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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Determinants – These are influencing elements.

Effective – successful in producing a desired or intended result

M&E System – this is a set of components which are related to each other within a structure and serve a common purpose of tracking the implementation and results of a project

M&E Training – this is the acquisition of practical tools that enhance result-based management by strengthening awareness in M&E

Monitoring and Evaluation – this is the process of systematically collecting and analysing information of ongoing project and comparison of the project outcome/impact against the project intentions

Non Governmental Organization - is ‘a private voluntary association of individuals or other entities, not operated for profit or for other commercial purposes but which has organized itself for the benefit of the public at large and having as its objective the promotion of social welfare in any of, but not limited to, the areas set out in the First Schedule; includes a community based organization’

Project Management – It is a scientific application of modern tools and techniques in planning, financing, implementation, controlling and coordination of activities in order to achieve desired outputs according to the project objectives within the constraints of time and cost

Project - this is a specific activity to be carried out, which consumes resources and has a beginning and an end

Tools and Techniques – these are methods and procedures used to meet the project’s M&E needs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATIONS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
<td>Academy for Education Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human immunodeficiency virus infection / Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBO</td>
<td>Public Benefit Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Socio Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBS</td>
<td>Work breakdown structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

Organizations are currently in the process of reviewing ways in which monitoring and evaluation can achieve greater consistency and effectiveness in judging the impact of a project as well as getting recommendations on how future interventions can be improved. Building a resulted based M&E system is therefore a requirement by the growing pressure to improve performance which is also one of the requirements by the NGO and donor’s to check on the effective use of the donor funds, impact and benefits brought by the projects. This study looked at the determinants influencing the effectiveness of M&E systems in NGO’s within Nairobi County, Kenya. Its main objectives were: to find out how selection of tools and techniques, the role of management, M&E training and technical expertise of staff contribute to the effectiveness of the M&E system. The study will help NGOs, donor agencies and the project management in better understanding of the M&E systems and how to improve them to meet their expectations. The population for this research was 8,503 NGOs within Nairobi County and the target population was 200 NGOs, who had implemented successful projects and were in the process of monitoring and evaluating them. The sample of this research was selected using stratified random sampling method. The primary data was collected from the project managers or the M&E staff from each NGO. They were handed a questionnaire to fill in, which was later picked from them. Data was analyzed using correlation and regression analysis to establish the relationship between the variables. The SPSS computer program was also used. The findings are presented in tables and charts. The findings indicated that there are difficulties in the application of the M&E systems, which was mainly attributed to the tools and techniques used. This is due to the difficulty in their applicability. The role of management in the operations of the M&E system, although termed as adequate and prompt, also affects the effectiveness of the M&E system. A good number of the respondents had attended training in the M&E systems and termed it as comprehensive and relevant since it contributed to the effectiveness of the M&E system as well as to the competence of the staff. The M&E training was also found to be an important contributor towards induction of local M&E experts in addition to increasing the quality and quantity of the M&E human resource. The technical expertise of the team even though termed as one of the least factor contributing to difficulties in using M&E systems, it determines the echelon of success of the M&E system. The respondents advocated for M&E training as the best approach to improve effectiveness in M&E system. The study concludes that the NGOs should be flexible to allow the modification of their M&E systems including tools and techniques; the management should have the knowhow to run the project and M&E system; a capacity building policy to be put in place to emphasis on M&E training across the NGO sector and a professional association of M&E experts needs to be started. The study recommends the Gazettement of the Public Benefit Act 2013; the integration of the modern technology to the project activities and M&E system; the development of a harmonized training curricula on M&E; M&E training to be tailored toward effective application of tools and techniques and a management that is innovative and interrelate with all aspects of the M&E system. The study also recommends that the project managers and M&E staff in charge of the M&E systems to employee staff with the required technical expertise and offer them training for them to be able to handle the M&E systems effectively.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background to the Study

According to Shapiro (2011) getting something wrong is not a crime. Failing to learn from past mistakes because of not monitoring and evaluating is. Monitoring and evaluation is a tool in project management. Project management is possibly the second oldest profession (Raymond, 2009). In 1896 -1910 Karol Admiecki developed the first Ghant chart – a graphical schedule for planning and controlling work. In the 1950’s the DOD designed PERT or Critical Path Management or WBS. In the 1960’s the approach of earned value management was developed whose objective was to monitor project progress based on time and cost. According to most literature modern project management began in the 1950s.

Project management deals with the organization of project components to ensure successful completion of the project. Project management is the scientific application of modern tools and techniques in planning, financing, implementation, controlling and coordination of activities in order to achieve desired outputs according to the project objectives within the constraints of time and cost. Project management is therefore about managing the processes of a project from defining stage to planning, execution, control to the closure of the project. A project therefore is a specific activity to be carried out, which consumes resources and has a beginning and an end. A project has four main resources which need to be managed in order to ensure that the projects is successful. These resources are: people, time, money and scope. A program on the other hand, unlike a project is an ongoing process and it could
include managing of a series of several projects. Projects vary in their size, simplicity and complexity.

Project Management is hence acknowledged as being the most successful approach of managing changes brought about by projects. This is because it has techniques and tools that enable control and delivery of the project activities within given deliverables, timeframes and budget (Shapiro 2011). Monitoring and evaluation is one of the tools that help project managers know when plans are going according to plan and when conditions change. They provide the management with information to make decisions in regard to the project. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is useful to all projects, big or small, because it helps in identifying project areas that are on target and those that need to be adjusted or replaced. Different types of projects require different types of M&E systems (Shapiro 2011). However, the most popular M&E systems with project managers are the ones developed on M&E Matrix, based on the Logical Framework Approach to monitoring and evaluation (Welsh et al., 2005).

M&E is made up of two different processes: monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring is the process of regular and systematic collection, analysing and reporting information about a project’s inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. Monitoring is therefore a way of improving efficiency and effectiveness of a project, by providing the management and stakeholders with project progressive development and achievement of its objectives within the allocated funds (World Bank, 2011). It therefore keeps track of the project work and informs the management when things go wrong. Hence it is an invaluable tool for good
management as well as a useful base for evaluation. Monitoring is an internal function to a project and it involves: establishing indicators, setting up systems to collect information, collecting and recording and analysing information, and using the information to inform day-to-day management. Monitoring is important since it necessitates the modification of activities if they emerge not to be achieving the desired results (Hunter, 2009 and Shapiro, 2011).

Evaluation, on the other hand, is a scientific based appraisal of the strengths and weakness of the project (Hunter, 2009). It is therefore a comparison between the actual and the planed. Evaluation is a means of checking efficiency, effective and impact of a project. There are two types of evaluations: evaluation done when the project is ongoing – Formative evaluation; and evaluation done after the completion of the project – Summative evaluations. Evaluation involves: looking at what the project intended to achieve, assessing progress towards what was to be achieved and impact on targets, looking at the effectiveness of the project strategy, looking at the efficient use of resources, opportunity costs and sustainability of the project, and the implications for the various stakeholders (Hunter, 2009 and Shapiro, 2011). Monitoring and evaluation is therefore conducted for the following reasons: 1) to provide the project managers and stakeholders (including donors) with information on the extent to which the projects is meeting its objectives; 2) to build transparency and accountability on the use of project resources; 3) to provide project staff with a clearer basis for decision; 4) For future project planning and development which is improved when guided by lessons learned from project experience.
Organizations are currently in the process of reviewing ways in which M&E can achieve greater consistency and effectiveness (World Bank, 2008), that is, where M&E will enable them to judge the impact of a project as well as obtain recommendations on how future interventions can be improved (UNDP, 2009). However, one shortcoming of the M&E system is that there are no set standards for measuring its quality (Chaplowe, 2008). It is therefore subjective and relies on the rule of thumb. Although monitoring and evaluation is used mainly for checking the impact of the project as well as establish whether it meets its objectives, they are also a mandatory requirement for donor sponsored projects where donors use them to determine effective use of their funds by organizations (NGOs). NGOs implementing projects in developing countries, in many cases, get their funds from donors and development agencies (Hunter, 2009). And according to the national survey of NGOs report (2009), NGOs received Kshs 68,825,005,222.00 as funds to various projects in the year 2005/6, from different donors. The Global perspective also shows that 10% to 15% of all aids to development countries are channeled through the NGOs (Askari, 2011). These donors and development agencies include among others the World Bank, European Union (EU), United Nations (UN) and African Union (AU).

1.1 Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) within Nairobi County

The existence of NGOs can be traced from the colonial times, where they mainly focused on welfare; however this later changed to accommodate political actions and advocacy (Kameri-Mbote, 2000). Before the passing of the NGOs Co-ordination Act in 1990, which made provision for the registration and co-ordination of NGOs in Kenya (NGOs Co-ordination Act no. 19 of 1990), the NGOs did not have any institutional and legislative framework to govern
them (Kameri-Mbote, 2000). An NGO, according to the non-governmental organizations bill 2012, clause 22, is ‘a private voluntary association of individuals or other entities, not operated for profit or for other commercial purposes but which has organized itself for the benefit of the public at large and having as its objective the promotion of social welfare in any of, but not limited to, the areas set out in the First Schedule; includes a community based organization’. Non-governmental organizations are therefore charitable institutions that make use of donor funds for charitable as well as public benefit purposes. NGOs are therefore created to enhance government efforts in developmental issues and supplement service delivery with funds received from multilateral organizations (donors). NGO Board Executive Director, Amb. Peter ole Nkuruiyia, in his speech during the launch of the automated M&E system for NGOs (2012) stated that the government appreciated the role played by NGOs as developmental partner. He also added that NGOs are contributing to the national development by more than Kshs 100 billion annually in addition to employing more than 100,000 people (Chesos, 2010). The NGOs are coordinated and regulated by the NGOs Co-ordination Board established by an Act of Parliament in 1990. They also operate under the National Council of NGOs, also known as the NGO Council, established in August 1993 under the Non-governmental Organizations Co-ordination Act, 1990, as a forum for all voluntary agencies.

According to the national survey of NGOs report (2009), which was conducted to validate the existing data of NGOs that were registered with the NGO Board and are operational, done through the administering of a questionnaire to various organizations, out of the 5,929 NGOs previously registered with the NGO Board only 2,029 NGOs were traced. This was
attributed to: 1) the NGOs had ceased operations without informing the NGO Board; 2) the NGOs had filed wrong information and 3) the NGOs were inactive. Of the 2,029 NGOs traced, 708 (35%) were operating in Nairobi province. 18% of all national NGOs and 22% of all international NGOs countrywide were operating in Nairobi province. On the other hand the Board Executive Director, Amb. Peter O. Ole Nkuraiyia, states that there are more than 6,000 NGOs registered country wide (Chesos, 2010). The survey also indicated that 73% of the NGOs interviewed had implemented at least a project by 31st December 2006. Most of the projects done by the NGOs, as at December 2006, were in the fields of education and HIV/AIDS (13%). The NGO council also keeps an updated NGOs directory of all its members, who are active in different fields including: agriculture, water, education, environment, health, human rights, gender and development, children’s rights, poverty alleviation, peace, population, training, counseling, small scale enterprises, disability and many others

The non-governmental organizations bill 2012, First Schedule s. 62, states that NGOs can operate in any, but not limited, to the following areas: legal aid; agriculture; children; culture; disability; energy; education; environment and conservation generally; gender; governance; poverty eradication; health; housing and settlement; human rights; HIV/AIDS; information; informal sector; old age; peace building; population and reproductive health; refugees; disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation; relief; pastoralism and the marginalized communities; sports; water and sanitation; animal welfare; youth.
The NGOs, in Kenya, are under transformation to PBOs through the new Public Benefits Organizations Act, that was enacted in January 2013 but yet to be gazetted by the new Cabinet Secretary in the Ministry of Devolution and Planning, which will see local and international NGOs registering anew as Public Benefit Organizations (PBOs). The new Act is meant to transform the old Act (The Non-Governmental Coordination Act) to conform to the Constitution of Kenya (Shiundu, 2013).

The Jubilee Coalition (government), in its manifestos, also intends to introduce a Charities Act that will regulate the political campaigning by NGOs. The Act is also meant to establish transparency in the funding of NGOs and individual projects (W. Oloo, personal communication, June 5, 2013). According to the Public Benefits Organizations Acts, 2013 Part 1, section 5: ‘a Public Benefit Organization is a voluntary membership or non-membership grouping of individuals or organizations, which is autonomous, non-organization, Partisan, non-profit making and which is organized and operated locally, nationally or internationally; engages in public benefit activities in any of the areas set out in the Sixth Schedule; and is registered as such by the Authority’. The new law also states that the Public Benefits Organizations Authority will take over the roles and powers of the NGO Coordination Board and the Federation of Public Benefits Organizations taking over the role of the National Council of NGOs. (W. Oloo, personal communication, June 5, 2013).

The Public Benefits Organizations Act, 2013 also states that the PBOs will operate in any, but not limited to, the following areas: legal aid; agriculture; children; culture; disability; energy; education; environment and conservation generally; gender; governance; poverty
eradication; health; housing and settlement; human rights; HIV/AIDS; information; informal sector; old age; peace building; population and reproductive health; refugees; disaster prevention, preparedness and mitigation; relief; Pastoralism and the marginalized communities; sports; water and sanitation; animal welfare; and youth.

Technology is also playing a major role in monitoring and evaluation of projects in NGOs, where organizations like ViewWorld (established in 2010), are collaborating with NGOs to use paperless data collections processes (monitoring) through smart phones, where they have introduced mobile data monitoring and evaluation of projects. In Kenya a web-based monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems was developed for NGOs by Academy for Education Development (AED) and Advantech Consulting with funding from Rockefeller Foundation, which was launched in 2012. The main aim of the system was to allow NGOs to efficiently monitor and keep track of their activities and targets. This system was met to assist the NGOs to be able to engage with the Aid agencies (Chesos, 2010).

The target population for this research will therefore be registered and operational NGOs or PBOs within Nairobi County, who have implemented successful projects, between 2007 and 2012 who have or are in the process of monitoring and evaluating them. This will include both the local and international NGOs/PBOs. A list of operational NGOs will be obtained from either the NGOs Coordination Board and / or the National Council of NGOs current directory. If the new Act is gazetted then the list of PBOs will be obtained from the Public Benefits Organizations Authority or the Federation of Public Benefits Organization.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Monitoring and Evaluation has in the recent become a necessary requirement for projects. This is evident from the many advertisements for M&E experts and request for expression of interest for M&E consultants in the local dailies.

In the developing countries, Kenya included, NGOs are faced with several challenges in addition to inability to resourcefully respond to changing needs. The Kenya social protection sector review (2012), states that the monitoring and evaluation of social programmes in Kenya is weak, and where it is done the information is not made public. In addition most NGOs do not have the ability to hire skilled M&E professionals and ICT staff who understand M&E systems and are able to develop appropriate tools; hence they end up with substandard M&E systems that don’t meet either the managerial or donor needs (Chesos, 2010). The study by Koffi-Tessio (2002) also shows that M&E systems are not meeting their obligatory requirements as decision making tool; instead their activities are viewed as controlling by a bureaucratic management. M&E is also viewed as a donor and not a management requirement (Shapiro, 2011). The poor acquisition of the appropriate M&E systems by NGOs is also attributed to the organizations over emphasis on the physical infrastructure rather than methodological and conceptual training (Koffi-Tessio, 2002). Jaszczolt et al., (2010) in their recommendations emphasized that NGOs need to be educated on M&E through handbooks in order to increase quality, establishment of a national professional association of evaluators to aid in developing technical skills among the M&E specialists, as well as develop a widely accessible depositor for evaluation reports in order to learn from previous experiences. Likewise, the Public Benefit Organization Act, 2013 first
schedule, part II section 13 on monitoring, evaluation and reporting, calls for the organizations to work together through result-based management in order to meet the needs of their beneficiaries, develop transparent reporting policies and develop and use tools for M&E for development and impact of their work. They are also required to evaluate progress and success they have achieved annually.

Monitoring and evaluation, although very essential in improving performance, is also very complex, multidisciplinary and skill intensive processes (Engela and Ajam, 2010). Building a resulted based M&E system is a requirement by the growing pressure to improving performance which is also one of the requirements by the NGO and donor’s to check on the effective use of the donor funds, impact and benefits brought by the projects. Hence there is a need for establishment of rules for constructing minimum parameters for monitoring and evaluation for projects that can be used to track progress and effectiveness (Jha et al., 2010). Research also shows that the foundation for evaluation is being built in many developing countries (Kusek and Rist, 2004). Consequently with the growing global movement to demonstrate accountability and tangible results, many developing countries will be expected to adopt results-based M&E systems in the future, due to the international donors focus on development impact.

The above shows that the M&E systems are not performing satisfactorily. They are facing challenges that are contributing to their insufficiency and which calls for intervention. This research will look at the existing M&E systems, used by different NGOs operating in different sectors within Nairobi County, in regard to factors affecting the effectiveness of
M&E systems as well as recommend on how to adopt a result-based M&E system that is more effective and efficient for NGO projects.

**1.3 Research Objectives**

**1.3.1 General Objective**

The general objective of the research was to find out the determinants influencing the effectiveness of M&E systems in NGO’s within Nairobi County, Kenya.

**1.3.2 Specific Objectives**

The researcher was guided by the following specific objectives:

i. To evaluate whether the selection of tools and techniques influence the effectiveness of M&E systems.

ii. To examine how the role of management affects the effectiveness of the M&E system.

iii. To examine how M&E training aid in the effectiveness of the M&E system.

iv. To evaluate how the technical expertise of the staff influence the effectiveness of the M&E systems

**1.4 Research Questions**

The Researcher was guided by the following questions:

i. How does the selection of tools and techniques influence the effectiveness of M&E systems?

ii. How does the role of management affect the effectiveness of the M&E system?
iii. How does M&E training aid in the effectiveness of the M&E system?

iv. How does the technical expertise of the staffs influence the effectiveness of the M&E system?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study will particularly help the NGO’s staff, donor agencies and project managers in a better understanding of the M&E systems and how to improve them to meet the expectations of the stakeholders, as well as provide valuable information for future interventions. It will inform policies towards setting up of monitoring and evaluation systems, and show how M&E can be used as a powerful management tool to improve the way organizations and stakeholders can achieve greater accountability and transparency. The study is therefore beneficial to NGOs, donor agencies, project managers and project management students who are involved in the designing and implementation of result-based and effective M&E systems.

Although this paper looks at the determinants influencing the effectiveness of the M&E systems for projects by NGOs within Nairobi County, it is also relevant in areas where M&E systems are to be implemented.

This study will also contribute to the body of knowledge. This is because it can be used as a reference material by researchers. The study will also identify areas related to M&E field that will require more research, hence a basis of further research.
1.6 Scope of the Study

The study was conducted within Nairobi County. It involved both international and local NGOs who had successfully completed projects between 2007 and 2012, and had or were in the process of monitoring and evaluating using a defined M&E system. The Project managers or M&E staffs of these projects were the respondents of this study.

Nairobi County is the second smallest county in Kenya with an area of 684 sq km (Tourist Maps Kenya, 2010). Nairobi, the capital city of Kenya, is a cosmopolitan city with a population of 3,138,369 (Kenya census, 2009). The entire county is urban. Nairobi County is in Nairobi province and has eight constituencies – Makadara, Kamukunji, Starehe, Langata, Dagoretti, Westlands, Kasarani and Embakasi. Whose residents are of diverse ethnic groups and nationalities – all referred to as ‘Nairobians’. While a good number of the wealthy Kenyans live in the up market areas of Nairobi, the largest numbers of the Nairobians are middle class living in the estates and the poor living in the slums. Nairobi is a host of many businesses, companies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international companies and organizations. According to the NGOs Co-ordination Board (2009) there were 2,249 operational NGOs registered in Nairobi.

1.7 Assumptions of the Study

The researcher assumed that the identified NGOs would cooperate and share information on their M&E systems by answering the questionnaires correctly and accurately. Finally, that the sample size selected would be a good representation of the NGOs within Nairobi County.
1.8 Limitations of the Study

The researcher faced two major limitations, that is time and finances. Sharing time between employment, family and research work to satisfaction was a challenge. Financial constraints applied since the researcher was required to use courier services to drop and pick the project documents from the supervisor due to time constraints. These two limitations also influenced the selection of the sample size.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Monitoring and evaluation systems have been in existence since the ancient times (Kusek and Rist, 2004), however today, the requirements for M&E systems as a management tool to show performance has grown with demand by stakeholders for accountability and transparency through the application of the monitoring and evaluation by the NGOs and other institutions including the government (Gorgens et al., 2010). Development banks and bilateral aid agencies also regularly apply M&E to measure development effectiveness as well as demonstrate transparency (Briceno, 2010).

2.1.1 M&E System

Monitoring and Evaluation is a combination of two processes which are different yet complementary (Gorgens and Kusek, 2009). It is therefore a process of systematically collecting and analysing information of ongoing project and comparison of the project outcome/impact against the project intentions (Hunter, 2009). An M&E system, on the other hand is a set of components which are related to each other within a structure and serve a common purpose of tracking the implementation and results of a project (SAMDI, 2007). It is therefore an integrated system of reflection and communication that support project implementation. An M&E system is made up of four interlinked sections, which are: setting up of the M&E system, implementation of the M&E system, involvement of the project stakeholders, and communication of the M&E results (Guijt et al., 2002). Theoretically, ‘an ideal M&E system should be independent enough to be externally credible and socially
legitimate, but not so independent to lose its relevance’ (Briceno, 2010). It should therefore be able to influence policy making from recommendations of lessons learned as well as be sustainable overtime for it to be responsive to the needs of the stakeholders.

### 2.1.2 Information from the M&E system

Information got from M&E can be used to serve many purposes. A successful M&E system is therefore measured by the utilization of the information got from it (Briceno, 2010). It should also be able to: clarify the expected impact of the project; show how progress and impact will be assessed; collect and analyse necessary information for tracking progress and impact, give details reasons for success and failure, and show how this information can improve future actions (Welsh et al., 2005).

Monitoring and evaluation is an integral part of the project’s design, implementation and completion (Chaplowe, 2008). It is useful to all projects, big or small, since information got from it enables better decision making by helping to identify project areas that are on target and those that need to be adjusted or replaced. Although different types of projects require different types of M&E systems, collection of data and information at all levels of the projects life cycle adds value to every stage of the project by ensuring project targets are met. Weaknesses in the project are also indentified on time and collective measures taken (Gorgens et al., 2010). An effective M&E system also calls for the interaction between the employees, procedures, data, technology and key stakeholders, in order to ensure feasibility and ownership (Chaplowe, 2008). Although monitoring and evaluation are not of inherent value by themselves the information they provide is significant to improving performance.
(Mackay, 2010), which helps in learning from what/how we are doing or have done by focusing on efficiency, effectiveness, impact, relevance and sustainability (Hunter, 2009).

According to Kenya social protection sector review (2012), that focused on main programmes in the social protection sector in Kenya, conducted through literature review, landscape survey and in-depth interviews with project implementers, not many programmes in Kenya have a functional M&E systems, despite it being accredited for promoting transparency and accountability. From the programmes reviewed 96% had developed some type of indicator framework for M&E, 91% conducted monitoring activities, 61% had a planned or ongoing impact evaluation and 39% had no M&E reports for public consumption. This was attributed to programmes not allocating the required resources at the design stage of the M&E system. According to the international benchmark, the M&E allocation should be 10% - 12% of the total programme cost; however most programmes in Kenya were seen to allocate less than this. There was also an inconsistency in the choice of performance indicators among the Kenyan programmes which led to incoherent and incomprehensive M&E systems. Out of 88.1% of the Kenya safety net programmes only 16.7% could provide a review team with a logical framework. The review also established that although M&E rarely influenced the decision making process, its information was being used to inform project and programme designs as well as inform policies. The review also notes that the country relies much on M&E international consultants and therefore recommends capacity building of national and progressive wean programme of civil servants (locals) because they will stay in the sector over the long term.
2.2 Theoretical Review of Literature

A review of theories:

2.2.1 Program Theory

The program theory has been used to guide evaluation for many years; it shows the capability of the program to fix a problem by addressing the needs in the need assessment. It also gives tools to determine areas of impact in evaluation (Sethi and Philippines, 2012). Most NGO’s deal with human service programs that are designed to improve the society, which are at times designed and redesigned in due course (Hosley, 2005). The concept of a program theory is similar to the one used in logical models. The program theory hence uses logical framework approach as its methodology (J-Pal, 2003). The difference is that the program theory is a detailed version of the logic model. The program theory can also be represented graphically through the logical model. The logical model is used in guiding stakeholders’ engagement, the management and evaluation of outcomes (Hosley, 2009).

2.2.2 Theory of Change

Theory of change is part of the program theory that emerged in the 1990s as an improvement to the evaluation theory (Stein and Valters, 2012). A theory of change is a tool used for developing solutions to complex social problems. It provides a comprehensive picture of early and intermediate term changes that are needed to reach a long term set goal (Anderson, 2005). It therefore provides a model of how a project should work, which can be tested and refined through monitoring and evaluation. A theory of change is also a specific and measurable description of change that forms the basis for planning, implementation and
evaluation. Most projects have a theory of change although they are usually assumed (CARE, 2013). The theory of changes helps in developing comprehensible frameworks for monitoring and evaluation. It is mainly used by NGOs and donors to articulate long term impact on projects (James, 2011).

2.2.3 Evaluation Theory

Mark (2005), in his discussion on why a theory is important to evaluation practice, states that evaluation theory is a way of synthesizing prior experience. He also adds that lack of knowledge on theory of evaluation would lead to an evaluator repeating past mistakes as well as failing to build on past successes.

2.3 Factors Affecting the Effectiveness of M&E System

2.3.1 The Role of Management

Project management is the team in charge of the project and it includes: project manager, project staff, M&E staff and implementing partners (CARE, 2012). To ensure the success of the M&E system, the management needs to support it (World Bank, 2011). The project management is responsible for making decisions and strategic planning of the project. It also manages the M&E system by tracking indicators, producing quarterly project reports and annual strategic reports (IFRC, 2011). The project manager ensures that the project staffs carry out their jobs effectively (Guijt, 2002). The project staff does the implementation role where they collect monitoring data and present it in weekly and quarterly reports (IFRC, 2011). For an M&E to function as a managing tool, the project management and M&E staff need to identify and act on the project improvements. Also for the M&E to be more effective
it should be coordinated by a unit within the project management in order to facilitate management’s quick use of the M&E information (Guijt, 2002). It is the project management also that decides when project evaluation should be done (Welsh, 2005). If the project management fails to pay attention to the operations of the M&E, it diminishes its importance to the rest of the project staff. The M&E process hence provides useful information for decision-making to all levels of project management (Gaitano, 2011).

Otieno (2010) in his article Good Governance in NGOs that was published in the NGOs Coordination Board Newsletter – The Co-ordinator, Issue No. 6, defines governance as the process of making decisions. He states that there are eight major characteristics to good governance, which are: participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive and follows rule of law. He also adds that for an NGO to guarantee good and effective governance it should control its resources in a way that is: open, transparent, accountable, effective and efficient, as well as equitable and responsive to the stakeholders’ needs. Hence monitoring and evaluation system adds the fourth pillar to governance, which provides the feedback component that, gives decision makers (project management) an additional public sector management tool (Kusek and Rist, 2004). M&E is also a management function set by donor agencies as preconditions for allocation of funds to NGOs (Hunter, 2009). M&E system as well is part of management tool which provide feedback on performance fundamental for governance and decision making of projects and NGOs (Gorgens et al., 2010). The M&E system therefore provides information both to the internal (management) and external (donors) users. The project management uses the M&E information to make decisions, in planning, in impact assessment.
and for accountability (CARE 2012). An effective M&E should therefore be able to provide: managers with the needed information for day-to-day decisions; key stakeholders with guidance information on the project strategy; project early warnings signs; empowerment to beneficiaries; capacity building as well as assess progress and build accountability (Welsh et al., 2005). Monitoring and evaluation is therefore a learning process that centers on efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the project. However for M&E to deliver proper planning has to be in place, by which progress and achievements are measured against (Shapiro, 2011).

### 2.3.2 Selection of Tools and Techniques

Projects require different M&E needs depending on the operating context, implementing agency capacity and donor requirements. It is therefore important, when preparing an M&E plan to identify methods, procedures, and tools to be used to meet the project’s M&E needs (Chaplowe, 2008). There are many tools and techniques used to aid project managers in planning and controlling project activities which include: project selection and risk management tools and techniques; project initiation tools and techniques; project management planning tools and techniques; project management executing tools and techniques; and project management monitoring and controlling tools and techniques.

The NGOs mainly use two principal frameworks: result framework and logical framework (Jaszczołt et al., 2010). A framework is an essential guide to monitoring and evaluation as it explains how the project should work by laying the steps needed to achieve the desired results. A framework therefore increases the understanding of the project goals and objective
by defining the relationships between factors key to implementation, as well as articulating the internal and external elements that could affect the project’s success. A good M&E framework can assist with ideas through the project strategies and objectives on whether they are ideal and most appropriate to implement (Ending Violence against Women and Girls Programming Essentials 2, 2013). The M&E framework should also include details on budgeting and allocation of technical expertise, as well as inform donors and project management on the its implementation (Guijt et al., 2002).

The Result framework (also known as strategic framework) principal, endorsed in the Rome Declaration on Harmonization in February 2003 and advanced by the organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), applies coherent framework to develop effective practical tools for strategic planning, risk management, progress monitoring, and outcome evaluation (Jaszczolt et al., 2010). While the logical framework identified internationally, is a matrix that make use of M&E indicators at each stage of the project as well as identify possible risks. The logical framework hence shows the conceptual foundation on which the project M&E system is built (Chaplowe, 2008). It also works well with other M&E tools (Jaszczolt et al., 2010). The log-frame (logical framework) has four columns and rows that link the project goals and objectives to the inputs, process and outputs required to implement the project.
Table 2.1 General structure of the Log-frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative summary</th>
<th>Objectively verifiable indicators</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wider objective</td>
<td>How to measure wider objectives</td>
<td>How to check the measurement</td>
<td>What assumptions are made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project purpose</td>
<td>how to measure immediate objectives</td>
<td>How to check the measurement</td>
<td>What assumptions are made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>How to measure outputs produced</td>
<td>How to check the measurement</td>
<td>What assumptions are made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs / activities</td>
<td>How to measure inputs</td>
<td>How to check the measurement</td>
<td>What assumptions are made</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chaplowe, 2008

M&E results can however be criticized in regard to whether the data collection, analysis and results lead to reliable information that reflects the real situation (Nabris, 2002). On June 2013, Rasna Warah, wrote an article in the Daily Nation on UNDP’s shortcoming a reflection of a wider failure with the UN system, where she not only stated that internal evaluations are likely to be flawed, but also added that, after UNDP spent more than $8.5 billion on activities of anti-poverty between 2004 and 2011; it was a challenge for it to show major impact on the lives of the people it was trying to change (Warah, 2013). In response to Rasna’s article, Idran Naidoo, Director in the evaluation office, UNDP said that Rasna comments called for better monitoring of the impacts of UNDP programmes (Naidoo, 2013).

M&E systems use different tools and approaches, some of which are either complementary or substitute to each other, while others are either broad or narrow (World Bank, 2002). An evaluator however may choose to use a combination of methods and sources of information in order to cross-validate data (Nabris, 2002). The M&E system tools include performance
indicators, logical framework approach, theory-based evaluation, formal surveys, rapid appraisal methods, participatory methods, public expenditure tracking surveys, impact evaluation, cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis. The selection of these tools however depend on the information needed, stakeholders and the cost involved (World Bank, 2002).

There are also two main methods of data collection which are formal and less formal methods (Nabris, 2002). Formal methods although expensive, they have a high degree of reliability and validity and include surveys, participatory observations, and direct measurements among others. Less formal methods which are as well rich in information are subjective and intuitive, hence less precise in conclusion. They include, among others, field visits and unstructured interviews. In order to increase the effectiveness of an M&E system, the monitoring and evaluation plan and design need to be prepared as an integral part of the project (Nabris, 2002).

Organizations like United States Agency for International Development (USAID) require that their grant recipients document their M&E system in a Performance management Plan, which is a tool designed to help them set up and manage the process of monitoring, analyzing, evaluating and reporting progress towards achieving objectives. The Performance management Plan also serves as a reference document that contains targets, a detailed definition of each project indicator, the methods and frequency of data collection, as well as who is responsible for collecting the data. It will also provide details on how data will be analyzed and evaluations required to complement monitoring data (CAP, 2012).
M&E systems vary with type, sector and country of application, (Kofi-Tessio 2002 and Fitzgerald et al., 2009). A successful M&E system therefore should be modified to specific setting with allowance for flexibility and imagination (Jha et al., 2010). When establishing an M&E system, organizations should also consider experiences from other organizations (Briceno, 2010). There is therefore need to realizing the role and use of M&E systems as well as involvement of stakeholders since M&E has many audiences, who include managers, donor, field staff, partners, policy makers and program participants (CARE, 2012), thus the need for it to effectively communicate. A well prepared and executed M&E will contribute to both project outcomes and international standards of doing things (Jha et al., 2010).

According to the experience drawn from USAID Turkey M&E plan, best practices not only include linking M&E to strategic plans and work plans, but also focusing on efficiency and cost effectiveness, employing a participatory approach to monitoring progress, utilizing both international and local expertise, disseminating results widely, using data from multiple sources, and facilitating the use of data for program improvement (Mathis et al. 2001). This is because the M&E system that are set based on ‘acceptable best practices’ aid in making ‘data-based’ decisions as well as provide donors with ‘evidence-based’ project results. Hence M&E is a project asset (Mathis et al. 2001). However M&E in capacity building is still in the initial stages of development, and the standards and approaches to the tool have not been set. In instances of urgency to meet social needs the M&E is not prioritized, because there is no one-size-fit-all M&E strategy (Fitzgerald et al., 2009).
2.3.3 M&E Training and Technical Expertise

Human capital, with proper training and experience is vital for the production of M&E results. There is need to have an effective M&E human resource capacity in terms of quantity and quality, hence M&E human resource management is required in order to maintain and retain a stable M&E staff (World Bank, 2011). This is because competent employees are also a major constraint in selecting M&E systems (Koffi-Tessio, 2002). M&E being a new professional field, it faces challenges in effective delivery of results. There is therefore a great demand for skilled professionals, capacity building of M&E systems, and harmonization of training courses as well as technical advice (Gorgens and Kusek, 2009).

The UNDP (2009) handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluation for development results, emphasizes that human resource is vital for an effective monitoring and evaluation, by stating that staff working should possess the required technical expertise in the area in order to ensure high-quality monitoring and evaluation. Implementing of an effective M&E demands for the staff to undergo training as well as possess skills in research and project management, hence capacity building is critical (Nabris, 2002). In-turn numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for NGO staffs working in project, in order to provide them with practical tools that will enhance result-based management by strengthening awareness in M&E (Hunter, 2009). They also give many practical examples and exercises, which are useful since they provide the staff with ways of becoming efficient, effective and have impact on the projects (Shapiro, 2011).
These guidebooks also strengthen result oriented M&E role by improving programme and policies in organizational accountability. They inform on new innovations and methodologies in result-oriented M&E as well as practical guidance on monitoring and performance, which includes samples and options with adoptable formats for monitoring and evaluation tools (Handbook on M&E for results, 2002). All these books not only provide guidance to NGO staff, but also request for feedbacks from the users which is in-turn used to improve the guidebooks.

M&E practical training is important in capacity building of personnel because it helps with the interaction and management of the M&E systems. M&E training starts with the understanding of the M&E theory and ensuring that the team understands the linkages between the project theory of change and the results framework as well as associated indicators (CPWF, 2012). Training should therefore be practical focused to ensure the understanding (CPWF, 2012). Theory of change also known as the program theory/result chain/program logic model/ attribution logic (Perrin, 2012); it is a causal logic that links research activities to the desired changes in the actors that a project targets to change. It is therefore a model of how a project is supposed to work. The function of a theory of change is to provide a road map of where the project is heading while monitoring and evaluation tests and refines that road map (CPWF, 2012 and Perrin, 2012).

2.4 Review of Previous Studies

The study by Koffi-Tessio (2002), on Efficacy and Efficiency of Monitoring-Evaluation Systems (MES) for Projects Financed by the Bank Group that was done in Burkina Faso,
Mauritana, Kenya, Rwanda and Mozambique, through desk review and interviews, for projects approved between 1987 and 2000. Monitoring-Evaluation systems are not meeting their obligatory requirements as decision making tool; instead their activities are viewed as controlling by a bureaucratic management. The poor acquisition of the appropriate M&E systems by NGOs is also attributed to the organizations over emphasis on the physical infrastructure (for instance computer equipments, working capital etc) rather than methodological and conceptual training.

Jaszczolt et al., (2010) in their opinions and conclusions on experience in implementing a local Government Administration Component of the World Bank funded Development Program (RDP), recommended that: NGOs need to be educated on M&E through handbooks in order to increase quality, a national professional association of evaluators also needs to be established to aid in developing technical skills among the M&E specialists, and last but not least to develop a widely accessible depositor for evaluation reports as a system where organizations can learn from previous experiences.

The Kenya social protection sector review (2012), that focused on main programmes in the social protection sector in Kenya, conducted through literature review, landscape survey and in-depth interviews with project implementers, states that not many programmes in Kenya have a functional M&E systems, despite it being accredited for promoting transparency and accountability. From the programmes reviewed 96% had developed some type of indicator framework for M&E, 91% conducted monitoring activities, 61% had a planned or ongoing impact evaluation and 39% had no M&E reports for public consumption. This was attributed
to programmes not allocating the required resources at the design stage of the M&E system. There was also an inconsistency in the choice of performance indicators among the Kenyan programmes which led to incoherent and incomprehensive M&E systems. Out of 88.1% of the Kenya safety net programmes only 16.7% could provide a review team with a logical framework. The review also established that although M&E rarely influenced the decision making process, its information was being used to inform project and programme designs as well as inform policies. The review also notes that the country relies much on M&E international consultants and therefore recommends capacity building of national and progressive whom programme of civil servants (locals) because they will stay in the sector over the long term.

The Public Benefit Organization Act, 2013 first schedule, part II section 13 on monitoring, evaluation and reporting, calls for the organizations to work together through result-based management in order to meet the needs of their beneficiaries, develop transparent reporting policies and develop and use tools for monitoring and evaluation for development and impact of their work. They are also required to evaluate progress and success they have achieved annually.

In conclusion, from the literature review done and a review of previous studies that have been done, it shows that a lot of effort has been put in place to have a result-based and effective M&E systems, however, little has been done to cover determinants influencing the effectiveness of the M&E systems in NGOs like tools and techniques; management; M&E
training and skilled staff. This study will seek to fill this gap by focusing on NGOs with Nairobi County, Kenya.

2.5 Conclusion

M&E tools and techniques are identified when preparing an M&E plan. Their selection depends on the information needed, stakeholders and the cost involved (World Bank, 2002). Jaszcolt et al (2010), states that NGOs mainly use two principal frameworks, which are the result framework and the logical framework. According to this survey (2013) the most commonly used tools and techniques by NGOs within Nairobi County are: logical framework, participatory approaches, evaluation surveys, site visits and strategic planning frameworks. This shows that M&E systems use different tools and approaches, some of which are either complementary or substitute to each other. Others are either broad or narrow (World Bank, 2002). The evaluator also has a choice of using a combination of tools and techniques in order to cross-validate the data (Nabris, 2002). According to Chesos (2010) most NGOs in developing countries are not able to develop appropriate tools hence resulting to substandard M&E systems that don’t meet the stakeholders’ needs.

Training and experience are fundamental factors in the production of M&E results (World Bank, 2011). M&E being a new professional field, training is paramount in building an effective M&E human resource capacity both in quality and quantity (World Bank, 2011). Numerous training manuals, handbooks and toolkits have been developed for NGO staff in order to provide them with practical tools that will strengthen M&E awareness (Hunter, 2009). They also inform on new innovations and methodologies (Handbook on M&E for
results, 2002). Koffi-Tessio (2002), states that the poor acquisition of the appropriate M&E systems by NGOs could be attributed to their lack of emphasis on methodological and conceptual training. Jaszcolt et al (2010), therefore recommends that NGOs need to be educated on M&E in order to develop technical skills among the M&E specialists.

Human capital is another important factor in the production of M&E results (World Bank, 2011). M&E being a new professional field, it needs a human resource management in order to maintain a stable M&E staff (World Bank, 2011). In order to have an effective M&E the staff need to undergo training as well as possess skills in research and project management (Nabris, 2002). There is also a need to set up a national professional association of evaluators and a database for M&E evaluation reports, to aid in the development of the technical skills among the M&E specialist (Jaszcolt et al., 2010).

The management is held responsible of the M&E system; hence the management support is vital for its success (World Bank, 2011). The management therefore ensures that the project staffs carry out the M&E job effectively (Guijt, 2002). The M&E process as well provides useful information for decision-making to all levels of the management (Gaitano, 2011). However activities of the M&E systems are sometimes seen as a control by the bureaucratic management or a donor requirement (Shapiro, 2011).

2.6 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework is a diagram that illustrates the relationships among relevant factors that may influence the successful achievement of goals and objectives. It helps determine
which factors will influence and how each of these factors might relate to and affect the outcomes (Ending Violence against Women and Girls Programming Essentials 2, 2013). This research looks at the determinants influencing effective M&E systems in NGO’s. This determinants are tools and techniques; project management; M&E training and skilled staff. This study will strive to show how each as well as combinations of the independent variables contribute to the effectiveness of an M&E system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Tools and Techniques</td>
<td>Effective M&amp;E System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expertise of the Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

Source: Researcher, 2013
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines how the research was conducted. It focuses on the research design, target population, sampling strategy, data collection tools and techniques and data analysis used in this study.

3.2 Research Design

The researcher used descriptive research design, to demonstrate how selection of tools and techniques; role of the management; M&E training and technical expertise of the staff contribute to the effectiveness of an M&E system. Descriptive research design is used to describe an event or phenomena as it exists at present and is appropriate when the study is concerned in specific predictions, narrative of facts and characteristics concerning individuals or situations (Kothari, 2003). The researcher also used qualitative and quantitative research methods.

3.3 The Target Population

Population refers to the entire group of people; event or organizations that a researcher wants to study. The population of this research is the 8,503 NGOs operating within Nairobi County (NGO Bureau Database, 2013). The target population is 200 NGOs that are registered and operational within Nairobi County in different sectors, which have completed a project
between 2007 and 2012 and are in the process of monitoring and evaluating them using a defined M&E system. The population size is therefore finite.

3.4 Sampling Strategy

This is the process of selecting a sufficient number of elements from a population (Raval, 2009). It also refers to the techniques and procedures to be applied in selecting a sample. The sample of this research was selected using probability sampling – stratified random sampling method, where the NGOs within Nairobi were put in strata according to their sector of operation, and then a sample size selected from each stratum (Raval, 2009).

The sample size of this study is 200 NGOs. The researcher picked a 2% sample from each stratum and where the sample is zero at least 1 NGO was selected. The respondents for the target population were either the project manager or an M&E staff in the project. This is because they are responsible of many aspects of the project, including the M&E system, hence are in a better position to provide the information required by this study. The confidence level for this research will be 95% confident with a margin of error of +/-5% (Smith, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1: NGOs operating within Nairobi County by sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGO sector</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Advocacy and Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NGOs Co-ordination Board, online database (2013)

### 3.5 Data Collection Tools and Techniques

A questionnaire was used to collect information on the M&E systems being used by the NGOs. Primary data was collected through the administration of written questionnaires to the Project manager or M&E staff from each NGO. They were given oral instructions and then
handed the questionnaire to fill in. The questionnaires were later picked from them. The questionnaire focused on the determinants of effective M&E systems in NGO’s, which include the selection of tools and techniques, the role of management, M&E training and the technical expertise of staff. The questionnaire contained both closed and open ended questions, which allowed the collection of qualitative and quantitative data. The questionnaires were designed in a simple manner for the respondents to be able to understand the questions.

### 3.6 Validity and Reliability

These are the criterion of evaluating the research tools. Validity of the questionnaire was done through consultations with the supervisor and a field test (Radhakrishna, 2007). This was to establish any built-in errors in the measurement of the questionnaire. The researcher also did a pilot test in order to check on the reliability of the questionnaire, where data was collected from 10 NGOs. The NGOs used for pretesting were not part of the main study (Radhakrishna, 2007). The data collected was analyzed using correlation and regression analysis and SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) computer software.

### 3.7 Data Analysis and Presentation

This is the process of collecting, modeling and transforming data in order to highlight useful information, suggesting conclusions and supporting decision making (Sharma, 2005). Data was analyzed using correlation and regression analysis. The relationship between independent variables was measured through multiple correlation and multiple regression analysis, in order to find out the inter-relationship between the four independent variables.
and their influence on the dependent variable (Sharma, 2005). SPSS computer program was also used. The findings of the data are presented in tables and charts.

### 3.8 Ethical Issues

Ethics are norms or standards of behaviour that guide the moral choices about our behaviour and our relationship with others. All parties in research should observe ethical behavior. Research ethics was put into consideration when developing and administering data collection tools and techniques, to avoid any form of harm, suffering or violation. This was done through obtaining consent before the research; ensuring confidentiality of data obtained and learning more about the organization’s culture and project before the research and where necessary absolute sensitivity and caution was excised. In order to safeguard the rights of the participants, the researcher also explained to the participant the benefits of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is a presentation of the research findings obtained from field responses and data. This section includes the background information, presentation of findings and analysis based on the objectives of the study and as explored by the questionnaires, where both descriptive and inferential statistics have been employed.

4.2 Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires administered</th>
<th>Questionnaires filled &amp; returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013

Out of the 200 questionnaires administered, 188 were filled and returned, which represents a 94% response rate. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) a 50% response rate is adequate, and a response rate greater than 70% is very good. Hence the response rate was satisfactory. This response rate can be attributed to the data collection procedures, where the researcher pre-notified the potential participants and applied the drop and pick method to allow the respondents ample time to fill the questionnaires.
4.3 Demographic Information

The study sought to find out the demographic information of the respondents which included gender, level of education, years worked in M&E projects and age.

4.3.1 Respondents Gender

![Gender Distribution Chart]

Figure 4.1 Respondents Gender Distribution  
Source: Survey Data, 2013

The gender distribution of the respondents was sought in order to establish if there was any gender parities in the positions. The findings indicated that the majority of the respondents were male (65.52%) while females’ respondents were only 34.48%. This implies that there were more males than female involved in monitoring and evaluation activities amongst the sampled NGO’s.
4.3.2 Level of Education

The study sorts the respondents’ level of education in order to ascertain if they were well equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills in their respective areas of specialization. From the study findings majority (52%) indicated that they had university first degree (undergraduates), followed by 38% of the respondents who had post graduate qualification and 10% who had diploma. None had certificate qualification as their highest level of education. The findings therefore indicate that the respondents have the capacity, skills and management expertise to conduct M&E activities successfully in their organizations.
4.3.3 Respondents Work Experience

![Bar chart showing respondents' work experience](chart.png)

Based on the findings, majority (32%) of the respondents had worked in M&E projects for between 4-5 years followed by 25% who had more than 5 years experience in M&E projects. While 32% of the respondents had worked in M&E projects for a period between 2 to 4 years, a small proportion (6%) had an experience of 1 to 2 years and 4% had less than one year experience. The findings therefore implies that the respondents were experienced enough to provide valuable responses concerning determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems in NGOs within Nairobi County.
4.3.4 Age Distribution

Majority (38%) of the respondents indicated that their age ranged between 30 to 40 years, followed by 27% who indicated that their age range was between 40 to 50 years. The findings also revealed that 16% of the respondents were aged between 20 to 30 years; 11% were over 50 years of age; and 8% were less than 20 years of age. From the findings, it can be inferred that the respondents were old enough to provide reliable insights relevant to the study.
4.4 Effectiveness of M&E Systems

![Graph showing the effectiveness of M&E systems]

**Figure 4.5: Effectiveness of M&E Systems**  
Source: Survey Data, 2013

The respondents were required to rate the effectiveness of their M&E system. Based on the findings, 34% of the respondents indicated that the M&E system was effective; 25% indicated it was very effective; 22% indicated that the system was ineffective and 12% indicated that it was very ineffective. It is also worth noting that 7% of the respondents indicated that they did not know whether the M&E system was effective or not.

The ineffectiveness of some of the M&E systems could be attributed to the NGOs not allocating it adequate resources and inconsistency in selection of indicators leading to its incomprehensiveness. According to the international benchmark, the NGOs are supposed to allocate between 10% and 12% of the total project cost to monitoring and evaluation (Kenya social protection sector review, 2012). An effective M&E system requires the interaction between the employees, procedures, data, technology and key stakeholders (Chaplowe, 2008).
4.5 Difficulties in using M&E system

The findings indicate that 67% of the respondents faced difficulties in using M&E system while 33% indicated that they had no difficulties using the M&E system. The respondents who cited difficulties in using the M&E system were further asked to give their opinion on the possible factors contributing to the difficulty.

Table 4.2: Factors contributing to difficulty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors contributing to difficulty</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected tools and techniques</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of management in the operations of the M&amp;E</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adequacy of M&amp;E training</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical expertise of the staff</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013

From the analysis of the results, 30.85% of the respondents indicated that the selected tools and techniques contributed to difficult while 29.26% indicated that the role of management in
the operations of the M&E was also a challenge. The study also revealed that the adequacy of M&E training and technical expertise of the staff contributed to difficulty in use of the M&E systems as supported by 18.09% and 21.81% of the respondents respectively.

4.6 Tools and techniques used in M&E system

The common tools and techniques used by the sampled NGOs in their M&E systems are logical framework, participatory approaches, evaluation surveys, site visits and strategic planning frameworks. This shows that the NGOs use different tools and techniques for their M&E systems. This could be attributed to the projects M&E needs, information needed, the stakeholders and the cost involved as well as the evaluator’s preferred choice of tools and techniques (World Bank, 2002 and Nabris, 2002). The respondents were further asked to rate the applicability of those tools and techniques in M&E activities.

![Bar chart showing the applicability of tools and techniques](chart.png)

Figure 4.7: Applicability of the tools and techniques  
Source: Survey Data, 2013
Thirty five per cent (35%) of the respondents indicated that the applicability of the tools and techniques was difficult; 23% indicated that it was easy; 20% indicated that it was very easy and 14% of the respondents were of the view that the applicability of the tools and techniques was very difficult while a minority (8%) did not know.

The limitations of the instruments that NGOs use to monitor, evaluate and review are one reason why NGOs have not been able to achieve their goals. There has been a lot of argument over the value of the Logical Framework as a planning and monitoring tool (Bakewell and Garbutt, 2005). Logical Frameworks have been useful in the identification of indicators at the planning stage, but not so successful in ensuring their actual utilization during project monitoring and evaluation (Kenya social protection sector review, 2012). In the some cases the advocates of Logical Frameworks have promoted a very narrow view of indicators that is only that which is measurable can be managed (Bakewell and Garbutt, 2005). NGOs have been searching for other appropriate methods that will enable people's participation in the monitoring and evaluation of projects.

### 4.7 Training on M&E Systems

The findings indicate that most of the respondents had training in M&E systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>69.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013
The analysis shows that 69.15% of the respondents had attended training on M&E systems, while 30% had not attended any training. This implies that many of the respondents had knowledge on M&E systems. The respondents who had attended training were further asked to rate the training on the M&E systems.

![Training on the M&E systems](image)

**Figure 4.8: Training on the M&E systems**  
Source: Survey Data, 2013

Forty-two per cent (42%) indicated that the training was comprehensive; 23% indicated that the training was very comprehensive; while 11% and 9% of the respondents indicated that that training was incomprehensive and very incomprehensive respectively.
The respondents were also asked to indicate the relevance of the training in M&E systems.

### Table 4.4: Relevance of training in M&E systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The contents of the training in regard to the effectiveness of the M&amp;E system</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the general effectiveness of the M&amp;E system</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of personnel</td>
<td>2.028</td>
<td>0.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase staff technical expertise</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of local M&amp;E experts</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the positions of the M&amp;E system</td>
<td>1.624</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the quality of the M&amp;E human resource</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013

The contents of the training, in regard to the effectiveness of the M&E system, were termed as relevant with a mean of 1.020 and a standard deviation of 0.821. Contribution of the training to the general effectiveness of the M&E system was also found to be relevant as supported by respondents with a mean of 1.554 and standard deviation of 0.821. The capacity building of personnel and increase in staff technical expertise were also found to be relevant with a means of 2.028 and 1.050 respectively.

The training in M&E systems was as well found to be relevant in the following areas: induction of local M&E experts (mean- 1.715 and standard deviation- 0.765), understanding the positions of the M&E system (mean- 1.624 and standard deviation- 0.820), and in the increase the quality of the M&E human resource (mean- 1.770 and standard deviation-
1.061). M&E human resource management, both in quality and quantity, is required in order to have an effective M&E staff (World Bank, 2011). The Kenya social protection sector review (2012) encourages the development of capacity building of national and progressive weaning programme of local M&E experts.

4.8 Competence of Staff handling the M&E System

The study sought to find out the competence of other staff handling M&E system.

![Chart showing competence levels of M&E staff]

Figure 4.9: Competence of Staff handling the M&E System  Source: Survey Data, 2013

Based on the findings, 54% of the respondents indicated that the staff were competent followed by 17% who indicated that they were very competent. The findings also showed that 13% and 8% were incompetent and very incompetent respectively. A small proportion of the respondents however did not know about that level of competence of the other staff handling M&E system.
4.9 Role of Management

The study also sought to examine how the role of management affected the effectiveness of M&E systems.

![Bar chart showing the role of management towards effectiveness of the M&E systems](chart)

**Figure 4.10: Role of management towards effectiveness of the M&E systems**

Source: Survey Data, 2013

From the findings, majority (45%) of the respondents of the NGOs sampled rated the role of management as very adequate while 21% rated it as adequate. A significant proportion (19%) of the respondents rated the role of management as being inadequate while 11% indicated that it was very inadequate. Few of the respondents were not able to rate the role of management towards effectiveness of the M&E systems because they did not know.

The study also indicated that the management acted promptly to the project demands and improvements.
Figure 4.11: Role of management in regard to acting to project demands and improvements

Source: Survey Data, 2013

The management acted promptly and very promptly to project demands and improvements as supported by 39% and 33% of the respondents respectively. The findings also indicated that 12% and 6% of the respondents were of the opinion that the management acted late and very late respectively. Few (6%) of the respondents indicated that the management would act was impromptu while 4% did not know.

The management is responsible of making decisions and strategic planning of the project as well as manages the M&E system (IFRC, 2011). The success of the M&E system depends on the support it gets from the management (World Bank, 2011). The management as well relies on the information provided by the M&E system for its decision-making (Gaitano, 2011).
4.10 Use of information from the M&E system

Table 4.5: Use of information from the M&E system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating policies</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project impact assessment</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing with other NGOs in the sector</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project improvement</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013

The findings revealed that the information from the M&E systems is used in: making decisions and formulating policies as supported by a mean of 1.24 and 1.62 respectively; planning (with a mean of 1.77 and a standard deviation of 1.142); project impact assessment (mean- 1.01 and standard deviation-0.954), sharing with other NGOs in the sector (mean-1.02 and standard deviation-1.800) and project improvement (mean- 1.83 and standard deviation-0.781). This shows that the information from the M&E system is widely consumed although it does not actually show the level of satisfaction in its consumption.

In regard to the authorities responsible for the performance of the project and M&E activities, the respondents point out that the project manager oversees the entire project monitoring and evaluation process while the project staffs do the monitoring and evaluation and the M&E staffs were responsible for M&E system.
4.11 Determinants of Effective M&E system

The respondents were to ask to rank the determinants in order of priority using the scale of 1-4 where 1 is the highest priority and 4 is the lowest priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinants</th>
<th>Rank in order of priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of tool and techniques</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of M&amp;E system</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical expertise of the staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013

The ranking from the highest to the lowest was as follows: 1) technical expertise of the staff, 2) training of M&E system, 3) the role of management and 4) selection of tool and techniques.

4.12 Regression and Correlation Analysis

4.12.1 Multiple Regression Equation

Regression analysis was utilized to investigate the relationship between the variables. These included an error term, whereby the dependent variable was expressed with a combination of independent variables. The unknown parameters in the model were estimated, using observed values of the dependent and independent variables. The following model represents the regression equation representing the relationship between effective M&E system as a linear function of the independent variables (selection of tools and techniques, role of management,
M&E training and technical expertise of the staff), with \( \epsilon \) representing the error term. The regression model was therefore used to describe how the mean of the dependent variable changes with the changing conditions.

\[
Y_i = a + \beta_1(X_1) + \beta_2(X_2) + \beta_3(X_3) + \beta_4(X_4) + \epsilon. \text{ When } \beta_5 = 0 \ldots \text{ Equation 1}
\]

(Equation 1: Regression Equation)

Where; \( Y_i \) = Effective Monitoring and Evaluation System

\( X_1 \) = Selection of Tools and Techniques

\( X_2 \) = Role of Management

\( X_3 \) = M&E Training

\( X_4 \) = Technical Expertise of the Staff

\( \epsilon \) representing the error term

The coefficient was obtained as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7 Multiple Regression Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unstandardized Coefficients</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Tools and Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expertise of the Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013
Incorporating the values of the Beta values into equation 1 above:

\[ Y_i = 11.132 + 0.231(X_1) + 0.321(X_2) + 0.553(X_3) + 0.734(X_4) + \epsilon \ldots \text{Equation 2} \]

(Equation 2: Regression Equation with Beta Values)

According to the regression equation, taking all factors into consideration, effective M&E system is equal to 11.132. The Standardized Beta Coefficients give a measure of the contribution of each variable to the model. A large value indicates that a unit change in this predictor variable has a large effect on the criterion variable. The t and Sig (p) values give a rough indication of the impact of each predictor variable – a big absolute t value and small p value suggests that a predictor variable is having a large impact on the criterion variable. At 5% level of significance and 95% level of confidence, Selection of Tools and Techniques had a 0.231 level of significance, Role of Management had a 0.321 level of significance, M&E Training had a 0.054 level of significance and Technical Expertise of the Staff had a 0.734 level of significance.
4.12.2 Regression Model Summary

Table 4.8 Coefficient of determination (Regression)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.777a</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.43829</td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.777a</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.43829</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013

a. Predictors: (Constant), selection of tools and techniques, role of management, M&E training and technical expertise of the staff

The variables, collectively, show that 77.6% of variation or change in the effective M&E system is explained by the variables considered in the model, that is the selection of tools and techniques, role of management, M&E training and technical expertise of the staff as indicated by the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) which is also evidenced by F change $108.505 > p$-values (0.05). This implies that these variables are significant (since the $p$-values $< 0.05$) and therefore need to be considered in any effort to boost the effectiveness of M&E systems in NGOs in Kenya. The study therefore identifies selection of tools and techniques, role of management, M&E training and technical expertise of the staff as critical determinants of an effective M&E system.

4.12.3 Correlation Coefficient

Pearson correlation was used to measure the degree of association between variables. Pearson correlation coefficients range from -1 to +1. Negative values indicates negative correlation and positive values indicates positive correlation where Pearson coefficient $< 0.3$. 
indicates weak correlation, Pearson coefficient > 0.3 < 0.5 indicates moderate correlation and Pearson coefficient > 0.5 indicates strong correlation.

Table 4.9 Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Selection of Tools and Techniques</th>
<th>Role of Management</th>
<th>M&amp;E Training</th>
<th>Technical Expertise of the Staff</th>
<th>Effective M&amp;E systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Tools and Techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Management</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Training</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expertise of the Staff</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective M&amp;E systems</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Source: Survey Data, 2013

The analysis above shows that technical expertise of the staff has the strongest positive (Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.713) influence on effective M&E system. In addition, selection of tools and techniques, role of management as well as M&E training are positively correlated to effective M&E system (Pearson correlation coefficient = 0.511, 0.524 and 0.614).

The correlation matrix implies that the independent variables: selection of tools and techniques, role of management, M&E training and technical expertise of the staff are very
crucial determinants of effective M&E system as shown by their strong and positive relationship with the dependent variable.

### 4.12.4 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

#### Table 4.10: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F-critical value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>88.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.89</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data, 2013

Predictors: (Constant), selection of tools and techniques, role of management, M&E training and technical expertise of the staff.

The value of the F statistic, 18.33 indicates that the overall regression model is significant hence it has some explanatory value, that is, there is a significant relationship between the predictor selection of tools and techniques, role of management, M&E training and technical expertise of the staff (taken together) and effective M&E system.

### 4.13 Conclusion

The study identifies the independent variables: selection of tools and techniques, role of management, M&E training and technical expertise of the staff as important determinants for
an effective M&E as shown by their strong and positive relationship with the dependent variable.

The correlation matrix shows that the independent variables are key determinants of effective M&E system. This is further illustrated by the regression equation which after taking all factors into consideration, indicated that effective M&E systems is 11.132. The Standardized Beta Coefficients gave a measure of the contribution of each variable to the model. A large value indicates that a unit change in the predictor variable had a large effect on the criterion variable. The t and Sig (p) values give a rough indication of the impact of each predictor variable – a big absolute t value and small p value suggested that a predictor variable is having a large impact on the criterion variable. Furthermore the model summary, shows that the variables collectively have 77.6% of variation or change in the effective M&E system which is explained by the variables considered in the model as indicated by the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) which was also evidenced by F change $108.505>p$-values (0.05). This implies that these variables are significant (since the p-values< 0.05) and therefore need to be considered in the endeavor to boost the effectiveness of the M&E systems in NGOs.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is a synthesis of the entire study, and contains summary of research findings, conclusions and recommendations and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of Research Findings

The summary below presents the research findings in brief according to the research objectives. The objectives of the study were to find out how the effectiveness of the M&E system was influenced by: the selection of tools and techniques; the role of management; M&E training and the technical expertise of the staff.

5.2.1 Background Information

The study had 188 respondents which represents a 94% response rate. The gender distribution of the respondents indicates that there are more male (65.52%) than females (34.48%) involved in monitoring and evaluation activities. The findings also indicate that the respondents had capacity, skills and management expertise to conduct M&E activities, with majority (52%) being undergraduates, 38% being post graduates and 10% being diploma holders. The respondents were also experienced enough to provide valuable responses with 32% having a working experience of between 4-5 years, 25% with more than 5 years, 32% with between 2-4 years working experience while only 6% and 4 % had 1-2 years and less than 1 year working experience respectively. The age distribution of the respondents also
show that they were old enough to provide reliable insights relevant to the study with majority (38%) with age ranged between 30 to 40 years, 27% between 40 to 50 years, 16% between 20 to 30 years, 11% over 50 years and 8% with less than 20 years.

5.2.2 Selection of Tools and Techniques

NGOs used different tools and techniques in their M&E systems. The most commonly used being logical framework, participatory approaches, evaluation surveys, site visits and strategic planning frameworks. The selection of tools and techniques ranked as the highest factor contributing to the difficulties faced in the use of the M&E system, as cited by 30.85% project manager and M&E staff. A big number of the project managers and M&E staff (49%) also indicated that the applicability of the tools and techniques was difficult compared to 23% and 20% that indicated that it was easy and very easy respectively.

5.2.3 M&E Training

More than a half of the project managers and M&E staff (69.15%) had attended training on M&E systems although a noteworthy proportion (30.85%) had not attended any training. The training contents were termed as being comprehensive (42%) as well as very comprehensive (23%). Although in some instances it was termed as being incomprehensive (11%) and very incomprehensive (9%). The contents of the training were said to be relevant and contributed to the effectiveness of the M&E system. The training also had a positive impact on capacity building of personnel and increase in staff technical expertise. M&E training was cited as
being the least factor (18%) contributing to the difficulty in the utilization of the M&E system.

The M&E training was also found to have an important contribution towards the induction of local M&E experts, understanding of the positions of the M&E system in addition to increasing the quality and quantity of the M&E human resource. Training was also one of the recommendations given by the respondents in order to improve future M&E systems.

### 5.2.4 Role of Management

In regard to the difficulties faced during the application of the M&E system, the role of management ranked 2nd with 29.26% project managers and M&E staff indicating that it is a challenge to the operations of the M&E system. In contrast, the role of management to the operations of the M&E system was perceived to be very adequate (45%), and adequate (21%). However 30% still saw the role of management as inadequate. The management was also alleged to act promptly (39%) and at times very promptly (33%) to project demands and improvements. Few however indicated that the management would act impromptu while a small proportion did not know.

The management was also able to utilize the information from the M&E system. The information was used to making decisions, formulate policies, in planning, project impact assessment, was shared with other NGOs in the sector and in project improvement.
5.2.5 Technical Expertise

The technical expertise of the staff was ranked 3rd among the factor that contributed to difficulties in using M&E systems. The project managers and M&E staff stated that the staff handling the M&E system were competent (54%) and very competent (17%). Although some of the staff were seen to be incompetent (13%) and very incompetent (8%); it is also noteworthy that some project managers and M&E staff (8%) did not know about the competence of the other staff.

5.3 Conclusion

The selection of tools and techniques to be used in an M&E system determines its success or failure. However, NGOs in developing countries are said to be unable to develop appropriate tools hence resulting to substandard M&E systems that don’t meet the requirements of the stakeholders (Chesos, 2010). There is therefore a need to have consensus with all stakeholders on the kind of tools and techniques to be applied. The selection of tools and techniques also depends on information needed and available finances (World Bank, 2002). The limitations of the M&E tools and techniques should also be put in consideration during their selection. Logical framework for instance has been cited as one of the popular tools used by the sampled NGOs; however there are many arguments over its value as a planning, monitoring and evaluation tool (Bakewell and Garbutt, 2005). The NGOs should therefore be flexible to allow modification of their M&E systems including tools and techniques used as well as consider experiences from other organization.
The role played by the management majorly dictates the effectiveness of the M&E system (World Bank, 2011). The management is like the central nerve to an effective M&E system. It coordinates the processes of the M&E system ensuring its success and manages the M&E human resource. Although, at times, the M&E activities are seen as a control of a bureaucratic management (Shapiro, 2011). The management should have the knowhow to run the project and M&E system. It should also work with the other stakeholders, especially the employees to ensure that they have the required experience and training to handle the M&E system. The NGO Board should also ensure that the management puts into practice the Public Benefit Organization Act, 2013.

Training is relevant for an effective M&E system. M&E being a new profession, training is paramount in building an M&E human resource, which is able to manage the M&E system effectively (World Bank, 2011). The Kenya social protection sector review (2012), notes that Kenya mostly relies on international M&E consultants and therefore advocates for a progressive weaning program for local M&E specialists. Training courses should thus be harmonized across the NGO sector in order to encourage the induction of local M&E experts as well as to increase the quality of the M&E staff. A capacity building policy should also be put in place to emphasis on M&E training across the NGO sector on M&E systems.

A human capital with skills in research and project management is fundamental in the selection and execution of effective M&E systems for projects (Nabris, 2002). A professional association of M&E experts therefore needs to be started in order to develop and improve the
quality and quantity of our local M&E experts. It is the general expertise of the staff handling the M&E that determine its success.

Other determinants which are considered important for an effective M&E system include: project enabling environment, stakeholders' participation in project monitoring and evaluation activities, project capacity to supply project monitoring and evaluation information, and the project plan. The effectiveness of these determinants is manifested through easy assessment of projects, accountability in projects, capacity of staff to undertake project monitoring and evaluation work among others.

5.4 Recommendations

The Government to gazette the Public Benefit Organization Act, 2013 and enact the Charities Act which will see the transformation of the NGOs to PBOs, that will also conform them to the Constitution of Kenya. The PBO Act will see the organizations (NGOs) work together through result-based management to meet the needs of their beneficiaries, develop transparent reporting policies as well as development and use tools for monitoring and evaluation of their work and impact.

The NGOs Coordination Board and the NGO Council to work with the NGOs in developing a database of M&E systems information across the sector, where they can learn from previous experiences of other NGOs. They should also develop harmonized training curricula for the M&E staff and conduct training workshops. This will contribute to the induction of local M&E experts, as well as improve the quality and quantity of the experts. According to
the finding of this research project, in order to have an effective M&E system, training should be tailored towards M&E tools, methods, approach and concepts.

M&E tools and techniques should be identified when preparing an M&E plan and their limitation put into consideration. Training should be tailored towards the effective application of these M&E tools and techniques. Where they are considered to be a big challenge to the implementation of an effective M&E system they should be substituted.

Integration of modern technology into the NGO sector in regards to the improvement of the M&E systems. ICT will provide efficient management of the M&E systems and engage more stakeholders. The management should identify ways to integrate technology in to the project activities as well as ensure a good interaction between the employees, procedures, data and key stakeholders. The study therefore recommends that the management must to be innovative as well as interrelate with all aspects of the M&E system. There is also need for incentives to the management for M&E to be well executed and its information consumed.

The NGOs should ensure that there is adequate early planning for project M&E activities (including the human and financial resources) and involvement of all stakeholders in development and implementation of the M&E system. The project managers and the M&E staff in charge of the M&E systems should ensure that they employee staff with the required technical expertise and offer them the necessary training to operate the M&E system effectively.
5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

The empirical study has indicated a number of relevant issues that the research project did not investigate, but which might be important for further research on the determinants influencing the effectiveness of M&E systems in non-governmental organizations. In addition this study was conducted in Nairobi County, Kenya and considered only 200 NGOs; other studies should involve NGOs in other regions in order to obtain more holistic information on these determinants.
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APPENDICES

Questionnaire

Section 1: Introduction

This questionnaire is meant to collect information on determinants of effective monitoring and evaluation systems in Non-Governmental Organizations within Nairobi County, Kenya. The information collected through this questionnaire will be treated with confidentiality and used for academic purpose only. Kindly take a moment to answer all the questions as accurately as possible.

Section 2: Background information

NGO’s name: .............................................................................................................

Area of operation: ........................................................................................................

Project using M&E systems: ........................................................................................

Respondent position: ....................................................................................................

Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

Highest level of education:

a) Diploma holder ( )
b) Undergraduate  ( )
c) Post graduate  ( )
d) Other  ( )

Number of years worked in M&E projects:

- Less than 1 year  ( )
- 1 – 2 years  ( )
- 2 – 3 years  ( )
- 3 – 4 years  ( )
- 4 – 5 years  ( )
- More than 5 years  ( )

Age bracket:

- Below 20 years  ( )
- 20 – 30 years  ( )
- 30 – 40 years  ( )
- 40 – 50 years  ( )
- above 50 years  ( )

Section 3: Determinants of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

1. How would you rate the effectiveness of the M&E system?

   - Very effective  ( )
   - Effective  ( )
   - Ineffective  ( )
   - Very ineffective  ( )
   - Don’t know  ( )
2.a) Why do you say so?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

2. Do you have any difficulties in using the M&E system?

Yes ( )        No ( )

2. a) If yes, what do you think is contributing to the difficulty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Tools and techniques</th>
<th>Tick where appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The role of management to the operations of the M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adequacy of M&amp;E training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical expertise of the staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Name three (3) tools and techniques used in this M&E system

a. ............................................................................................................................

b. ............................................................................................................................

c. ............................................................................................................................

4. How would you rate the applicability of these tools and techniques?

Very Easy    ( )

Easy        ( )

Difficult   ( )

Very difficult ( )
5. a) Why do you say so? …………………………………………………………………………..

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. b) What other tools and techniques would you recommend for this M&E system?
   1……………………………………………………………………………………………………
   2. ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. Have you had any training on M&E systems?
   Yes ( )       No ( )

6. How would you rate the training on the M&E system?
   a. Very comprehensive ( )
   b. Comprehensive ( )
   c. Incomprehensive ( )
   d. Very incomprehensive ( )
   e. Don’t know ( )

7. How would you rate the training on M&E systems in terms of its relevance, to the following:
   In order of relevance using the scale of 1 to 4. Where 1 is the very relevant and 4 is the not relevant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The contents of the training in regard to the effectiveness of the M&amp;E system</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the general effectiveness of the M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase staff technical expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction of local M&amp;E experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the operations of the M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased the quality of the M&amp;E human resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What is the competence of the other staff handling the M&E system?

- Very competent ( )
- Competent ( )
- Incompetent ( )
- Very incompetent ( )
- Don’t know ( )

8.a) why do you say so? .................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................
9. What would you say is the composition of M&E experts in this project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0% - 20%</th>
<th>20% - 40%</th>
<th>40% - 60%</th>
<th>60% - 80%</th>
<th>80% - 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E International consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Local consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How would you rate the role of management towards the effectiveness of the M&E system

a. Very adequate  
   ( )
b. Adequate      
   ( )
c. Inadequate    
   ( )
d. Very inadequate
   ( )
e. Don’t know    
   ( )

11. What would you say about the role of management in regard to acting on the project demands and improvements:

a. Very prompt
   ( )
b. Prompt        
   ( )
c. Late          
   ( )
d. Very late     
   ( )
e. Impromptu     
   ( )
f. Don’t know    
   ( )
12. How would you rate the use of information from the M&E system in the following areas, using the scale of 1 to 4, where 1 is highly used and 4 is least used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project impact assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing with other NGOs in the sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Which authority is responsible for the performance of the following project activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Project manager</th>
<th>Project staff</th>
<th>M&amp;E staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Rank the following determinants in order of priority using the scale of 1 to 4. Where 1 is the highest priority and 4 is the lowest priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinant</th>
<th>Rank in order of priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Tools and Techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on M&amp;E system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expertise of the Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. What recommendations would you give to help improve the M&E systems used in projects by NGO sector?

End

Thank you for your response
Letter of Introduction
Map 1: Nairobi County
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