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DEFINITIONS OF OPERATIONAL TERMS

NGO : An organization that is registered and/or is operating in Kenya in compliance with the NGOs Coordination Act No. 19 of 1990.

Project : A set of activities aimed at achieving defined set of objectives within a defined period of time and using defined amount of resources.

Project Manager : The officer in-charge of the overall management of a project or projects in an organization.

Project Management : This is the discipline of planning, organizing, securing and managing resources to bring about the successful completion of specific project goals and objectives.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CIDA : Canadian International Development Agency
DFID : Department for International Development
INGO : International Non Governmental Organization
LFA : Logical Framework Approach
Logframe : Logical Framework
MoV : Means of Verification
NASA : National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NGO : Non-Governmental Organization
NORAD : Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OVI : Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PERT : Project Evaluation Review Technique
SIDA : Swedish International Development Agency
USA : United States of America
USAID : United States Agency for International Development
ABSTRACT

Project management has previously been a preserve of the building and construction industry. However, with time the discipline has been adopted by other sectors ranging from the government sector, the not-for-profit sector and the private sector. In the planning and execution of projects, project managers make use of various project management tools such as Work breakdown structure (WBS), Gantt chart, Logical framework, Run chart and PERT chart among many others. Among these tools, logical framework commonly referred to as logframe has attracted a lot of attention as well as controversy. This is because despite the tool's effectiveness, the level of its adoption among organizations remains low raising the fundamental question on what determines its adoption among these institutions. This study sought to find out the various factors that determine logframe adoption among project managers in NGOs operating in Nairobi County in order to provide the necessary facts on the use of this important tool. The researcher endeavoured to achieve the following research objective: to find out the economic factors that influence the adoption of logframe among the NGOs; to establish the policy factors that influence adoption of logframe; to determine the technical factors that influence the adoption of logframe; and to investigate the socio-cultural factors that influence the adoption of logframe. To achieve the above objectives, the researcher sought to find answers the question on how each of the above factors influences the adoption of logframe among the participating NGOs. This was based on the assumption that the information collected was correct, up to date, accessible and timely. The researcher adopted a descriptive research design in carrying out the study so as to present facts as they were. Due to time and financial constraints, the researcher used stratified sampling technique so as to study a subset of the population while at the same time ensuring that the research findings were generalizable to the entire population. In addition to collection of primary data through the use of a questionnaire, the researcher had conducted a thorough literature review of the existing secondary materials so as to supplement his research as well as identify knowledge gaps in order to eliminate unnecessary duplications. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics with the aid of statistical package in social sciences. The data was presented using frequency distribution tables, pie charts and bar graphs so as to provide a visual and pictorial presentation of the research findings for ease in understanding, comparison and interpretation of the research findings. After data analysis, it was found that economic factors have the highest influence on the adoption on logframe followed by policy and technical factors. Socio-cultural factors were the least influential. In conclusion, it is worth noting that logframe is far from being fully mainstreamed in project management though organizations are using it.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study
The dynamisms associated with the ever-changing global trends such as developments in technology, urbanization, industrialization, climate issues, human rights and globalization among others come with a myriad of challenges. In order to tackle these challenges, organizations come up with interventions in form of projects in their efforts to attempt in mitigating the challenges, adapting to the changing conditions or even engaging in inventions in order to ensure they are part of the developments. According to Kousholt (2007), the temporary nature of projects ensures that they are carried out within specified time frames within which their completion time brings about beneficial change or added value to the subjects. He argues that the temporary nature of projects stands in contrast with business as usual or operations, which are repetitive, permanent, or semi-permanent functional activities to produce products or services. In practice therefore, the management of these two systems is often quite different, and as such requires the development of distinct technical skills and management strategies.

Project management on the other hand involves the planning, organizing, securing and managing resources to bring about the successful completion of specific project goals and objectives (Nuguti, 2009). It entails the planning and control of events that together comprise the project. Project management aims at ensuring there is effective use of resources and delivery of the project objectives on time and within the cost constraint. The purpose of project management is therefore to achieve successful project completion with the available resources. A successful project is one which has been completed within the planned time, the budgeted cost and technical performance which satisfies the end user (The World Bank, 2000).

For projects to be carried out effectively and efficiently, a number of project management tools are used depending on the project management phase. Some of the project management tools include but are not limited to the following: Work Breakdown Structure, Gantt chart, Logical Framework, Responsibility Assignment Matrix, PERT Chart, Risk Register and Run Chart. Among these tools, logical framework has raised a lot of interest especially among the
international donor agencies some of whom have made it a mandatory requirement for NGOs applying for grants from them to be effectively and justifiably using it.

The logical framework commonly referred to as logframe is a management tool used to design and manage projects. Its purpose is to identify problems and needs in a certain sector of society; facilitate selection and set priorities between projects; plan and implement development projects effectively; as well as follow-up and evaluate development projects (The World Bank, 2000).

The logical framework approach has come to play a central role in the planning and management of development interventions over the last years. Its origins lie in a planning approach for the USA military, which was then adapted for the US space agency NASA before being adopted by USAID for development projects. It was picked up by European development organisations in the 1980s and by the end of the 1990s the LFA had become the standard approach required by many donors for grant applications (Hailey & Sorgenfrei, 2004).

The use of logframe dates back in 1960s when it was originally developed by the United States Department of Defense, and adopted by the United States Agency for International Development in the late 1960s. It is a highly effective planning tool for defining inputs, outputs, timetables, success assumptions and performance indicators. It provides a structure for specifying the components of an activity and for relating them to one another. It also helps to identify the place of a project within an overall program or a national system (Guijt & Woodhill, 2002).

Over time, the tool has been faced with controversies from organizations with some accepting it as an effective tool while others reject it on the basis of its limitations. Bakewell and Garbutt (2005) contend that “Although the logical framework has become universally known, it is far from universally liked. It has been the subject of much criticism over the years, concerning both the theoretical basis of the approach, and the way it is applied in practice.” They argue that a simplistic characterization of the prevailing attitudes to the use of logframe runs as follows: donors insist on it, while NGOs use it under sufferance. Hence it carries on being widely used against all objections.

In order to ensure efficiency, effectiveness and accountability in the utilization of resources, most international grant agencies have made it a mandatory requirement for organizations seeking funding from them to have their projects designed according to logframes. Such
international agencies include DFID, CIDA and SIDA. In addition, local grant agencies such as the Safaricom Foundation put it as a mandatory requirement for all the organizations seeking funding from them to present a logframe upon which their projects are designed together with the project proposal for which the funds are being sought (Safaricom Foundation, 2011).

1.1.1 NGOs in Kenya

According to Kameri-Mbote (2000), the roots of NGOs may be traced to philanthropy mainly during the colonial era during which the activities of NGOs largely focused on welfare. Over time, the activities of NGOs have changed from those of provision of services to diversified activities such as political action, advocacy and human rights. NGOs in Kenya became most vibrant with the relaunch of multiparty politics in 1990s. This can largely be attributed to the fact that political pluralism greatly enhanced the space for legal implementation of the right of freedom of association and the institutions of democracy. This promoted the identification of various challenges that have been facing the citizens thereby making NGOs diversify their operations in their efforts to find solutions to these challenges.

NGOs in Kenya operate under a legal framework whose premises are derived from the NGO Coordination Act No. 19 of 1990. The act provides the framework upon which the registration, coordination and regulation of NGOs in Kenya are carried out. The act also led to the establishment of the NGO Coordination Board whose legal mandate is to register, co-ordinate and facilitate the work of all national and international NGOs operating in Kenya so as to ensure compliance with the legal framework governing their operations in the country as well as provide a regulation mechanism to monitor their operations (NGO Coordination Act, 1991).

Failure to effectively and efficiently make use of project management tools and principles by some organizations has led to a number of problems. According to Kameri-Mbote (2000), NGOs in Kenya have suffered from a number of problems some of which include: Administrative inefficiencies resulting from lack of effective and efficient management systems for good governance especially for NGOs that rely on donor funding; Lack of accountability leading to fraud and mismanagement of resources by some NGOs; and lack of sustainability of the projects due to inadequate or lack of operational linkages among the project components. In this regard, international donor agencies such as DFID, SIDA, CIDA and NORAD have come to a common
consensus that logframe has proven to be a highly effective accountability tool among organizations that receive grants from them (NORAD, 1999).

Based on the need to find out why some of the NGOs adopt the tool while others are reluctant to adopt it despite its universal recognition as an effective tool, the researcher found it worth carrying out this study. The purpose of this study therefore was to find out and analyze the factors that determine the adoption of logframe among NGOs in Nairobi County, Kenya.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
For success and sustainability of projects, sound project management is an essential prerequisite and this calls for effective adoption of project management tools. Logframe being one of the tools has been universally acknowledged as a very effective tool that can be used at all the phases of the project life cycle. However, according to Bakewell and Garbutt (2005), although logframe has been universally acknowledged as an effective project design and management tool, it is far from universally liked and thus it has been the subject of much criticism over the years, concerning both the theoretical basis of the approach, and the way it is applied in practice.

A survey commissioned by SIDA in 2005 on the use and abuse of logframe found out that although some NGOs had internalized its use, for most the original driving force came from donors, some of whom have insisted that those receiving grants should adopt an LFA. However, the research also found out that some NGOs had taken logframe on board and said they have adopted it due to its usefulness in their work. The study found out that some of the major factors influencing the adoption of logframe are economic factors, policy factors and technical factors. It was also found that socio-cultural factors influence the adoption of the tool but to a lesser extent.

Another survey conducted by USAID in 2003 among NGOs in Kenya found out that 85% of the organizations that design their projects according to a logframe were more accountable on the utilization of their resources than those that did not make use of the tool. This prompted the agency to making it mandatory for organizations seeking its funding to adopt logframe in all the projects for which the funds have been sought. This indicates that ideally NGOs are expected to adopt and mainstream logframe into their operations due to its universal recognition. However, this has not been the case and so this study sought to find out the factors that influence the adoption of this important tool so as to enrich the knowledge behind its use.
1.3 Research Objectives

1.3.1 General Objective
To analyze the determinants of logical framework adoption among Non-Governmental Organizations in Nairobi County, Kenya

1.3.2 Specific Objectives
The study sought to fulfil the following specific objectives:

(i) To find out the economic factors that influence the adoption of logframe among NGOs in Nairobi County, Kenya.
(ii) To determine the technical factors that influence the adoption of logframe among NGOs in Nairobi County, Kenya.
(iii) To establish the policy factors that influence the adoption of logframe among NGOs in Nairobi County, Kenya.
(iv) To investigate the socio-cultural factors that influence the adoption of logframe among NGOs in Nairobi County, Kenya.

1.4 Research Questions
The researcher was guided by the following research questions:

(i) How do economic factors influence the adoption of logframe?
(ii) How do technical factors influence the adoption of logframe?
(iii) How do policy factors influence the adoption of logframe?
(iv) How do socio-cultural factors influence the adoption of logframe?

1.5 Significance of the Study
The study will be useful to project managers and the participating organizations by availing to them the necessary facts about the adoption of logframe so as to enhance decision making and policy formulation based on informed perspectives.

The study findings will also be useful to scholars and future researchers by recommending areas for further research in addition to adding value to the already existing knowledge about the logframe.
The study will also be useful to donor agencies by providing them with the information about logframe adoption among NGOs in Kenya in general and those operating in Nairobi in particular thereby enhancing informed donor policies on the adoption of the tool.

Finally, the study will be significant to academia fraternity as it will act as a reference material for future reference as well as a guide to future research on project management tools especially the logframe.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The scope of this study was the NGOs operating in Nairobi County with the study targeting project managers from these NGOs. The total number of NGOs in the county is 336 and they are spread across ten major areas of operations namely; Humanitarian Assistance, Education, Health, Agriculture, Child Welfare, Human Rights, Policy and Governance, Environment, Science and Technology, and Integrated Development. The decision to carry out the study in Nairobi County was informed by the cosmopolitan nature of the county. This makes the county have a variety of NGOs operating in different sectors as opposed to other counties which tend to have NGOs operating in similar or related sectors due to the homogeneity of the prevailing conditions in the counties. In addition, most of the NGOs operating in Kenya have their head offices in the county which enhanced access to integrated information (NGO Coordination Board, 2012).

1.7 Limitation of the Study

The researcher anticipated the limitation of this study to be the degree to which the research findings would be generalizable due to time and financial constraints which would make it difficult for the researcher to carry out a census on the target population. This was resolved through carrying out the research on a sample of the population which was identified through probability sampling hence making the research findings generalizable to the larger population.

1.8 Assumptions of the study

The researcher assumed that the information collected from the respondents was correct, up to date and accessible. In addition, the researcher assumed that all the respondents selected for the study would be available to fill in the questionnaire in time so that the study is completed as per the research schedule thereby eliminating chances of delays in the submission of the research findings.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

Logframe is based on Leon Rosenberg’s linear temporal logic model which stipulates that components in a project or a program should be presented in a systematic and logical hierarchy which clearly shows how the components are linked together through a justifiable linkage aimed at achieving the overall goal of the project/program.

2.1.1 Definition of Logical Framework

The logical framework commonly referred to as logframe is a management tool used to design and manage projects. Its purpose is to identify problems and needs in a certain sector of society; facilitate selection and set priorities between projects; plan and implement development projects effectively; as well as follow-up and evaluate development projects (The World Bank, 2000).

The logframe is an analytical tool used to plan, monitor, and evaluate projects. It derives its name from the logical linkages set out by the planners to connect a project’s means with its ends. The logframe is only one planning, monitoring and evaluation tool and its use does not pre-empt the use of other evaluation tools such as priority-setting or rate-of return analysis (Gasper, 1999).

According to Nuguti (2009), the logical framework takes the form of a four by four project table. The four rows are used to describe four different types of events that take place as a project is implemented: the project Activities, Outputs, Purpose and Goal from bottom to top on the left hand side. The four columns provide different types of information about the events in each row.

The first column is used to provide a narrative description of the event. The second column lists one or more objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) of these events taking place. The third column describes the means of verification (MoV) where information will be available on the OVIs, and the fourth column lists the assumptions.

Assumptions are external factors that it is believed could influence (positively or negatively) the events described in the narrative column. The list of assumptions should include those factors that potentially impact on the success of the project, but which cannot be directly controlled by the project managers. In some cases these may include what could be killer assumptions, which
if proved wrong will have major negative consequences for the project. A good project design should be able to substantiate its assumptions, especially those with a high potential to have a negative impact (Nuguti, 2009).

There is a clear distinction between the logical framework approach and the logical framework matrix. The former refers to the steps involved in planning and designing the project. These steps include a stakeholder analysis, cause-effect analysis, objectives analysis, and alternatives analysis culminating in the design of the project. The matrix, which summarizes the final design of the project, usually comprises 16 frames organized under 4 major headings (Saldanha and Wittle, 2002).

The results of the stakeholder, problem, objectives and strategy analysis are used as the basis for preparing the logical framework matrix. The standard logical framework matrix consists of a matrix with four columns and four rows, which summarizes the key elements of a project plan as shown in the table below (Nuguti, 2009).

Table 2.1: Logical Framework Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Summary</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)</th>
<th>Means of Verification (MOV)</th>
<th>Important Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nuguti (2009)
It is worth noting that it is through the logical framework approach (LFA) that a logframe is developed and therefore it is not easy to look at logframe while ignoring LFA and vice versa. The logical framework approach leads towards the presentation of key project information in a simple table referred to as the logframe. The logframe summarizes long term and short term levels of project objectives and respective measures for assessing progress. It provides a logical, practical and transparent project summary for all stakeholders (Nuguti, 2009).

2.1.2 Analytical Elements of Logical Framework Approach

According to USAID (2005), logical Framework approach has four main analytical elements to help guide the process of analyzing the existing situation. These are:

Problem Analysis: this involves identifying what the main problems are and establishing the cause and effect relationships which result in, and flow from, these problems.

Stakeholder Analysis: having identified the main problems and the cause and effect relationships between the problems, it is then important to give further consideration to who these problems actually impact on most, and what the roles and interests of different stakeholders might be in addressing the problems and reaching solutions.

Objective Analysis: objective trees should be prepared after the problem tree has been completed and an initial stakeholder analysis has been undertaken. This gives an image of an improved situation in the future.

Strategy Analysis: this involves comparison of different options to address a given situation.

2.1.3 Use of Logframe in Project Design and Management

Logframe is a widely applied tool for comprehensive project formulation since it encourages concise project description in a standardized way. The logframe is also a practical monitoring tool during the implementation of projects. Its function as a management tool is however less known and the use of the logframe during the implementation period depends widely on how it was designed during the identification and formulation stage of a project. The logical framework approach is a highly effective strategic planning and project management methodology with wide application (Bell, 2000).
The logframe is an effective analytical tool used to support project planning and management. According to the World Bank (2000), the logframe has the power to communicate the essential elements of a complex project clearly and succinctly throughout the project cycle. It is used to develop the overall design of a project, to improve the project implementation, monitoring and to strengthen periodic project evaluation. It provides a set of interlocking concepts which are used as part of an iterative process to aid structured and systematic analysis of a project idea (European Commission, 2004).

2.1.4 Relevance of Logframe

Logframe allows information to be analyzed and organized in a structured way, so that important questions can be asked, weaknesses identified and decision makers can make informed decisions based on their improved understanding of the project rationale, its intended objectives and the means by which objectives will be achieved (European Commission, 2004). This enhances an informed monitoring and evaluation process.

The logical framework approach provides a set of designing tools that, when used creatively, improve the planning, designing, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of development projects thereby ensuring innovative monitoring and evaluation arising from the creativity (The World Bank, 2000).

Logframe provides a structured logical approach to setting priorities and determining the prospected results and activities of a project. This means that if the logframe is used correctly, it can provide a sound mechanism for developing a project concept into a comprehensive project design document. Logframes can also provide the basis for evaluating the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of a project therefore enhancing effective project management through cost minimization, enhanced timeliness of deliverables and improved organizational processes (Nuguti, 2009).

It acts as a tool for helping project designers to think rationally about what the project is trying to achieve (the specific objectives), what the project needs to do to make this happen (the outputs or results) and what has to be done to produce these outputs (the activities). In its turn, the specific objective of the project is to serve the higher level goal (the overall objective). This therefore means that the logframe is a necessary tool that acts as a guide during the project management
process by providing the information that is used as indicators against which the project is carried out (European Commission, 2004).

The logframe is applied when planning, implementing and evaluating specific projects within an action plan. It is valuable for carrying out logical checks during project design as well as for monitoring progress and reviewing activities and output during project implementation (The World Bank, 2000).

Using logical framework approach for project or program design imposes rigour in assessing what is to be achieved and the assumptions behind what interventions and activities will be required. Many international donors such as the Asian Development Bank and the European Commission require projects they fund to be designed according to a logical framework approach (Wageningen, 2010). During initial stages, it can be used to test project ideas and concepts for relevance and usefulness thereby facilitating initial monitoring and evaluation necessary for ensuring that the projects implemented are relevant and useful to the various stakeholders (Wageningen, 2010).

Logframe guides systematic and logical analysis of the key interrelated elements that constitute a well-designed project hence facilitating sound monitoring and evaluation of such elements (The World Bank, 2000). It also defines linkages between the project and external factors thereby providing the basis of monitoring and evaluating the external environment on which the project operates as well as the effects of the environment to the project and also the effects of the project to the external environment (USAID, 2005).

During implementation, logframe serves as the main reference for drawing up detailed work plans, terms of reference, budgets, etc (Wageningen, 2010). Therefore, logframe provides information about the various deliverables during the implementation of the project. Moreover, it provides indicators against which the project progress and achievements can be assessed (Wageningen, 2010). It provides a shared methodology and terminology among governments, donor agencies, contractors and clients (The World Bank, 2000).

According to Gasper (1999), the advantage of the LFA is that it forces people to carefully think through what they are planning to do. It encourages a useful thought experiment where one can ask the 'what if' questions hence making people to consider systematically how the proposed
activities might contribute to the desired goal through delivering outputs and outcomes. However, these positive aspects are offset by the almost universal complaint that it rests on a very linear logic making it a mechanistic idea of cause and effect.

2.1.5 Limitations of Logframe

Despite logframe being so relevant in project management, it has a number of limitations some of which include but not limited to: Logframe focuses too much on problems rather than opportunities and vision (Wageningen, 2010); Organizations may promote a blueprint, rigid or inflexible approach, making the logframe a barrier to creativity and innovation (The World Bank, 2000); There is limited attention to problems of uncertainty where a learning or adaptive approach to project design and management is required (Wageningen, 2010); and the strong focus on results can miss the opportunity to define and improve processes (Tembo, 2012).

The failure of the logframe to cope with unintended consequences is one of the most common criticisms of the whole approach, especially when it is applied to evaluation. To adopt the logframe as a central tool in effects and impact evaluations assumes there is high power of foresight, so that neither unforeseen routes nor unintended effects are important (Gasper, 2000). 'Logframes produce confusion rather than clarity and generate assessment processes unrelated to real project issues and thus they can function to sideline the politics and messiness of development itself, reinforcing and generating mechanistic views of the development process in which inputs automatically lead to the specified outputs' (Bornstein, 2003: p.398).

2.2 Determinants of Logframe Adoption

According to NORAD (1999), adoption of logframe by organizations is determined by the following: Technical know-how among the staff, the type of projects the organizations are involved in, availability of funds to invest on training the staff on logframe and the organizations policies as well as the policies of the donor community.

Bakewell and Garbutt (2005) note that whether an NGO will make use of logframe or not is determined by: softness or hardness of a project, ability to understand the technical jargon used, the cultural context in which the project is to be implemented, availability of resources to train on logframe, the ability of the project team to interpret the concepts and terminologies used in
the logframe into local dialects and the ability of the logframe to adapt to the changes in the
project requirements.

Economic factors revolve around the financial and monetary implications resulting from
adopting logframe in the organization. According to NORAD (1999), whenever an organization
wishes to introduce a tool including logframe into its operations, it should put into consideration
some costs attached to such a development. These costs may include cost of training on the tool
and development of the tool. The organization should also consider whether there are funds
available to invest in the tool as well as whether the organization has enough resource base to
support such a development.

Socio-cultural factors are those factors that arise from the day to day socialization and interaction
among individuals in the organization as well as their unique communities in which they were
brought up and socialized in. These factors include organizational culture, perception, cultural
beliefs and language particularly regarding interpretation of terms (Bakewell and Garbutt, 2005).

Policy factors result from guidelines, rules and regulations governing the operations of different
organizations in different environments. Policy factors that determine the adoption of logframe
include but are not limited to: donor conditionalities, organizational policies and government
legislations (NORAD, 1999).

Technical factors influence efficiency and effectiveness in the use of the logframe as a result of
the tool’s technical specifications and attributes. Technical factors determining logframe
adoption include: the technical jargon used, technical know-how (expertise) and technical
rigidities associated with the tool (Bakewell and Garbutt, 2005).
2.3 Empirical Review

A research on the use and abuse of logframe among INGOs commissioned by SIDA and conducted by Bakewell and Garbutt in the year 2005 found out that although some NGOs have internalized the use of the logframe approach, for most the original driving force came from donors, some of whom have insisted that those requesting for grants should adopt an LFA.

The study revealed that while many respondents found that the structure the LFA provided for their thinking was actually quite helpful, they often found it difficult to communicate this way of thinking to others. Some respondents claimed that the main problem was one of training. They reported that it was smaller NGOs, whose training resources were more limited, that struggled most with the LFA. Others suggested that it was difficult to translate the concepts used in the LFA into other languages and the way of thinking did not carry across in some cultures, making the inherent logic in the framework difficult to grasp. These problems were not confined to cross-cultural communication – others found similar problems in working with compatriot colleagues.

The study further noted that some NGOs cited technical complexities and rigidities as the main reason why they do not make use of logframe in their organizations since the nature of their work requires a greater degree of flexibility so as to achieve higher levels of participation for all the stakeholders in the projects they undertake as well as to easily adapt to the changing conditions in their environment. A common experience was that introducing the logical framework in an organization requires a high level of investment in training and support to ensure that people can use it effectively.

However, some NGOs had taken logframe on board and said they find it useful for their own work and therefore they have incorporated its use in their organizational operations. In this regard, one grant making NGO, which only receives a minority of its funding from donors, noted that it uses logframe internally for all its projects and programmes.

Other respondents noted that logframe is treated as a contract document, which specifies the work of the recipient of donor funds and hence modifications cannot be made lightly, especially if it has been the product of a considerable level of negotiation between multiple stakeholders.
and this also renders aspects of the project which do not easily fit within the framework problematic.

According to Chemelili (2011), although NGOs contribute about 60% of the basic services such as water, food, clothing and medicine to the people of Turkana, they are usually bedevilled by the malpractices of corruption, mismanagement and lack of accountability hence the need for them to be regularly audited in order to provide checks and balances. He recommends that there is need for a body to be set up in order to monitor the activities of the organizations so as to encourage transparency and accountability in their operations.

Musyimi (2006) in his study on ‘factors affecting the utilization of community water projects for small irrigation in Kyuso’ noted that training in a project is paramount as 78% of the stakeholders requested for training regarding the irrigation project. He recommended that the government and concerned Non-Governmental Organizations should ensure that the delivery of services to their targets fosters their participation and enablement rather than lack of agenda and inability to maintain projects especially after end of external support. He further contends that Projects should be designed not only to meet the immediate need of the target community but also to allow for the exit of the donor and for redesigning to meet future needs. This would help in building their capacities in order to make use of the projects as production resources.

Ayiro (2008) recommends that organizations dealing with HIV/AIDS management response should configure organizational management structures and put in place strategies that are innovative and business-like. According to him, considering the complexity of managing the response to HIV/AIDS in terms of resource mobilization, coordination, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of these activities, a hybrid between private, non profit and public sectors has to be adopted under the framework of social entrepreneurship. This is a clear indication that NGOs play a pivotal role in the development agenda of the country.

Kameri-Mbote (2000) in a study themed ‘The Operational Environment and Constraints for NGOs in Kenya’ notes that most NGOs in Kenya fail the test of sustainability due to corruption, misappropriation of resources and mismanagement resulting from lack of accountability and transparency and therefore she recommends a comprehensive mechanism of providing checks and balances to the NGOs. She also notes that 75% of NGOs registered in Kenya operate in
Nairobi and this can be attributed to the proximity of the region by donors hence resulting in the mushrooming of NGOs whose sole purpose is to get funding even without an elaborate plan of action. Such NGOs end up collapsing before accomplishing the goal for which they purported to have been formed to accomplish.

A survey by USAID among NGO that receive grants from it in Kenya carried out in 2003 revealed that up to 85% of the organizations that have effectively adopted logframe in designing and implementing their projects are able to account for all their actions and resource use and end up completing their projects successfully within the specified budget, scope and time (USAID, 2003). As a result of these findings, USAID made it mandatory for all organizations seeking its funding to adopt the LFA in their project design and management. Such conditionalities have also been imposed by a number of grant giving bodies such as The World Bank, DFID and CIDA who insist that organizations seeking funding from them should submit their funding proposals together with annexed logframes failure to which their proposals would not be considered for funding. Others even prescribe the format and the components that must be included in the logframe (Nuguti, 2009).

2.4 Summary of Research Gaps

Most of previous researches laid emphasis on the importance of the logframe while ignoring the constraints the users of the tool are faced with. This has led to some grant making bodies insisting on the tool without even giving reference to the users. Some even go a step further and develop the logframe for their grant recipients without involving them thereby hindering participation and inclusion as well as hindering creativity.

Previous studies failed to consider the unique circumstances faced by organizations in different environments and thus they studied logframe as a universal tool. Therefore, the studies did not address the issue of heterogeneity among organizations and among operational environments.

Finally, despite the fact that previous studies identified some of the factors that determine the adoption of logframe among the NGOs, they failed to identify the relative influence of these factors making it difficult to rank them according to their hierarchical influence from the most influential to the least influential.
2.5 Conceptual Framework

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework

Independent variables

- **Economic factors**
  - funds availability
  - resource base
  - cost

- **Technical factors**
  - technical jargon
  - technical rigidities
  - expertise

- **Policy factors**
  - donor conditionalities
  - organizational policies
  - government legislation

- **Socio-cultural factors**
  - organizational culture
  - language
  - perception
  - cultural beliefs

Dependent variable

Adoption of Logframe

Source: Researcher (2012)

The indicators of logframe adoption were the frequency of logframe use, percentage of resource allocation to logframe development and adoption, frequency of trainings on logframe and the number of projects that have been successfully completed using the LFA.

Interpretation of Variables

**Economic factors**: These are the financial and monetary elements that contribute to an accomplishment, result or process. In this particular context, it is in reference to the financial and monetary elements that influence the adoption of logframe among NGOs in Nairobi County.
Technical factors: These are the elements that describe the expectation and the adaptability of the users of a process, an output, a good and/or a service as a result of the knowledgeable capacity about it. In this case, technical factors refer to those factors that influence the adoption of logframe as a result of its technical specifications and the technical know-how of its users.

Policy factors: These are elements that proscribe as well as prescribing the expected and the accepted ways of carrying out activities as a result of laws, rules and regulations that guide the activities of an organization. In this context, policy factors refer to the guidelines governing the operations of an organization within and without its operating environment.

Socio-cultural factors: These are large scale forces within cultures and societies that affect the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of individuals and organizations. In this context, they refer to the factors that influence the adoption of logframe as a result of the day to day socialization and interaction among individuals in the organization as well as the environment in which they operate.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This section outlines the methodology that was used to conduct the study. Specific areas highlighted are: research design, target population, sampling design, data collection procedures, instrument and method, data analysis and data presentation.

3.2 Research Design
The researcher adopted a descriptive research design using the survey approach. This is the design whose purpose is to provide a description of affairs as they are (Delno and Kombo, 2006). Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) recommend this design as suitable in cases where the problem has been defined specifically and the researcher wants to establish certain issues about the problem.

This design was considered because it would give the researcher an opportunity to administer a questionnaire to a sample of project managers concerning the adoption of logframe so as to facilitate in the measurement, classification, analysis, comparison and interpretation of the research data (Delno and Kombo, 2006). Additionally, since the design allows respondents to be in their natural setups, the environment would not be manipulated thus it was assumed that the respondents would give information more freely.

3.3 Target Population
The study targeted 336 project managers of the NGOs in Nairobi County. This population was drawn from 336 NGOs which is the total number of NGOs operating in the county as per the statistics from the NGO Coordination Board (2012).

3.4 Sampling Design
The researcher adopted probability sampling design in the study. The design was preferred since it would give all the 336 NGOs in the population an equal chance of being selected for the study. This therefore made the research findings generalizable to the larger population. The sampling frame was obtained from the NGO Coordination Board in March 2012.
Out of the 336 NGOs in Nairobi County, a sample of 68 was selected to participate in the study out of which a questionnaire was administered to one project manager per NGO. This sample size was 20.24% of the entire population. This sample size had been considered based on three factors namely: the need for the sample to be representative of the population in which Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) recommends 10% of the population. In addition, the researcher had considered time and budget constraints as articulated by Kothari (2004).

The sample was obtained through stratified sampling whereby the population was divided into ten strata based on the areas of operation of the NGOs. Since each stratum was included in the final sample, the results were generalizable to the population. Respondents were then selected from each stratum through systematic sampling proportionate to the population size of the stratum and relative to the sample size as shown in the table below.

Table 3.1: Target Population and the Resulting Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA OF OPERATION</th>
<th>POPULATION SIZE (P)</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE (S)</th>
<th>% OF POPULATION SIZE (S/P*100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Assistance</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Governance</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.6721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Development</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.0769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Conservation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.1818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>336</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.2381</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2012)
3.5 Data Collection Procedures, Instrument and Method

The research instrument for the study was a semi-structured questionnaire. The questionnaire had both open ended and close ended questions. This was aimed at ensuring ease in data analysis while at the same time providing for diversity of information from the respondents. To ensure validity of the instrument, the researcher carried out a pilot test of the questionnaire so as to incorporate the desired changes prior to the actual data collection. To ensure reliability, the researcher used test-retest method prior to the actual data collection.

The questionnaire was self-administered whereby the project managers were left to fill in the questionnaire for collection by the researcher or the research assistant after one week or as may be advised by the respondents. However, the maximum period was two weeks beyond which the researcher treated the status of the questionnaire as non-response. Self-administered questionnaires were preferred due to the busy schedules of the project managers. This provided flexibility in terms of time whereby the respondents filled in the questionnaires during their convenient times.

3.6 Data Analysis

The researcher used quantitative data analysis techniques. In this regard, the researcher analyzed data using descriptive statistics mainly the measures of central tendency which are mean, mode and median and measure of deviation mainly the standard deviation. To aid in data analysis, the researcher used the statistical package for social sciences.

3.7 Data Presentation

The researcher presented data by use of descriptive data presentation methods namely bar graphs, pie charts and frequency distribution tables so as to provide a visual and pictorial representation of the research findings for ease in understanding, comparison and interpretation.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter comprises of the data analysis and the findings components of the study. Areas covered in the section include the following: Background Information, Economic Factors, Technical Factors, Policy Factors, Socio-Cultural Factors and Overall Ranking of the Factors Influencing the Adoption of Logframe.

4.2 Background Information

4.2.1 Response Rate

The target sample was 68 organizations; however 58 organizations filled the questionnaires representing 85.3% response rate.

Figure 4.1: Response Rate

![Response Rate Chart]

Source: Research data (2012)

4.2.2 Gender

The respondents were asked to indicate their gender; 53.4% indicated Male while the other 46.6% indicated Female. This shows that among the respondents, men were more than women by 6.8%.
4.2.3 Level of Education

When asked to indicate their highest level of education; 20.7% indicated they had attained Diploma, 44.6% had Bachelors Degree, 27.6% had Master’s Degree; 3.4% were PhD holders while 3.4% had other academic qualifications not listed in the research tool. This indicates that majority of the project managers had undergraduate qualification and below while very few had postgraduate qualifications. However, Masters Degree holders were eight times more than the PhD Degree holders which may be an indicator of the need for incentives aimed at promoting acquisition of higher education among project staff.

Figure 4.2: Level of Education

Source: Research data (2012)
4.2.4 Training on Project Management

The respondents were asked to indicate if they had any specialized training on project management; 46.6% indicated No while 53.4% indicated Yes as shown in figure 4.3. This can be an indicator that majority of the project managers have the necessary specialized skills to effectively manage projects in the organizations.

**Figure 4.3: Training on Project Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialized Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

4.2.5 Frequency of Logframe Use

The respondents were asked to indicate the frequency at which they use the logframe in their organizations; 22.4% indicated monthly, 62.1% indicated annually while 15.5% indicated others which includes alongside timeline of projects and dependent on project activities as shown in table 4.2 below. This indicates that majority of the organizations use logframe on annual basis.

**Table 4.2: Frequency of Logframe Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)
4.2.6 Sectors in which the Organizations Operate

The respondents were drawn from ten sectors of operation as presented in table 4.3 below. This shows that Humanitarian Assistance has the highest number of NGOs operating in Nairobi County while Science and Technology has the least since the strata sizes were based on the population size of the organizations in the sectors. NGOs in the Education, Integrated Development, Science and Technology, Agriculture and Environmental Sectors recorded the highest response rate as per the strata size at 100.00% whereas Policy and Governance Sector recorded the lowest response rate at 75.00%. Other sectors were as follows: Humanitarian Assistance (78.57%), Health and Human Rights (80.00% each) and Child Welfare (83.33%). Table 4.3 presents the number of the respondents from every sector and their percentage relative to the total number of the respondents.

Table 4.3: Sectors in which the Organizations Operate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Assistance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Governance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Conservation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)
4.2.7 Category of the NGO

The respondents' indication shows that 48% of the organizations were Local while 52% were International. This means that among the participating organizations, the International NGOs outnumbered the local NGOs by 4% as illustrated in figure 4.4.

Figure 4.4: Category of the NGO
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Source: Research data (2012)

4.2.8 Number of Staff Trainings on Logframe Conducted Annually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainings</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

When asked how many staff trainings they conduct annually; 62.1% indicted 0-5 times, 6.9% indicated 5-10 while 31.0% indicated specifically none. According to these statistics, there is a clear indication that training on logframe is not emphasized in most of the organizations as almost a third of the respondents were categorical that no such trainings are conducted at all.
while still majority of the respondents indicated they conduct 0-5 trainings annually and this may translate to one or even no training per month. This therefore calls for increased training among project staff so as to enhance their technical capacities for effective adoption of logframe and other project management tools.

4.2.9 Years of Operation in the Country
When asked to indicate the number of years their organizations have operated in Kenya, 18.97% indicated 0-5 years, 24.14% indicated 5-10 years, 20.69% indicated 10-15 years, 15.52% indicated 15-20 years, 12.07% indicated 20-25 years, 5.17% indicated 25-30 years while 3.45% indicated over 30 years as presented in figure 4.5. This shows that majority of the participating organizations have had operations in Kenya for twenty years and below while very few of them have had operations in the country for more than thirty years.

Figure 4.5: Years of Operation in the Country
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Source: Research data (2012)
4.2.10 Years of Operation with Logframe

Table 4.5: Years of Operation with Logframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

The respondents were asked to indicate how many years their organizations had used logframe in their operations; 41.4% indicated 0-5 years, 32.8% indicated 5-10 years, 19.0% indicated 10-15 years while 6.9% indicated more than 15 years. This indicates that although logframe has been in use in Kenya for more than fifteen years, more than 70% of the organizations have used the tool for less than ten years and this may be an indicator of low adoption rate of the tool. However, it is also worth noting that all the organizations are aware of logframe and have made use of the tool but at different paces and therefore efforts should be geared towards increasing the rate of adoption of the tool rather than awareness creation on the tool since virtually all the respondents indicated they make use of it. This also calls for the need to establish the reasons behind the difference in the adoption rate of the tool to as to inform the formulation of strategies for enhancing increased adoption of the tool.

4.2.11 Budgetary Allocation to Adoption and Development of Logframe

The study sought to recognize what percentage of the project budget the organizations appropriated for the development and adoption of the logframe; 81.0% of the respondents indicated 0-5 percent; 1.7% indicated 5-10 percent while 17.2% indicated they have never allocated any budget to adoption and development of logframe. In this regard, it is worth mentioning that low budgetary allocation may have been a contributing factor to the low adoption rate of the tool since there lacks enough financial resources for its development and training.
4.2.12 Completed Projects using Logframe

Table 4.6: Completed Projects Using Logframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

When asked to indicate how many projects had been completed successfully using the logframe 46.6% of the respondents indicated 0-5, 22.4% indicated 5-10, 6.9% indicated 10-15 while 24.1% indicated more than 15 projects as presented in table 4.6 above. This shows that logframe is an effective tool when the number of successful projects is compared with the number of years organizations have made use of the tool and the allocation to its development and therefore if improvements are made the tool could be more effective in project management.
### 4.3 Economic Factors

Table 4.7: Economic Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Cost of Training is a barrier to the adoption of logframe</th>
<th>Adoption of logframe requires a lot of capital investment</th>
<th>Decision to use logframe depends on funds available</th>
<th>Logframe is expensive to adopt</th>
<th>Organizations with little resource base do not prioritize logframe in their budgets</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

| 58   | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 |

Source: Research data (2012)

The study sought to understand the perception of respondents on cost of training, capital investment, funds availability, expensiveness of logframe and resource base towards development and adoption of the logframe by an organization. Summary of value totals indicated that 17.9% responses strongly do not acknowledge that these economic factors affect adoption of logframe, 22.4% responses indicate disagreement on the extent of effects, 15.5% responses indicate neutral effects of economic factors, 26.2% responses show agreement that the factors affect adoption of the logframe. This is compared to 17.9% who strongly agreed that these economic factors affect the development and adoption of the logframe. This shows that more
respondents were in agreement that economic factors influence the adoption of logframe as compared to those who had disagreement on the same.

Other economic factors identified by the respondents as influencing logframe adoption are: lack of funding for the logframe, irregular project funding, poor budgeting skills, funding agreements that ignore logframe, use of irrational methods for funding for logframe and lack of management support towards the funding for logframe. In this regard, majority of the respondents (79.31%) indicated that irregular funding highly influence negatively on effective adoption of the logframe since it results in irregular allocation to the organizational activities and thus adversely affecting the training and development component of the organizations.

4.4 Technical Factors
Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement and acknowledgement of technical factors' effect on logframe adoption; the study was based on technical rigidities of the logframe, stakeholders understanding of the logframe jargon, revision of logframe during project implementation and substitutability of logframe with other project management tools. Responses indicate that 18.5% strongly disagreed, 16.8% disagreed, 16.0% had neutral perception, 31.9% agreed while 16.8% strongly agreed that the enlisted technical factors had an influence on the adoption of the logframe. Those who agreed that technical factors influence logframe adoption were more than those who disagreed by 13.4%.

Other technical factors cited as influencing the adoption of logframe are: lack of knowledge on logframe among human resource personnel who are charged with the recruitment of the project staff, shortage of qualified project management professionals, lack of know-how on the importance of logframe among the management, lack of staff training on logframe, lack of consistence in terminologies used in logframe, variation of donor specifications on logframe, failure by learning institution to mainstream logframe in the curriculum and the degree of simplicity or complexity of the projects. 82.76% of the respondents noted that the human resource personnel who have the mandate to hire the project staff lacked the basic project management skills, competences and knowledge making them end up recruiting project staff without the necessary capabilities to manage the projects effectively. In addition, 56.90% of the
respondents cited inconsistencies in the terminologies used in the logframe and its ever-changing structure as hindrances to its effective adoption.

Table 4.8: Technical Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Logframe is rigid</th>
<th>Jargon used in Logframe can be revised in the course of project implementation</th>
<th>Logframe can be substituted with other tools</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

4.4.1 Logframe Use in the Organization

Respondents were asked to tick the phase or phases of project cycle where they had used logframe in the organization. 51.7% indicated they had used it during project design, 72.4% during project planning, 86.2% in project monitoring, 75.9% for project evaluation and 29.3% in impact assessment. This shows that majority of the organizations use logframe in project monitoring as opposed to impact assessment. In addition, most of the organizations had used logframe in more than one project management phase with majority using it in the monitoring and evaluation phases of the project management cycle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Project</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Monitoring</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Assessment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

4.4.2 Effectiveness of Logframe in Project Management Processes

Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of the logframe in project management processes; the majority of the respondents (72.4%) indicated most effective at project monitoring, 53.4 rated most effective at project evaluation, 25.9% at project planning, 15.5% at project design while 12.1% rated most effective at impact assessment as presented in figure 4.7. This may be based on the perception among project managers who have previously perceived logframe as a monitoring and evaluation tool rather than a project management tool. The low rating of effectiveness at the impact assessment process may be attributed to the long period of time taken to realize the impact of a project thereby lowering the chances of referring to the logframe especially among organizations without an elaborate project management data bank for the necessary future referencing.
When respondents were asked to list other tools if any that they can use as alternatives to logframe, the following tools were cited: Project dashboard, Activity log, Work plans, Outcome mapping matrix, Microsoft project software, Social framework, Project indicator checklist and Project budget. The availability of alternatives to logframe may therefore be one of the reasons why adoption of the tool is low especially if the substitutes are more user-friendly. However, some respondents noted that ‘logframe is the best’ and therefore stated that other tools can only be used to supplement logframe but not to substitute it. Hence other tools should be used to address the shortcomings of logframe rather than being viewed as substitutes to the logframe.

4.5 Policy Factors

The study sought to understand the perception of respondents on the organizational policy framework on logframe use, government policy framework on adoption of logframe, donor requirements and logframe as an accountability tool on development and adoption of the logframe by an organization. Summary of value totals indicated that 9.9% responses strongly did not acknowledge that these policy factors affect adoption of logframe, 19.0% responses indicated disagreement on the extent of effects, 13.8% responses indicated neutral effects of policy factors, 31% show agreement that the factors affect adoption of the logframe. This is compared to 26.3% who strongly agreed that these policy factors affect the development and adoption of the logframe. Policy factors are therefore perceived by twice the number of the respondents as
influencing logframe adoption as compared to those who were in opposition. Almost all the respondents were in agreement that logframe is an accountability tool with only 0.07% of the respondents taking a neutral stand as regards to whether logframe is an accountability tool or not.

Table 4.10: Policy Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>My organization has policies that support use of logframe</th>
<th>The government has policies that promote adoption of logframe</th>
<th>I use logframe because it's a Donor Requirement</th>
<th>Logframe is an accountability tool</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

Other policy factors identified by the respondents as influencing logframe adoption include the following: Hiring policy for project management staff, financial policies of donors, changes in donor policies, expected output, lack of standard policy framework regarding logframe, management styles, training and development policies of the organizations and lack of standard monitoring and evaluation requirements among organizations and donors.
4.5.1 Stakeholders Involved in Logframe Development

When asked to indicate which of the project stakeholders were involved in logframe development 75.9% indicated the donors, 70.7% indicated the implementing agencies while 43.1% indicated primary stakeholders. This shows that majority of organizations involve donors in the development of logframe as opposed to primary stakeholders. This may pose the risk of developing logframes that ignore the role of the primary stakeholders in project management and logframe development thereby resulting in lack of ownership which may threaten the survival of the project as well as the adoption of the logframe after its development.

Table 4.11: Stakeholders Involved in Logframe Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Involved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Agencies</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Stakeholders</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

4.6 Socio-Cultural Factors

The respondents were asked to rate their perception on socio-cultural factors and how they affected the adoption of logframe in an organization; The study sought opinions on how cultural differences affect the adoption of the logframe, difficulties of translation of logframe terms into Kenyan Dialects, Logframe as serving donor interests and the organisation has a culture of mainstreaming logframe in project management; Results indicated that 10.3% of the cumulative responses strongly disagreed that these social cultural factors had an influence on the adoption of logframe; 16.8% disagreed, 20.7% had a neutral perception, 35.3% agreed while 16.8% strongly agreed that these social cultural factors had an influence on the adoption of logframe. This shows that almost a quarter of the respondents were undecided in their assessment while more than a quarter were in disagreement. This can be highly attributed in the recent developments derived from modernization and liberalization which has brought about socio-cultural integration and borderless interaction among individuals and organizations from different socio-cultural backgrounds thereby enhancing socio-cultural fusion and coexistence. This makes socio-cultural factors less effective in influencing the adoption of logframe among organizations.
Table 4.12: Socio-Cultural Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Cultural differences affect the adoption of logframe</th>
<th>Difficult to translate the terms used in the logframe in to Kenyan Dialects</th>
<th>Logframe is perceived as serving donor interests</th>
<th>Organization has a culture of mainstreaming Logframe in Project Management</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

Other socio-cultural factors cited as influencing the adoption of logframe are: suspicion among stakeholders, resistance to change, commitment/goodwill from the management, ethics and standards of the project staff, level of education of the project implementers, beneficiaries’ failure to own projects, limited timeframe of implementing the projects, group-think which affects decision making, cultural ethnocentricity among project staff and lack of teamwork among staff due to senior-junior conflicts. This indicates that organizations need to strive and make efforts towards bringing about socio-cultural integration aimed at expeditiously and effectively handling the emerging socio-cultural issues that may affect effective project management.
4.7 Respondent Ranking of Factors Affecting Logframe Adoption

4.7.1 Influence Ranking of Economic Factors

When asked to rank the influence of economic factors on adoption of logframe in the organization; 37.9% indicated it was the most influential, 13.8% agreed it was influential, 27.6% had the opinion that it was less influential while 20.7% indicated it was the least influential. This is an indicator that economic factors have a strong influence on logframe adoption. This can mainly be attributed to the competing financial and economic needs in the organization that result in low priority given to logframe due to its opportunity cost vis-à-vis other requirements of the projects. In addition, this scenario can also be attributed to the economic hardships experienced by many organizations making them not consider logframe development and adoption as a priority area.

Figure 4.8: Influence Ranking of Economic Factors

![Influence Ranking of Economic Factors](image)

Source: Research data (2012)
4.7.2 Influence Ranking of Policy Factors
Respondents were asked to rank the influence of policy factors on the adoption of logframe; 31.0% indicated they were the most influential, 36.2% indicated they were influential, 25.9% indicated they were less influential while 6.9% admitted they were the least influential. This can be attributed to the absence of a policy framework both at the organizational level and the government level. This therefore calls for an elaborate policy framework to guide the use of logframe as this would offer guidelines on the use of the tool as well as offering a logical rationale on which the tool is to be used hence promoting its adoption by organizations.

Figure 4.9: Influence Ranking of Policy Factors

![Influence Ranking of Policy Factors](image)

Source: Research data (2012)

4.7.3 Influence Ranking of Technical Factors
When asked to rank the influence of technical factors on adoption of logframe in the organization; 31.1% indicated they were the most influential, 43.1% agreed they were influential, 17.2% had the opinion that they were less influential while 8.6% indicated they were the least influential. Most respondents attributed this to the technical complexities associated with the tool as well as the availability of tools that can be used effectively as alternatives to logframe. This shows there is need for logframe to be simplified and made more user-friendly to make it easy to use as well as enhance its adoption thereby increasing its effectiveness and efficiency in project management and project performance.
4.7.4 Influence Ranking of Socio-Cultural Factors

Respondents were asked to rank the influence of socio-cultural factors on adoption of the logframe; 0% indicated they were the most influential, 6.9% indicated they were influential, 29.3% indicated they were less influential while 63.8% admitted they were the least influential. This shows that majority of the respondents (93.1%) do not perceive socio-cultural factors as influential to the adoption of logframe in their organizations with only 6.9 agreeing that the factors are influential. This shows that although some socio-cultural factors have a strong bearing on the adoption of logframe, overall the factors have the least influence on the adoption of logframe and therefore organizations should focus on tackling the individual socio-cultural factors that have a strong bearing on the adoption of logframe. This low ranking of socio-cultural factors may be as a result of modernization which has brought about socio-cultural integration resulting in reduced socio-cultural differences and increased socio-cultural tolerance.
### Table 4.13: Influence Ranking of Socio-Cultural Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most influential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Influential</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Influential</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data (2012)

### 4.7.5 Overall Ranking of the Factors Influencing the Adoption of Logframe

When the respondents were asked to rank the factors from the most influential to the least influential, majority of them (38%) cited economic factors as the most influential in the adoption of logframe. Technical factors and policy factors took the second place with an equal share of 31%. However, socio-cultural factors were the least influential factors with zero percent. This indicates that most organizations highly consider economic factors in deciding on whether to adopt logframe or not while socio-cultural factors are least to consider.

Economic factors were cited as the most influential factors mainly due to the high costs of training and irregular donor funding. There was also a common feeling among the respondents that logframe has been given a raw deal in budgetary allocation of the project finances thereby denying logframe the much needed resources for its development and capacity building among the project staff for effective adoption of the tool.

It is worth noting that technical factors and socio-cultural factors were equally influential but less influential when compared with economic factors. In the case of technical factors, this can be attributed to the availability of alternative tools that can be used as substitutes to the logframe due to their simplicity and user-friendliness. On, the other hand, policy factors were cited as influential mainly due to deficiency of policy framework guiding the use of logframe among organizations. This has been presented in figure 4.11 below.
Figure 4.11: Overall Ranking of the Factors Influencing the Adoption of Logframe

Overall Ranking

- Economic factors: 38%
- Policy factors: 31%
- Technical factors: 31%
- Socio-cultural factors: 0%

Source: Research data (2012)
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Introduction
This section outlines the overview of this study whose objective was to find out the various factors determining the adoption of logframe among NGOs in Nairobi County. Specific areas highlighted are: summary, conclusions and recommendations.

5.2 Summary
This research was conducted with the sole purpose of establishing the factors that influence the adoption of the logframe among non-governmental organizations operating in Nairobi County, Kenya. In this regard, the researcher endeavoured to find out how economic factors, socio-cultural factors, policy factors and technical factors influence the adoption of logframe among the participating organizations. The researcher adopted a descriptive research design using the survey approach in carrying out the study. In order to avoid unnecessary duplications as well as identify research gaps, the researcher conducted a thorough literature review of the existing secondary materials which included books, journals and previous research works. The literature review entailed both the theoretical review and the empirical review. The study involved project managers from 68 organizations selected through stratified sampling. However, 58 project managers responded to the questionnaires within the set time frame of two weeks which represented 85.3% response rate. The research findings can be summarised as follows:

5.2.1 Background Information
International NGOs comprised of 52% while local NGOs comprised 48% of the respondents whose composition was 53.4% men and 46.6% women. 62.1% of the respondents reported they use logframe annually, 22.4% monthly while 15.5% use it differently ranging from quarterly, weekly and biannually. Majority of the respondents reported having used the logframe between 0-5 years at 41.4%. However, 6.9% of the respondents reported having used the tool for more than 15 years with some having used it for as many as 23 years. More than half of the respondents (62.1%) indicated they usually have 0-5 trainings on logframe annually. However, 31% of the same respondents specifically indicated that they have never had any training on logframe. There was also a relatively low budgetary allocation to logframe with 81% indicating
0-5% of the project budget is allocated to logframe while 17.2% indicated that no allocation for logframe has ever been made.

5.2.2 Economic Factors
Economic factors were cited as the most influential factors in determining the adoption of logframe. Majority of the respondents (56.9%) cited the cost of training on logframe as the main barrier to effective adoption of the tool. Another 50% cited the availability of funds. 44.8% of the respondents also indicated that the amount of resource base of an organization influences the adoption of logframe. This was mainly attributed to irregular funding from donors as well as poor budgetary allocation that does not prioritize logframe though almost all the projects are designed according to the tool. Other economic factors identified include: funding agreements, poor budgeting skills and reluctance by the management towards funding for the logframe.

5.2.3 Technical Factors
Technical factors were ranked as the second most influential factors together with policy factors. 31% of the respondents ranked technical factors as the most influential in the adoption of logframe. This could be attributed to the availability of alternative tools that can be used in the place of logframe. According to the respondents, these tools include: work plans, activity logs, outcome mapping matrix, project dashboards, social frameworks, Microsoft project software, Project indicator checklist and Project budget. However, some respondents argued that any other project management tool has its roots in the logframe and therefore they contend that logframe is the best. Technical jargon used in logframe was identified by 51.7% of the respondents as the main technical factor that influences the adoption of logframe and hence respondents suggested that the terminologies used in the tool need to be simplified as well as standardized for ease in their usage. In addition, 41.3% of the respondents were of the opinion that logframe is technically rigid hence inappropriate for projects that require flexibilities.

5.2.4 Policy Factors
Policy factors were ranked as the second most influential together with technical factors at 31%. Despite an overwhelming 93.1% of the respondents agreeing that logframe is an accountability tool, majority of the respondents (63.4) cited lack of a policy framework that supports and enforces the use of logframe as a main hindrance towards the adoption of a tool that has proved to be effective. In addition, half of the respondents noted that they use logframe since it is a
donor requirement rather than out of their own initiative. This therefore calls for an elaborate policy framework; both at the government and the organizational level, in order to reap full benefits derived from the logframe thereby promoting effective and efficient project management. In addition, there is need for awareness creation among the organizations in order to enlighten on the benefits of adopting logframe rather than using it just because it is a donor requirement.

5.2.5 Socio-Cultural Factors

These factors were identified as the least influential factors that influence the adoption of logframe among the respondents. Although socio-cultural factors were ranked as the least influential, majority of the respondents (55.2%) were in consensus that logframe uses terminologies that are difficult to translate into local Kenyan dialects and therefore the tool is not user friendly as the project implementers find difficulties in transferring the knowledge on logframe to the local communities where they work due to language barrier. In addition, 41.4% of the respondents agreed that cultural differences are a barrier to logframe use and this calls for an elaborate mechanism among organizations to bring about socio-cultural integration for effective project management. According to the respondents, other socio-cultural factors influencing logframe adoption include: suspicion among project stakeholders, resistance to change, ethics and standards among project staff, groupthink and lack of teamwork and cultural ethnocentrism.

5.3 Conclusions

Though organizations have made tremendous trends towards the adoption of logframe, the tool has not yet been fully mainstreamed in their operations and therefore a lot needs to be done to mainstream the tool. In this regard, organizations need to promote adoption of logframe and other project management tools and concepts through regular training, increased budgetary allocation and hiring competent personnel for effective project management.

Socio-cultural factors are the least influential in the adoption of logframe and this concurs with the findings of Bakewell and Garbutt (2005) who concluded that socio-cultural factors influence the use of logframe but to a lesser extent. One of the respondents indicated that ‘our project stakeholders have adopted a culture of tolerance and coexistence and therefore we no longer...
consider socio-cultural factors as anything to consider while adopting any project management tool including logframe.'

Training costs and availability of funds were noted as the major financial factors that influence logframe among the respondents. These two factors were also identified in previous studies conducted by NORAD (1999) and Bakewell and Garbutt (2005). In additional, other economic factors which emerged in the course of the research included: irregular funding which results in irregular allocation to logframe and poor financial management practices as well as hiring of unqualified personnel who are 'cheap' to hire.

Technical jargons used in logframe and technical rigidities were identified as the main technical factors that influence the adoption of logframe. Bakewell and Garbutt (2005) noted that many organizations reject logframe due to its technical rigidities and complexity as well as use of terminologies which are difficult to translate into local dialects. In addition, there was a common notion among the respondents that the human resource personnel who are entrusted with the duty of project staff procurement lacked technical know-how on logframe and therefore they end up recruiting project staff who lack the requisite skills to effectively use logframe thereby lowering the quality of the projects. USAID (2005) had identified technical factors as the most influential in logframe use among project implementers. There was a common feeling among the respondents that logframe should be standardized in terms of technical terms used and the structure so as to bring about technical simplicity and ease of use across different organizations and projects.

Policy factors influence logframe adoption mainly due to lack of an elaborate policy framework both at the organizational level and the government level. It was clearly noted that it is only donors who have an elaborate policy framework guiding the use of the tool in project management and therefore most organizations adopt logframe in order to comply with donor conditionalities rather than for its effectiveness. This therefore calls for the formulation and implementation of policy frameworks that would compel all organizations to adopt logframe. The World Bank (2000) and Tembo (2012) advocate for a policy framework to enforce logframe use so as to enhance transparency, accountability and efficiency in project/programme management both at the governmental and the non-governmental levels.
In conclusion, logframe has been acknowledged as an effective project management tool and therefore its effective adoption should be encouraged by elimination of barriers that lead to its rejection as well as ineffective adoption. This will go a long way in ensuring projects are implemented and completed successfully as well as promote transparency, accountability and responsiveness in project management.

5.4 Recommendations

There is need for regular staff training on logframe and other project management tools so as to enhance their competences on the use of the tools thereby promoting efficiency and effectiveness in the operations of the organizations.

Logframe should be mainstreamed in all the project related activities to ensure its use across the board. In this regard, logframe should be prioritized in the projects’ budgetary allocation so as to avail the much needed resources for its development and training in order to enhance increased adoption of the tool. Moreover, organizations should put in place contingent measures to ensure irregular funding and funding agreements do not effect the adoption of logframe and other tools.

There is need for projects stakeholders to come up with a logframe that is standardized among organizations and one that is universally acceptable in order to ensure uniformity of the tool hence ease of adoption within an organization as well as across organizations. This would also promote mastery of the tool by the project stakeholders with ease. This would go a long way in making the tool user friendly and thus increasing its adoption. This should also entail simplifying the structure of logframe as well as simplification of the technical jargon used in the tool.

All learning institutions should review their curriculum in order to incorporate logframe in all project related disciplines. This would ensure that learners are well equipped with the necessary knowledge relating to logframe thereby promoting their competences at work place. The curriculum should provide for both theoretical and practical sessions aimed at providing the learners with relevant insights regarding the tool.

Organizations should endeavour to mainstream vibrant monitoring and evaluation frameworks in their operations. This would ensure there are experts entrusted with the development, adoption and also enforcement on the use of logframe in the organization. This is based on the realization that many organizations lack fully fledged monitoring and evaluation units and thus the roles of
the units are either performed by other staff members who may lack the capacity to effectively and efficiently carry them out or even are left completely unattended to.

Policy frameworks should be put in place by both the government and the individual organizations so as to offer policy direction on the use and adoption of logframe. Since logframe has proved to be an accountability tool, coming up with a legal framework that enforces its adoption would enhance accountability and transparency through minimizing mismanagement of project resources.

Logframe should be developed within the frameworks of the SWOT and PESTEL analytical structures in order to ensure its viability in the project due to the consideration of the various factors that may affect the implementation of the projects upon which the tool has been used in designing. This will help in examining the environment upon which the project is to be implemented thereby taking into consideration the culture of the people as well as the socio-cultural dynamisms among the project stakeholders.

5.4.1 Recommendations for Further Study

There is need for future researchers to find out the relationship between the competences of the human resource personnel and the adoption rate of logframe among organizations and how these competences influence their capacity to hire project related personnel as well as their capacity to promote effective adoption of logframe in organizations.

It is also necessary for future researchers to find out how the environment in which an organization operates (both internal and external environment) influences the adoption of logframe by the organization.

Finally, future researchers need to establish the extent to which organizations tend to perceive the effectiveness of logframe vis-à-vis the alternative tools that can be used in the place of logframe in order to find out why some organizations prefer logframe while others prefer the substitutes to logframe.
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Appendix 1: List of Participating Organizations

- Partners in Adult Literacy Ministries
- Elimu Yetu Coalition
- I-DAY International
- African Network Campaign on Education for All
- Pathfinder International
- Médecins Sans Frontières
- Kenya Network of Women with AIDS
- Hope World Wide
- Family Health International
- African Medical and Research Foundation
- Regional AIDS Training Network
- Sightsavers International
- Action Against Hunger
- Action Aid International
- Kenya Red Cross Society
- International Rescue Committee
- Oasis of Hope
- Oxfam International
- The Ford Foundation
- World Vision International
- Voluntary Service Overseas
- Rockefeller Foundation
- Norwegian Refugee Council
- Farm Concern International
- Technoserve
- German Agro Action
- Africa Center for Open Governance
- Center for Multiparty Democracy
- East African Women's League
- Heinrich Böll Stiftung
- Institute for Education in Democracy
- League of Kenya Women Voters
- National Council of Women of Kenya
- Transparency International
- Education Center for Women in Democracy
- Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa
- Green Africa Network
- Environment Liaison Center International
- Green Belt Movement
- Womankind International
- International League for Human Rights
- Human Rights Watch
- The Kenya Human Rights Commission
- Save the Children Canada
- Girl Child Network
- Child Welfare Society of Kenya
- Child Fund International
- The CRADLE-The Children Foundation
- Regional Integration and Scientific Cooperation
- Aga Khan Foundation Kenya
- Community Aid International
- German Agency for Technical Cooperation
- Integrated Development Africa Programmes
- Poverty Eradication Network
- Society for International Development
- Trocaire International
- Kenya Community Development Foundation
Appendix 2: Research Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DETERMINANTS OF LOGICAL FRAMEWORK ADOPTION AMONG NGOs IN NAIROBI COUNTY, KENYA

A. Background Information

1. What is your gender?
   Male ☐ Female ☐

2. What is your position (designation) in the organization?
   Program manager ☐ Project manager ☐ Others ☐ Specify

3. What is your highest educational qualification?
   Certificate ☐ Diploma ☐ Bachelors degree ☐
   Masters ☐ PhD ☐ Others ☐ Specify

4. Do you have any specialized training in project management?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. What category of an NGO is your organization?
   Local ☐ International ☐

6. In which sector does your organization operate?
   Education ☐ Health ☐ Humanitarian Assistance ☐
   Agriculture ☐ Human rights ☐ Others ☐ Specify

7. For how many years has your organization operated in Kenya?
   0–5 ☐ 5–10 ☐ 10–15 ☐ Others ☐ Specify

8. For how many years has your organization been using logframe in its operations?
   0–5 ☐ 5–10 ☐ 10–15 ☐ Others ☐ Specify

9. How frequently do you use logframe in your operations?
   Daily ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly ☐ Annually ☐ Others ☐ Specify

10. How many staff trainings on logframe do you conduct annually?
    0–5 ☐ 5–10 ☐ 10–15 ☐ Others ☐ Specify

11. What percentage of the project budget do you allocate to the development and adoption of logframe?
    0–5 ☐ 5–10 ☐ 10–15 ☐ Others ☐ Specify

12. How many projects have you ever completed successfully while using the logframe?
    0–5 ☐ 5–10 ☐ 10–15 ☐ Others ☐ Specify
B. Economic Factors

13. Tick (✓) your most appropriate responses to the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The cost of training is a barrier to the adoption of logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Adoption of log frame requires a lot of capital investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The decision to use logframe depends on the funds available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Logframe is expensive to adopt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Organizations with little resource base do not prioritize logframe in their budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What other economic factors do you think influence the adoption of logframe?

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

C. Technical Factors

For numbers 15 to 18 below, indicate any of the following in the box after each statement: (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4= agree and 5= strongly agree)

15. Logframe is technically rigid and does not allow for flexibilities. □
16. It is difficult for project stakeholders to understand the jargon used in logframe. □
17. Logframe can be revised in the course of project implementation □
18. Logframe can be substituted with some other tools which are less complex □
19. What does your organization use the Logframe for? (Tick (✓) the applicable boxes)
   - Project design □
   - Project planning □
   - Project monitoring □
   - Project evaluation □
   - Impact assessment □
   - None of the above □
20. In a scale of 1 to 5, how would you rate the effectiveness of Logframe during the following project management processes? (Choose 1 for the 'lowest score' and 5 for the 'highest score')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. What other tools can you use as an alternative to logframe?

22. What other technical factors do you think influence the adoption of logframe in an organization?

C. Policy Factors

23. Tick (√) the most appropriate response to the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My organization has policies that support the use of logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. There are government policies that promote the adoption of logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I use logframe because it is a donor requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Logframe is an accountability tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Which stakeholders does your organization involve in logframe development? (Tick where applicable, more than one box may be ticked)

- Donors
- Implementing agencies
- Primary Stakeholders
- Others

(Specify)

25. What other policy factors do you think influence the adoption of logframe in your organization?


D. Socio-Cultural Factors

26. Tick (✓) the most appropriate response to the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cultural differences affect the adoption of logframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It is difficult to translate the terms used in logframe into Kenyan dialects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Logframe is perceived as serving donor interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My NGO has an organizational culture that has mainstreamed logframe in project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. What other socio-cultural factors do you think influence the adoption of logframe?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

E. Overall

28. Overall, how would you rank the following factors as influencing the adoption of logframe?

(Rank from 1=most influential to 4= least influential)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>RANKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. What recommendations do you have on how adoption of logframe can be increased among organizations?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

-THE END-