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DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. **Beneficiaries**: These people who directly or indirectly are assisted by the project. They possess different values, attitudes, beliefs, norms, stories and perceptions.

2. **Non Governmental Organisation**: A private voluntary grouping of individuals or associations, not operated for profit or for other commercial purposes but for the benefit of the public at large.

3. **Local NGO**: An NGO that is registered by NGO board and operates within Kenyan boundaries.

4. **Project ex-post evaluation**: Assessment of a project’s results and sustainability once it is completed or thereafter.

5. **Barazas**: Meetings held at local community most steered by local elders and sometimes by subchiefs.
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

NGO- Non Governmental Organisation
CBO- Community Based Organisation
FBO- Faith Based Organisation
IPAR- Institute of Policy Analysis and Research
ICNL- International Center for Not-for-Profit Law
IDS- Institute for Development Studies
CSO- Civil Society Organization
UNAIDS- Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
GDP- Gross Domestic Product
IDRC- International Development Research Centre
KAP- Knowledge, Attitude and Practices
KIPPRA- Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research Analysis
VSO- Voluntary Service Organisation
ANOVA- Analysis of variance
ABSTRACT

Commencement of Projects can be for commercial purposes or to generate revenues, for sustenance of livelihoods, for eradication of poverty, for humanitarian purposes amongst others. Projects are important for individuals, organizations and different sectors of economy. This study was necessitated by the fact that the sustainability of local NGOs projects at the county level is crucial at such a time of new constitutional dispensation that acknowledges existence of counties in Kenya. In Laikipia county despite presence of these NGOs the poverty rate stands at 48.1% and poverty level is at 46%. If local NGOs look critically the relevance and sustainability of projects, the poverty levels can be levelled downwards in the communities. There exists various factors that influences sustainability and relevance of local NGOs projects through well planned ex-post evaluation. The purpose of this study was to examine the factors influencing ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Kenya, a case of Laikipia county. The research explored factors that included baseline survey results, project management skills, community awareness and characteristics of the beneficiaries that would included religion, education, culture, gender, exposure among others. The review of related literature included historical perspective of local NGOs, models of development, baseline survey, project management skills, community awareness and characteristics of the beneficiaries. Monitoring and Evaluation, project management cycle, project identification and preparation of the project and implementation process was focused. The study used primary and secondary data in order to present a more comprehensive view of the factors influencing ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Kenya. The researcher expected to collect data from a sample of 15 out of 45 local NGOs in the county. However 2 of the NGOs were unreachable due to accessibility limitations. For the other groups data collection was achieved by using questionnaire and interview schedule as data collecting instruments. These data was then analysed using statistical Package for Social Scientist (SPSS). Analysed data was presented through frequency tables and graphical representations. Analysis tools such as measures of central tendency, ANOVA, Chi-square and correlation. From the study findings it was established through association that these four factors influence the ex-post evaluation. The findings of this study highlights the factors influencing ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Kenya and therefore promote effective monitoring and ex-post evaluation in the community based projects. This will enhance the community’s development agenda from the grassroots and therefore promote project control and ownership. The conclusions made were based on study findings on the dependent variables namely baseline survey, project management skills, community awareness and characteristics of the beneficiaries. Appropriate recommendations that if implemented would contribute immensely to quality, effective and efficient ex-post evaluations of local NGO projects in Kenya. However during the research study there some limitations in terms of accessibility of some parts, this has been highlighted how the researcher dealt with it. Some areas that do require further research have been proposed that would create deeper exploration in Ex-post evaluation.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

A project is an interrelated set of activities that has a definite starting and ending point and results in the fulfillement of a unique often major outcome. (Harveu Maylor, 2003). It is a well-defined set of tasks or activities that must be completed in order to meet the project's goal (Klastorin, 2004). Projects act as major avenues through which the needs of community are achieved. UNAIDS defines a community as: “a group of people with something in common, whether they live together, come from the same area (village or town), gender, or ethnic background. Communities are also people who work together... or share common behaviour...” Within these groupings, “there are common interests and understanding that bring people together and unite them around a common purpose” (UNAIDS 1996).

Projects therefore being a key drive to improvement of community livelihood need to be given appropriate management through project management skills. "Project and program management is the art and science of planning, controlling and tracking of activities and resources to achieve the organization's strategic and business objectives." (Lock, 2007). Though local NGOs are for no profit making, social cost benefit analysis should be conducted to establish their success for projects initiated, implemented and completed.

Although the history of NGOs goes back to the 1940s, it is largely since the 1980s that they began receiving a high profile as development role-players offering an alternative development approach to poverty alleviation and long-term sustainable development to poor communities in developing countries (Drabek, 1987). Their interventions are largely as a result of requests for collaboration with communities, thereby making development a
community-based activity and getting the community to define their needs and empowering them to achieve these. Since their interventions are usually on a small scale it is also possible to adapt them to the requirements of communities (Fowler, 1988). NGOs are also now participating in implementing official donor programmes/projects (Clark, 1991) in most African countries because they are thought to embody an approach that makes it easier to deliver community development projects that the large-scale bureaucratic donor official agencies cannot easily handle. There are also perceived problems with large, donor funded rural development projects, which are said to lack the desired level of 'participation' of the intended beneficiaries (Dennis, 1994).

Since Kenya gained its independence in 1963, the development of the country and indeed of the economy has been formulated, financed and implemented and controlled by the central government. This has not worked well since it has been characterized by beauracracy, command and control from the centralized managerial authority (Mapesa and Kibua, 2006). NGOs play currently a major role in development of the country through conducting projects for the community working with a host of CBOs and groups.

According to Thomas (1992), he argues that intermediary NGOs are well positioned to strengthen informal and formal grassroot groups. Hence the existence of local NGOs is of paramount importance. During 1980-1988, grassroots self-help organizations in Kenya surged from less than 5000 to 26000 (Fowler, 1991). These groups are active in a cross section of sectors including: agriculture, water, education, environment, health, human rights, gender and development, children's rights, poverty alleviation, peace, population, training, counseling, small scale enterprises, disability and many others. The NGO Coordination Board provides overall leadership to the local NGO sector. It champions the key values of probity, transparency, accountability, justice and good governance.
It enhances the self-regulation of its members, and assists them to realize their potential in improving services that improve the socio-economical status of Kenyan society in pursuit of sustainable development. Because of the need to push through with the reform policies, donors have placed NGOs to take the responsibility of social sector management. Aid recipient governments are prodded by donors to create alternative poverty-alleviation mechanisms (Sollis, 1992). Although it is a recognised fact that NGOs contribute a great deal of resources to development in Kenya, there is still lack of tangible data and information on the worth of both social and monetary contribution of NGOs to development which continues to undermine the ability of the local NGO sector to effectively advocate for a bigger say in the development affairs of this nation. Communities hardly question the operations of NGOs fearing that they might withdraw their support. They regard them as saviours, who assist them to accomplish what they could not have achieved on their own (Thomas, 1992).

Evaluation is a systematic process to prove the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency (in terms of costs), sustainability and impact of interventions against a set of defined objectives, and to point out lessons learned for future action (next project phase or new project). It is more comprehensive in terms of methodology and resources required for finances, expertise and time. (Jensen et al., 2002)

The performance in these established projects at the point of ex-post evaluation will be determined by certain factors such as baseline survey results, community awareness, project management skills and eventually the characteristics of beneficiaries involved. If well put in place, this factors can contribute enormously to quality and sustainable projects. There is a need for more thinking on how to appraise projects for institutional development, sustainability, and environmental impact" (Butcher, 1988).
Laikipia county is one of the 47 counties established in the republic of Kenya through promalagation and implementation of the new constitution 2010. The 9,500km² Laikipia County is located to the north west of snow-capped Mount Kenya, in Kenya’s Rift Valley Province. It neighbours Samburu District to the North, Isiolo and Meru to the East and Baringo to the West. Laikipia County is home to ethnically diverse communities, including the Mukogodo Maasai, Kikuyu, and Meru, who live side by side with, Turkana, Samburu and Pokot (see the map on appendix). Approximately 700,000 people reside in Laikipia County. Crop farming, Cattle-rearing on large commercial ranches and community owned rangelands has for many years been the life-blood of the community. According to NGO Council data there are 45 registered local NGOs in the county dealing in diverse activities.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The NGO sector in Kenya comprises a very diverse grouping of organizations ranging from large national organizations, local NGOs that work with CBOs, FBOs to small welfare groups (Kameri et al., 2000). In the last two decades, the number of NGOs and the amount of resources they control have grown tremendously. A study conducted by Karuti Kanyingi and Winnie Mitullah in 2006 found that a total of 350,000 nonprofit organizations were registered in Kenya in the period 1997–2005. Although actual figures are difficult to obtain, it is estimated that NGOs in Kenya have an annual development expenditure of about $270 million and contribute 2.5 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) and provide 42.6 percent of all public employment (Ndewa, 1996). The broad aim of participation in development is to actively involve people and communities in identifying problems, formulating plans and implementing decisions over their own lives (Guijt and Shah, 1998).
The predominance of ‘white elephant’ projects and the high vulnerability of these organizations is one major cause of the lack of confidence so many people have in the not-for-profit sector (Kanyingi et al., 2007). In Laikipia county despite presence of these NGOs the poverty rate stands at 48.1% and poverty level is at 46%. If local NGOs look critically the relevance and sustainability of projects, the poverty levels can be levelled downwards in the communities (Ndegwa, 1996). Various factors influences sustainability and relevance of local NGOs projects through well planned ex-post evaluation. Some factors such as lack of adequate baseline survey findings, community awareness, project management skills, and beneficiaries characteristics play pivotal role to improve project ex-post evaluation. There is a need for more thinking on how to appraise projects for institutional development, sustainability, and environmental impact" (Butcher, 1988).

A well established management structure for the project allows the operational problems, that frequently happen during the implementation of a complex project to be quickly identified (Klastorin, 2004). Efficient communication and good corporation is of great importance in order to acquire the desired deliverables. At the same time large number of stakeholders involved in implementation create constraints. This study therefore sought to investigate the factors influencing ex-post evaluation of the local NGO projects in Laikipia county which are 45 in number.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General objective.

To to investigate the factors influencing ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county.
1.3.2 Specific objectives of the study

a) To establish the impact of previous baseline surveys results on ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county.

b) To determine the influence of project management skills on ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county.

c) To establish influence of community awareness on ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county.

d) To determine the influence of beneficiaries educational level on ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county.

1.4 Research Questions

1. How does the previous baseline surveys results impact on ex-post evaluation of NGO projects in Laikipia county?

2. How does influence of project management skills influence ex-post evaluation of NGO projects in Laikipia county?

3. How does the community awareness influence ex-post evaluation of NGO projects in Laikipia county?

4. How do beneficiaries educational level influence ex-post evaluation of NGO projects in Laikipia county?

1.5 Scope of the study

This study is aimed at factors influencing ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Kenya within laikipia county. Laikipia county is made up of three constituencies namely, Laikipia West, Laipikia East and Laikipia North. The study will focus on grassroot NGOs based in laikipia county which are composed mainly by self-help groups, youth groups
and women groups since they are the key project drivers and are well established within the communities in Laikipia county. This county is categorised as arid and semi arid land (ASAL) thereof attracting establishment of several grassroot NGOs to cater issues related to HIV/AIDS, poverty alleviation, minimise hunger, empower women, eradicate domestic violence, rehabilitate street children among others.

1.6 Limitations of the study

To conduct this research the expected overarching issues would be like poor access to different parts due to the poor road network and conditions. The vast nature of the county requires more finances to cover and thus having financial and time implication. The level of the feedback from community is expected to be filtered due to irrelevance as education levels of respondents is low. Due to high levels of poverty and at a time like now when hunger has hit the place, the researcher would be expected to give something in return for the information gathered. Diverse culture could also give low yields and in some areas like Laikipia North no access at all due to banditary attacks.

1.7 Significance of the study

This study is intended to target on local NGOs in order to assist them in terms of conducting quality based ex-post evaluation on the projects they undertake. By extension this will continually see the sustainability of the already intended, on-going and completed projects that have an impact on communities outreached. The study will act as a source of reference for future research to be conducted within the scope. The study tends to respond to the needs of beneficiaries of local NGO projects thus increasing their potentials in different perspectives. The government benefits from this study since it its
not directly involved but the recommendations are supposed to improve the livelihood of the communities which is the government’s responsibility.

1.8 Assumptions of the study

All NGOs, projects were accessible during the period of study and both directors and projects managers were willing to openly share and discuss their situation.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
This chapter covers a review of literature related to the study. First literature on theoretical review on project, project management, project management cycle and their relevance is given, after which empirical literature on baseline survey, community awareness and attitude, project management, community awareness, characteristics of beneficiaries and monitoring and evaluation is reviewed.

2.2 THEORETICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

2.2.1 Definition of an NGO project
A project is an interrelated set of activities that has a definite starting and ending point and results in the accomplishment of a unique often major outcome. (Harveu, 2003) With perspective of grassroot NGOs, a project means a way of reaching out to the community. UNAIDS defines a community as: “a group of people with something in common, whether they live together, come from the same area (village or town), gender, or ethnic background. Communities are also people who work together . . . or share common behaviour. . . .” Within these groupings, “there are common interests and understanding that bring people together and unite them around a common purpose” (unaids, 1996).

2.2.2 Project Management Cycle
In management of the local NGO projects, the basic project cycle should be used to provide a good basis for project success. The following diagram illustrates the four phases of project management cycle.
2.2.3 Project Identification/ initiation

Project Identification requires that there is a demand (or more generally) for the outputs and the availability of resources to produce them (Grubb, 2000). In grassroots NGOs projects, the projects are supposed to be identified by the management of these organisations at local level. Incorrect perception of needs by the people with inadequate knowledge of the project area can have serious implications for the sustainability and acceptance of a project (Grubb, 2000). According to Barkely (2001) early project and professional services concepts are grounded in legitimate customer needs.
2.2.4 Planning of the Project

NGOs committees must base their actions on the existing policies and use them while discharging their duties. At planning the 6 P rule, namely Prior Planning Precludes Poor Project Performance should be observed (Klastorin, 2004). Plan is a package including goals and objectives, customer requirements, general product specifications, quality policy, budget, risk management plan and team structure and roles (Barkely, 2001).

2.2.5 Project execution/design and implementation

Design involves a detailed fleshing out of the outcomes desired. Projects are implemented according to the schedule sequencing tasks and monitoring progress at convenient gateways in the schedule (Barkely, 2001). Execution involves building the deliverables and controlling the project delivery, scope, costs, quality, risks and issues. The model below show an example that can be used in evaluating a local NGO project.

Figure 2.2 Project’s implementation strategy, monitoring and evaluation with active local participation: the Kyson modality.

![Diagram showing the Kyson modality strategy]

Source: Boonwaat (2001)
2.2.6 Project closure/ termination

Closure involves winding-down the project by releasing staff, handing over deliverables to the customer and completing a post implementation review. According Barkely (2001), the key issue at this phase is finding follow-on business development potential from the project deliverable, documenting lessons learned and moving to the next level of customer partnership.

2.3 EMPIRICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

2.3.1 History of local NGOs and their relevance

Heightened self-awareness disabuses the NGO of the degree to which it presents an alternative development path. NGO projects are important, but they do not by themselves provide solutions to problems on a national scale. As a Zimbabwean development worker says, 'No nation in the world was ever developed by projects alone, let alone by projects based on borrowed models.' Their projects will remain irrelevant to the majority of the poor, unless used as beacons to light up pathways for others - notably the State- to pursue (Sithembiso, 1987).

In the registration of NGOs the various registration regimes give guidelines on internal management, scope of permissible activities, financial reporting, and dissolution, but are weak in their emphasis on good governance and management. The dissolution clause in the laws governing the various registration types addresses distribution of assets, but does not address other aspects of closing an NGO (Igan, 2009).
Local NGOs rely more on donor funding, government grants and in-kind contributions from well-wishers. While the scale of support from these sources is low, it is more assured and sustainable than donor funding.

2.3.2 Baseline survey results

Project managers can and must refer to a range of secondary data (available on, say, the demographic aspects of fertility), but this information is rarely tailored to the tasks of establishing the pre-intervention status in target communities and later verifying the progress made through project measures (Ferguson, 1997). Project managers - who do not necessarily have a background in empirical social science research - have to engage with an activity that may well appear alien and daunting: the exploration of knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) through baseline surveys. Here in Kenya, we have, over the years, accumulated a great deal of experience and expertise in baseline surveys. The methodology of planning, performing and analysing these surveys has matured to the point where we feel we have a valuable body of know-how for wider application and it would be almost unethical not to share the lessons we have learnt! By the same token, there is plenty of room for improvement: A baseline study should take place as soon as practicable after an activity begins. This does not necessarily mean that such studies must be conducted within the first few months of activity implementation. A study is better conducted when the main implementation partners have a reasonable understanding of the context of the activity. This will allow time for the delivery organisation to thoroughly plan the study and gain the commitment and involvement of local partners (AUSGuideline, 2005).
2.3.3 Community awareness

An empowered citizenry must have access to high quality information and knowledge. Empowered citizens, who are networked and speaking with one voice, have the potential to serve as powerful change agents who have an impact on policy making and the enforcement of existing policies. The public perception of NGOs varies from sector to sector. The millions of people who are beneficiaries of goods and services from NGOs generally appreciate them and have a positive perception of NGOs at the time the service is on. A study by Synovate Research (previously Steadman Group) in 2009 indicated that the public trusts NGOs more than the executive branch of government. In some localities, especially remote areas, people recognize the NGOs providing them with essential services more than the government itself. Local government has a more positive perception of NGOs than the central government. To begin with, NGOs do not view themselves as businesses. Philosophically, NGOs are established to meet social and economic needs and to fill the gaps in society by addressing the concerns of the disadvantaged. Some may argue that they have socio-economic agendas rather than strictly economic ones. Although this has changed somewhat in recent years, traditionally their objectives do not involve making a profit. Many well-meaning attempts have failed because commercial partners did not respect the philosophy of the NGO and/or its objectives and approach. According to Ron Miller, the term “participatory democracy” has been used by people who seek to reclaim the essence of democratic idealism in a society that has grown over-organized, hierarchical, and authoritarian and represents a renewed faith in the intelligence and moral judgment of common citizens pursuing their daily lives and interests. (Miller, 2005). Hence, one of the stimulants to this interest in participatory democracy is the apparent “reduce(d) trust in public and private institutions, especially disillusionment with politicians, political parties, and political institutions” (
Pharr, Putnam and Dalton, 2000). This is quite a great and influential community enabling tool in all the aspects for the purposes of social economic development. While public participation in democratic society is vital, it is also problematic. Sometimes governments seek extensive public input in numerous forms only to ignore the public’s comments later. Some public meetings are so dysfunctional that observers end up wishing someone in charge would bring an end to the chaos and misery (Co-intelligence, 2008). In the absence of a sure direction, the consensus method so typical of participation becomes less likely to produce good policy for an appropriate implementation and follow up.

The media perception of NGOs is also poor. To the media, NGOs are self-serving and poverty perpetuating agents whose huge administrative budget expenditures have little impact in addressing community needs. On some occasions, the local media, especially radio, does highlight the good work of NGOs, but national level NGOs tend to make news when there is a scandal or when they have paid for coverage. NGOs have not taken adequate measures to correct the poor perception by the media and the business sector. Only advanced NGOs and those that generate income are keen to develop their profiles and enhance their public image (Igan, 2009). Relevant methods of communication are key in letting the stakeholders not only to hear about evaluation findings, but also to interpret them and construct meaning. Sometimes it is worthwhile publishing the evaluation report to reach a wider audience to increase rate credibility. (see box 1 below, dissemination channels to consider). The information collected should be comprehensive enough to address pertinent questions about the project and be responsive to the interests and needs of stakeholders. When planning an evaluation, it is important to distinguish information that is essential versus information that is desirable.
Fig 2.3 Dissemination channels to consider

BOX 1. Dissemination channels to consider

- Detailed written report and Annual report
- Executive summary, summaries of evaluation findings and key conclusions.
- Brochure on the principal evaluation lessons and recommendations
- Article in technical or organisational newsletter
- News release, Press conference, Media, Public meeting, public debate
- Seminar, workshop, or group discussion, Electronically (e-mail, internet, websites) Using different dissemination channels is vital for enhancing organizational learning and sharing experiences across organizations.

Source: adapted from USAID, performance monitoring and evaluation, 1997

First results should be disseminated to those with a direct interest in the project being evaluated, especially those with the responsibility for making important decisions about the project (Igan, 2009), and then to other potential users. In addition to delivering the final report, it is useful to organize meetings with various stakeholders using a variety of techniques such as visual displays and oral presentations to communicate evaluation results, and help users to assimilate and interpret the information.

2.3.4 Project management skills

Kenya has one of the most vibrant NGO training programs. A number of local and international universities and colleges have established professional training centers in Nairobi City and other towns across the country. Highly qualified and experienced trainers are in most areas of NGO operations but less so in good governance, volunteer
management and resource mobilization. There is also a lack of mechanisms for post-
training support and mentorship to ensure that knowledge and skills acquired are applied. Access and affordability of the trainings are also issues for most NGOs. Training materials are mainly produced in English and rarely in Kiswahili and local languages, although readership of materials prepared in Kiswahili and local languages is poor (Igan, 2009).

The common problem for both large and small NGOs is translating strategic plans into action (Kanyingi et al., 2007). This is mainly attributed to a lack of funds and lack of capacity. In most cases strategic planning processes are donor-driven and usually written by consultants without the participation of NGO stakeholders. A growing number of NGOs have internally driven strategies, but still struggle when it comes to implementing them.

Most NGOs lack a clear separation of the governance and management functions of the organization. In addition, most boards are dysfunctional and rarely available to serve their oversight role. In a few other cases executive directors, especially those who are the organizations’ founders, are more powerful than the boards, often having handpicked the board members. In other cases, the board lacks a mechanism for re-election.

Although not widespread, a number of NGOs work in coalitions and networks, which are either sector- or issue-based. NGOs have not developed a strong structured knowledge for learning and sharing experiences and lessons. Some of the networks that have been established also serve as resource centers for network members.

NGOs of all sizes have unreliable income and can only employ staff on short-term contracts. The situation is worse for small grassroots NGOs that rely on membership fees as a primary source of income. The culture of volunteerism is not very well developed in Kenya. Few NGOs have developed adequate systems and policies to engage and manage
volunteers and interns. Opportunities exist to engage volunteers through international volunteer organizations such as VSO, Peace Corps, and Skill Share, as well as local institutions of higher learning, but only a few NGOs are aware of these opportunities. With limited income, human resources management practices are highly compromised, resulting in low staff motivation and high turnover.

2.3.5 Project beneficiaries educational level

The audience for the assessment will influence its scope and the types of result expected. They are generally referred as stakeholders (Butcher, 1988). These are quite important to be identified during stakeholders mapping. They come in with different philosophies thus can adequately affect the project scope, largely due to their difference in their own characteristics which include education, culture, religion, gender and exposure among others. The diagram below indicates various beneficiaries of local NGOs projects.

Fig 2.4 Organisational stakeholders

Source: International Development Research Centre (IDRC)
According to a research done by KIPPRA, (2007), respondents were asked to rate their participation in relation to different kinds of involvement in the management of local NGOs projects. The survey found that, generally, participation is very low in the various projects, particularly in decision-making processes. Respondents indicated that 32.8% of them were involved to the extent of receiving information or listening at *barazas*, less than 10% attended meetings to discuss specific issues and less than 5% felt that they were involved in decision-making. Over 90% of respondents indicated that they were not involved in the setting of the development agenda for their areas. This underlines the appropriateness of efforts aimed at increasing public participation through increased level of education. Education assists highly in gaining knowledge skills and attitude. Skills in the cognitive domain revolve around knowledge, comprehension, and critical thinking of a particular topic. Traditional education tends to emphasize the skills in this domain, particularly the lower-order objectives. The diagram below shows hierarchy education achievement and abilities acquired. (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001). There are a number of issues relate to individuals as far as their perception of issues is concerned.

**Fig 2.5 Categories in the cognitive domain of Bloom's Taxonomy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyze</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Create</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remember</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Wikipedia*
2.3.6 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of an organization's programs entails the systematic gathering and analysis of data on project and their activities. It identifies progress as well as difficulties that impact on implementation and assesses the achievement of the individual program's or project's objectives. M&E also appraises an institution's overall performance towards the achievement of the goals and objectives. Therefore, M&E should be seen as an integral element of management that helps to track implementation schedules and activities towards the fulfilment of institutional objectives and mandates (Kinyua and Murungi, 2011).

According to Atakara, (2000) the demand for Monitoring and Evaluation needs to be generated, specified and articulated by all stakeholders within a project or programme. In other words evaluation needs to be owned. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are closely interlinked. There is not much use in conducting monitoring activities if the results are not evaluated and it is difficult to evaluate a project unless there is monitoring data. Both terms are often used interchangeably and synonymously. However, monitoring and evaluation are two distinct processes and it is essential, especially in project planning and management, to treat them as such. (Jensen et al., 2002)

Monitoring and evaluation are an integral part of the project cycle and not just "add-ons". The first project plan is composed using the information gathered before a project is designed. M&E is crucial to understand how effective and realistic this initial plan was and to which extent objectives are likely to be achieved. Monitoring is therefore simply a logical extension of the planning process, i.e. the more precise and structured a project plan, the easier it is to monitor. New information is gathered as the project proceeds, which may change your assessment of the situation. As a result, logical connections
between various factors may be challenged. However, if the plan is designed thoroughly and based on a sound problem analysis, the ongoing process is more likely to happen as expected. Therefore, regardless of whether your organisation has been asked to submit regular progress reports to its funding agencies, you need to monitor and evaluate the project to review your plans and permit any necessary adjustments. (Jensen et al., 2002)

Both monitoring and evaluation are management tools. In the case of monitoring, information is routinely gathered for tracking progress according to previously agreed plans and schedules. In contrast, evaluation is more episodic than monitoring and may be conducted: during mid-term, towards the end of a project phase (to prepare for the next phase), and as an end-of-project exercise to assess the impact (ex-post evaluation).

Evaluation is a systematic process to prove the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency (in terms of costs), sustainability and impact of interventions against a set of defined objectives, and to point out lessons learned for future action (next project phase or new project). It is more comprehensive in terms of methodology and resources required for finances, expertise and time. External experts are often involved to add an independent view and to enhance the credibility of results (Jensen et al., 2002). A good project evaluation provides an extremely useful tool to manage ongoing work, identify successes and plan effectively for new initiatives.

Review visits should generate a number of general themes or 'lessons' from which individual projects themselves, other practitioners, and donors can learn. Indeed, the range of projects which it is possible to visit in a short period offers a rare opportunity to overview the experiences of a number of NGOs operating in a similar field but pursuing different approaches and in different contexts (Gibson, 1993). Evaluation can be useful, exciting and important knowledge development tool. It is a basis of belief that it can be
useful and can provide positive experience that promotes learning and action. An effective evaluation gives yield to better accounting for what has been accomplished through project funding. It also promotes learning on strategies that aid in project sustainability. Evaluation provide feedback to inform decision making at all levels since it contributes to the existing body of knowledge and assesses the cost effectiveness of various strategies that position high quality projects for future funding opportunities therefore contributing to policy development (Jensen et al., 2002).

2.3.7 Ex-post evaluation

Basically there exist three evaluations namely ex-ante evaluation, ongoing basis evaluation and ex-post evaluations. Ex ante evaluation is primarily for one purpose: selection for funding (Campbell and Rozsnyai, 2002). It continues to be largely focused on identifying research quality, although it is increasingly taking into account potential ‘usability’. Both ex-ante and ongoing basis evaluations are said to be formative form of evaluations.

The ex-post evaluation of a project is a collection of information, based on documents and on –the-spot assessment. It includes an indepth analysis of the implementation performance and the impact of the project after its completion (Campbell and Rozsnyai, 2002). The intent of ex-post evaluation is to establish how well the project served its purpose and how effective and efficient was its implementation. It is also to asses aspects related to the sustainability of the project and identify the lessons learnt that could be applied in future projects, design and implementation. Ex-post evaluation also seek to look at operational aspects, inputs as well as outputs, activities carried out and tangible products in terms of both efficiency and effectiveness, with emphasis on the impact and effects on the given project. International experience in research evaluation shows that
techniques and approaches for ex post evaluation are continuing to evolve. There has been more advances in this area than in the ex ante (or assessment for selection) form of evaluation.

Ex-post evaluation, on the other hand is carried out for a variety of purposes. It can be directed towards improving programme design, assessing the impact of programmes or whole agencies, or producing better value for money. It is therefore not surprising that there is a wider range of approaches used in ex post evaluations. Many agencies have attempted to learn, through ex post evaluations, of the effectiveness and impact of their ex-ante assessment mechanisms and processes. Better-practices, however, have developed more systematic approaches for ensuring that ex post analyses are linked to ongoing refinements in ex ante processes. In some cases this has been approached through the dissemination of reports to research assessment committees and their administrative organs. More effective learning processes have included representatives of ex ante assessment committees in the ex post evaluation process (Campbell, C. & Rozsnyai, C., 2002).

The other type of evaluation is that carried out some years after the completion of the project. The World Bank is the only agency identified which has made a formal study of projects ten to fifteen years after their completion. The observations from that study were found to be very instructive and perhaps this type of evaluation should be carried out more frequently. Most development workers are familiar with cases where past projects can only be located by the project buildings, now serving some other purpose, or by the piles of rusting machinery - which leads to the question of continuity (Jensen et al., 2002).
Few agencies feel that they have the resources to evaluate every project, and so evaluation, particularly ex-post evaluation, tends to be biased towards projects with problems. Also, small agencies particularly are reluctant to use the time of project staff on evaluation when they could be getting on with the next project. The larger agencies which have separate evaluation units face the difficulty that the independence of these units makes them less able to influence the operational departments. There are several different approaches to evaluation reporting. To some extent the termination report by project staff can be considered as an evaluation, but it is often biased by the frustrations and difficulties, and tends to be more a catalogue of problems than a balanced account of performance (Klastorin, 2004). An ex-post evaluation either by an evaluation unit or by sub-contractors tends to be more open-minded, but the very fact that it is done after the event means that it is dependent upon records and reports, which are likely to be unwritten, incomplete, unavailable, or less comprehensive than the evaluation team would wish. The other source of information for ex-post evaluation teams is personal recollection which is notoriously inaccurate (Jensen et al., 2002).

Informal ex-post evaluations are also frequently done as part of a study of a group of projects. Evaluations of this type are particularly useful in identifying trends, and frequently-occurring good and bad factors, but being less detailed they are less effective at evaluating individual projects. Through a discussion of the much used (and abused) expression 'transparency', examining three basic problems faced by most NGOS, and by the organisations that support and work with them: the real cost of doing business; the enduring problem of evaluation and quality control; and account- ability (Smillie, 1997). The consensus is that evaluation, like monitoring, is important because it allows lessons to be learned, leading to improvement in future projects. But like monitoring, it is not done with sufficient rigour. For example, "Many projects cannot precisely pinpoint who
has benefitted and by how much or in what way. This does not indicate the projects are unsuccessful, but that existing methods of appraisal and evaluation are too limited. There is a need for more thinking on how to appraise projects for institutional development, sustainability, and environmental impact" (Butcher, 1988).

2.3.8 Approaches of evaluation

A determination of whether a project's outcomes endure beyond the end of that project can only be determined with certainty after the project has ended (Klastorin, 2004). Unfortunately, project evaluations are usually scheduled for some months prior to the closing date so that accounts can be resolved prior to closure. We have different approaches in conducting ex-post evaluation.

The first kind of approach is Peer evaluation. It involves inviting colleagues from a comparable project or organisation to evaluate the progress on an unilateral or mutual basis as per project's outcome (Lusthaus et.al, 1999). Other projects can consult the specific project based on agreed terms of reference. Peer evaluation is not very common, but combines the advantages of internal and external evaluation and can provide fruitful experiences to all participants. Involving an external professional helps to design the planning and steering activities. There is participatory evaluation which is a form of internal evaluation. The intention is to involve as many people with a direct stake in the work as possible (Lusthaus et.al, 1999). This may mean project staff and beneficiaries working together on the evaluation. If an outsider is called in, it is to act as a facilitator of the process, not an evaluator. It aims to create a learning process for the program recipients that will help them in their effort to reach desired goals. It includes cooperative action in which the stakeholders participate substantively in the identification of the
evaluation issues, the design of the evaluation, the collection and analysis of the data, and the action taken as a result of the evaluation findings. You have to take ethical issues into consideration to prove whether this approach is appropriate.

According to Lusthaus (1999), self-evaluation involves an organisation or project holding up a mirror to itself and assessing how it is doing, as a way of learning and improving practice. It takes a very self-reflective and honest organisation to do this effectively, but it can be an important learning experience. The other form is rapid participatory appraisal which originally was used in rural areas. The same methodology can, in fact, be applied in most communities. This is a qualitative way of doing evaluations. It is semi-structured and carried out by an interdisciplinary team over a short time. It is used as a starting point for understanding a local situation and is a quick, cheap, useful way to gather information. It involves the use of secondary data review, direct observation, semi-structured interviews, key informants, group interviews, games, diagrams, maps and calendars (Klastorin, 2004). In an evaluation context, it allows one to get valuable input from those who are supposed to be benefiting from the development work. It is flexible and interactive.
2.4 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

BASELINE SURVEY
- Scope
- Planning
- Data collection
- Data analysis
- Recommendations

COMMUNITY AWARENESS
- Methods of communication
- Stage of involvement
- Method of involvement

PROJECT MANAGEMENT SKILLS
- Academic
- Training
- Experience

PROJECT BENEFICIARIES
EDUCATION LEVEL
- Writing skills
- Comprehension
- Analytical skills
- Culture

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

PROJECTS EX-POST EVALUATION
- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Sustainability
- Impact

INTERVENING VARIABLES
- Political conditions
- Economic conditions
- Technological conditions
- Natural conditions

Source: Author (2012)
It is expected that the baseline survey results influences projects ex-post evaluation through both geographical and content scope. Planning skills are important in baseline survey results as this offer the extent of exploration (AUSGuideline, 2005). Form of data collected, analysed and thereof recommendations are crucial. This collection attempts to share the experience of the Project with a wider audience, by making available the data sets collected in their original and amalgamated forms (Klastorin, 2004). Community awareness has been identified to inform more the ex-post evaluation of project through the methodologies and level of involvement. Project management skills are expected to determine projects results and impact to the intended clients. The major success of a project is realised when the intended beneficiaries find it to be relevant and effective to their day to day and future needs. However, all these factors despite the level of consideration, they are expected to be influenced either way by intervening factors such as politics, economic conditions, technological and natural occurrences.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the procedures that will be used in the study including the research design, target population, sampling design, data collection instruments, procedure, and data analysis methods.

3.2 Research Design
The study used a descriptive survey design to determine the factors influencing ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county, Kenya. Descriptive survey designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret for the purpose of clarification (Mutai, 2000). According to Orodho (2004), he notes that descriptive survey research is intended to produce statistical information about aspects of the population that interest policy makers without manipulating any variables. The choice of the descriptive survey research design was made based on the fact that in the study, the researcher was interested on the state of affairs already existing on the ground and no variable manipulated.

3.3 Target Population
The target population for study was 45 local NGOs currently registered in the Laikipia county with the NGO council. These comprises of NGOs that have registered and are currently operational within the three constituencies of Laikipia West, Laikipia East and Laikipia North. This was used since this local NGOs are compliant with the rules of operating an NGO in Kenya.
3.4 Sampling Design and Procedure

The sampling frame consisted of 45 local NGOs. Since the population size is greater than 30, the researcher conducted sampling (Kathuri, 1993). Systematic random sampling was adopted, picking every 3\textsuperscript{rd} group from a shuffled list. This yielded to a total of 15 groups. In addition, purposive sampling technique was used to select one project manager and two project staffs. The local NGO director of each of the 15 organisations automatically was selected for the study. With the help of the project manager, the researcher purposively sampled two project staff members to take part in the study. Therefore the study sample comprised of 15 directors, 15 project managers and 30 project staff members from 15 local NGOs in Laikipia county. Therefore the total number of respondents expected was 60.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Size sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project directors</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project managers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project staffs</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author (2012)

This sample is well within the 10% minimum sample preferred by Marion (1994) for statistical analysis. In this case the sample selected will be a third of the population which according to Kerlinger has a high degree of accuracy and precision of estimate. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) the sample should be small enough to be economical in terms to time and expenses.
3.5 Data Collection Instruments and techniques

Primary data was collected using questionnaires which were administered by the researcher with the help of a research assistant. The questionnaires comprised questions which sought to answer questions related to the objectives of this study. The questions were both closed to enhance uniformity and open ended to ensure maximum data was obtained. Secondary data was obtained from books, internet, and journals as indicated in the literature review. A pilot study was done to assess the capability of the research instruments to collect required data for the research. The questionnaire was first administered to five respondents in the Baringo county as part of the pilot study. The pilot test meant to establish whether all the questions from the questionnaire can be fully understood by the targeted respondents and hence rectification if need be. The pilot study took place before the actual research.

3.6 Data Analysis Techniques

The results of the research were analysed using quantitative methods. The Quantitative Data generated was subjected to the Descriptive Statistics feature in SPSS to generate information which was presented using frequency distribution and measures of tendency such as mean, mode and median as well as measures of dispersion such as percentages were calculated. Data will be presented using tables, pie charts, graphs (Kathuri and Pals, 1993). The data was then coded and themes within documents that relate to the research questions in the study were identified. The qualitative data were then interpreted by attaching significance to the themes and the patterns observed using Chi-tests and ANOVA. Alternative explanations were also considered by looking at differences in responses recorded in data collection.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND RESULTS

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents data analysis and discussion of the study findings on factors influencing ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county.

4.2 Background Information
This section deals with the background information of the respondents, their ages, and gender, level of education and religion.

4.2.1 Response Rate
The study targeted 60 respondents in Laikipia. However, only fifty respondents managed to respond to the questionnaires and interview schedule. This translates to 83.333% response rate which was a good response rate as it was above the 70% threshold. The respondents were distributed as follows:

Table 4.1 Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project directors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project managers /officers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project members</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Survey Data, 2012)
Table 4.1 above shows that 22.0 % of the respondents who were interviewed were project directors, 26.0 % were project managers and 52.0 % were project staff members.

4.3 BASELINE SURVEY

The methodology of planning, performing and analysing these fact finding surveys remain critical for the success of any given project. The researcher observed the following.

Table 4.2 Baseline survey responses by Project directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements on Baseline surveys</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope evaluation is the starting point</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need on planning for baseline studies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to collect data</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of analysing data collected</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with surveys recommendation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Survey Data, 2012)

Key: SA [Strongly Agree], A [Agree], AA [A Little Agree], D [Disagree], SD [Strongly Disagree]

From the table 4.2 above shows that organisations' directors interviewed by the researcher, 63.6% strongly agree that it is important to focus on the scope of baseline studies in order to have successful projects. 27 % agreed on the scope since a project
study should be done in line with its relative advantages to the project that is being designed and planned for (Atakara, 2000). There was however a few who didn’t find great importance for baseline studies due to costs involved or lack of qualified personnel to handle the same. On the planning for baseline survey, 45.5% had a strong believe while 36.4% just saw the need. The trend on data collection and analysis was a clear indication that required skills in conducting baseline survey were wanting. Either way majority of 54.5% and 36.4% really felt the need of following the recommendations as this would have impact on their projects.

4.4 COMMUNITY AWARENESS

The community targeted to benefit from various projects under study were involved in ex-post evaluation as per the data provided below. The major methods used are verbal, posters, letters and in some instances none.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of communication</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LETTERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTERS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Survey Data, 2012)
The table 4.3 clearly indicates that the major method of communication to the community is done through posters at 54% followed by verbal at 32% and little percentages of 10% and 4% to none and letters respectively. The same is reflected on the figure 4.1 below.

Fig 4.1 METHODS OF COMMUNICATION

METHODS OF COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Survey, 2012)

The study revealed that only 76% are involved at project formulation level, 11% at implementation stage and about 3% at project review.
4.5 PROJECT MANAGEMENT SKILLS

Figure 4.2 Project management skills chart

Source (Survey, 2012)

Table 4.4 Project management skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on job</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Survey Data, 2012)

According to the chart (figure 4.2 and table 4.4) displayed above concerning how the respondents have acquired project management skills, the study shows that 26.0% is
through learning academically, 38.0% is training while on project and 36.0% is through experience as they execute their projects.

Table 4.5 Experience on project work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in projects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and above years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (survey Data, 2012)

Figure 4.3 Experience graph with normal curve.

Source (Survey, 2012)
As clearly shown on figure 4.3 above the normal curve indicates that majority of those involved in projects (54%) have very little experience in terms of project handling. On average the experience is 1.54 years with a standard deviation of 0.65 years. Work experience gives an individual adequate information on how to deal with everyday issues that come up in a project, as opposed to having no experience at all. The figure above shows that the majority of respondents had little experience in their projects, and this proves that they don’t have adequate ability to tackle the issues of evaluation.

Table 4.6 Number of projects done Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum m</th>
<th>Maximum m</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects done</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.4800</td>
<td>.67733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source (Survey Data, 2012)*

On average the number of projects conducted by various groups is 1.48 projects with minimum of one project and maximum of four projects.

Table 4.7 Number of projects done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of projects</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source (Survey Data, 2012)*
Many of these organisations 60.0% as per study findings listed in the table above are engaged with their first project. 34.0% have conducted two, 4.0% have done 3 to 4 projects and only 2.0%

4.6 PROJECT BENEFICIARIES CHARACTERISTICS

Table 4.8 Gender distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Survey Data, 2012)

Figure 4.4 Gender distribution

gender

Source (survey, 2012)
4.7 CHI–SQUARE TESTS ON INDEPENDENCE OF VARIABLES

4.7.1 Chi-square test on baseline survey with beneficiary characteristics variable

The table below shows the association of baseline survey with beneficiary characteristics and how it influence ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects.

**Table 4.10 Baseline Survey with Beneficiary Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFICIARY CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASELINE SURVEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Beneficiary</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Beneficiary</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the respondents, 76.0% were male while female were 24.0%. The study reveals that more men are involved in these projects than their counterparts female who take about a quarter of the reached population.

### Table 4.9 Education level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree and above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source (Survey Data, 2012)*

From the data obtained in Table 4.9 above, those that have no educational levels form the major percentage of 40.0%. Those with certificate are 24.0%, diploma 26.0% while those with degree and above are 10.0%. The study identified that majority of the respondents had low levels of literacy. These representations are clearly illustrated in the figure 4.5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>4.0%</th>
<th>14.0%</th>
<th>6.0%</th>
<th>4.0%</th>
<th>28.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Beneficiary Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Beneficiary Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Beneficiary Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Survey Data, 2012)

Table 4.11 Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>15.631(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>19.699</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>7.028</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 14 cells (87.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .84.

Source (Survey Data, 2012)

From the table 4.11 above on Chi-tests it was found that \( X^2 (9, N=50) = 15.631 \), \( p<0.05 \) and therefore it is a significant effect.
The table below shows the association of baseline survey with Project Management Skills and how it influences ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects.

Table 4.12 Project Management Skills with Baseline Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASELINE SURVEY</th>
<th>PROJECT MANAGEMENT SKILLS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Project Management Skills</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Project Management Skills</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Project Management Skills</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Project Management Skills</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Project Management Skills</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Survey Data, 2012)
Table 4.13 Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>26.415(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>35.677</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 14 cells (87.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.26.

Source (Survey Data, 2012)

From the table 4.13 above on Chi-tests it was found that $X^2 (9, N= 50) = 26.415$, $p<0.05$ and therefore it is a significant effect.

4.73 Chi-square test on baseline survey with Community Awareness variable

The table below shows the association of baseline survey with Community Awareness and how it influences ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects.

Table 4.14 Community Awareness with Baseline Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COMMUNITY AWARENESS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASELINE SURVEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Community Awareness</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Community Awareness</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>% within Community Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3% 85.7% .0% .0% 100.0%</td>
<td>12.5% 26.1% .0% .0% 14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>12.5% 37.5% 50.0% .0% 100.0%</td>
<td>12.5% 13.0% 30.8% .0% 16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Community Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8 23 13 6 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Baseline Survey</td>
<td>16.0% 46.0% 26.0% 12.0% 100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Community Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Survey Data, 2012)

**Table 4.15 Chi-Square Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>29.622(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>39.765</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 13 cells (81.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .84.

Source (Survey Data, 2012)

From the table 4.13 above on Chi-tests it was found that $X^2 (9, N= 50) = 29.622$, p < 0.05 and therefore it is a significant effect.
4.8 FACTOR RATING

This section postulates how the various factors influence ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects.

**TABLE 4.16 HOW THE FACTORS AFFECT EX-POST EVALUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline survey</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community awareness</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management skills</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries characteristics</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source (Survey, 2012)*

Table 4.16 shows the respondents view on the rating on how the various factors affect the ex-post evaluation of NGO projects in Laikipia county. According to the table 16 % of the respondents rated that baseline survey most affect ex-post evaluation while 42 % it least affect. 12% viewed that community awareness most affect ex-post evaluation while 16 % least affect. 34 % of the respondents viewed that project management skills most affect ex-post evaluation while 20% it least affect. On beneficiaries characteristics 18 % most
affect ex-post evaluation while 16% least affect it. This shows that availability of project management skills were mandatory in the ex-post evaluation of the local NGO projects, followed by community awareness.

4.9 Rating the ex-post evaluation of Projects

This section deals with how the local NGO projects were rated at the time of the study.

FIGURE 4.6 Rating ex-post evaluation of Projects in percentages

The table 4.10 and Figure 4.6 above show the perceptions of the respondents towards the ex-post evaluation of NGO projects in Laikipia county. The majority of the respondents felt that the ex-post evaluation was average at 17(34 %), 13 (26 %) good and 11(22 %) very good, 6( 12%) poor while only 3(6%) felt it was very poor.

The study revealed that the local NGO projects were evaluated ex-postly on average.

4.10 Association of ex-post evaluation with independent variables

The table below reveals the Analysis of variance (ANOVA) as per the association of dependent variables and independent variables.
Table 4.17 ANOVA results on association of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASELINE SURVEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>17.261</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.315</td>
<td>7.550</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25.719</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.980</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY AWARENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>40.311</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.078</td>
<td>7.626</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>59.469</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.780</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT MANAGEMENT SKILLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.313</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.828</td>
<td>3.334</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>51.667</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.980</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENEFICIARY CHARACTERISTICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>29.116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.279</td>
<td>3.843</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>85.250</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114.366</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.5 level

Source (Survey, 2012)

The ANOVA summary table reveals that there was a significant relationship at $p < 0.05$ between baseline surveys at $p = 0.00$, community awareness at $p = 0.000$, project management skills at $p = 0.018$ while beneficiary characteristics $p = 0.013$ and ex-post evaluation. Specifically, directors from organisations with good structures on variables above indicated that their NGOs projects were doing better than those without.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the summary of the study findings, conclusions and recommendations arrived at. The chapter also presents suggestions for related studies that could be carried out in the future.

5.2 Summary
The main purpose of this study was to establish the factors influencing ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county. Based on the study’s objectives, the findings of this study are summarized below as per the variables. The study revealed that majority of the respondents interviewed were having no advanced educational levels at 40.0% while the rest had other qualifications such as certificate, Diploma, Graduates and above. This indicated that they lacked the knowhow and the skills required to carry out the projects at hand.

5.2.1 Baseline Surveys
According to the findings 63.6% of the respondents saw the significance of conducting baseline survey evaluation which can be said to be the majority. However there was a decline in percentage when it came to planning of the baseline survey, only 45.5 who strongly felt the need to plan. The number of those who did not support data collection was high with 18.2% agreeing a little, 9.1% disagreeing while 9.1% strongly disagreed. On data analysis it was notable that many either did not have these skills or found it to be too involving as only 9.1% who strongly agreed while 18.2% disagreed and 18.2 strongly
disagreed. However when it came to working with the already given recommendations in the baseline studies majority of respondents were affirmative with 54.5% strongly agreeing and 36.4% agreeing. The trend on data collection and analysis was a clear indication that required skills in conducting baseline survey were wanting. Either way majority of 54.5% and 36.4% really felt the need of following the recommendations as this would have impact on their projects. Further from the Chi-square tests findings it clearly indicated that for relation between baseline surveys and beneficiary characteristics, the results were \( X^2 (9, N = 50) = 15.631 \), \( p < 0.05 \) hence the two variables are independent of each other. Overall from the analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted, the results of association revealed how each independent variable influences the ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Kenya. The Baseline survey using Post Hoc had \( p \) value of 0.000 (\( p < 0.05 \)) thus indicating that it has influence on ex-post evaluation.

### 5.2.2 Community Awareness

It came out clearly from the research that there are three formal methods of engaging community in allowing them to familiarize with local NGO projects. These were found to be 54% use of posters, 32% use of verbal communication and only 4% who used letters. 10% did not use any form of communication. These would be as a result of low educational level of community members. At the level of the community involvement in project undertakings, 76% were involved at the early phase of project formulation. However these percentage reduces to 11% at implementation stage while only 3% are involved at project review level. From further results of the Chi-square tests findings it clearly indicated that for relation between community awareness and baseline surveys,
the results were $X^2 (9, N = 50) = 29.622$, $p < 0.05$ hence the two variables are independent of each other. As per the analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted, the results of association shows that each independent variable influences the ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Kenya. The Community Awareness using Post Hoc had $p$ value of $0.000$ ($p < 0.05$) thus indicating that it has influence on ex-post evaluation.

### 5.2.3 Project Management Skills

In order to gain project management skills there are different ways of acquiring such skills. Under study it was observed that on project training took lead with $38\%$ of the cases, $36\%$ through experience while only $26\%$ obtained these skills through academic pursuit. Experience had $36\%$ but as per the duration of experience $54\%$ had an experience of $1$ year which cannot be said to be adequate to gain all necessary project management skills. $38\%$ had an experience of between $2$-$3$ years while only $8\%$ who had an experience of $4$ and above years. At the same time the number of projects completed would have revealed the levels of experience and on project training. The findings clearly showed that $60\%$ had conducted only one project, $34\%$ had done $2$ projects while $4\%$ had completed between $3$-$4$ projects and only $2\%$ had done $5$ and above projects. Further from the Chi-square tests findings it clearly indicated that for relation between project management skills and baseline surveys, the results were $X^2 (9, N = 50) = 26.415$, $p < 0.05$ hence the two variables are independent of each other. From the analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted, the results revealed how each independent variable influences the ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Kenya. The Project management skills using Post Hoc had $p$ value of $0.018$ ($p < 0.05$) thus indicating that it has influence on ex-post evaluation.
5.2.4 Beneficiaries Characteristics

The beneficiaries characteristics observed in terms of gender parity, there was a clear indicator that females suffered the greater disparity with only a proportion of 24% represented. The males had 76% thus being the dominating group on local NGO projects in Laikipia. As per educational levels, high levels of illiteracy was evidenced by findings where the lot forming the highest percentage being those without proper basis of academics, standing at 40%. Those in certificate level were 24% below those that were diploma holders at 26%. Only 10% of the respondents that had degree and above level. The levels of education are critical especially when it comes to data treatment. From further results of the Chi-square tests findings it clearly shown that for relation between beneficiary characteristics and baseline surveys, the results were $X^2 (9, N = 50) = 15.631$, $p < 0.05$ hence the two variables are independent of each other. As per the analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted, the results of association shows that each independent variable influences the ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Kenya. The Community Awareness using Post Hoc had p value of 0.013 ($p < 0.05$) thus indicating that it has influence on ex-post evaluation.

5.3 Conclusions

Project managers can and must refer to a range of secondary data available, but this information is rarely tailored to the tasks of establishing the pre-intervention status in target communities and later verifying the progress made through project measures. However the study has revealed that this is not the case as many were not interested in data collection, analysis and interpretation. Baseline survey is important as it forms the basis of project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability as well as impact.
Planning entails the following: determining how to plan; developing the scope statement; selecting the planning team; identifying deliverables and creating the work breakdown structure; identifying the activities needed to complete those deliverables and networking the activities in their logical sequence. All these can take place only if there exists other studies within the same scope for clarity of ideas.

According to the study, community awareness influences ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects. Therefore necessary channels of communication ought to be put in place. As the study has revealed there is a considerable high level of illiteracy standing at 40%, as a result better methods such as involving *barazas* would serve better. First results should be disseminated to those with a direct interest in the project being evaluated, especially those with the responsibility for making important decisions about the project.

Project management skills play a paramount role at all phases of any given project, therefore even during ex-post evaluation it becomes very significant in both the data collection and manipulation. The study has established that project management skills are central for project running, there were 38% whose skills were obtained through on project training. These would mean that some time was taken from the project inorder to impart these skills to these involved. A batch of 36% acquired these skills through experience, however the study has identified a high percentage of 54% of these project had been run for only one year. Twelve months is a very short time of obtaining all necessary skills in project management and needs to be coupled with another approach such training or academical.

According to the research study findings, beneficiary characteristics do have effect on local NGO projects ex-post evaluation. The characteristics under scrutiny were only gender and educational levels. Other characteristics were not observed as stated under research limitations. However it was clearly observed that projects is male dominated
field in Laikipia county as male proportion was on a high of 76%. The ways project managers frame their deliverables, their understanding of how to effectively mobilize a team, and their tendency to focus their energies on task or human aspects of the project management role are all gender-laden, shaped by normative expectations about how to be seen as competent. The projects should be open to gender equity in order to avoid such a disparity. On educational levels, majority of 40% did not have certificate, diploma or any degree, this would attribute the reason as to why baseline data collection and manipulation was disregarded at such high levels. The data analysis will always give a clear information that induces optimal decision making process.

5.4 Recommendations

According to the findings of the study, there was a major concern in the ex-post evaluation of NGO projects and the following recommendations were made:

a) The study recommends that key project drivers be enhanced through capacity building on issues relating on baseline survey data collection, analysis, presentation and interpretation in relation to their lines of operation.

b) Project practitioners and organizations should develop flexible and adaptive project designs and plans to incorporate and accommodate the benefitting communities in order for them to contribute greatly in feedback responses that will yield to true findings during any ex-post evaluation conducted.

c) Key project players should use rich channels of communications to ensure that information is timely and correctly received by the intended recipients.

d) The project players that have learnt project management skills through experience and especially those in projects that have run for less than two years should be
trained. Such a training should be accompanied by motivational tokens such as certificates, promotions, recommendation letters, e.t.c.

e) The organisations should make use of available project consultants in areas where there is ill equipment of skills and techniques.

f) In project human resource recruitment, academic merit should be given priority in order to acquire project staff with skills and competencies needed. This would translate into training cost reduction.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

The following areas need further investigation:

1. A study could be conducted to establish whether there exists other beneficiary characteristics that adversely affect ex-post evaluation of NGO projects.

2. A research could be conducted to investigate Gender parity and its influence in projects.

5.6 Limitations of the study

The researcher encountered the various limitations

a) There was poor accessibility in some areas due poor road networks and hence transport challenges. This made it not possible to capture all intended respondents quite elaborately. Alternatively phone calls were made to those reachable and some responses were obtained that made some contribution to the study.

b) There was cultural barrier and as a result, data obtained was the only one to rely on thus limiting identification of more beneficiary characteristics.

c) The human-wildlife conflicts made some zones unreachable.
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APPENDIX (I): QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT MANAGERS AND STAFF.

INTRODUCTION

This questionnaire seeks information on factors influencing ex-post evaluation (review after a period) of local NGO in their projects'. All the information you give will be treated confidentially and for academic purposes only. Please respond to all items in the questionnaire.

PART A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Instructions

Put a tick (✓) in the statements that relate to your situation.

1. Your gender
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

2. Number of years in the organisation
   - [ ] 1 year
   - [ ] 2 to 3 years
   - [ ] 4 years and above

3. State the number of projects in past and currently undertaken by your group.

PART B: PROJECT EX-POST EVALUATION

4. Projects undertaken by your NGO helpful
   - a) Strongly agree [ ]
   - b) Agree [ ]
   - c) Agree A little [ ]
   - d) Disagree [ ]
   - e) Strongly disagree [ ]
5. Should the projects undertaken be evaluated (assessed)?
   a) Strongly agree □  b) Agree □  c) Agree A little □  d) Disagree □
   e) Strongly disagree □

6. If you agree at what times are evaluations conducted
   a) At the beginning of the project. □
   b) During the time the project is going on. □
   c) After the project is completed. □
   d) In all a, b, and c above. □

PART C: BASELINE SURVEY (STUDIES)

7. How many projects have you begun in this NGO?..............................

8. Baseline studies carried out of a project before starting the project? (N/B baseline studies are studies on knowledge, attitudes and practices related to the project).
   □ Yes
   □ No. If No, what do you suggest to be limiting factor(s)..........................

9. The success of any project is related to baseline studies.
   a) Strongly agree □  b) Agree □  c) Agree A little □  d) Disagree □
   e) Strongly disagree □

PART D: COMMUNITY AWARENESS
10. Do you involve the rest of community in your project(s)?

☐ Yes

☐ No. If No, why? 

11. If yes to (1) above, at what times do you involve them.

☐ At the planning stage

☐ At implementation stage.

☐ After project completion

☐ At all stages above

☐ Not at any stage. Give reason(s) for this last choice. 

12. How is community involved in stage(s) ticked in (2) above? 

13. How do you communicate with the community? 

14. The involvement of community contribute to your project(s) success.

a) Strongly agree ☐ b) Agree ☐ c) Agree A little ☐ d) Disagree ☐

☐ e) Strongly disagree.

15. The community is satisfied by your project(s).

a) Strongly agree ☐ b) Agree ☐ c) Agree A little ☐ d) Disagree ☐

☐ e) Strongly disagree.

PART E: PROJECT MANAGEMENT SKILLS

16. Do you have project management skills

☐ Yes
17. If yes to (1) above, how did you acquire these skills?

☐ School

☐ Training

☐ Experience

☐ elsewhere, give details?

18. Skills mentioned above should be applied to manage your project(s)?

a) Strongly agree ☐ b) Agree ☐ c) Agree A little ☐ d) Disagree ☐

e) Strongly disagree ☐.

19. Project management skills and attitudes are of great importance to project success.

a) Strongly agree ☐ b) Agree ☐ c) Agree A little ☐ d) Disagree ☐

e) Strongly disagree ☐.

20. The project management skills and attitude are crucial in completed project evaluation.

a) Strongly agree ☐ b) Agree ☐ c) Agree A little ☐ d) Disagree ☐

e) Strongly disagree ☐.
PART F: PROJECT BENEFICIARIES LEVEL OF EDUCATION

21. Education is important for project management.
   a) Strongly agree ☐ b) Agree ☐ c) Neutral ☐ d) Disagree ☐
   e) Strongly disagree ☐.

22. Education is a great tool on project evaluation.
   a) Strongly agree ☐ b) Agree ☐ c) Neutral ☐ d) Disagree ☐
   e) Strongly disagree ☐.

23. Please rate the following factors as to which least affect ex-post evaluation to the most affecting
   (1-most affecting to 4- least affecting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries characteristics e.g gender, level of education etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Rate the ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county? Tick where appropriate

V. GOOD =5, GOOD =4, AVERAGE =3, POOR =2, V. POOR =1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. What recommendations do you have on what should be done to improve the ex-post evaluation of local NGO projects in Laikipia county?

---------- THANK YOU ----------
APPENDIX (II): INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR LOCAL NGOs DIRECTORS

This guide is to be used in interviews to be held with local NGOs directors

1. Do you find scope evaluation of baseline studies necessary before embarking on any project?
2. Is planning needed in conducting baseline survey?
3. Should conducting of these studies involve data collection?
4. Is it necessary to analyse data obtained?
5. Do you work with the recommendations provided for by these studies?
6. How often do you meet with the Project managers and project staff members to discuss project development matters?
7. In these meetings, do they actively contribute ideas regarding project development?
8. Do you find it necessary to have a project evaluation after project has been completed?
9. What is your understanding of ex-post evaluation of projects?
10. To what level of satisfaction are ex-post evaluation plans drawn?
11. What are the factors that influence ex-post evaluation in within the county?
12. What measures that could be taken to assist project managers and the staff to be actively involved in ex-post evaluation of projects.
APPENDIX (III)  THE MAP OF LAIKIPIA COUNTY

Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Boundaries</th>
<th>Livelihood Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Boundary</td>
<td>Formal Employment/Business/Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Boundary</td>
<td>Marginal Mixed Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Boundary</td>
<td>Mixed Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Location Boundary</td>
<td>Pastoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The map was produced under the guidance of the Kenya Institute of Applied Geospatial Research (KIR) and printed by the Library of the University of Nairobi, Kenya.