outcome in Bobasi sub county-Kisii County. This is in agreement with Singh (2009) that planning cannot be left only to the government but the function that is decentralized to down to the people.
The study also revealed that quality work is done which further helps in attainment of objectives. According to Abugah (2011), PM&E results encourages the use of bottom-up development approach in which the people prioritize development agendas. World Bank (2009), participatory monitoring and evaluation results promotes transparency and accountability by ensure finances and other resources are utilized as planned.

Further, it was revealed that the needs identification forums held at the outset of the project greatly contribute to the success of the project. These findings agree with the study by the World Bank (2011) that PM&E results creates a good environment for interaction between stakeholders and bring on board resources available, use and monitor and evaluate impact brought by the resources. The study additionally established that efficient and effective utilization of resources and also project ownership contribute to success in road development projects in Bobasi sub county-Kisii County.

4.6.1 Hypothesis Testing

Key informants participated in a scheduled interview whereby they gave their views and rating of influence of PM&E results on stakeholder ownership of project outcome to enhance project performance. The findings from key informants were used to test hypothesis on how PM&E results influences project quality as follows:

\[ H_0: \text{The application of PM&E results had no influence on the level of the stakeholders ownership of project outcome.} \]

\[ H_1: \text{the application of PM&E results had an effect on the level of stakeholders ownership of project outcome.} \]
Chi-square test was also used to test correlation.

Using the chi-square test of the statistics availed the results in table 4.9.

**Table 4.10- Project quality and performance of the county road projects.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed(N)</th>
<th>Expected(N)</th>
<th>residual(d)</th>
<th>d²</th>
<th>d²/40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>32.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td>35.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = n-1=4-1=3; \text{where } F \text{ is degree of freedom.} \]

At 5% level=9.488

Calculated value=116.92

\[ X^2 = \sum (O^i-E^i)/E^i = \sum d^2/N = 1936/60 + 2116/60 + 256/60 + 529/60 = 80.63 \]

The standard table of \(x^2\) gives a value of 9.488 at 5% level with 4 degrees of freedom. Yet the calculated value is 80.63 which is much higher than the table value.

The results show that correlation is significance hence the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Implifying reject Ho and accept Ha that reflects that the PM&E results influence the stakeholders ownership of project outcomes.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of major findings as deduced by the study, it also presents conclusions, recommendations and areas of further research.

5.2 Summary of the study

The study sought to investigate how participatory monitoring and evaluation results influence development projects i.e. And the following were the study findings.

Concerning project accountability, the finding indicated that majority of respondents (95%) were of the opinion that involvement of stakeholders results from PM&E increases project accountability as well as creates wide felt awareness of the project (95%) said that most projects are not efficient due to lack of PM&E results, (78%) were of the opinion that most project are over budgeted due to lack of PM&E results and enormous corruptions from county officials and MCAs.

On project quality and PM&E results the findings revealed that projects that are subjected to PM&E are more effective and durable hence value for money since the previous gaps are fixed in advance, (95%) believed that PM&E results greatly improves quality of the projects since the projects are evaluated at every stage and any emerging issues as handled that are not performing are as a result of lack ok PM&E results integration plan, (95%) were of the opinions that lack of public involvement gives room of use of interior goods hence making the project not to
survive up to its design period or fail to meet intended purpose since it ignores important stage of PM&E results integration.

On stakeholders ownership of project outcome and participatory monitoring and evaluation results, (81%) held that PM&E results is a key driver to the project ownership by the users/local community (81%) were of the opinion that failure to integrate the local community in the project execution make them to isolate themselves from the project hence lack of the local support which at long run limited project sustainability, (78%) said that political interference influences the project execution and location hence no prioritization of the needs.

5.3 Discussions of the findings

This section discusses the findings of the study. The purpose of the study was to investigate how participatory monitoring and evaluation results influences the county projects in Bobasi sub County. The following were the study findings concerning project accountability, and it can be deduced that majority of the respondents (95%) were of the opinion that PM&E results improves projects accountability and makes the implementing authority/department to be accountable if only the results from the previous study is used at screening stage. This will assist avoid project failure since local community are actively involved right from initiation and interwoven continuously in monitoring process. 86% said that without project monitoring and evaluation results, projects poses dangers as they are exposed to the former omissions and hence leading to the resources wastage. This was interpreted to mean that much of the project in Bobasi sub county are not accountable since they did not use PM&E results work plans from previous projects and reports were not available
at sub county strategic planning department for reference. PM&E goals were therefore an obstacle to the project development in Bobasi sub county projects. These findings confirm with World Bank (2009), participatory monitoring and evaluation results promotes transparency and accountability by ensuring resources are better utilized as planned. Through direct participation in the monitoring and evaluation process, the PM&E process allowed the different stakeholders involved in the projects to better understand each other’s views and values and to design ways to resolve competing or conflicting views and values and to design ways to resolve competing or conflicting views and interests. The community’s perspectives and contributions in terms of priorities in providing more qualitative measures will assist in making the road projects more efficient than the use for monitoring as a field tour. Estrella and Gaventa (1998) and Guijt and Gaventa (1998) write that the issues that affects the interests in PM&E results include the feud in management circles towards performance based accountability which results into growing concerns to shift towards decentralization and devolution of central government responsibilities and authority to lower the level of government, necessitating new forms of oversight to ensure transparency and accountability. PM&E results improve support to sub county level by responsibly initiating a more stronger capacities and experience on how to make informed decisions and all-inclusive development process. On project quality and participatory monitoring and evaluation results, the findings shared the majority of the respondents where 95% believed that PM&E results improves projects quality. The finding are in the agreement with earlier study finding by world bank (2012), identities PM&E results as a major tool to promote project
quality and performance i.e through addition of value to effectiveness of the process and regulatory frameworks particularly with regards to achieving results for the desired outcome. The study also established that PM&E results has enabled the management to monitor the progress of the project by assessing actual change against stated objectives to a great extent. It was clear that there were no open forms/meetings held at Bobasi sub county hence ignoring involvement of stakeholders opinions. These findings counters with Singh (2004) who opined that participation ensures the stakeholders are listened to.

The study also find that public accountability has helped in exploring the influence to which the outcome of a project improves the project performance. According to World Bank (2009), participatory monitoring and evaluation results promotes transparency and accountability by ensuring finances and other resources are utilized as planned hence improving project quality and enhances project objectives. The study additionally established that efficient and effective utilization of resources and also project ownership contribute to success in development work at Bobasi sub county.

Concerning the stakeholders ownership of project outcome, it can be deduced that majority of the respondents (81%) held that PM&E results influences the stakeholders ownership of project outcome. This is in the line with the Narayan (2010) who affirms the thought of Wasike (2010) by stating that development is not a one man show hence the need to promote inclusivity in development projects so as to enhance people’s social economic aspects. The study further revealed that the insufficient skills hindered the PM&E among stakeholders. These findings agree
with the study by the World Bank (2011) that PM&E creates a good environment for interaction between stakeholders and bring on board resources available, use and monitor and evaluate impact brought by the resources.

The PIM concept developed by German et al. (1996) and by probst (2002) which focused on the use of PM &E results as an instrument to support systematic reflection, learning, the generation of knowledge and process-oriented management at the community level assisted in the use of the results from previous projects, Bobasi being not exceptional community driven PM&E, members should identify their own projects and get involved in initiating activities to achieve these goals. The purpose of the community driven PM & E results is to empower the local community to initiate control and take corrective action and basically empower themselves to improve their social well-being by providing participatory approaches, that gives the rural people a voice in their community by helping them manage their own affairs and take more control of the projects and their aspirations. It enables the community to look systematic at what they want to achieve by deciding their own goals, what they have done, their achievements, what they still need to do i.e. what action has to be taken and what changes they have seen (McAllister, 1999).

5.4. Conclusion.

The purpose of the study is to investigate the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation results on road projects in Bobasi sub county- Kisii County. Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.
Concerning the project accountability and PM & E results, it can be deduced that majority of the respondents were of the opinion that development projects were greatly influenced by the level of PM & E results. This was interpreted to mean that most county road projects in Bobasi sub county- Kisii county; were held up due to low level of involving participatory monitoring and evaluation results and this posed a big challenge to their performance at the long run. On project quality and PM & E results, the findings showed that majority of the respondents believed that due to lack of PM&E results most project were of poor quality and less durable hence they may not meet its design period. This finding affirms with the earlier study findings by World Bank (2012) which identified PM&E results as a major tool to promote project quality and performance thereafter improving project life-span.

Concerning the stakeholders ownership of project outcomes and participatory monitoring and evaluation results, it was deduced that majority of the respondents held that project success in Bobasi sub county-Kisii county; depends on the extent to which stakeholders involvement is done. The finding is in agreement with the earlier findings by Naidoo (2010) PM&E results empowers the marginalized groups, promotes project ownership, improves chances of project sustainability and opens the doors wide for transparency and accountability in government initiated projects. Therefore, this research project report suggest that it is prudent for Bobasi sub county to stress on involvement of PM&E results to its road projects to make them durable.
5.5 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and conclusions above this sector presents the recommendations of the study.

1. There ought to be mandatory requirement for the county project proposed to be subjected to though PM&E results. This is to limit imposed project in a region which do not promote socio-economic growth to the local community. The legislation should be passed to force the county governments to thoroughly carry out PM&E and certificate issue by approved body of PM&E expertise.

2. There should be an introduction of civic education to the locals to understand the importance of PM&E results hence enabling them to raise alarm whenever a project is initiated which they do not know and prioritize in their region since the resources to engaged is from their taxes.

3. There ought to be an independent PM&E body at county levels to steer the vetting of the project. This will limit the politicians from forcing certain projects which are not of economic value in some region due clanism. Also, these body will develop curriculum to be introduced in learning institutions to promote the spirit of PM&E results from earlier stages hence becoming the norm for development projects.

4. The sub county government of Bobasi management should ensure that all the relevant stakeholders participate in the monitoring and evaluation activities. These will increase the level of effectiveness of their projects. This is because PM&E results will enable the institution and the development partners have
platform to learn more from the previous projects and also help avoid conflicts.

5. In addition, the research recommends that PM&E result should be published on our daily papers to enhance wide coverage hence help in the exploring how best public resources are used.
5.6 Contributions to the body of knowledge

The study had the following contributions to the body of knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To establish the extent to which the use of PM&amp;E results enhances the projects accountability</td>
<td>This study found that most projects are not economically viable due to lack of PM&amp;E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is important to involve the local community in decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the use of PM&amp;E results enhances project stakeholders ownership.</td>
<td>The study noted that stakeholders involvement was omitted in the development projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was established that the county project ignored the spirit of stakeholders inclusivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All stakeholders should be brought to the board on any project done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the use of PM&amp;E results enhances quality of project outcome.</td>
<td>The study established that by use of PM&amp;E project quality is improved through sharing sufficient information if proper design procedures are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also, the public involvement makes the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development projects have more watchdogs hence improving its performance and sustainability.

5.7 Suggestion for further study

1. Influence of politics on the sub county road projects
2. How participatory monitoring and evaluation tools enhances road development projects
3. Assessment on factors which influences road development projects performance.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTRODUCTION LETTER

SETH OOGA ONDITI

THE UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

P.O. BOX 30192-00100

NAIROBI

Dear Recipient

Am seth Ooga Onditi Masters Student in the University of Nairobi Carrying out a research study on “the influence of participatory monitoring and evaluation results on the performance of county funded road projects in Bobasi sub county- Kisii County, Kenya”.

The information collected was used to make recommendations for the improvement of stakeholders involvement projects.

You are therefore kindly requested to participate and respond as best as you can to items in the questionnaire interview guide. The information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality and was only used for the purpose of the study.

Let me take this early opportunity to thank you in advance for taking part in this study.

Yours Sincerely

SETH OOGA ONDITI
APPENDIX II: KISII COUNTY MAP
APPENDIX III: QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is to be used by the researcher/ research assistant when interviewing the respondent. The questionnaire is made up of sections A and B. Please answer each question by writing on the spaces provided or tick ( ) against the boxes provided. The information provided was used for the purpose of this research only; therefore do not write your name on the answer sheet. Please note that there are no correct or wrong answers.

SECTION A PERSONAL DETAILS

1. Name of the enterprise and its physical location
   
   Name: ........................................................................................................
   
   Business location/street: .................................................................

2. Marital status
   
   Married ( ) Divorced ( ) Single ( ) Windowed ( )

3. Level of education and training
   
   Pre-primary ( ) KCPE ( ) KCSE ( ) Certificate ( ) Diploma ( )
   
   Degree ( ) Master ( ) Doctorate ( )
SECTION B : Specification Research Questions

1) To what extent was the use of participating M&E results enhanced project
development accountability in Bobasi sub County?

Using the rating given below, provide your response in relation to the statement
regarding project accountability in development projects.

Key – Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project accountability</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County projects that involves PM&amp;E results properly utilize public resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E results creates awareness of the development projects to the local community hence improving transparency and accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local politics influences project prioritization ignoring the plight of the local peoples’ idea leading to projects which are of no social economic value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) To what extent was the use of PM&E results enhanced quality of project outcome in Bobasi sub County.

Using the rating given below provide your response in relation to the statement
regarding how PM&E enhances quality of the project outcome on county projects in Kisii county government.
Key – Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of project outcome</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing project does not meet value for money due to lack of PM&amp;E results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E results improves the county project quality and performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of PM&amp;E results lead to use of inferior materials in projects leading non-performing projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) To what extent was the use of participatory M&E results enhanced stakeholders ownership of county road project.

Using the rating given below, provide your response in relation to the statement regarding stakeholders ownership of county project in Bobasi county.

Key – Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders ownership</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County development project lacks stakeholders involvement during design, implementation and after implementation stages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County development projects are politically imposed leading to social economic crisis and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholders in Bobasi county are rarely asked to prioritize their needs hence leading to lack of local support to county development projects.

4) **Kindly rate the following statements as the extent to which you agree on them on the ways in which PM&E results improved the county road projects in Bobasi sub county.**

Key – Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) Strongly Disagree (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects executed by the county government do not improve living standard of local community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education from Local community as lead to poor project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many stalled county projects in Bobasi sub county due to political influence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other opinion
5) Efforts being undertaken by Bobasi sub county to acknowledge the use of PM&E results to improve the county road project efficiency and effectiveness.

a) In your opinion what efforts are being undertaken by the Bobasi sub county to form PM&E committee?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

b) Do the local communities/ stakeholders understand/know their role in the county project implementation as regards to PM&E?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

How are these efforts in a) & b) above improving county road project performance as regards to PM&E results?

6. Do you possess any key skills and abilities

Yes ( )      None ( )
If you have specific abilities/skills, please give details and state how you achieved them.

a) Community mobilization skills

b) Administration / management skills

c) Natural resource management skills

d) Technical skills e.g monitoring & evaluation training
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