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DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

**Evaluation:** Evaluation is a selective exercise that attempts to systematically and objectively assess progress towards the achievement of an outcome.

**Monitoring:** This refers to a continuing function that aims primarily to provide the management and main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results.

**Project:** This refers to a unique endeavor which is undertaken in order to achieve a planned outcome or benefit.

**Project implementation effectiveness:** This refers to the process of implementing a project within budget, on time, achieving the project stakeholder satisfaction and conforming to the quality specification.

**Project Management:** This is the application of processes, methods, knowledge, managerial skills, monitoring and evaluation techniques, involvement of primary stakeholders and an understanding of the factors attributed to donor behavior to achieve the project objectives.
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of project management on effective implementation of donor funded projects in Busia County, Kenya. The study was guided by the following specific objectives: Evaluation of the influence of monitoring and evaluation, managerial factors, empowerment of primary stakeholders and factors attributed to donor behavior on effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya. Descriptive research design was used to undertake the study. The target population was donor funded projects implemented in Busia County, Kenya, whose number stood at 415 as at June 30th 2016. In each of the projects, the respondents were the project managers and a randomly selected community member per project. Sample sizes of 204 project managers and 204 community members were selected to participate in the study. Primary data was collected with the aid of semi-structured questionnaires. Data pertaining to the objectives of the study was analyzed using descriptive statistics, which includes measures of central tendency and measures of dispersion. In order to meet the objectives of the study, descriptive and regression analysis were undertaken. Based on the findings of the study, all the four factors examined are validated as key in influencing effectiveness of projects implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County, Kenya. Primary stakeholder involvement however has the most significant influence, followed by factors attributed to donor behavior. Whereas monitoring and evaluation is ranked third, the least ranked are managerial factors. Findings of the study reveal that effective institutional and management capacity is a recipe to effective project implementation as it encourages participation and involvement of the community in all the processes of project implementation, hence people feeling empowered. Involvement of community members and other stakeholders enables them to better influence the course of their lives and the decisions which affect them with respect to projects implementation. In view of the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made: Monitoring and evaluation is key to effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects as it determines the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of projects so that the information obtained can inform the design of future projects. It is of paramount importance to involve primary stakeholders in various aspects of projects implementation since it helps in building up the capacity of people to generate and influence development at various levels, increasing their access to and influence over resources and institutions. This in turn helps in achieving projects sustainability. In order to avoid delay in projects stating time, occasioned by delays in funds disbursement by donors, there is need for the donors to be informed of the consequences of the delays, so that when designing their policies, the process will be informed by strategic rather than bureaucratic thinking. Project effectiveness is often used in measuring results towards the vision, mission and goals attainment of the organization. It is therefore important that all stakeholders understand the project vision, mission and objectives and work as team members with the aim of attaining the desired results. This at times may call for working long hours and in difficult conditions, which requires that all stakeholders go an extra mile, without taking their eyes off the ultimate goal.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Since Kenya’s independence in 1963, the government’s strategies and priorities on socio-economic development have recognized that rural development is essential for reduction of inequalities and vulnerability to famine, water-stress and land degradation. After four decades of trying, food insecurity has persisted, for example an estimated half of Kenya’s estimated 38.5 million people are poor, and some 7.5 million people live in extreme poverty, while over 10 million people suffer from chronic food insecurity and poor nutrition. (Republic of Kenya (RoK), 2013).

Most donor funded development projects are implemented by Non-governmental organizations (NGOs). NGOs are private, nonprofit making organizations that aim to serve particular societal interests by focusing advocacy and or operational efforts on social, political and economic goals, including equity, education, health, environmental protection and human rights (Teegen, Doh & Vachani, 2004). In Kenya, the NGOs Co-ordination act, 1990 (No. 19 of 1990), amended through the Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 85 (Act No. 8) 23 October 1992, defines a Non-Governmental Organization as “a private voluntary grouping of individuals or associations, not operated for profit or for other commercial purposes but which have organized themselves nationally or internationally for the benefit of the public at large and for the promotion of social welfare, development, charity or research in the areas inclusive of, but not restricted to, health, relief, agriculture, education, industry, and the supply of amenities and services” (Republic of Kenya, 1990).
Doh and Teegen (2003), described NGOs as non-profit, voluntary citizens groups that are organized on a local, national or international level, and may be of three types: operational NGOs, that provide goods and services to needy clients; advocacy NGOs, that promote the interests of groups who do not have either voice or access to do so themselves; and hybrid NGOs, which perform both of the previous functions. NGOs are organized around specific issues, including health and environmental protection, human rights, and in their areas of concern they can serve as early warning mechanisms or monitors of official agreements (Teegen et al., 2004). NGOs offer a number of distinct advantages that can enhance the provision of social services or the promotion of social needs, whether on their own or in cooperation with business or government (Nancy & Yontcheva, 2006; Yaziji, 2004).

Within East Africa, a study done by Wairimu (2014) entitled “Transition or stagnation; everyday life, food security and recovery in post-conflict northern Uganda” focused on the impact of the NGOs in Northern Uganda” and concluded the legitimacy and impact of the NGOs activities can be improved if they research and understand the local population. This study gives impetus in the need to review if the donor and legal policies in Kenya are a moderating variable that will then affect strategy implementation and organization effectiveness.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) noted that “the funds that industrialized economies channeled through NGOs rose from 0.2% of their total bilateral official development aid (ODA) in 1970 to 17% in 1996 (OECD, 2006). In Africa, by 1994 already 12% of foreign ODA was being channeled to the region through NGOs, and the number has continued to rise (Chege, 1999). Transfers of official developed country aid to
NGOs in 2006 total was more than $2bn of total ODA, about 123% more than in 2002 (OECD, 2006). Kapstein (2000) argued that though NGOs also suffer from some drawbacks, chief among them their relative immunity from transparency and accountability and their dependence on donors for funds, which are often scarce, their strengths have led governments and multilateral institutions to direct more and more funding through them.

The extent of success of donor funded projects is determined by both technical and managerial capacity of the human resources of the implementing agencies. In addition, appropriate supportive infrastructure is a necessity. According to Arndt (2000), the officers in the donor funds projects chain may lack the formal training in donor funded projects management, budgeting and accounting. These weak skills may lead to poor understanding of the donor expenditure protocols resulting in ineligible expenditures, which lead to rejection for further funding by the donor. O’Connell & Soludo (2001) argued that accountability is a key pillar of effectiveness. Accountability refers to full transparency regarding the purpose, content, responsibility and performance of the development agency. Martens et al. (2002) observed that because of the broken natural feedback loop in donor funded projects, inserting an explicit evaluation function in donor funded projects is necessary to eliminate performance problems.

1.1.1 Effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects

Effectiveness is the capability of the organization to meet its set vision and mission given the resources it has in possession (Yukl, 2008). Project effectiveness is often used in measuring results towards the vision, mission and goals attainment of the firm (Bartuseviciene & Sakalyte, 2013). Effectiveness determines the degree to which an organization meets its
strategic goals (Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010). Business efficiency informs the performance of input and output ratio, whereas organizational efficiency examines the enhancement of internal processes of the organization such as structure and culture (Bartuseviciene & Sakalyte, 2013). Efficiency is all about resource allocation across alternative uses (Kumar & Gulati, 2010).

Several measures of project effectiveness are suggested, Campbell (1977) lists over 30 different measurement criteria from profitability, productivity, sales turnover, growth, sustainability and collaboration. Chakravarthy (1986) provides various facets of effectiveness; high quality of transformation, learning, improved financial performance, profitability and stakeholder contentment. Different stakeholders to an organization will emphasize different measures; managers lean on measures that focus on structure since it’s within their control, staff members would prefer procedure and practice measurements parameters and clients will lean on outcome measurements like speed of delivery, courtesy, need met and sensitivity, (Cameron, 1978; Cameron & Whetten, 1996; Ashraf & Kadir, 2012). Seven dimensions are proposed for the measurement of organizational efficiency, these are: motivation of staff commitment; management and business system building; development of employee’s skills; corporate structure design; organizational strategy; development of corporate and employee styles; and subordinate goals (Pinprayong & Siengthai, 2012).

The term effectiveness has been addressed in the performance measurement literature of NGOs. According to Sowa et al. (2004), effectiveness in NGOs can be divided into organizational effectiveness and project/program effectiveness. Organizational effectiveness
is associated with structure, process, management systems and other organizational functions. This term is closely linked to strategy implementation drivers. On the other hand, project effectiveness, which is the main highlighted variable in this study, can be defined as a measure aimed at determining how a project is meeting the stated objectives successfully. It is about how an NGO fulfill its mission, short and long term objectives. Morley et al. (2001) defined it as outcomes or “a specific desirable result or quality of an organization’s services.”

1.1.2 Donor funded projects in Busia County

Busia is one of the forty seven (47) counties of Kenya and it is situated at the extreme western region of the country. The County borders three other counties which include: Bungoma to the north, Kakamega to the east and Siaya to the south west. Part of Lake Victoria is in the County on the South East and borders the Lake with the Republic of Uganda to the west. It lies between latitude 0° and 0° 45 north and longitude 34° 25 east. (Busia County Integrated Development Plan 2013-2017). The County covers an area of 1,694.5 square kilometers with 10 divisions, 60 locations and 181 sub-locations based on the previous administrative arrangement. Following the promulgation of the new Constitution in 2010, there are new administrative units covering the same area in form of sub-counties numbering 7 and 35 wards. The 7 sub-counties are also constituencies, namely Funyula, Budalang’i, Butula, Matayos, Nambale, Teso North and Teso South. The 2012 population of Busia was estimated to be 816,452 with females numbering 425,622 (53.13%) and the males 390,830 (47.87%) respectively. By the year 2017, the population is estimated to have grown to a total of 953,337 (456,356 males and 496,981 females). Out of the estimated total population in 2012, a total of 144,616 (17.71%) people were below the age of five years
while in 2017 the number is expected to be 168, 862 (Busia County Integrated Development Plan (2013-2017)).

The ongoing projects which were the main focus of this study are as follows: Rural roads program to link inter and intra county road network; Busia energy center which was aimed at reducing wood fuel reserves by introduction of more efficient energy saving technologies such as bio gas, wind among others; Rural Electrification Program; Sio- Port jetty landing aimed at improving fish and passenger landing; Multi lane highway connecting major commercial centers countywide; Upgrading of level 3 facilities to level 4 in Nambale, Funyula and Butula; STI/HIV/AIDS Control program; East Africa public health laboratory network project (county outlook); Schools water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) program; Jigger infestations control program in Nambale, Funyula, Teso South; TB control program aimed at up scaling the testing, treatment and adherence to treatment plan; Sewerage plant installation program targeting one on each of the seven sub-counties; Establishment of child friendly Early Child Development classrooms in all schools county wide; Establishment of Technical Training institutes (TTIs); Adult and continuing Education program which targets out of schools youths and adults learners countywide; School text books project; One village one product (OVOP) program; Program for Agriculture and Livelihoods in western communities; Entrepreneurial training program; Land Banking program; and Construction of youth empowerment centers to equip the youth with skills.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Since the late 20th Century, the call for NGOs to demonstrate their effectiveness has become increasingly popularized (Abdel-Kader & Wadongo, 2011; Ebrahim & Rangan, 2010; Lecy,
Schmitz, & Swedlund, 2011) with many paying more attention on how effective they implement their strategies to achieve desired results. Muema (2012), analyzed factors influencing strategy implementation among local non-governmental organizations in Nairobi and concluded that the major factors influencing strategy implementation in NGOs are; poor communication, lack of commitment of top management to strategy implementation, poor leadership style of managers, inadequate funds, limited human resource skills, economic forces and pressure from donors. Ochanda (2014), studied “The Local Development Dynamics of the Third Sector in Kenya: The Empowerment Dimension” and reviewed how the not for profit sector which is often labeled ‘third sector’ has developed within the legal, bilateral agreements and political influences in Kenya.

Abok (2013) did a study on “Factors Affecting Effective Implementation of Strategic Plans in NGOs in Kenya” with a focus on Nairobi District under Youth, Relief, Micro-finance and health sectors and concluded four major aspects impact on effective implementation of strategic plans in NGOs in Kenya; management style, communication, organizational culture, stakeholders and organizational resources. However, Abok’s data analysis does not give insights if there are any differences in the factors affecting effective implementation of donor funded development projects. The study’s limitation is that it has focused only on five organization facets namely management styles, communication, culture, stakeholders and resources effect on strategic planning.

Abok, Waititu, Ogutu and Ragui, (2013), did a study on “A Resource-dependency perspective on the implementation of strategic plans in Non-Governmental Organizations in Kenya” and concluded that management styles, organization culture, stakeholders and
organization resources had a great significance on strategic plans implementation while communication had some significance but not as strong as the other variables. This research focused on donor funded development projects in the following sectors; agriculture, health and education sectors different from sectors. The study did not focus on leadership styles and organizational structure, hence the difference with the current study. This research adds to the gap as echoed by Ochanda (2014) by adding onto the insights on how NGOs have used strategy implementation to ensure better economic, positioning, social and technological innovation. This study therefore, investigated the influence of project management on effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County, Kenya.

1.3 Research Objectives

1.3.1 General objective

This study sought to investigate the influence of project management on effective implementation of donor funded projects in Busia County, Kenya.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The study was guided by the following specific objectives:

i. To evaluate the influence of monitoring and evaluation on effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya.

ii. To assess the influence of managerial factors on effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya.

iii. To investigate the influence of empowerment of primary stakeholders on effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya.
iv. To assess the influence of factors attributed to donor behavior on effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya.

1.4 Research Questions

The study sought answers to the following research questions:

i. How does monitoring and evaluation influence effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya?

ii. How do managerial factors influence effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya?

iii. How primary stakeholders’ empowerment influence effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya?

iv. How do factors attributed to donor behaviors influence effective implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County in Kenya?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The study sought to raise ideas and issues in the hope that the various stakeholders and persons directly addressing issues related to donor funded projects will continue the discussion. It did not presume to offer a prescription for the ideal measures to be employed by the stakeholders so as to reverse the trends. Specifically, it is hoped that the findings of this study will be beneficial to various key stakeholders as discussed below:

The study findings will enable the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) already operating in Kenya to understand the missing link between the humanitarian services they offer to the communities and the social and economic needs of the communities in order of priority. The government policy makers, who include planners, will gain an understanding of
the barriers to effective implementation of donor funded projects for sustainable development in Busia County, Kenya

The project managers will gain an understanding of the barriers to effectiveness of donor funded projects in promoting sustainable development in Kenya and use the research findings to improve on their own performance in managing donor funded projects; the donor community will understand their role in the donor funds management and projects successes; and this study will make a significant contribution to the growing body of research on effective use of donor funds. Academic researchers can rely on the findings of this study by duplicating the analysis undertaken in other locations and settings. In addition, academic researchers may need the study findings to stimulate further research in this area and as such form a basis of good background for further researches.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The focus of the study was donor funded projects implemented in Busia County, whose number stood at 415 as at 30th June 2016. The responses were limited to one community members per project and the project manager. Whereas review of the literature reveal many barriers to effective implementation of donor funded projects for sustainable development, including governance of the implementing agencies; stakeholder empowerment, capacity building, factors attributed to donor behavior (including timeframe, donor regulations and funding); Managerial factors (including human resources capacity); technical factors (including appropriate technology and availability of infrastructure and equipment); empowerment of primary beneficiaries; timely availability of resources; monitoring and evaluation; project staff competencies; and stakeholder analysis. For purposes of this study,
the following factors were examined: Monitoring and evaluation; Managerial factors; Empowerment of primary stakeholders; and Factors attributed to donor behavior.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

Limitations included, but were not limited to the following: Restrictive organizational confidentiality hindering provision of full responses to the study-this was addressed by assuring respondents of utmost confidentiality and disclosing the academic purpose and intention of the study; Loss of questionnaires by the respondents, incomplete questionnaires and failure to provide objective responses by the respondents which was overcome by organizing meetings outside working hours and seeking for personal contacts of would be respondents; Some issues being misunderstood by the responses; unexpected occurrences like respondents proceeding on leave before completing the questionnaires which was mitigated through constant reminders to the respondents during the period they were expected to complete the questionnaire.

1.8 Assumptions of the Study

The study assumed that in accomplishing the objectives of the study the independent variables selected for the study would have a contribution to the dependent variables. In addition, the study assumed that the respondents would not only be reached and cooperate, but also provide sincere and honest information and views to enable objective results, conclusions and recommendations be made.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

It is of importance to have established a sound literature base around which this study is built, so as to address the aim of the research. The chapter presents a review of the theoretical literature, review of the empirical studies, conceptual framework of the study, and the research gaps. The review was undertaken in order to eliminate duplication of what has been done and provide a clear understanding of existing knowledge base in the problem area. The literature review is based on authoritative, recent, and original sources such as journals, books and dissertations.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The study was anchored on one theory - Stakeholder Theory, which was relevant to the study since it articulates a link between key independent variables – stakeholders’ empowerment in projects implementation, Donor behavior, Management and the dependent variable – effective implementation of donor funded development projects. The theory is briefly described below.

2.2.1 Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory has its origins in management literature. Preston (1999) traces the notion of stakeholders back to the Great Depression in the United States (1929-1941), when the General Electric Company defined four major stakeholder groups - shareholders, employees, customers, and the general public. Freeman (1984) indicated its origin linked to the research
conducted by the Stanford Research Institute, which defined it in 1963 as “those groups without whose support the organization would cease to exist” (Freeman, 1984). Freeman (1984) recommended a managerial perspective, which identifies four key stakeholders being the firm-owners, customers, employees, and suppliers and also found that during late Twentieth Century, the owners of corporation were no longer focusing on just their returns on investment, but were also interested in “shareholder activism” and promoting social justice.

The framework of the stakeholder model illustrates more clearly the relationships among the various groups of actors in and around the organization. Based on extensive literature reviews on organizational theory and corporate strategy along with a vast amount of research and observation Freeman provided the notional view of the organization in a new and simplified fashion. Freeman (1984) originally presented the stakeholder model as a map in which the organization is the hub of a wheel and stakeholders are at the ends of spokes around the rim (Freeman, 1999). It consisted of one central circle, or oval, representing the firm, surrounded by a variable number of other circles or ovals with bi-directional arrows toward and from the central oval, each oval representing a group of stakeholders. Freeman’s original framework included eleven stakeholders on a non-exhaustive basis (Freeman, 1984).

Stakeholder Theory has three approaches: The descriptive approach which describes and explains the characteristics and behavior of organizations including how companies are managed and how board of directors consider corporate constituencies. Instrumental approach uses empirical data to identify connections that exist between the management of stakeholder groups and the achievement of corporate goals. Normative approach examines
the function of corporation and identifies moral and philosophical guidelines for the operation and management of the corporation. It has two principles: Principle of corporate legitimacy - The Company should be managed for the benefit of its stakeholders. Stakeholders must participate in decisions that substantially affect their welfare. The stakeholder fiduciary principle - Managers must act in the interests of the stakeholders as their agent in the interests of the corporation to ensure the survival of the firm (Ozturk, 2012). This study identified government and regulatory authorities, The National Council of NGOs, the County Government of Busia, Local communities, suppliers and the media as some of the stakeholders of donor funded projects in the county.

2.2.2 Systems Theory

Systems theory is a concept that originated from biology, economics, and engineering, which explores principles and laws that can be generalized across various systems (Dubrovsky, 2004; Yoon & Kuchinke, 2005; Alter, 2007). The concept of general systems theory (GST) was first advanced by Ludwig von Bertalanffy in 1940, and is primarily concerned with how systems operate, and integrates with other broad range of systems by naming and identifying patterns and processes common to all of them (Bausch, 2002; Capps & Hazen, 2002). A system is a set of two or more elements where; the behavior of each element has an effect on the behavior of the whole; the behavior of the elements and their effects on the whole are interdependent; and while subgroups of the elements all have an effect on the behavior of the whole, none has an independent effect on it (Skyttner, 1996). Steele (2003) stated that “a system comprises of subsystems whose inter-relationships and interdependence move toward equilibrium within the larger system”.

GST provides a distinction between open and closed systems; closed systems is the study of organizations by assuming that the main features of an organization are its internal elements whereas, open systems approach views the organizations’ interaction
with the external environment as vital for organizational survival and success (Shafritz & Russell, 2005; Wang, 2004). Since systems theory considers the input-output component and their interactions both within themselves and with the external environment, the elements of purpose, people, structure, techniques and information must be coordinated and integrated by the managerial system, in order to maximize value for the organization (Randolph and Blackburn, 1989; Montouri, 2000). In analyzing organizations, the open-systems approach investigates the repeated cycles of inputs, transformation, and output, which comprise organizational systems and subsystems (Yoon & Kuchinke, 2005; Stewart & Ayres, 2001). Organizational structure and design are important as they entail decisions related to resource allocation for various units and activities within the business ecosystem (Brenes, Mena & Molina, 2008).

An effective organizational structure facilitates working relationships between various entities in the organization and may improve the working efficiency within the organization units (Johnson, 2009). Senge (1990) argued that an organization which is continually expanding its capacity to create its future, learning takes place under two conditions: When design of organizational action matches with the intended outcome and when initial mismatch between intentions and outcomes is corrected, resulting in a match.

Yoon and Kuchinke (2005), argue the systems theory does not specify when and how collaboration with the organization needs to take place, nor what to do when the analysis suggests that there are existing or potential conflicts between the organizational environment, work environment and the structure of the organization. According to Shrode and Voich (1974), systems theory has the following shortcomings, failure to specify precisely what is meant by a system and the vagueness over what is to be included within systems theory. The systems concept assumes that the boundaries between the organization and its environment are distinct (Fioretti & Visser, 2004). However, Castells (1996) cautions that differentiating boundaries and transformations
are not always easy when organizations have multiple nodes of interactions and communication lines.

In a rapidly changing environment where tasks and group compositions become intermingled, open-systems theory does not provide immediate answers to how organizations need to address complex situations (Clippinger, 1999). Consequently, Systems theory does not appear to provide a way forward when constituents of a system are in conflict with each other and or are very ill matched in terms of power and resources (Stewart & Ayres, 2001). Kast and Rosenzweig (1973), identify the weaknesses in systems theory comparing organizations to organisms as espoused in systems theory by making the analogy between living organisms and organizations too literal. They also argue, the dichotomy between closed and open systems is difficult to apply to social organizations since most organizations are partially “open” and partially “closed”.

Beeson and Davis (2000) argue that the systems theory emphasis on boundary, environment, feedback and adaptive response presumes that management is readily identified as the control center, which directs the organization’s operations. Thus, the model attributes a central role to management and overestimates management’s power to control events and actions. With System theory informing that managers should focus on the role played by each part of an organization; rather than dealing separately with the parts (Hannagan, 2002), both interpersonal and group behavioral aspects leading to a system of cooperation is emphasized (Koontz, 2001). Donor organizations are open systems which respond to both internal and external influences.

2.3 Empirical Review

This section presents a review of literature related to the objectives of the study, articulated in chapter one.
2.3.1 Monitoring and Evaluation

The organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) defines monitoring and evaluation (M & E) as “a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators, to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indication of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds”.

The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors (Görgens & Kusek, 2009). Monitoring gives information on where a policy, program or project is at any given time (and over time) relative to respective targets and outcomes. It is descriptive in intent. Evaluation gives evidence of why targets and outcomes are or are not being achieved. It seeks to address the issues of casualty.

It allows learning from the experiences of previous projects and allows sharing these outcomes with the development and scientific community. In particular, without some form of follow-up, the benefits of the projects and the outcomes will remain unknown. By incorporating feedback into the planning process, follow-up assesses the impact and thereby enables learning from experience to occur. Through activities such as monitoring and evaluation, follow-up provides concrete evidence of outcomes (Arts, 2004). This knowledge can be utilized by the implementers or other agencies alike to improve future projects. Subsequent projects are to some extent easier to carry out, as they build on previous
experiences. During the planning of subsequent projects, it is necessary to include the lessons from the previous projects, based on the findings in the follow-up processes (Sansom et al., 2001).

The consensus is that evaluation, like monitoring, is important because it allows lessons to be learned, leading to improvement in future projects. But like monitoring, it is not done with sufficient rigor. For example, "many projects cannot precisely pinpoint who has benefitted and by how much or in what way. This does not indicate the projects are unsuccessful, but that existing methods of appraisal and evaluation are too limited. There is a need for more thinking on how to appraise projects for institutional development, sustainability, and environmental impact (Butcher, 1988).

The last type of evaluation is that which is carried out some years after the completion of the project. The World Bank is the only agency identified as having made a formal study of projects ten to fifteen years after their completion. The observations from that study were found to be very instructive and perhaps this type of evaluation should be carried out more frequently. Most development workers are familiar with cases where past projects can only be located by the project buildings, now serving some other purpose, or by the piles of rusting machinery - which leads to the question of continuity and sustainability. As the foregoing discussion notes, monitoring and evaluation is core to any project’s effectiveness. Given that there is a lack of literature on Busia County, as far as the influence of monitoring and evaluation on the effectiveness of donor funded projects is concerned, the present study sought to bridge the knowledge gap by focusing on the same.
2.3.2 Managerial Factors

The extent of success of donor funded projects is determined by managerial capacity of the human resources of the implementing agencies. Arndt (2000) argued that the officers in the donor funds projects chain may lack the formal training in donor funded projects management, budgeting and accounting. These weak skills may lead to poor understanding of the donor expenditure protocols resulting to ineligible expenditures, which lead to rejection for further funding by the donor. This may be affected by the quality and timeliness of the liquidation documents which complicate the donor fund release, with obvious implications on levels of donor aid effectiveness.

According to Mc Dade (2004), good management ensures that sufficient local resources and capacity exist to continue the project in the absence of outside resources. Espinosa, et al. (2007) opines that task familiarity is important in the community based projects and this is usually linked to performance which in turn is linked to sustainability. Good management goes beyond mere skills to technical and expertise required to successfully implementing the project (Little, 1993). Empowered people have freedom of choice and action, which in turn enables them to better influence the course of their lives and the decisions which affect them.

Competence in human resources is a standardized requirement for an individual to properly perform a specific job. Cuban (2001) observed that there are many ways to define and measure the adequacy of staff competency, capacity and the effectiveness of agencies tasked with the projects. The effectiveness of the project team tasked with projects’ administration depends to a large extent on the project staff capacity relative to the demands placed upon them. To be effective, projects need to have sufficient and capable staff with the appropriate
mix of skills and expertise, the motivation and will to act, and the incentives and resources necessary to achieve their mandate. Kent (2011) postulates that the ability of a project’s staff to meet demands for its services depends on both its numbers and the skills and expertise staff members bring to the job. A project team needs to have at least the minimum necessary mix of skills and expertise and a sufficient number of staff with appropriate skills relative to the scale of its responsibility.

Connectivity projects do not implement themselves. They require people to carry out laid down work, there is need to understand who will work on the systems, what skills and knowledge they have and the overall level of human resources available—both within the team and externally – to support your project execution plan. The minimum required mix of skills and expertise, and the required number of staff per unit managed or administered by the agency can be established through estimates provided by knowledgeable informants (Economic Stimulus Program Handbook, 2009). These informants could include current and past managers of the stimulus project analysts, researchers, tracking the stimulus project operations and functioning (Cambridge, 2000).

Coordination Problems due to incompetency of project manager may cause project delays and even failure of completion. In a construction project there are many parties involved such as contractor, consultant, sub-contractor and client. Often, it may be difficult for these various separate parties to coordinate well in order to complete the project. Majid and McCaffer (1998) found that there is difficulty in coordination between the parties is one of the factors that contributes to delay.
Kalinova (2007) convey that planning and management of a project, irrespective of its complexity require the opinions of a system based on the number of stakeholder’s involved. Mutual communication between these stakeholders enhances division of labor, development of individual competencies and responsibilities for effective decision making. According to Harris et al (2006), support from senior management is a factor that positively influences the success of a project. This category of staff provides direction, guidelines and control in a project. The majority of the skilled operatives need to be told what to do, either daily or weekly. The lower management staffs supervise the work of the skilled workers while the top management oversees the entire system in terms of time, quantity of materials, workmanship and cost. When there is inadequate supervision/inspection of work it might result in rework, increased project cost, delay and abandonment.

2.3.3 Involvement of Primary Stakeholders

Empowerment is a complex term that is not easily defined and has different interpretations, just like participation. Empowerment focuses on the notions of power and capacity-building (Oakley & Clayton, 2000) According to Narayan (2000), numerous conceptualizations of power have been advanced in the literature, but little agreement has been reached among academics as to what power is, how it can be identified and studied, where it is, and how it operates. It thus comes as no surprise that the notion of empowerment has multiple and contested meanings.

The World Bank (2008) defines empowerment as the process of enhancing the capacity of individuals or groups to make choices and to transform those choices into desired actions and
outcomes. Central to this process are actions which both build individual and collective assets, and improve the efficiency and fairness of the organizational and institutional context which govern the use of these assets. Empowered people have freedom of choice and action. This in turn enables them to better influence the course of their lives and the decisions which affect them.

Perceptions of being empowered vary across time, culture and domains of a person's life: in India, a low caste woman currently feels empowered when she is given a fair hearing in a public meeting, which comprise men and women from different social and economic groups; in Brazil, in Porto Allegre, citizens – both men and women -- feel empowered if they are able to engage in decisions on budget allocations; in Ethiopia, citizens and civil society groups report feeling empowered by consultations undertaken during the preparation of the poverty reduction support program; in the USA, immigrant workers feel empowered through unionization which has allowed them to negotiate working conditions with employers; and in the UK, a battered woman feels empowered when she is freed from the threat of violence and becomes able to make decisions about her own life (World Bank, 2008(b)).

Various mechanisms through which participation empowers the primary stakeholders of development intervention can be drawn from participatory theory. Oakley (1991) contends that participation empowers the primary stakeholders by helping break the mentality of dependence, promoting self-awareness and confidence, by leading the poor to examine their problems and to think positively about solutions. Participation also empowers the primary stakeholders by helping the poor to acquire new skills and abilities which could enable them to better defend and promote their livelihoods (Oakley et al., 2001). Participation helps in building up the capacity of people to generate and influence development at various levels,
increasing their access to and influence over resources and institutions (Karl, 2000). Karl (2000) also asserts that participation helps in building social capital, promoting networks and facilitating better management of risks by households through reciprocal self-help, sharing information and strengthening local institutions. The World Bank (2002) further avers that participation of primary stakeholders strengthen the poor’s voice.

Chambers (1983) points out that poverty often refers to powerlessness and exclusion from social participation, resulting in discrimination; empowerment is seen as very crucial to poverty reduction. This is because empowerment allows people to have access to productive resources which enables them to increase their earning and obtain goods and services that they need, and to participate in the decisions that affect them. As the foregoing review reveals, empowerment as a factor that influences the effectiveness of donor funded projects in Kenya has not been tackled by researchers. This present a knowledge gap on what influence empowerment of primary stakeholders may pose on the effectiveness of such projects thus a need to study the same in Busia County.

2.3.4 Factors Attributed to Donor Behavior

Accountability: Accountability is a key pillar of effectiveness. It refers to full transparency regarding the purpose, content, responsibility and performance of the development agency (O’Connell & Soludo, 2001). NPA (2008) defines accountability as responsibility, reliability, confidence and transparency in the context of development cooperation; associated specifically with financial issues, but includes all relevant matters of development concern and cooperation between partners (NPA, 2008). A distinction can be made between political, administrative and social accountability (Narayan, 2000). While political accountability takes
place through elections, administrative accountability is ensured through internal accountability mechanisms both within and between agencies (ibid.). This study shall use the definition of accountability in the context of development intervention where it is related to information, reliability, confidence and transparency.

Participatory methods can be used to guarantee the inclusion of all the stakeholders, the establishment of agreements between them, and the provision of appropriate information at each level and for different purposes. Information is a key ingredient for accountability because it is only when people know what resources are available, how they are being channeled, and how decisions are being made, that they can hold project’s staff to account (Sen, 1997).

Project evaluation complexities: Because of the broken natural feedback loop in donor funded projects funding, inserting an explicit evaluation function in donor funded projects is necessary to eliminate performance problems (Martens et al., 2002). If the evaluations are well done, to the extent there is no mechanism in place to act on these evaluations (that is, no mechanism to get the evaluation results out in the public), the aid agency’s behavior would likely not be affected. An independent donor funded projects evaluation agency could be a way around these problems. In addition, even if donors adopt formal evaluation as a key component in aid programs, there would still be difficulties in exercising external influence without undermining local accountability relationships (World Bank, 2003).

Fund disbursement bureaucracies: In all governments, resources earmarked for particular uses flow within legally defined institutional frameworks. Typically, funds pass through several layers of government bureaucracy down to service facilities, which are charged with
the responsibility of spending the funds. However, in developing countries, information on actual public spending at the frontline level or by program is seldom available (Dehn et al., 2003).

Multiple objectives and tasks: Most donors have multiple objectives. The Swedish foreign aid agency, Sida, for example lists six goals for Swedish development cooperation: Economic growth, Economic and social equality, Economic and political independence, Democratic development, Environmental care, and Gender equality.

2.3.5 Effective Implementation of Development Interventions

For a long time, development agencies have had a long standing history of implementing projects, which fail shortly after these agencies have withdrawn. Most of the interventions implemented are not effective in achieving set goals and objectives. Participatory theory states that stakeholder participation is one of the ways of enhancing effectiveness of development projects. However, this has not been the case, the communities where projects are being implemented have long been viewed as a hurdle to implementing projects and historically have been engaged as little as possible.

According to Greenall & Revere (1999), implementing agencies both local and international expressed several difficulties when engaging community right from the design stages to withdrawal, citing slow implementation, but Karl (2000) is of the view that development interventions will achieve their objectives if the people who are most affected are actively involved. Participation is an effective mechanism for poverty reduction capable of achieving immediate and lasting results at the grassroots level for the reason that it assures better
targeting of benefits to the poor, increases the impact and ensures that the development gains are equitably distributed (Chavangi, 1995).

Chambers (1983) and Oakley (1991) aver that participation in projects ensures that the development activities are based upon indigenous knowledge and are more relevant to locals. Karl, (2000) asserts that local people understand their problems better and can therefore use their skills and resources to find flexible solutions that are tailored to suit their unique needs. Oakley et al. (1998) opines that in order for the development efforts to have sustainable changes in the poor people’s lives, they must take into account local values. Generally, from the authors view, stakeholder analysis should be done to ensure all parties/actors are actively involved in all stages of project management cycle. This is in concurrence with (Rudqvist & Woodford-Berger, 1996) that the community will help to detect problems during implementation at early stages before they escalate into major sources of conflict and wastefulness.

Interventions will be successful and sustainable when people have a voice in determining their objectives, to support their implementation, to evaluate their outcomes, and to make indigenous knowledge available. However, it is disappointing to note that in Kenya, most donor funded projects do not give much consideration to community participation and empowerment, hence becoming unsustainable. The authors argue that the determinant factors for the sustainability of any community-based project are pre and post-implementation factors.

According to Aras & Crowther (2008), there are four aspects of sustainability, which are needed to be recognized and analyzed, and include societal influence, which measures the
impact a society makes upon the corporation in terms of the social contract and stakeholder influence; environmental impact, which is the effect of the actions of the corporation upon its geophysics environment; organizational culture, which is the relationship between the corporation and its internal stakeholders and finances, an adequate return for the level of risk undertaken in pursuit of sustainable development and financial sustainability.

2.3.6 Review of Previous Studies

Recent research into NGO leaders in Kenya, Malawi and Uganda highlights that NGO’s operate in three different worlds, the global aid world, the urban context in which they live and work, and the rural village setting where many of their extended family still live (James, 2005a). Kaplan (2002) concludes that tight project schedules, over-hasty timeframes and quick results demands placed by donors add to the pressure faced by national NGO leaders. Allen, Smith and Silva (2013), assert that transformational leadership is positively related to psychological climate towards organizational change readiness and creativity. Researchers have also examined the influence of hierarchical leadership in implementing strategies; O’Reilly, Caldwell, Chatman.

Hrebniak (2006), examined obstacles to effective strategy implementation and found that poor or inadequate information sharing, unclear responsibility and accountability, and working against the organizational power structure which are all part of organizational structure results in a failed implementation processes. Chandler (1962) suggested that organizational structure is influenced by the organization’s strategies that are ‘structure follows strategy’. Concurring with Chandler’s (1962) study, Zaribaf and Bayrami (2010) revealed that strategy is formulated by top management exclusively and middle-level
managers only implement the strategy unless a wide range of changes is required before implementation which would then mean structure alignment with strategy. Lorange (1998) presented a disquiet with business restructuring and proposed that an organization restructuring efforts have to outweigh the anticipated gains of the new strategy and not lead to the unintentional discarding of know-how that could have been used for future growth in another context.

Hailey and James (2004), concluded that NGO leaders work long hours with limited resources in uncertain and volatile political and economic circumstances to help the most marginalized and disadvantaged members of communities while at the same time they are expected to lead efficient organizations. NGO management pursue multiple bottom lines, often these are fundraising, sustainability, achieving donor expectations; meet national and international government regulations, management of environment and societal stakeholders, forcing them to adapt for-profit strategy concepts (Schwenger, Straub & Borzillo, 2014). Despite changes in membership and leadership an organization’s culture is traditionally passed on from "generation" to "generation" creating a relatively high level of stability over time (Janicijevic, 2012).

In a study involving 172 Slovenian companies, Cater and Pucko (2010) demonstrated that managers mostly rely on planning and organizing activities when implementing strategies, while the biggest obstacle to strategy implementation and execution is poor leadership. Their results showed that adapting the organizational structure to serve the execution of strategy has a positive influence on performance. Funk (1993) explored the process of product development and implementation strategies in large Japanese and American companies and
concluded that Japanese firms, in contrast to American firms, implement strategies using a combination of organic and mechanistic structures.

Samour (2010) did a study on “Strategic Management; the Case of NGOs in Palestine”, the study revealed that majority of NGOs in Palestine practice strategic planning, implementation and evaluation with challenge being limited freedom of operation from the national regulator. Muzinda (2007) did a study on the ‘Monitoring and Evaluation practices and challenges of Gaborone based local NGOs implementing projects in Botswana”, the study concluded that the performance monitoring being done by NGOs was still below international benchmarks and there is need to train on performance evaluation and monitoring, allocate resources to performance measurement and improvement with the consideration been made at the project design phase. Within East Africa a study that has been done is by Wairimu (2007) who studied “Transition or Stagnation; everyday Life, Food Security and Recovery in Post-conflict Northern Uganda” focused on the impact of the NGOs in Northern Uganda” and concluded the legitimacy and impact of the NGOs’ activities can be improved if they research and understand the local population.

Similarly, in a study involving Zimbabwe’s state-owned enterprises, Mapetere, Mavhiki, Tonderai, Sikomwe, and Mhonde (2012) found that low leadership empowerment in projects implementation led to partial strategy success in the organizations studied. While studying factors that affect strategy implementation in NGOs in Kenya, Abok (2013) concluded NGO leaders often face extraordinary challenges both at a personal and organizational level. Abok (2013) concludes that four major aspects impact on effective implementation of strategic plans in NGOs in Kenya these are; management style, communication, organizational
culture, stakeholders and organizational resources. Kafashpoor, Shakoori and Sadeghian (2013) studied the relationship between the following independent variables: culture, structure, leadership style and strategy and organizational effectiveness, with knowledge management playing the mediating roles. In this study, the measures of effectiveness were: market share, profitability, growth rate and innovativeness. The study focused on 14 employees of Mashhad Municipality, the second largest city in Iran. Chi-square test and linear regression were used to test the hypotheses.

Results indicate that all context variables are significantly associated with organizational effectiveness. Moreover, there is a significant relationship between context variables and knowledge management and also knowledge management plays a mediating role in relationship between context variables and organizational effectiveness. Besides the sample of only 14 employees from one organization, this was a case study of one Municipality in Iran, whose findings may not be generalizable to other organizations in other sectors or locations. Review of literature reveals many measure of organizational effectiveness. This study focuses on market share, profitability, growth rate and innovativeness only but does not justify the choice and justification for leaving the others out.

Pfister (2014), undertook a study entitled, “Sustainability Measurement Framework for Development Aid NGOs, an integrated Approach for Development Aid NGOs to plan, evaluate and increase the Impact of Projects and the Sustainability of the Organization” in Germany, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America; the study provides a performance measurement framework for nonprofit sector given the increased expectation of NGOs to show results and address organizations sustainability issues.
2.4 Conceptual Framework

Mugenda and Mugenda (2006) defined conceptual framework as “the concise description of the phenomenon under study accompanied by visual depiction of the variables under study.” The conceptual framework, representing the relationship between independent variables, and the dependent variable are depicted in figure 2.1 below.

**Independent Variables**

- **Monitoring and Evaluation**
  - Frequency of M & E
  - Tools used
  - Stakeholders involved

- **Managerial factors**
  - Management of relationships with stakeholders
  - Managing human resources
  - Managing financial resources
  - Managing risks
  - Ensuring flexibility
  - Facilitating learning

- **Factors attributed to donor behavior**
  - Accountability
  - Project evaluation complexities
  - Fund disbursement bureaucracies
  - Multiple objectives

- **Empowerment of primary stakeholders**
  - Involvement of community
  - Level of community knowledge of project purpose

**Dependent Variable**

- **Effective implementation of donor funded development projects**
  - Project stakeholders satisfaction
  - Efficient internal processes
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - Timeliness of completion
  - Projects meeting specifications

**Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework**

Source: Author, 2016
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The research design, including the target population, data collection methods, research procedures, data analysis, interpretation and presentation are described. The following sections provide a detailed description of the research methodology used in the study.

3.2 Research design

Descriptive research design was used in this study. Descriptive design was best suited for this study since it resulted in a description of the data, whether in words, pictures, charts, or tables, and whether the data analysis shows statistical relationships or is merely descriptive. Researchers based on a carefully selected representative sample can produce results that are broad, credible and reliable to the whole population. Descriptive design was preferred since it focused on data rather than theory besides the financial constraints. In this case, it was possible to administer the data collection tools to the respondents in their duty stations with relative ease, and this played a great role in increasing the response rate.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2006) noted that descriptive statistics enable meaningful description of a distribution of scores or measurements using a few indices or statistics. Descriptive statistics help to simplify large amounts of data in a sensible way. Each descriptive statistic reduces lots of data into a simpler summary. Measures of central tendency were obtained using mean scores, while measures of variability were presented in the form of standard
deviations. Frequency distributions show a record of the number of times a score or record appears.

3.3 Target population

According to Combo and Tromp (2006) a population is a well-defined or set of people, services, elements, events, group of things or households that are being investigated to generalize the results. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) observed that the target population should have observable characteristics to which the study intends to generalize the result of the study. The target population for this study was donor funded projects implemented in Busia County, whose number stood at 415 as at 30\textsuperscript{th} June 2016. The responses were sought from the project managers and community members of the selected projects.

3.4 Sampling design and procedure

Burns and Groove (2001) refer to sampling as a process of selecting a group of people, events or behavior with which to conduct a study. Polit and Hungler (2001) confirm that, in sampling a portion that represents the whole population is selected. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2006), the researcher should take as big a sample as possible if he has adequate time for the study-to ensure someone else would get similar findings to a higher degree if he selected another sample of the same size. The population of interest was donor funded projects implemented in Busia County, whose number stood at 415 as at 30\textsuperscript{th} June 2016. Consequently, the sampling frame was made up of the whole list of 415 donor funded development projects. Based on the population figures, sample size was determined by adopting Yamane (1967) simplified formula to calculate sample size using the equation.
\[ n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \]

A 95% confidence level and \( p=0.05 \) was assumed for Equation where \( n \) is the sample size, \( N \) is the population size and \( e \) is the level of precision.

Hence
\[ n = \frac{415}{1 + 415(e)^2} \]
\[ n = 203.681 \]
\[ n = 204 \]

Whereas simple random sampling technique was used to select the projects to participate in the study, in selection of study respondents, purposive sampling was used to select the project managers to participate in the study. Purposive sampling generally considers the most common characteristics of the type it is desired to sample, tries to figure out where these individuals can be found and tries to study them (Kothari, 2004). Project management requires more than just implementing activities identified in a log frame. The project team relies on the project manager to oversee all project components in an integrated, holistic manner, to ensure that the project meets its stated objectives and contributes to organization’s vision. It was thus assumed that the project managers and community members were all well placed to articulate issues related to donor funded projects since they all participate in the projects implementation at different levels.
3.4.1 Sample Size

Computation of the sample size was done by apportioning the sample size to the target population per project sector. In each of the projects, the project manager and one community member was selected using simple random sampling, giving the sample size of 408. Table 3.1 below presents the sample size.

Table 3.1: Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Target population (N) (Number of projects)</th>
<th>Sample size (n) = 204/415 X Number of projects per sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads network</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural electrification</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Hygiene &amp; Sanitation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health sector</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security &amp; Livelihoods</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generating activities</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Empowerment</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.5 Data collection

3.5.1 Data collection instruments

Primary data was collected with the aid of questionnaires (a self-administered detailed questionnaire that was completed by the project managers of donor funded projects in Busia County while personal interviews with community members conducted by research assistants, guided by the said questionnaires). According to Neuman (2006), a questionnaire is a written document in quantitative research that has set of questions directed at
respondents. It is used by an interviewer to pose questions to respondents and to record the answers. Kothari (2004) asserts that structured questionnaire is best suited for descriptive study as it is easily applied and requires less skill.

The questionnaire was designed to answer the questions identified in the problem statement. Structured questions were presented on a likert scale. The likert scale, commonly used in business research was used because it allowed participants to respond with degrees of agreement or disagreement. The ratings were on a scale from 1 (lowest impact or least important) to 5 (highest impact or most important). The advantage of closed questions is that it is easier and quicker for respondents to answer. Furthermore, the answers of different respondents are easier to compare code and statistically analyze. There are also fewer irrelevant or confused answers and replication is easier. Closed questions are an appropriate means of asking questions that have a finite set of answers of a clear-cut nature. Sometimes this is factual information, but closed questions are also used for obtaining data on attitudes and opinions (Anon, 2003d).

3.5.2 Pilot study

A pilot study is a small scale preliminary study conducted in order to evaluate feasibility, time, cost, adverse events, and size (statistical variability) in an attempt to predict an appropriate sample size and improve upon the study design prior to performance of a full-scale study. Kothari (2004) observed that a pilot study gives the researcher the opportunity to evaluate the usefulness of the data. A sample size of 10 – 20% of the sample size for the actual study is a reasonable number of respondents to consider for participation in a pilot study (Baker 1994).
For purposes of this study, a pilot study of 10% of sample size of 204 donor funded development projects in Busia County was randomly selected to participate in the pilot study. Mugenda and Mugenda (2006) argued that “a relatively small sample of 10 to 20 respondents can be chosen from the population during piloting which is not included in the sample chosen for the main study. This study thus selected 20 respondents to participate in the pilot study and was not included in the final study. The pilot study helped in revealing questions that were vague and allowed for their review until they conveyed the same meaning to all the subjects (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2006).

3.5.3 Validity of Data Collection Instrument

Validity refers to the extent to which the data collection instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. According to Sekaran (2006), content validity is a judgmental act where experts check whether the items represent the construct which is being studied as well as the wording, formatting and scoring of the instrument. Two steps were taken to ensure validity. Firstly, wherever possible, research questions from prior studies were used to improve the validity of the research instrument. Secondly the instruments were reviewed by the University supervisors to ensure that validity is met. The validity tests were undertaken so as to assess the structure, length, and appropriateness of the questions used.

3.5.4 Reliability of Data Collection Instruments

A reliable measuring instrument is one that gives the researcher the same measurements when the researcher repeatedly measures the same unchanged objects or events. Cresswell (2008) observed that reliability reflects the degree to which the researcher will get the similar results even with repetitive measure; reliability states the consistency of a measure which
reflects expectations of similar results from one administration of an instrument to another administration. Sekaran (2006) opined that “reliability analysis is conducted to ensure that the measures of variables have internal consistency across time and across the various items that measure the same concept or variable”.

Data collected during pilot test was tested for relevance and consistency of results in order to minimize errors. Commonly, the measure of reliability of research instrument is the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient, which was used for this study. The alpha coefficient ranges in value from 0 to 1 (Rovai, 2002). Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient value of 0.7 was used as the cutoff point and all items whose value was less than 0.7 were considered weak, thus left out.

Data collected during pilot test was tested for reliability by determining Cronbach alpha coefficient of reliability. The results are summarized and presented in table 3.2 below.

Table 3.2: Reliability of the Research Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study variables</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha(α)</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial factors</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of primary stakeholders</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors attributed to donor behavior</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in projects implementation</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2016)

The findings of the test shows that questions on factors attributed to donor behavior had the highest reliability (α=0.974) followed by empowerment of primary stakeholders (α = 0.900), then effectiveness in projects implementation (α = 0.889), then managerial factors (α = 0.872), and finally monitoring and evaluation (α = 0.861). This illustrates that all the five variables were reliable as their reliability values exceeded the prescribed threshold of 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978).
3.5.5 Data Collection Procedure

Consent to collect primary data was sought from Kenyatta University. Four Research Assistants were engaged to assist in data collection. Prior to launching a full-scale study, the questionnaires were pre-tested on 20 respondents, selected from amongst the project managers and community members of donor funded projects in Busia County. The pilot study gave the researcher the opportunity to evaluate the usefulness of the data (Kothari, 2004). The pilot study was used to gauge the reliability of the research instruments, and also assisted in providing data for making estimates of time and the cost for completing various phases of the research (Gall & Borg, 1996).

The pre-test was undertaken to ensure suitability of the data collection instrument in terms of structure, content, flow, and duration. After the pre-testing of the questionnaire, modifications were made in the questionnaire to reduce the possibility of ambiguity of some of the questions before delivering them to the respondents. Experts and colleagues who are experienced in research were also requested to examine the questionnaire to check whether there were any items that needed to be changed or rephrased, as well as the appropriateness of the time set for completing it. At the end of the exercise, the items in the questionnaires were considered to be satisfactory in term of both wording and format.

3.6 Data analysis and Presentation

Data analysis refers to examining the collected data and making discussions, inferences and conclusions (Kothari, 2004). Data pertaining to the objectives of the study was analyzed using descriptive statistics, which includes measures of central tendency, measures of variability and measures of frequency among others. Means will be used to find the degree of
agreement between variables (Faridi & El-Sayegh, 2006). Each response was assigned a score according to the way the respondents feel that it contributed to effective implementation of donor funded development projects.

Further, multiple regression analysis was conducted. Multiple regression analysis technique was used to calculate the extent of contribution of each independent variable (Involvement of primary stakeholders, managerial factors, Factors attributed to donor behavior and Projects Monitoring & Evaluation) to the dependent variable (effective implementation of donor funded development projects). It also permitted the analysis of a relationship among a large number of variables in a single study (Gall & Borg, 1996). A typical multiple regression model below was used.

\[
Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \epsilon
\]

*Where:*

\(Y\) = Effective Implementation of Donor funded development projects  
\(X_1\) = Monitoring & Evaluation  
\(X_2\) = Managerial factors  
\(X_3\) = Empowerment of primary stakeholders  
\(X_4\) = Factors attributed to donor behavior  
\(\epsilon\) = Error Term.  
\(\beta_0\) = Point of intercept on the y axis
3.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethics were observed before, during and after carrying out the study. Permission was sought from the relevant authorities before embarking on the research. Full disclosure of the purpose of the study was made to the sampled respondents by way of a letter of introduction. The respondents were assured of confidentiality of the information to be provided and anonymity of the source of data as the questionnaire did not require disclosure of identity. To facilitate objectivity in the research, efforts were made to ensure that personal bias and opinion did not get in the way of the research and that all parties were given a fair consideration.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide a summary of the data collected through the use of questionnaires. General trends are explained using percentages, frequency tables, figures and descriptions of data as a way to present the findings of the investigation. Primary data, collected using questionnaires, was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 24.0. The findings are presented as per the objectives and research questions of the study.

The study results are presented in two sections, namely: descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. The first stage involved reporting all the information related to each of the respondents’ personal profiles. This was followed by data analysis in relation to the research objectives outlined in chapter one. Descriptive analysis was done to report on the respondents including the results of the measurement variables. Finally, the results of regression to test the relationships between constructs are reported in detail. This Chapter concludes by highlighting the main findings obtained from the quantitative data. The section presents the results of the empirical analysis, discusses the findings and interpretations.

4.2 Background Information

4.2.1 Response rate

Out of the 388 questionnaires that were distributed to the respondents (1 project manager and 1 community member per project), 365 questionnaires were returned completed. This means
that the researcher achieved a 94.1% response rate. The findings are presented in figure 4.1 below.

![Graph showing response rate](image)

**Figure 4.1: Response Rate**  
**Source:** Survey Data (2016)

The high response rate could be attributed to the good rapport created between the researcher and the respondents and the efforts of the data enumerators.

4.2.2 Gender distribution of respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender. The responses are summarized and presented in figure 4.2 below.

![Pie chart showing gender distribution](image)

**Figure 4.2: Gender distribution of respondents**  
**Source:** Survey Data (2016)
The results indicate that majority of the respondents (68.5%) were of male gender while only (31.5%) were of female gender. The results do not conform to the one third gender rule as per the Kenyan Constitution. There is need for the projects to involve more project officers and community members of female gender to increase their representation, in compliance with the gender rule.

4.2.3 Age distribution of respondents
The respondents were asked to indicate their age, by ticking as appropriate against the age bracket to which they belonged. The responses are summarized and presented in figure 4.3 below.

![Age distribution of respondents](image)

**Figure 4.3: Age distribution of respondents**
**Source: Survey Data (2016)**

The results indicate that out of the 365 respondents, majority of them, (62.8%) were aged 35 years and below, while only (37.8%) were aged above 36 years. The results also show that beyond 35 years, the higher the age bracket, the lower the number of respondents involved in the study. The findings also show that that only (3.6%) of the respondents were aged above
50 years. The respondents were thus of a relatively youthful age and their active participation in projects implemented in their areas were expected to enhance ownership and hence sustainability.

4.2.4 Highest level of education attained

The respondents were asked to state the highest level of education they had attained. The responses are summarized and presented in figure 4.4 below.

![Figure 4.4: Highest level of education attained](source: Survey Data (2016))

The findings show that majority of the respondents (42.5%) had attained secondary school level of education, followed by (28.8%) who had attained at least a college certificate, and (17.0%) had attained an undergraduate degree. Whereas only 5.2% of the respondents had attained a postgraduate qualification, 6.6% of the respondents reported that they did not complete secondary school. It is assumed that the higher the level of education one attained, the higher the level of understanding of issues and the more objective the responses would be.
on the various issues in the study. The findings show that majority of the respondents had at least some formal education and as such, it is expected they provided objective responses to the study questions.

4.2.5 Number of Years worked in the current organization

The respondents (project officers) were asked to indicate the number of years they had worked in the current organizations. The responses are summarized and presented in figure 4.5 below.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of years worked in the current organization.](image)

Figure 4.5: Number of Years worked in the current organization

Source: Survey Data (2016)

The results show that majority of the respondents (75%) had worked in the current organizations for at least 3 years. Assuming that the longer one worked in an organization, the better they understood the organization’s operations and projects, the results show that majority of the respondents had a sound understanding of their organizations and the projects they managed; hence they were in a better position to provide objective responses to the questions posed.
4.2.6 Current position on the project

The respondents were asked to indicate the current position on the project. The responses are summarized and presented in figure 4.6 below.

![Figure 4.6: Current position on the project](image)

The results show that majority of the respondents were either project supervisors or project managers (54.8%). The rest (45.2%) comprised of Project technical advisors (23.3%), Project Monitoring & Evaluation Officers (13.2%), and Project finance managers (10.7%). The results indicate that all the respondents played a key role on the donor funded development projects under implementation in Busia County and as such, they were all capable of providing objective responses to the study questions.

4.2.7 Number of years worked on the current project

The respondents were asked to state the number of years they had worked on the current project. It is assumed that the longer the period one worked on a project, the more conversant one was on issues pertaining to implementation of the projects. The responses are presented in figure 4.7 below.
The results show that majority of the respondents (56.2%), had worked on the current project for more than 3 years, a period long enough to understand the operations of the donor funded development projects implemented in Busia County. The responses provided were thus expected to be objective.

4.2.8 Desire to receive a summary of the results from this research

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they would like to receive results from the research. The responses are summarized and presented in figure 4.8 below.
The results show that majority of the respondents (97%) expressed desire to receive the results of the study. This is an indicator that majority of the respondents were interested in the study findings and would have liked to know how the projects performed, especially from an independent source of information. The study presented such an opportunity.

4.3 Influence of monitoring and evaluation on effective implementation of projects

4.3.1 Stakeholders involvement in projects monitoring
Firstly, the respondents were asked to state the persons responsible for monitoring donor funded projects in their area. The responses are summarized and presented in table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Stakeholders involvement in projects monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Alternative response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluators</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officers</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administration</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 365

Source: Survey Data (2016)

The findings show that projects are monitored by the various stakeholders, who include the local administration, the project officers, community members, the donors and external evaluators. Majority of the respondents (26.3%) reported that it was the project officers who were involved in projects monitoring, followed by community members (25.2%), and donors (19.5%). The results indicate that all the stakeholders were involved in projects monitoring, though the degree of involvement varied.
4.3.2 Accountability by project managers

The respondents were asked to state whether the project managers were accountable for the projects. The responses are presented in figure 4.9 below.

![Pie chart showing accountability by project managers]

Figure 4.9: Accountability by project managers

Source: Survey Data (2016)

Majority of the respondents (92%) were of the view that the project managers were accountable for the projects, while only (8%) were of the contrary opinion. Accountability in the management of donor funded projects is a fundamental issues to the stakeholders, especially the donors, in making decisions on future funding.

4.3.3 Community members’ empowerment in projects monitoring and evaluation

The respondents were asked to state the extent to which community members were empowered in projects monitoring and evaluation. The findings are summarized and presented in figure 4.10 below.
Findings in figure 4.10 above indicate that majority of the respondents (76%) reported that community members’ empowerment in projects monitoring and evaluation was “to a great extent”, and whereas (18%) of the respondents reported that community members’ empowerment in projects monitoring and evaluation was “to a small extent”, only (6%) of the respondents reported that community members were not involved at all in projects monitoring and evaluation. The findings thus show that the great majority of community members (94%) were empowered and actively participated in the projects implementation.

### 4.3.4 Extent of projects success

The respondents were asked to state whether the projects were successful in achieving the set goals. Where 1 = Not successful at all, 2 = Successful, and 3 = Very successful. The responses are summarized and presented in table 4.2 below.
Table 4.2: Extent of projects success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 (%)</th>
<th>2 (%)</th>
<th>3 (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Started on time</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met the set specifications</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was implemented within budget</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved the community members</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was/were completed on time</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2016)

Findings of the study show that the donor funded projects in Busia County were successful in various aspects. The findings also show that the donor funded projects in Busia County were successful in various aspects; the highest ranked item being that “the projects met specifications”, followed by “the projects were completed on time”, “the projects involved community members” was ranked third, while the least ranked item was “the project was implemented within budget”. Görgens & Kusek (2009) opined that the aim of projects monitoring and evaluation is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors.

When asked to make suggestions for improvement, delays in projects commencement time were cited as an area that requires attention. Causes of delays included funds disbursement bureaucracies and recruitment of project implementers. In addition, these delays led to budgetary variation since prices of inputs and materials rose over time, a situation that had
not been contemplated before projects commencement. These findings concur with the findings by Arts (2004) who established that activities such as monitoring and evaluation, follow-up provides concrete evidence of outcomes and that this knowledge can be utilized by the implementers or other agencies alike to improve future projects. Subsequent projects are to some extent easier to carry out, as they build on previous experiences. During the planning of subsequent projects, it is necessary to include the lessons from the previous projects, based on the findings in the follow-up processes (Sansom et al., 2001).

4.4 Influence of managerial factors on effective implementation of projects

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with listed statements relating to managerial factors in implementation of donor funded projects in this area along a scale of 1 to 5, where 1= Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree 3=Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5= Strongly agree. The responses are summarized and presented in table 4.3 below.
Table 4.3: Influence of managerial factors in projects implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial factors in projects implementation</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National and County governments</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project partners</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project participants</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The donor (s)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing risks</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating learning</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring flexibility</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey Data (2016)

Findings in table 4.3 above show that managerial factors affected projects implementation in Busia County. Firstly, the projects had successful relationships with various stakeholders, the highest ranked being “project partners”, while the least ranked was “the National and County Governments”. In addition, the project management was successful in managing various resources. The highest ranked resource was “managing risks” and “facilitating learning”. The least ranked resources were “financial resources”. This was occasioned by delays in projects commencement, leading to price variation when procuring materials and other inputs.

Good management goes beyond mere skills to technical and expertise required to successfully implementing the project (Little, 1993). Mc Dade (2004) opined that good management ensures that sufficient local resources and capacity exist to continue the project in the absence of outside resources. This study argues that institutional and management capacity is a recipe to effective project implementation as it encourages participation and empowerment of the community in all the processes of project implementation, hence people
feeling empowered. Empowered people have freedom of choice and action, which in turn enables them to better influence the course of their lives and the decisions which affect them. Kent (2011) postulates that the ability of a project’s staff to meet demands for its services depends on both its numbers and the skills and expertise staff members bring to the job. A project team needs to have at least the minimum necessary mix of skills and expertise and a sufficient number of staff with appropriate skills relative to the scale of its responsibility.

When asked to make suggestions for improvement in terms of project management, the key suggestion was that the various persons responsible for funds disbursement should avoid unnecessary delays, which cause variations between actual expenditure and the budgets. In addition, there were complaints of relatively poor remuneration, especially to the unskilled workers, which required urgent attention. Poor coordination contributes to delay from estimated completion time. Poor site management may occur when contractors do not have enough experience and suffer from a lack of knowledge in managing the project team (Kadiretal., 2005). Kalinova (2007) convey that planning and management of a project, irrespective of its complexity require the opinions of a system based on the number of stakeholders involved. Mutual communication between these stakeholders enhances division of labor, development of individual competencies and responsibilities for effective decision making. According to Harris et al (2006), support from senior management is a factor that positively influences the success of a project.

4.5 Primary stakeholders’ empowerment and effective implementation of projects

4.5.1 Rating of empowerment of stakeholders in projects implementation

The respondents were asked to give a rating of stakeholders’ empowerment in the management of donor funded projects in Busia County using a five-point scale where 1 =
poor, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = good and 5 = excellent. The responses are summarized and presented in figure 4.2 below.

![Figure 4.2: Stakeholders’ empowerment in projects implementation](image)

**Stakeholders’ empowerment ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders’ empowerment ratings</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.2: Stakeholders’ empowerment in projects implementation**

*Source: Survey Data (2016)*

The results show that stakeholders’ empowerment in donor funded projects in Busia County was highly rated, with (43%) of the respondents stating “Good” and (25.5%) stating “Excellent”. The results show that the stakeholders were empowered and had a say in the projects implementation, which would enhance the project activities’ ownership, and hence sustainability.

### 4.5.2 Community members’ empowerment

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which community members are empowered and hence involved in the various donor funded project activities by ticking as appropriate along a scale, where 1 = Not at all, 2 = Somehow, 3 = Much, and 4 = Very much. The responses are summarized and presented in table 4.4 below.
Table 4.4: Extent to which community members are involved in projects activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 (%)</th>
<th>2 (%)</th>
<th>3 (%)</th>
<th>4 (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects conceptualization</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project monitoring</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluation</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project closure (On completion)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N = 365\)

Source: Survey Data (2016)

The results show that community members were involved in all the activities that are undertaken in implementation of donor funded projects in Busia County, though to a varying degree. Involvement in project activities by target beneficiaries increases ownership and hence empowerment and projects sustainability.

4.5.3 Stakeholders’ involvement in projects implementation

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed that stakeholders were involved in project implementation by providing a rating along a three – point scale, where 1 = Not at all, 2 = to a small extent, 3 = to a large extent. The responses are summarized and presented in table 4.5 below.
Table 4.5: Stakeholders’ involvement in projects implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements related to stakeholders’ empowerment in projects</th>
<th>1 (%)</th>
<th>2 (%)</th>
<th>3 (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders are involved during implementation of donor funded projects facilitated by donors in this area</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The communication channels used to engage stakeholders are appropriate</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key interests of stakeholders are addressed by project teams in good time</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders’ own interests affect project implementation</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress of our projects is reported to all stakeholders</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders empowerment affect implementation of donor funded projects</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 365

Source: Survey Data (2016)

Findings of the study in table 4.5 above indicate that the stakeholders were involved in various aspects of the projects implementation. Findings of the study with respect to empowerment of primary stakeholders show that the stakeholders were involved in various aspects of the projects implementation. The highest ranked statement was “the communication channels used to engage stakeholders are appropriate”, followed by “all stakeholders are involved during implementation of donor funded projects facilitated by donors in this area”. The least ranked statement was “stakeholders’ own interests affect project implementation”. Oakley (1991) contends that participation empowers the primary stakeholders by helping break the mentality of dependence, promoting self-awareness and
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confidence, by leading the poor to examine their problems and to think positively about solutions. Participation also empowers the primary stakeholders by helping the poor to acquire new skills and abilities which could enable them to better defend and promote their livelihoods (Oakley et al., 2001).

When asked to make any suggestions for improvement, the respondents indicated that the donor funded projects in Busia County was a closed affair between the project officers and selected stakeholders within the communities. There is need to widen the scope so as to include other stakeholders, who are not necessarily committee members. In addition, the meetings between project implementers and project beneficiaries should be as inclusive as possible. Participation helps in building up the capacity of people to generate and influence development at various levels, increasing their access to and influence over resources and institutions (Karl, 2000). Karl (2000) also asserts that participation helps in building social capital, promoting networks and facilitating better management of risks by households through reciprocal self-help, sharing information and strengthening local institutions. The World Bank (2002) further avers that participation of primary stakeholders strengthen the poor’s voice.

4.6 Factors attributed to donor behavior on effectiveness of projects

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which various factors attributed to donor behavior affected effective implementation of donor funded projects in Busia County. The responses are summarized and presented in table 4.6 below, where 1 = Not at all, 2 = to a small extent, 3 = to a large extent. The responses are summarized and presented in table 4.6 below.
Table 4.6: Factors attributed to donor behavior affect effective implementation of projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors attributed to donor behavior</th>
<th>1 (%)</th>
<th>2 (%)</th>
<th>3 (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation Complexities</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Disbursement bureaucracies</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Objectives and tasks</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local communities are involved in the project approval process</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before donors disburse funds, they gather credible evidence that the project will be sustainable and will not be donor dependent</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 365 \)

Source: Survey Data (2016)

Findings with respect to factors attributed to donor behavior show that effectiveness in implementation of donor funded projects is affected by factors attributed to donor behavior. The highest ranked statement was “before donors disburse funds, they gather credible evidence that the project will be sustainable and will not be donor dependent”, followed by “accountability”, then “fund disbursement bureaucracies”. The least ranked statement was “local communities are involved in the project approval process”. According to O’Connell and Soludo (2001), accountability is a key pillar of effectiveness. It refers to full transparency regarding the purpose, content, responsibility and performance of the development agency.

When asked to make suggestion on the areas that donors can improve on their conditions in order to enhance the effectiveness of donor funded projects in Busia County. The respondents were of the view that there is need to undertake a thorough baseline survey with
a view to identifying the key problems/challenges affecting communities in the area, and thereafter, implement the projects in accordance with the identified needs. This calls for stakeholders (beneficiaries’) empowerment in selection of the projects to be implemented and the actual approval process. Sen (1997) argued that information is a key ingredient for accountability because it is only when people know what resources are available, how they are being channeled, and how decisions are being made, that they can hold project’s staff to account (Sen., 1997).

Funds disbursement bureaucracies are another area that requires addressing by the various stakeholders, so as to be within the projects starting and closing time. Typically, funds pass through several layers of donor agencies bureaucracy down to service facilities, which are charged with the responsibility of spending the funds. However, according to Dehn et al (2003), in developing countries, information on actual public spending at the frontline level or by program is seldom available (Dehn et al., 2003).

**4.7 Effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects**

The respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with listed statements relating to effectiveness in implementation of donor funded projects that are implemented by donors in Busia County, along a five point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree. The responses are summarized and presented in table 4.7 below.
Table 4.7: Effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects implemented by donors in this area are implemented within schedule</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The target beneficiaries are satisfied with the project results</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The projects comply with environmental standards (noise level, waste disposal, air quality etc.)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects enhance innovation and learning</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every aspect (scope) of safety project is implemented</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects conform to quality specifications</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 365

Source: Survey Data (2016)

Findings indicate that donor funded projects in Busia County were effectively implemented. The highest ranked statement was “the projects comply with environmental standards (noise level, waste disposal, air quality etc.)”, followed by “projects conform to quality specifications” and then “every aspect (scope) of safety project is implemented”. The least ranked statement was “projects enhance innovation and learning”. According to Chavangi (1995), participation is an effective mechanism for poverty reduction capable of achieving immediate and lasting results at the grassroots level for the reason that it assures better targeting of benefits to the poor. This increases the impact and ensures that the development gains are equitably distributed.
Suggestions for improvement with respect to effectiveness of donor funded projects in Busia County included timely implementation of projects being cited as one area that requires adequate attention. The respondents reported that at times there were delays in payments to community members who worked on the projects. The delays were occasioned by delays in approval of budgets and disbursement of funds by the various authorities. In addition, care should be taken to factor in delays occasioned by unfavorable weather conditions when preparing implementation plans. Karl, (2000) asserts that local people understand their problems better and can therefore use their skills and resources to find flexible solutions that are tailored to suit their unique needs.

Oakley et al. (1998) opines that in order for the development efforts to have sustainable changes in the poor people’s lives, they must take into account local values. Generally, from the authors view, stakeholder analysis should be done to ensure all parties/actors are actively involved in all stages of project management cycle. This is in concurrence with (Rudqvist & Woodford-Berger, 1996) that the community will help to detect problems during implementation at early stages before they escalate into major sources of conflict and wastefulness.

As Karl (2000) puts it, local people’s judgments of what constitutes success, give a more pragmatic view about what works and what does not work. Consequently, interventions will be successful and sustainable when people have a voice in determining their objectives, to support their implementation, to evaluate their outcomes, and to make indigenous knowledge available.
In order to meet the purpose of the study “to investigate the influence of project management on effective implementation of donor funded projects in Busia County, Kenya”, multiple regression analysis of the variables was employed. The analysis was carried out in SPSS version 24.0 for windows at 95% confidence level. Before the regression analysis, various diagnostic tests were undertaken as presented below.

4.8 Diagnostic tests

The data was subjected through a thorough data screening process which included tests to ascertain that the data met the general assumptions of the regression analysis which was a key analytical model for the study at hand.

4.8.1 Test for normality

Tests for normality are undertaken for purposes of comparing the shape of the selected sample distribution to the shape of a normal curve. It is assumed that if the sample is normal shaped, the population from which it came is normally distributed. Normality is then assumed. A significant test means the sample distribution is not shaped like a normal curve. Shapiro -Wilk's W is recommended for small and medium samples up to n = 2000. Since the sample is only 365 respondents, Shapiro Wilks W test was used. The following normality hypotheses are assumed:

H₀: the observed distribution fits the normal distribution.

Hₐ: the observed distribution does not fit the normal distribution. If we accept the H₀, we accept/assume normality
Table 4.8: Shapiro – Wilk test of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of Normality</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov(^a)</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of projects implementation</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Lilliefors Significance Correction

H\(_0\) = Normality

Source: Survey Data (2016)

Since the sig. or the \(p\) value of the Shapiro-wilk test of normality is more than 0.05 for effectiveness of implementation of projects, standing at 0.068, then the researcher failed to reject H\(_0\) (the data does not deviate from a normal distribution. The interpretation was guided by conventional wisdom presented by Shapiro & Wilk (1965) and Razali & Wah (2011).

4.8.2 Test for Auto correlation

The Durbin Watson statistics as generated using SPSS with effectiveness of projects implementation are summarized and presented in table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9: Durbin Watson Test for auto correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Predictors: (Constant), Monitoring and Evaluation, Managerial factors, Stakeholder empowerment, and factors attributed to donor behaviour.

\(^b\) Dependent variable: Effectiveness of projects implementation

Source: Survey Data (2016)

The Durbin-Watson in the Model summary, \(d = 1.930\) lies between the two critical values of 1.5<\(d<2.5\). Following the conventional wisdom presented by the authors, Durbin & Watson
(1971), the researcher therefore made an assumption that there was no first order linear autocorrelation in the multiple linear regression data.

4.8.3 Test for multi Collinearity
The statistics on the multi collinearity test employed using SPSS tools are presented in table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: Test for multi collinearity using Tolerance and VIF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial factors</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of primary stakeholders</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors attributed to donor behavior</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable : Effective Project Implementation

Source: Survey Data (2016)

According to Liu, Kuang, Gong & Hou (2003), extremely small values would indicate that a predictor is redundant. This means that values that are less than 0.1 merits further investigations. In this output, tolerance values stand at 0.118, 0.158, 0.126 and 0.112 for monitoring and evaluation, Managerial factors, Involvement of primary stakeholders and factors attributed to donor behaviour. In addition, Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) stands at 8.47, 6.33, 4.63 and 8.93 for monitoring and evaluation, Managerial factors, Involvement of primary stakeholders and factors attributed to donor behaviour. All this values are below the maximum cut off point of 10. This implies that the researcher made a conclusion on the absence of multi collinearity problem in the data set.
4.9 Regression Results

The results for the regression analysis are presented in the sections below.

4.9.1 Regression Coefficients

The regression coefficients are presented in table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10: Coefficients table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>1.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial factors</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>1.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of primary</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>1.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders</td>
<td>Factors attributed to donor</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>1.933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effective Implementation of donor funded development projects

Source: Survey Data (2016)

The B values and the p-value to check for significance are depicted in table 4.10 above. We reject Ho if p < .05. This means the relationship is reliable and can be used to make predictions. The findings also show the contribution of each variable in explaining the effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County, Kenya as depicted by unstandardized beta values which assess the contribution of each variable towards the prediction of the dependent variable. The overall equation as suggested in the conceptual framework can be represented by use of unstandardized coefficients as follows:
Y = β₀ + β₁X₁ + β₂X₂ + β₃X₃ + β₄X₄ + \( \epsilon \)

Where:

Y = Effective Implementation of Donor funded development projects

X₁ = Monitoring & Evaluation

X₂ = Managerial factors

X₃ = Empowerment of primary stakeholders

X₄ = Factors attributed to donor behavior

\( \epsilon \) = Error Term.

\( \beta_0 \) = Point of intercept on the y axis

Y = 0.339 + (0.141X₁) + (0.181X₂) + (0.324X₃) + (0.392X₄). This means that even without the four variables under study, effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects would be 0.339. The findings also indicate that a unit change in monitoring and evaluation would result in 0.141 change in effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects, a unit change in managerial factors would result in 0.181 change in effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects, a unit change in empowerment of primary stakeholders would result in 0.324 change in effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects and a unit change in factors attributed to donor behavior would result in 0.392 change in effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects.

Findings in the table also show that factors attributed to donor behavior (p=0.027) and empowerment of primary stakeholders (p=0.008) were statistically significant. The error term (0.02) means that the model will not be completely accurate, and will result in differing results during real world applications. Findings of the study indicate that, overall, the order of
ranking in terms of relative influence is as follows: (1) empowerment of primary stakeholders = (0.008); (2) factors attributed to donor behavior = (0.027); monitoring and evaluation = (0.052); and managerial factors = (0.061).

4.9.2 Coefficient of determinant

The regression model is presented in table 4.11 below.

**Table 4.11: Regression Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.280(^a)</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Influence of project management

b. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness of projects implementation

**Source: Survey Data (2016)**

Table 4.11 above presents the model summary, which depicts the values of R and R Square. The table includes information about the quantity of variance that is explained by the predictor variables. The first statistic, R, is the multiple correlation coefficients between all of the predictor variables and the dependent variable. In this model, the value is .280, which indicates that there is a great deal of variance shared by the independent variables and the dependent variables. This is frequently used to describe the goodness-of-fit or the amount of variance explained by a given set of predictor variables. In this case, the value is 0.784, which indicates that 78.4% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables in the model.

4.9.3 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

The results for analysis of variance are presented in table 4.12 below.
Table 4.12: F- test on ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10.410</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.097</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (constant), Monitoring and Evaluation, Managerial Factors, Involvement of primary stakeholders, Factors attributed to donor behaviour.

b. Dependent variable: Effective Implementation

Source: Survey Data (2016)

It can be concluded from the ANOVA that at 5% significance level, there exist sufficient evidence to justifiably conclude that that the slope of regression line is not zero. As such, project management factors included in the model are useful predictors of effective implementation since the p value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05. Sig = 0.000 suggests that the model adopted for the current study is significant for predicting effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County, Kenya.

The next chapter presents a summary of the key findings, discussions of the study findings, based on the objectives of the study, articulated in chapter 1, conclusions, recommendations and limitations of the study.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of key findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

5.2 Summary of key findings

This section presents a summary of the findings of the study

5.2.1 Background Information

Out of the 388 questionnaires that were distributed to the respondents (1 project manager and 1 community member per project), 365 questionnaires were returned completed. This means that the researcher achieved a 94.1% response rate. The high response rate could be attributed to the good rapport created between the researcher and the respondents and the efforts of the data enumerators. The results show that majority of the respondents (68.5%) were of male gender while only (31.5%) were of female gender. The results do not conform to the one third gender rule as per the Kenyan Constitution. There is need for the projects to involve more project officers and community members of female gender increase their representation, in compliance with the gender rule.

The results also indicate that out of the 365 respondents, majority of them, (62.8%) were aged 35 years and below, while only (37.8%) were aged above 36 years. The results also show that beyond 35 years, the higher the age bracket, the lower the number of respondents involved in the study. The findings also show that that only (3.6%) of the respondents were
aged above 50 years. The respondents were thus of a relatively youthful age and their active participation in projects implemented in their areas were expected to enhance ownership and hence sustainability.

The findings show that majority of the respondents (42.5%) had attained secondary school level of education, followed by (28.8%) who had attained at least a college certificate, and (17.0%) had attained an undergraduate degree. Whereas only 5.2% of the respondents had attained a postgraduate qualification, 6.6% of the respondents reported that they did not complete secondary school. It is assumed that the higher the level of education one attained, the higher the level of understanding of issues and the more objective the responses would be on the various issues in the study. The findings show that majority of the respondents had at least some formal education and as such, it is expected they provided objective responses to the study questions.

The results show that majority of the respondents (75%) had worked in the current organizations for at least 3 years. Assuming that the longer one worked in an organization, the better they understood the organization’s operations and projects, the results show that majority of the respondents had a sound understanding of their organizations and the projects they managed; hence they were in a better position to provide objective responses to the questions posed. The results show that majority of the respondents (56.2%), had worked on the current project for more than 3 years, a period long enough to understand the operations of the donor funded development projects implemented in Busia County. The responses provided were thus expected to be objective.
The results show that majority of the respondents were either project supervisors or project managers (54.8%). The rest (45.2%) comprised of Project technical advisors (23.3%), Project Monitoring & Evaluation Officers (13.2%), and Project finance managers (10.7%). The results indicate that all the respondents played a key role on the donor funded development projects under implementation in Busia County and as such, they were all capable of providing objective responses to the study questions. The results show that majority of the respondents (97%) expressed desire to receive the results of the study. This is an indicator that majority of the respondents were interested in the study findings and would have liked to know how the projects performed, especially from an independent source of information. The study presented such an opportunity

5.2.2 Influence of monitoring and evaluation on effective implementation projects

The findings show that projects are monitored by the various stakeholders, who include the local administration, the project officers, community members, the donors and external evaluators. The results indicate that all the stakeholders were involved in projects monitoring, though the degree of involvement varied. The findings also show that the great majority of community members (94%) were empowered and actively participated in the projects implementation. Monitoring and evaluation, follow-up provides concrete evidence of outcomes and that this knowledge can be utilized by the implementers or other agencies alike to improve future projects.

The regression results indicate that a unit change in monitoring and evaluation would result in 0.141 change in effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects.
Findings also show that factors attributed to donor behavior gave (0.052), which is statistically significant.

5.2.3 Influence of managerial factors on effective implementation of projects

Findings of the study show that managerial factors affected projects implementation in Busia County. Firstly, the projects had successful relationships with various stakeholders, the highest ranked being “project partners”, while the least ranked was “the National and County Governments”. In addition, the project management was successful in managing various resources. The highest ranked resource was “managing risks” and “facilitating learning”. The least ranked resources were “financial resources”. This was occasioned by delays in projects commencement, leading to price variation when procuring materials and other inputs. The results also show that the various persons responsible for funds disbursement should avoid unnecessary delays, which cause variations between actual expenditure and the budgets. Poor coordination contributes to delay from estimated completion time. Poor site management may occur when contractors do not have enough experience and suffer from a lack of knowledge in managing the project team.

Results of regression analysis show that a unit change in managerial factors would result in 0.181 change in effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects. Findings also show that factors attributed to donor behavior gave (0.061), which is statistically significant.
5.2.4 Influence of primary stakeholders’ empowerment on effectiveness of projects

The results show that stakeholders’ empowerment in donor funded projects in Busia County was highly rated, with (43%) of the respondents stating “Good” and (25.5%) stating “Excellent”. The results show that the stakeholders were empowered and had a say in the projects implementation, which would enhance the project activities’ ownership, and hence sustainability. The results also show that community members were involved in all the activities that are undertaken in implementation of donor funded projects in Busia County, though to a varying degree. Involvement in project activities by target beneficiaries increases ownership and hence empowerment and projects sustainability.

Findings of the study indicate that the stakeholders were involved in various aspects of the projects implementation. Findings of the study with respect to empowerment of primary stakeholders show that the stakeholders were involved in various aspects of the projects implementation. The highest ranked statement was “the communication channels used to engage stakeholders are appropriate”, followed by “all stakeholders are involved during implementation of donor funded projects facilitated by donors in this area. Participation empowers the primary stakeholders by helping break the mentality of dependence, promoting self-awareness and confidence, by leading the poor to examine their problems and to think positively about solutions. Therefore, there is need to widen the scope so as to include other stakeholders, who are not necessarily committee members. In addition, the meetings between project implementers and project beneficiaries should be as inclusive as possible.

Regression results show that a unit change in empowerment of primary stakeholders would result in 0.324 change in effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development
projects. Findings also show that factors attributed to donor behavior gave (p=0.008), which is statistically significant.

5.2.5 Influence of factors attributed to donor behavior on effectiveness of projects

Findings with respect to factors attributed to donor behavior show that effectiveness in implementation of donor funded projects is affected by factors attributed to donor behavior. The highest ranked statement was “before donors disburse funds, they gather credible evidence that the project will be sustainable and will not be donor dependent”, followed by “accountability”, then “fund disbursement bureaucracies”. The respondents were of the view that there is need to undertake a thorough baseline survey with a view to identifying the key problems/challenges affecting communities in the area, and thereafter, implement the projects in accordance with the identified needs. This calls for stakeholders (beneficiaries’) empowerment in selection of the projects to be implemented and the actual approval process. Funds disbursement bureaucracies are another area that requires addressing by the various stakeholders, so as to be within the projects starting and closing time.

Results of regression analysis show that a unit change in factors attributed to donor behavior would result in 0.392 change in effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects. Findings also show that factors attributed to donor behavior gave (p=0.027), which is statistically significant.
5.3 Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, all the four managerial factors examined are validated as key in influencing effectiveness of projects implementation of donor funded development projects in Busia County, Kenya. Primary stakeholder empowerment however has the most significant influence, followed by factors attributed to donor behavior. Whereas monitoring and evaluation is ranked third, the least ranked are managerial factors.

Effectiveness of implementation of donor funded development projects is dependent on projects monitoring and evaluation, whose main purpose is to determine the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of projects so that the information obtained can inform the design of future projects. In order to enhance quality of monitoring and evaluation there is need to not only empower primary stakeholders in monitoring and evaluation, but also ensure that the evaluation parameters are well understood.

Management capacity of human resources has a significant positive influence on effectiveness in implementation of donor funded projects. This implies that there is need to have a budgetary allocation to facilitate continuous capacity building of human resources involved through training and development.

Empowerment of primary stakeholders in projects implementation enhances capacity of human resources to not only generate, but also influence development, leading to increased access to and influence over resources and institutions, hence projects sustainability.

Prior to disbursement of funds, donors go to great lengths to gather credible evidence pertaining to the project’s sustainability, accountability, and local communities’ are
empowerment in the project approval process. This leads to delays in projects starting times, which lead to budget variations due to unforeseen price increases that would have been avoided. This calls for donors to be provided with information pertaining to the consequences of the delays, so that when designing their policies, the process will be informed by strategic rather than bureaucratic thinking.

5.4 Recommendations

Findings of the study reveal that projects monitoring and evaluation is key to projects effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects. The purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to determine the relevance, appropriateness, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of projects so that the information obtained can inform the design of future projects. The empowerment of primary stakeholders in monitoring and evaluation is therefore of paramount importance. In addition, the evaluation parameters should be understood by all projects stakeholders.

Findings of the study also indicate that management capacity of human resources significantly and positively influence effectiveness in implementation of donor funded projects. There is thus need to have a budgetary allocation for training and development of the projects implementers, which should be used to fund formal training in projects management, human resources management and financial resources management.

Further, the findings indicate that empowerment of primary stakeholders in various aspects of projects implementation helps in building up the capacity of people to generate and influence development at various levels, increasing their access to and influence over
resources and institutions. This in turn helps in achieving projects sustainability. It is therefore of utmost importance that frequent stakeholders meetings are held, where ideas are shared so that teamwork is achieved and ownership is enhanced in projects implementation.

The study findings reveal that there were delays in projects starting time, which were occasioned by delays in funds disbursement by donors. The delays lead to budget various due to unforeseen price increases that would have been avoided. There is thus need for the donors to be informed of the consequences of the delays, so that when designing their policies, the process will be informed by strategic rather than bureaucratic thinking.

Effectiveness is the capability of the organization to meet its set vision and mission given the resources it has in possession. Project effectiveness is often used in measuring results towards the vision, mission and goals attainment of the firm. It is therefore important that all stakeholders understand the project vision, mission and objectives and work as team members with the aim of attaining the desired results. This at times may call for working long hours and in difficult conditions, which requires that all stakeholders go an extra mile, without taking their eyes off the ultimate goal.

5.5 **Recommendations for further research**

The study should be replicated by undertaking similar studies in other locations, as this research only covered donor funded development projects in Busia County, Kenya. An investigation of other factors influencing effectiveness of projects implementation could also be undertaken and whereas the focus for the current study was the project managers and
community members, future studies should focus on the donors, so as to get their side of the story.
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APPENDIX I: INTRODUCTION LETTER

Edwine Sheltone Omollo
Kenyatta University
P.O. Box 43844-00100
Nairobi,
Kenya.

Dear Respondent,

RE: ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROJECT

I am carrying out a research study entitled “Project management and effective implementation of donor funded projects in Busia County, Kenya”. The research is towards the partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Master of Business Administration (MBA) of Kenyatta University.

I would be grateful if you could spend a few minutes filling out the attached questionnaire. No personal information will be disclosed or made public, and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. If you are interested in the results of this research, I would be more than happy to send you a summary upon completion of this study.

The questionnaire is divided into two sections. Please complete each section as instructed. Do not write your name or any other form of identification on the questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

EDWINE SHELTON OMOLLO

RESEARCHER
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you very much for accepting to participate in this interview. This Research will be used for academic purpose only and any data or information given will be treated with utmost confidentiality, the result will be analyzed and reported collectively. As such no finding will be attributed to any of the participant as an individual. Please provide your honest opinion.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Organization Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question and Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Name of Project being implemented (Optional) :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Name of implementing organization (Optional) :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Period of operation in Kenya (Years):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Respondent Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question and Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender (1) = Male [ ] (2) = Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age (Years) (1) = Less than 20 [ ] (2) = 21 - 30 [ ] (3) = 31 – 40 [ ] (4) = 41 – 50 [ ] (5) = 51 - 60 [ ] (6) = Above 60 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highest academic level attained: (1) = Less than Secondary school [ ] (2) = Secondary school [ ] (3) = College Certificate [ ] (4) = College Diploma [ ] (5) = Undergraduate Degree [ ] (6) = Postgraduate Degree [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of Years worked in the current organization:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Current position on the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of years worked on the current project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would like to receive a summary of the results from this research (1) = Yes [ ] (2) = No [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART B: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF DONOR FUNDED PROJECTS IN BUSIA COUNTY, KENYA

Influence of monitoring and evaluation on effective implementation of donor funded development projects

3. Please indicate the person(s) who monitor the donor funded development projects in this area (Tick as appropriate) – (Multiple responses allowed)
### Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local administration</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you think that the project managers are accountable for the project? (Tick as appropriate)

1 = YES  2 = NO

5. To what extent are community member(s) involved in Project monitoring and evaluation?

(1) Community members are not involved at all
(2) Community members are involved to a small extent
(3) Community members are involved to a great extent

6. Please state whether the projects project (s) was/were successful in achieving the set goals (Tick as appropriate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not successful at all</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Very successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Started on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met the set specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was implemented within budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved the community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was/were completed on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please provide any suggestions on the areas that can be improved in terms of monitoring & evaluation in order to enhance the effectiveness of donor funded projects in your area

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

### Influence of managerial factors on effective implementation of donor funded development projects

8. In your own opinion, indicate your level of agreement with the statements below relating to managerial factors in implementation of donor funded projects in this area. Use a scale of 1-5, Where 1- Strongly disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly agree.
The project has successful relationships with various stakeholders as listed below:

- Project participants
- Project partners
- The National and County governments
- The donor(s)

The project has been successful in managing the following:

- Human resources
- Financial resources
- Facilitating learning
- Managing risks
- Ensuring flexibility

9. Please provide any suggestions on areas of improvement that the project management should address in order to enhance the effectiveness of donor funded projects in your area.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

Influence of empowerment of primary stakeholders on effective implementation of donor funded development projects

10. In your opinion how do you rate empowerment of stakeholder in projects in Busia County using the scale below?

1. Poor □ 2. Below average □ 3. Average □ 4. Good □
5. Excellent □

11. Please indicate the extent to which community members are involved in the following donor funded project activities (Tick as appropriate). Use a scale of 1-5, Where 1- Not at all; 2 = somehow; 3 = Much; 4 = Very much.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Projects conceptualization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Project monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Project evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project closure (On completion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. In your own opinion, indicate your level of agreement with the statements below relating to stakeholder empowerment in implementation of donor funded projects in this area. Use a scale of 1-5, Where 1- Strongly disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a All stakeholders are involved during implementation of donor funded projects facilitated by donors in this area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b The communication channels used to engage stakeholders are appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Key interests of stakeholders are addressed by project teams in good time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Stakeholders’ own interests affect project implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Progress of our projects is reported to all stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Stakeholders empowerment affect implementation of donor funded projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Please provide any suggestions on other roles that stakeholders should be involved in order to enhance the effectiveness of donor funded projects in your area

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

**Influence of factors attributed to donor behavior on effective implementation of donor funded development projects**

Please indicate the extent to which each of the factors attributed to donor behavior, listed below affect effective implementation of donor funded projects in Busia County. Where: Very Much = 5; Much = 4; Somehow = 3; Neutral = 2; Not at all = 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors attributed to Donor Behavior</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Somehow</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation Complexities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Disbursement bureaucracies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Objectives and tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local communities are involved in the project approval process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before donors disburse funds, they gather credible evidence that the project will be sustainable and will not be donor dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Please provide any suggestions on the areas that donors can improve on their conditions in order to enhance the effectiveness of donor funded projects in your area

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Effectiveness in implementation of donor funded development projects

15. In your own opinion, indicate your level of agreement with the statements below relating to effectiveness in implementation of donor funded projects that are implemented by donors in this area. Use a scale of 1-5, Where 1- Strongly disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Projects implemented by donors in this area implemented within schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>The target beneficiaries are satisfied with the project results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>The projects comply with environmental standards (noise level, waste disposal, air quality etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Projects enhance innovation and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Every aspect (scope) of safety project is implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Projects conform to quality specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any suggestions on what the stakeholders of the donor funded projects can do in order to improve effectiveness of the projects in your area

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

The End – Thank you for your cooperation