AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION AS A TOOL FOR MEASURING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: A CASE OF KENYA NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY

by

Linet Musyoka

A thesis presented to the School of Human and Social Sciences

of

Daystar University
Nairobi, Kenya

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in Monitoring and Evaluation

October 2020
APPROVAL

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION AS A TOOL FOR MEASURING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: A CASE OF KENYA NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY

by

Linet Musyoka
09 -0298

In accordance with Daystar University policies, this thesis is accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree.

Date:

Daniel Mutunga, PhD,
1st supervisor

Solomon Nzyuko, PhD,
2nd supervisor

Philemon Yugi, PhD,
HoD, Development Studies

Kennedy Ongaro, PhD,
Dean, School of Human and Social Science
DECLARATION

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION AS A TOOL FOR MEASURING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: A CASE OF KENYA NATIONAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY

I declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been submitted to any other university or college for academic credit.

Sign: ___________________    Date: ___________________
         Linet   Musyoka
         09-0298
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge that this work would not have been a success without the blessing of the Almighty God who showered upon me His grace throughout the research work. I greatly acknowledge the support of my supervisors, Dr. Daniel Mutunga and Dr. Solomon Nzyuko, in the process of coming up with this research report and reading all the drafts that I came up with. I also appreciate the moral support and encouragement of my family, friends, and colleagues in coming up with this research work.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** ........................................................................................................... vi

**DECLARATION** ......................................................................................................................... iv

**LIST OF TABLES** ........................................................................................................................ viii

**LIST OF FIGURES** ..................................................................................................................... ix

**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS** ........................................................................ x

**ABSTRACT** ................................................................................................................................. xi

**CHAPTER ONE** ............................................................................................................................ 1

**INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY** ..................................................... 1

- Introduction ................................................................................................................................. 1
- Background to the Study .............................................................................................................. 1
- Statement of the Problem ........................................................................................................... 7
- Purpose of the Study ................................................................................................................... 8
- Objectives of the Study .............................................................................................................. 8
- Research Questions ................................................................................................................... 8
- Justification for the Study .......................................................................................................... 9
- Significance of the Study .......................................................................................................... 9
- Assumptions of the Study .......................................................................................................... 10
- Scope of the Study .................................................................................................................... 10
- Limitations and Delimitations of the Study .............................................................................. 11
- Definition of Terms .................................................................................................................. 11
- Summary .................................................................................................................................... 11

**CHAPTER TWO** ........................................................................................................................ 13

**LITERATURE REVIEW** .............................................................................................................. 13

- Introduction ................................................................................................................................. 13
- Theoretical Framework ............................................................................................................... 13
- Empirical Literature Review ...................................................................................................... 34
- Conceptual Framework ............................................................................................................... 36
- Discussion .................................................................................................................................... 36
- Summary .................................................................................................................................... 37

**CHAPTER THREE** ....................................................................................................................... 38

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY** .................................................................................................. 38

- Introduction ................................................................................................................................. 38
- Research Design .......................................................................................................................... 39
- Population .................................................................................................................................... 40
- Target Population ....................................................................................................................... 40
- Sample Size ................................................................................................................................ 41
- Sampling Techniques .................................................................................................................. 41
- Data Collection Instruments ...................................................................................................... 43
- Data Collection Procedures ....................................................................................................... 44
- Pretesting ..................................................................................................................................... 45
- Data analysis Plan ....................................................................................................................... 46
- Ethical Considerations ............................................................................................................... 46
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER FOUR</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Interpretation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Key Findings</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER FIVE</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions of Key Findings</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Further Studies</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Research Questionnaire</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: In-Depth Interview</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Research Permit</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: Plagiarism Report</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Target Population ........................................................................................................ 40
Table 3.2: Sampling Frame ........................................................................................................... 42
Table 4.1: Period Worked for KeNHA .......................................................................................... 49
Table 4.2: Level of Education ....................................................................................................... 50
Table 4.3: Respondents’ Department ........................................................................................... 51
Table 4.4: Position in Department ............................................................................................... 51
Table 4.5: Use of M&E by Departments ...................................................................................... 52
Table 4.6: Respondents’ Awareness of M&E ............................................................................ 53
Table 4.7: M&E Perceptions ........................................................................................................ 55
Table 4.8: Basis for Staff Perceptions on M&E ......................................................................... 56
Table 4.9: Perceptions on M & E’s Influence on Project Implementation ................................... 58
Table 4.10: Benefits of Monitoring and Evaluation ................................................................. 59
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework ............................................................................................. 36
Figure 4.1: Gender of Respondents .............................................................................................. 49
### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KeNHA</td>
<td>Kenya National Highway Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOSTI</td>
<td>National Commission for Science, Technology and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>Project Management Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to identify and analyze Kenya National Highway Authority (KeNHA)’s staff perceptions on monitoring and evaluation as a measurement tool with a view to establish what constituted the perceptions. Its objectives were to; analyze KeNHA’s staff perceptions on M&E as a tool for effective project implementation, examine the basis for staff perceptions on M&E and explore how staff perceptions on M&E tool influenced effective project implementation at KeNHA. The study employed a descriptive research design and targeted the staff at KeNHA in Nairobi region. Simple random sampling was used to sample 125 respondents for the study. Both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used. Questionnaires and in-depth interview schedules were used for data collection. Analysis of data was then done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22. The study found out that the staff at KeNHA were aware of M&E. This was confirmed by findings that showed that 100% (90) of the respondents said M&E was about ensuring the most effective and efficient use of resources. Furthermore, 96% (86) reported that their basis for perceptions on M&E was their past experiences, 92% (83) indicated their basis was the culture at KeNHA, 88% (79) on personal and organizational expectation, while 74% (67) indicated that the M&E skill influenced their perception. The study concluded that staff perception at KeNHA provided a way of assessing the important relationship between project implementers and beneficiaries on the ground and decision makers. The study recommended that KeNHA need to cultivate a positive M&E culture and also engage the staff more in all stages of program implementation to inculcate a sense of ownership.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is an instrument in project management that assist stakeholders to know when operations are proceeding as per the plan and when situations change (Meyer, 2004). The M&E provide management with information upon which decisions regarding the project are made. M&E is an important tool for all projects, since it aids in determining the areas of a project that are progressing according to plan and those that require to be reviewed or altogether replaced. Various kinds of projects need various types of M&E tools (Shapiro, 2011). This chapter introduces the study and provides its background. Similarly, the chapter has presented the problem statement, the study’s purpose, its objectives, research questions, and limitations and delimitations of the study.

Background to the Study

A project is a short-term undertaking intended to create a unique product, service or outcome and it has a predetermined start and end time and a definite scope and resources assigned to it (White, 2004). It is unique since it is not a regular process but has a defined set of activities intended to fulfill certain goals and objectives (Perrin, 2012). The main objective of a project’s existence is to address a need with the aim of improving the living standards. On this premise, therefore, a project has a design and a collection of strategies on how to realize its purpose of improving the welfare of the people. Project experts come in to provide checks and balances in tandem with the project design and regularly assess the project’s progress in relation to set plans (Perrin, 2012). Data is also taken and
analyzed to inform the performance of the project in terms of achieving its goal. The process of tracking data collection and analyses is what is commonly referred to as M&E.

Monitoring and evaluation more often is viewed as one thing but in reality it encompasses two various sets of a firm’s operations that though related are not the same (White, 2004). Monitoring is a systematic set and analysis of information as a project continues (United Nations Development Program (UNDP), 2009). The United Nations Development Program further observed that it is purposed at promoting a project’s effectiveness and efficiency and that monitoring is premised on pre-formulated targets and planned designed actions during the planning stages of a project. Meyer (2004) defined monitoring as the regular check of information on an intervention, in order to verify that progress is taking place against defined direction. Meyer added that monitoring usually involves monthly to quarterly reporting on utilization of resources such as money, time, materials, people, outputs, and actions.

A study by Gitonga (2012) defined monitoring as a continuing process that employs systematic data collection on particular indicators to offer management and the key stakeholders a continuing intervention with suggestions on the extent of objective achievement and progress in usage of allocated resources. There are four types of monitoring including input monitoring which is mainly for accountability as it establishes if resources that is human, financial, and materials are mobilized as planned; output monitoring which establishes if products or services are delivered as planned, process monitoring which reviews the processes by which a program is managed together with issues such as participation by primary and other stakeholders; and impact monitoring
which establishes if a program is having the expected effect and if not, what the required modifications are (Neil, 2012).

Evaluation is the assessment of real project impacts against established strategic plans and it looks at what one is set out to do, what he/she has accomplished, and how it has been accomplished (Olive, 2002). In his study, Desmond (2001) indicated that evaluation can be of two types, namely formative evaluation which means it takes place throughout the project lifecycle with the objective of enhancing the strategy or manner of the project functioning; and summative, which means that it draws ideas from completed projects whose stipulated cycle has come to close, though its outcomes might still be generating the project benefits to the beneficiaries. In addition, evaluation is used in confirming that the set direction is correct, and that the correct mix of strategies and resources have been used to get there. It usually focuses on outcomes and their link with outputs (Meyer, 2004).

Evaluation is the methodical and objective assessment of continuing or completed projects, policies, and programs with regard to their design, implementation, and outcome (Robinson, 2005).

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems are very effective as project implementation tools in that they inform project managers whether or not the implementation is going as expected (White, 2004). M&E systems also informs whether project inputs, actions, outputs, and external elements are taking place according to plan and if corrective measures are required to adjust implementation (Schelle, 2001). Additionally, M&E systems provide confirmation of project results and give reason for project funding allocations (Chottepanda, 2011). According to a report by UNDP (2009), M&E is very effective as a project management tool that performs various roles including providing the
only combined source of information showcasing the project progress, providing a premise for evaluating and gauging assumptions, offering a compelling basis for raising funds, manipulating policy, and providing a way of assessing the important relationship between project implementers and beneficiaries on the ground and decision makers. Conversely, M&E helps project managers determine if there are adequate resources and if the resources are being utilized in the right way (Olive, 2002).

Staff Perception on Monitoring and Evaluation

According to a study by Bryk (2001) on staff-based evaluation model, in order to monitor and evaluate a program or system, the implementers should be conscious of the staff requirements, problems, and perceptions. Perceptions can be defined as the process in which people transform sensory understanding into reasonable and harmonized view of the world surrounding them (Robbins, 2004).

According to Young (2007), perception begins with matters that capture employee’s attention via the various sense organs. The authors added that the other things that may also influence people’s perception include people’s expectations, experiences from the past, customs, understanding and skills. It can thus be deduced that perception is a combination of consciousness to stimuli and the interpretation of the same and this is what would determine how an individual reacts. Sense organs are vital when it comes to establishing perceptions. One can be said to perceive something based on how it tastes, it appears to the eyes, it tastes or how they heard about it. In this study, the way the staff members of Kenya National Highway Authority (KeNHA) perceive M&E as a project implementation tool was assessed.
Rist (2009) asserted that since M&E are integral constituents of a project, they are effective tools that enrich the quality of interventions via their role in learning and decision making. Conversely, the project design quality in terms of the clarity of objectives and establishment of indicators can affect the quality of M&E. Thus, the tools are perceived by staff, especially project managers and donors as effective and better tools in project implementation. In addition, as aforementioned, M&E are ongoing processes and thus can reveal early signs of problems during project implementation. This knowledge can be applied by the project management to initiate corrective interventions geared to ensure that the goals and objectives of a project are fulfilled and therefore M&E instruments are viewed as important and effective by the project management (Horton, 2001). According to Robbins (2004), when staff members have differing perceptions on quality, quantity, and schedules of some task, it becomes very challenging to accomplish organizational goals and objectives.

Positive perception towards M&E, more so, from project managers and donors is attributed to the tools being perceived to help identify areas that require improvement, identify what is working well, and account for time spent on training as well as on actual implementation. This is very helpful as it helps account for funds allocation and spending and also results in success of the projects as it gives room for continuous improvement (Wilk, 2005). Viewing M&E systems favorably reduces the likelihood of employees expressing feelings of leaving their organizations (Greengard, 2000).

Conversely, there are employees especially the M&E field officers who harbor negative feelings in regard to M&E as project implementation tools (Greengard, 2000). They link M&E systems to negative outcomes like fear of losing their jobs, emotional fatigue and
stress. There is also a negative perception around increased workload disappointment in case the M&E tools reveal the need to make adjustments on the project (Deane, 2000). According to Pituro (2001), most monitoring and evaluation field officers have negative perceptions on M&E tools for project implementation as they find the systems to invade their privacy, and decrease their job satisfaction and trust. Hence, it is because of these mixed feelings that this study purposed to assess KeNHA employee perceptions on M&E as an instrument for measuring effectiveness of project implementation. Examples of organizations that have implemented monitoring and evaluation as a tool include the Kenyan government ministries for performance evaluations in the wake of performance contracting and also non governmental organizations that implement various community development projects.

Kenya National Highway Authority

Kenya National Highway Authority (KeNHA) is an autonomous road agency that was established under the Kenya Roads Act (2007) with the task of managing, developing, rehabilitating and maintaining international trunk roads of class A roads (those that link centers of international significance, cross international boundaries and those terminating at international ports, class B roads (national trunk roads connecting globally important centers) and primarily class C roads (roads connecting provincially important centers to one another or 2 higher-class roads). KeNHA is committed to quality, safe and sufficient national trunk roads. Their current objective is to construct and manage national trunk roads that improve socio-economic growth and wealth (KeNHA, 2012).

The key functions of KeNHA are to implement road policies in relation to national roads, ensure adherence to rules and regulations on axle load control and, collect and collate all
data related to the national roads usage for future planning (KeNHA, 2012). According to a study by Jeptoo (2017), KeNHA has employed monitoring and evaluation tools that aid it in generating quarterly and annual progress reports. Examples of projects undertaken by KeNHA that employ monitoring and evaluation are the Thika Highway Improvement project, road traffic congestion in Nairobi Metropolitan Area project and Kenya-Mombasa-Mariakani road projects among others. With a monitoring and evaluation framework in place, KeNHA was a suitable case study for this research to identify and analyze staff perceptions on monitoring and evaluation as a measurement tool.

Statement of the Problem

Rist (2009) opined that monitoring and evaluation tools are very important during project implementation as they keep track of how the implementation is going on. The tools also ensure that project inputs, actions, outputs and external factors are occurring as expected and show if there is need for corrective measures to adjust the implementation plans. However, despite the benefits of M&E tools, mixed staff perceptions have been found regarding monitoring and evaluation tools. For instance, a study by Issah (2016) found that most project managers were pleased with the tools and found them helpful in achieving project goals, while a few deemed them as threats to their jobs and total stress. In another study, Mackay (2010) established that 20% of the respondents had positive perceptions of about monitoring and evaluation tools, while the remaining 80% perceived them negatively. These mixed perceptions affect the project implementation in that not all staff are motivated in performing the job tasks out offer of losing their jobs.

Kenya National Highway Authority employs Monitoring and Evaluation as a tool that aids in generating quarterly and annual progress reports. However, no study has ever been
conducted at KenNHA to understand how employees perceive the M&E tool, the basis of the perceptions held and hence how the perceptions influence effective project implementation. Similarly, there is deficit in research on the said sphere both in Kenya and other countries in the region such as the gaps in intellectual or academic sphere as well as service. This study therefore purposed to breach these gaps by investigating staff perception on M&E in KeNHA and what influenced these perceptions.

Purpose of the Study
The study sought to identify KeNHA’s staff perceptions on monitoring and evaluation as a measurement tool with a view to establish what constitutes the perceptions and what influences them in project implementation.

Objectives of the Study
1. Analyze KeNHA’s staff perceptions on M&E as a tool for effective project implementation.
2. Examine the basis for staff perceptions on M&E as a tool for effective project implementation at KeNHA.
3. Explore how staff perceptions on M&E tool influence effective project implementation at KeNHA.

Research Questions
1. What were KeNHA’s staff perceptions on M&E as a tool for effective project implementation?
2. What was the basis for staff perceptions on M&E as a tool for effective project implementation at KeNHA?
3. How did staff perceptions on M&E tool influence effective project implementation at KeNHA?

4. What recommendations could be made from the results of the study?

Justification for the Study

Monitoring and evaluation is relatively a new method that offers consolidated information indicating project progress, enabling project implementers to learn from their experience and gained knowledge, identifying errors and providing paths for learning and improvement (Wilk, 2005). However, the success or failure of monitoring and evaluation as project implementation instrument in an organization has to a great extent been associated with perceptions held by employees. Negative employee perceptions towards monitoring and evaluation may cause resistance resulting in a failed project. On the other hand, positive perceptions held by staff may motivate project success or failure, it becomes an important subject for research hence this study. This study was key in bringing to the fore issues surrounding perceptions and how these perceptions impact project implementation to enable its effective management.

Significance of the Study

The results of this research would be helpful in a number of ways as indicated here below:

1. The study revealed the perceptions held by employees on monitoring and evaluation as an instrument for measuring project implementation effectiveness. This would enable formulation of new policies and interventions that may help foster positive perceptions towards monitoring and evaluation.
2. Keya National Highway Authority would benefit by identifying what influences staff perceptions towards M&E then work towards managing them for successful project implementation.

3. The study’s findings might contribute to the body of knowledge existing in project management and M&E.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made:

1. That KeNHA employees would provide information necessary for this study to enable the study to achieve the study’s objectives.

2. That KeNHA staff held perceptions on M&E as a tool for effective project implementation.

3. That there was a basis for staff perceptions on M&E as a tool for effective project implementation at KeNHA.

4. Staff perceptions on M&E tool influenced effective project implementation at KeNHA.

5. The study would be beneficial to KeNHA and relevant institutions. Do the rest

Scope of the Study

The study targeted project employees at KeNHA in Nairobi County. This was because the researcher found that KeNHA projects in Nairobi County were enough in providing the necessary information needed for the study. Similarly, because of logistical concerns involved in visiting all the offices in the country and beyond the borders, the researcher restricted the study within Nairobi County. Data was gathered from KeNHA project
employees based in Nairobi Region. The study was limited to identifying and analysing staff perceptions on monitoring and evaluation as a measurement tool with a view to establish what the perceptions were and what influenced them in project implementation.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

1. Because the research targeted project practitioners, obtaining participants to be interviewed during working hours was a challenge as some were out in the field. To mitigate this, the researcher ensured a prior arrangement to secure appointments based on respondents’ availability.

2. Staff perception on monitoring and evaluation tools is sensitive topic and the participants could not provide data for fear of being victimized. The participants were assured that the data they provided would be treated in a confidential manner and that their identity would be kept anonymous.

Definition of Terms

Monitoring and evaluation framework – This describes how the M&E process for a project operated. It includes matters to do with the people responsible for it, the tools employed, how the information flows through the organization, and prescribes the people to make decisions using the data. The meaning was retained in this study (Perrin, 2012).

Attitude - This are the thoughts or feeling held in regard to something or someone, one that is replicated in an individual’s conduct (Rist, 2009). The meaning was retained in the study.
Perception – This refers to the manner in which people interpret issues surrounding them premised on how they understand it, the process through which a person gets to know about the events, objects (DeVito, 2006). The same meaning was retained in this study.

Summary

In this chapter, the study has been introduced and the background provided in regard to M&E, staff perception on M&E, and KeNHA. Further, the chapter has outlined the statement of the problem, intent of the study, the study’s objectives, and research questions. The chapter has also provided the study justification, scope, significance, assumptions, and limitations and delimitation of the study. The following chapter discusses the theoretical framework, general and empirical studies review and the variables of the study in the form of a conceptual framework.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature pertinent to employee perceptions on M&E as an instrument for measuring project implementation effectiveness. The areas that were considered include the relevant theories on the topic, general and empirical literature review, and the conceptual framework. The theories reviewed were top-down theory and theories of change. General literature was reviewed to capture the concept of perception and perception linkages to M&E. Empirical literature review looked at previous studies conducted on the topic of study.

Theoretical Framework

Bless and Smith (2008) described a theoretical framework as a structure that details the theory on which a study is grounded. The framework details the theory that responds to why the research problem being studied exists (Bless & Smith, 2008). In this study, the theoretical framework was directed by theories of perception, including Top-down theory and the theory of change.

Theories of Change

Fear of the Known and Unknown Change consequences

This theory emerged in the 1990s as an improvement to the evaluation theory (Kotter & Cohen, 2002). The change theory is an instrument applied in crafting answers to complex social issues. It offers an all-round picture of early and intermediate term changes that are required to realize a long-term determined goals (Anderson, 2005). It hence offers a framework of how a project needs to be operated, which can be evaluated and improved.
via M&E. A change of change is also a specific and quantifiable definition of change that constitutes the planning, implementation, and evaluation basis. Many of the projects have a theory of change even though they are normally not considered (CARE, 2012). The theory of change assist in crafting an understandable frameworks for M&E. It is majorly employed by NGOs and donors to explain long-term effect on projects (James, 2011).

A change theory explains how a development program is expected to produce the intended and/or unintended results (Kotter & Cohen, 2002). M&E has come in as a condition that enables an organization to begin change; be they adjustment in processes, project redesigning, eliminating bottlenecks even if it means laying off employees. Therefore, the importance of theories of change in the perceptions of staff on M&E cannot be over emphasized. Fear is always an element that brings about resistance to change by employees (Kotter & Cohen, 2002).

In the case of M&E, where the donor is trying to do checks and tracking that may lead to change, which is intended to improve project performance, fear of known and unknown consequences of such kind of a change becomes an opportunity or barrier to employees’ acceptance of change; a barrier because it exerts a negative effect on any person’s rational thinking. If the notion that fear can affect thinking and reasoning is accepted, then it suffices to say that fear can also affect decision-making in general. The above goes to indicate that during project M&E, employee perception would be negative in case there are known mistakes in the project and would reveal negative results if identified and that would automatically change their perception in regard to M&E to the negative, hence, fear of the known. Fear of the unknown would come in where the M&E process is not communicated to the staff hence no prior knowledge of what would be checked in the
project process thus creating a repulsive reaction towards M&E (Kotter & Cohen, 2002).

Research has linked fear with resistance to change (Gouldner, 1960). For instance, Dubrin and Ireland (1993) observed that resistance to change is associated with employees’ fear of poor results, the unknown, and pitfalls that comes with the change initiative. Similarly, Kotter and Cohen (2002) indicated that fear or panic directs self-protection or immobilization. The known effects of fear can be unbearable psychologically, that is, staff members who consider the known and unknown effects as psychologically unpalatable or as a threat to their well-being psychologically may respond negatively to ideas of having this change. Lastly, the known effects may be seen as practically unachievable at personal or organizational level. For instance, if new demands and limitations contrary to employees’ beliefs are placed on their abilities and resources, then they will be more likely to respond negatively to this change as is in most M&E scenarios.

Courtesy of the fear-producing mechanisms and the impact of fear of known effects, workers tend to negatively respond to change (Kotter & Cohen, 2002). The fact of employees resisting change is relatively clear. To the degree that staff fear the known and unknown effects, they will view this change as not helpful, at least for them. The fear will drive them to protect themselves. So as to eliminate the fear feelings, employees either accept the scenario as it is and embrace it (positive perception), or eliminate a source of fear, that is, to adjust the change (negative perception) (Dubrin & Ireland, 1993). It is argued that fear feelings and perceptions are likely to end in a more negative assessment of the change process since this change is seen as a negative handling an individual gets from the organization. This implies that if staff fear the effects of change, and they perceive that the firm might treat them unfairly with any type of change, they react to the organization
with a negative treatment (Kotter & Cohen, 2002). They might even resist the change or embrace the change.

This theory is relevant in this study since M&E processes may reveal mistakes in project implementation and therefore help learning and putting in place intervention measure to yield intended outcomes. By so doing, M&E introduces change conditions that enable an organization to bring in adjustment in processes, project redesigning, and eliminating bottlenecks which may include laying off employees.

Top-Down Theory (indirect theory)

The top down theory was proposed by Richard Gregory in 1970. Richard Gregory reasoned that perceptions triggers a constructivist process which depends on top-down processing (Gregory, 1970). Gregory explained that perception are about drawing inferences regarding what is seen and attempting to make the best guess. To Richard Gregory, perception is an hypothesis. That previous knowledge, stored information and past experiences are critical in perception building. This was supported by McLeod (2007) who added that perceptions of human beings are associated with what is already known to them and perception of reality is actively constructed. When information is gotten from the environment, it is combined with what is already known regarding the world as a result of experiences (Mcleod, 2007). The environment is made of objects that allow action performing in so many aspects. From this information, this theory was relevant to this study as past experiences are one of the items that make up for the independent variables and has an effect on staff perceptions. An individual’s experience to a certain stimuli has an effect on how individuals perceive a certain phenomenon and how they respond when subjected to the same stimuli or situation.
General Literature Review

Monitoring and Evaluation

Even though the terms M&E appear to go together, they are, in fact, two distinct sets of organizational operations, interrelated but dissimilar (Perrin, 2012). Furthermore, they can be viewed from the angle of evaluation, which can be formative, meaning occurring during a project life or organization life, with the purpose of enhancing the strategy or way in which a project or organization functions. It may also be a summative, drawing lessons from a fully implemented project or an organization that is not functioning (Perrin, 2012). M&E are common as they both center on efficiency, effectiveness, and the effect of the project. While efficiency means that input into the operation is correct in terms of the output, effectiveness, indicates the degree to which a development project is fulfilling its specific set objectives, and effect informs the project actors on the difference they have created to the problem condition while trying to solve by implementing the project (Shapiro, 2011).

Monitoring

This operation is done while a project is ongoing, with the purpose of improving its plan and performance while functional (Perrin, 2012). Monitoring similarly describes the methodical gathering and analysis of information as project implementation continues along the lines of predetermined procedures and measures which will ultimately indicate the project’s success or failure (Gyorkos, 2013). It is intended to render project efficiency and effectiveness better based on predetermined targets and planned operations during the project design stages. If effectively executed, it is an important instrument for proper management, because it offers a helpful base for evaluation and enables project actors to
determine if the resources at their disposal are sufficient and are being utilized well, whether the capacity in place is enough and suitable and whether project actors are doing what they planned to do (Nabulu, 2015).

Evaluation

An evaluation activity studies the project outcomes, that is, improvement in income, housing quality, benefits distribution, and cost-effectiveness, et cetera. Its objective is to be the premise upon which future projects will be designed (Nabulu, 2015). Nabulu further noted that evaluation is mostly applied in the identification and design of potential projects. Evaluation outcomes can measure the extent to which a project realized the intended outcome and the sharing of the benefits by various groups, and can measure project cost-effectiveness in relation with other options.

Monitoring and evaluation systems are key in providing periodic reports in regard to the degree to which the goals and objectives of a project are being achieved, identify likely issues early enough and prescribe effective interventions. M&E systems also help to monitor the convenience of the development projects to all spheres of the target consumers, monitor the effectiveness with which the various project phases are being executed and prescribe improvements. The M&E further helps in measuring the degree to which the project is able to achieve its key objectives and provide guidelines for the establishment of future projects (Perrin, 2012).

Monitoring and evaluation is an instrument in management of projects. It aids project management to know when operations are progressing as per the plan and when conditions change (Meyer, 2004). It gives management the necessary information to come up with
decisions bordering on project implementation. M&E is important for all projects, since it aids in identifying areas where projects are on target and those that require to be adjusted or changed.

Monitoring entails periodic and methodical gathering, analyzing, and documenting information in regard to inputs of a project, its activities, benefits, outcomes, and effects (World Bank, 2011). Monitoring emphasizes on efficiency and hence setting the stage for improved project effectiveness, by offering management and stakeholders progressive development and realization of its objectives within the available funds (World Bank, 2011). Therefore, it keeps project work on track and informs project managers when things go wrong. Thus, it is an invaluable instrument for effective management and also a useful basis for evaluation. Monitoring is an internal operation for a project, and it entails establishing measures, putting in place systems for gathering information, recording, and analyzing data, and applying the data in informing day-to-day management (Shapiro, 2011). Monitoring is vital because it enables the modification of operations if they prove not to be realizing the desired outcomes (Hunter, 2009; Shapiro, 2011). For example, monitoring can inform whether processes are resource effective and if not, then adjustments are done to ensure everything runs accordingly.

Conversely, evaluation refers to is a science-based measurement of the strengths and weaknesses of a project (Hunter, 2009). It involved carrying out comparisons between the actual and the planned project activities. It is a means through project efficiency and effectiveness and its impact are measured. There exist two forms of evaluations, that is, evaluation executed when the project implementation is going on, formative evaluation; and the evaluation effected upon project completion, summative evaluations. Evaluation
entails considering what the project expected to realize, looking at progress towards what was to be realized and effect on target beneficiaries, considering the effectiveness of the project strategy, considering the efficient resource utilization, opportunity costs and project sustainability, and the implications for the different actors (Hunter, 2009; Shapiro, 2011). Evaluation thus encompasses both the efficiency and effectiveness aspects of project implementation.

Monitoring and evaluation is thus done in order to provide the project management and stakeholders information on the extent to which the project is satisfying its set objectives and to establishing transparency and accountability on the utilization of project resources. Further, M&E is conducted to supply project employees with a premise for making decisions and for future plans and development in regard to project implementation which is enhanced when directed by lessons picked from project implementation experience.

Currently, organizations are reviewing avenues in which M&E can realize and enhance consistency and effectiveness, that is, where M&E would provide for considering the project impact on beneficiaries and also being able to prescribe recommendations on how future interventions measures can be enhanced. This ensures a rigorous and robust M&E system geared towards higher level outcomes hence sustainability. A good starting point to check is on perceptions of staff on M&E (UNDP, 2009).

Monitoring and Evaluation

There are several distinct purposes for M&E (Perrin, 2012). Organizational management is not at all times clear on which purpose and the appropriate procedure that is most appropriate for the realization of specific project requirements. M&E can be employed for accountability reasons (Hunter, 2009). It can be applied to measure project compliance
with required measures and illustrates to donors, or the public that resources have been effectively applied. In accountability focused M&E, scrutiny of high levels is expected, and comparisons are done against the existing standards and norms that have been put in place for a variety of performance areas. This encompasses effective budget management employees, meeting of legal and regulatory standards, transformational, and ethical standards (UNDP, 2009). In this context, M&E can be seen as supporting a governance practice, which includes the overall management, operating mechanisms, and institutional culture.

Monitoring and evaluation similarly connects to government if supported by an elaborate public auditing mechanisms. Enhancing public management is another reason evaluation is applied in government (Perrin, 2012). Furthermore, the significance given to M&E by governments in Africa, as components of their process of enhancing their efficiencies, shows appreciation that change cannot be driven without suitable instruments that produce strategic management information. In addition to M&E serving the very necessary purpose of accountability, it is meant to promote the “learning organization”. This can occur at the context of M&E utilization, and comes about when outcomes are communicated or shared to the stakeholders. It is assumed that organizations would be more open and self-reflective when encountered with information that emanates from the evaluation process, but it is not always the case as implementing learning is hard, in the face of the complex protocols and culture in management which must be discussed to reach an agreement (Preskill & Torres, 2005).

Applying evaluation in organizations is, however, not easy, and is determined by various elements including contextual (political), technical methodological), and bureaucratic
(psychological) elements. Shapiro (2011) considered how M&E leads into learning and observed that in this environment, M&E is seen as tool that helps management by improving the information quality generated for decision-making. There is a lot potential in evaluation causing organizational learning, and not just accountability (Briceno (2010). The main point is that the reason behind M&E is greatly fundamental as it could lead to various results.

According to Horton (2001), in some instances, M&E focuses on evaluating the condition of socioeconomic criteria to enhance available information on factors of concern, including health or population levels. Hunter (2009) described these as status assessment methodologies to M&E. In the natural resource conservation field, status assessment procedures aid management to decide where to focus management efforts by offering information in regard to threats to species or other ecosystem related elements. The results from status evaluations of M&E may determine policy and management decisions (Hunter, 2009). Typically, status assessment of M&E does not offer direct feedback on the projects’ or policies’ effectiveness.

An example of global scale status assessment approach to M&E is the Millennium Development Goals which are purposed to gauge progress toward sustainability and determines policy decisions at the international stage (UNDP, 2009). According to Hunter (2009), M&E describes the tracking of performance. This approach to M&E is purposed to measure the effect of management steps so as offers feedback on the progress toward realization of goals and the effectiveness of development projects and offer understanding of the relevant solution. In measurement that are effective, performance frameworks like those that are results-based and adaptive, organizational management incorporate the
outcomes of M&E into project cycles developed to enable continuous improvement (Perrin, 2012).

Deciding how much of resources to be assigned to measurement of M&E against status assessment is a common issue for resource managers (Hunter, 2009). M&E can be applied in a decision assessment scenario to enable understanding necessary for decision making amongst various policy alternatives (Perrin, 2012). In this scenario, legal procedures are intended to be employed as a basis for making decisions.

Stein and Valters (2012) pointed out that M&E provides legal procedures on whether the project is being implemented well or not and if there are any barriers that require corrective interventions. It achieves this by availing information which is helpful for policy making and advocacy. As such, it helps in planning future resource requirements and operations and hence M&E is an important instrument for effective good project management at every level since it avails information on project progress and the effectiveness of the project implementation operations.

Similarly, Shapiro (2011) viewed M&E to be part of program design as it facilitates systematic reporting. That the M&E mechanism transmits results and measures how accountable a process is. It tests how efficient and effective project implementation process is, facilitates effective allocation of resource, enhances learning that is continuous and improvement, and provides reports for enhanced the process of decision making (Shapiro, 2011). In agreement, Olive (2002) emphasized that M&E should be performed at every level of project implementation.
Information from the M&E system

An effective M&E system is tested by the use of the information obtained from the process (Briceno, 2010). It also helpful in clarifying the expected project outcomes; illustrating how project progress and effect will be measured; collecting and analyzing the necessary information for tracking project progress and effect, providing details of the factors for success and failure; and demonstrating how this information can be applied to enhance future actions (Welsh et al., 2005).

Monitoring and evaluation is critical component of project planning, implementation, and completion (Chaplowe, 2008). It is important to all projects because the information that results out of facilitates effective decision making by assisting in identifying project areas that are on track and those that require adjustments to institute or need to be replaced. Collection of at every project level adds value by ensuring project targets are realized.

Shortcomings in project the project implementation process are also determined early in time and collective measures implemented (Gorgens & Kusek, 2010). Effective M&E systems requires the interaction between the staff, procedures, information, technology, and key stakeholders, so as to guarantee feasibility and ownership (Chaplowe, 2008). The information that M&E provide is critical to enhancing performance (Mackay, 2010), which is vital for learning on what/how the project is progressing by focusing on sustainability, effectiveness, efficiency and effect (Hunter, 2009).

The international benchmark prescribes that the M&E allocation should be 11%-15% of the total cost of the project. However, many projects in Kenya assign less than this (Kenya Social Protection Sector Review, 2012). Inconsistency in the choice of performance
indicators is also a common feature among many Kenyan projects and this leads to unclear and incomprehensive M&E systems. Out of 90% of the Kenya safety net programmes, only 17% can offer a review team with a logical structures. The review similarly found that even though M&E did not influence the decision-making process, the information obtained out of it was applied in informing project designs policies. It was also observed from the review that the country depends mostly on M&E international consultants and therefore recommended capacity building for civil servants (locals) since they will work in the sector for along time (Kenya Social Protection Sector Review, 2012).

Concept of Perception

The term perception is described as a complex process by which sensory stimulation is selected, organized, and interpreted into a meaningful and understandable picture of the world (Berelson & Steiner, 1964). It is how people interpret issues around them on the basis of their understanding of it, the process through which an individual get to understand events, objects, and people via the sense of smell, sight, touch, taste and hearing (DeVito, 2006).

Perception is the capacity of individuals to be aware or conscious of what is taking place in their environment and be able give them an interpretation, that is, individual understand things on the basis of their perception. How individual perceive a situation determines their responses and each reaction forms a different results. The truth is mostly based on consensus, hence things look the way most people view them. Things that grab our attention is the first part of perception through the various sense organs. Other elements like skills, knowledge, our expectations, past experiences, cultures, and empathy similarly
determine our perception (Chikati, 2009; Young, 2007). It can hence be concluded that perception is a combination of consciousness to stimuli and the interpretation of the same and this is what would determine how an individual reacts. Sense organs are vital when it comes to establishing perceptions. One can be said to perceive something based on how it tastes, it appears to the eyes, or how they heard about it.

Perception based research can be tracked to Chikati’s (2009) study on the significance of cognition. Chikati argued that schematic reasoning is dominant on human perception in ways that impact and shape information processes. Allport’s (1954) study advanced the understanding that we have on attitude, perception, judgment, and many other terms. Perceptions bear a direct impact on decision making and the results of those decisions, hence, it is not a surprise that organizational theorists are keen in the link between perceptions and many organizational aspects. For instance, Young’s (2007) study revealed the impact of the perception of uncertainty in the environment in regard to perception of the requirement for change in an organization’s strategies. It can be agreed that perceptions highly influence decision-making. Depending on exposure to a certain stimuli and how decision making is perceived at the individual level, perception greatly influences whether to adopt or ignore a decision made and this also influences the outcome.

Monsen (2002) stated that perception can be classified into two processes, including processing sensory input and processing. Processing is associated with an individual’s understanding and expectations that influence perception. Perception relies on complex operation of the nervous system, but subjectively appears to be effortless since this processing occurs outside conscious awareness (Young, 2007). Perception has three components. Firstly, the person perceiving, secondly, the person getting to know about
something, and thirdly, the ultimate understanding (Perrin, 2012). Three factors exist that may determine a person’s perceptions. These include experience, motivational state, and lastly the emotional state. In various motivational or emotional states, the person perceiving will respond to or perceive an issue in a variety of ways. Similarly, in various conditions, an individual may use a perceptual defense where they seem to view what they want to view. It can also be added that cognitive states affect perceptions since cognition deals with previous knowledge and also creates new knowledge both of which influence perceptions. The second is the target, which is the individual that is being viewed or judged. Lack of clarity or lack of information in regard to a target yields an increased need for interpretation and addition. Third is the situation which equally influences perceptions to a large extent, since different situations might require additional information about the target.

Kibera and Waruingi (1998) described perception as a process through which individuals choose, organize, understand, and allocate meaning to phenomena or stimuli that is external. Hence, it is the process where individuals seek to understand the world around them. Largely, perception is selective. The selectivity of perception works as a filter through which potentially vital or favorable experiences flows, while potentially insignificant or unfavorable experiences are blocked. Extensions of these includes selective exposure and selective retention (Kibera & Waruingi, 1998). Perception is determined by internal and external elements resulting in people seeing some perceived objects, events or individuals differently. External elements are the traits of perceived objects or individuals, which may comprise intensity, size, repetition, motion, and appearance. Internal elements in perception are traits of the perceiver.
The perceivers tend apply themselves as a basis for perceiving events, objects. Or others. For example, an individual’s perception on another or on objects would greatly be influenced by one’s traits. An example is how an individual who is not positive or a pessimist will view M&E as a process that exposes the wrong doings of an operation. A positive individual or optimist will view the process as one that objectively intervenes and guides a project to an ultimate success. Internal factors that can influence perception are needs and motives, past experiences, and personality (Nzuve, 1999). Past experiences were utilized to inform this study. The researcher feels that past experiences greatly influence how perceptions are formed and enable decisions to be made.

Individuals come with various perceptions of the same stimulus object due to three perceptual processes that include selective attention, selective distortion, and selective retention (Gorgens & Kusek, 2010). Selective attention comes up because of the fact that individuals are subjected to an overwhelming amount of stimuli on a daily basis. People have an increased understanding of stimuli that is consistent with their needs or interests and limited understanding of stimuli that is not relevant to their needs. Selective distortion defines the tendency of individuals to twist information to suit their personal meanings (Nzuve, 2007). This is based on the fact that people hold preconceptions which in a large way influences their perceptions to stimuli. For example, when handed a knife what comes to mind are words like sharp, cut, careful handling etc. Selective retention emphasizes that individuals will forget much of the lessons they learn. They appear to retain that information which supports the attitudes and beliefs for preferred alternatives. A good case in point would be how individuals would choose to remember good attributes of a product
they like more and easily forget good attributes of a competing product (Kibera & Waruingi, 1998).

Robbins (2004) noted that individual view the world and look at things differently. Presented with a similar object, two individual might look at it in two differing ways. The view is a function of perception, which is the unique manner in which every individual looks, organizes or interprets issues. Hunter (2009) reasoned that perception is determined by personality, expectation, intelligence and interest. Bennet (1999) argued that managers need to understand the process of perception so as to ensure staff and managers consider the organizations’ objectives in the same way in order to speak with a single voice. Management need to equally acknowledge workers’ issues and complaints from their viewpoint and to enhance communication between management and the subordinate by perceiving issues in a similar manner.

Staff Perceptions and Monitoring and Evaluation

M&E mechanisms are very effective as instruments for project implementation because they let project managers to understand whether projects implementation is progressing as expected or not, that inputs into a project, actions, its outputs and external elements are occurring according to plan and helps to assess whether corrective interventions are required to according adjust implementation design. Its objective is to enhance management of current and future outputs, outcomes, and benefits (Schelle, 2001). Additionally, M&E systems provide confirmation of project results and give reason for project funding allocations (Chottepanda, 2011). According to a report by UNDP (2009), M&E is very effective as a project management tool in that it: (1) gives the only combined
source of information showcasing the project progress (2) provides a basis for questioning and testing assumptions (3) provides a forceful basis for raising funds and manipulating policy (4) provides a way of assessing the important relationship between project implementers and beneficiaries on the ground and decision makers. These are among the few notable benefits of M&E.

Research appreciates that little has been done concerning perceptions in M&E as an instrument for project implementation. However, there is sufficient information to indicate their connections (Brauns, 2003). The most significant before beginning the M&E process, is to carry out a readiness assessment (Gorgens & Kuesek, 2010). This will facilitate identification of the potential champions of M&E mechanism among the employees. This needs to be emphasized so as not to bombard the staff without prior notification of M&E taking place. It could be seen as a way to ensure the staff is in correct state mentally and physically to go through the process of M&E.

Zall (2011) asserted that for an organization to conduct monitoring and evaluation it should first identify those who may passively resist the exercise from among its employees. In essence the author suggests that the organization sort its employees in two categories that is those who are for and those who are against monitoring and evaluation in the company. However it might be suggested that care should be taken so as not to be seen as a process trying to incriminate those who are against M&E. Zall (2011) asserted that identifying those who are vocally opposed and those who vocally support the organizations culture will enable to know how best results can be managed. Vocal or outspoken people have a great influence over the perceptions and attitudes of other employees. Employees’ attitudes and perceptions drive their behavior related to Monitoring and Evaluation processes.
Perceptions and attitudes in M&E stem from the leaders/managers/supervisors in projects (Gorgens & Kesek, 2010). If M&E is championed by the leadership in a project, then it will be seen in the way an organization plans, manages and operates. When the organization’s management has a negative perception about M&E or lacks understanding of its benefits, it will be seen in funding levels for M&E. For instance, it could be revealed whether there are dedicated posts for M&E in the project structure and in the level of attention that M&E receives. This could clearly explain why leadership starts and ends in influence. Employees will easily support the position of their leadership in regard to M&E.

Proponents and opponents for M&E are not only found in the leadership, employees could also fall in these categories and influence the attitudes and perceptions of those around them with regards to M&E. If possible, it is important to try and find out why the opponents feel like they do and try and counter their bad attitude towards M&E. It can be suggested that leadership is all about influence hence can greatly determine the success or failure of an M&E process. If employees are influenced negatively towards M&E, then their perceptions could easily change to the negative and the converse is true. Hence leadership featured well in this study as a mediating factor as expounded on the conceptual framework.

Preskill and Torres (2005) highlighted some of the reasons for negative perception towards M&E that leads to stakeholder resistance. First, resistance can emanate from the evaluation itself, for instance, originating from failure to agree on the methodology and interpretation of outcomes. The resistance may also be due to specific project traits and features of the larger environment; the different people, and categories of individuals affected by the evaluation. This is true considering such aspects as the values of program-staff, employee
expectations, and characteristics of M&E staff, which are mediating elements in this study. Preskill and Torres (2005) further stated that M&E is done on the programs and not the people. Nevertheless, the staff feel affected because the whole process brings in the concept of competition and an element of personal performance, hence they (staff) extend evaluative judgment about the program to their personal lives with effect on their self-image (Preskill & Torres, 2005). The more a person is committed to the program, the more affected and attached they feel.

Resistance from stakeholders may present a challenge during the M&E process. For example, the notice of the evaluation exercise may cause the employees concerned to remember previous negative experiences with the M&E process, causing them to adopt a resistant position to it. When evaluation objectives and questions are established, conflicting power issues and conflicts of interest may emerge and cause resistance of certain groups of people. Failure to implement the results of evaluation findings and suggestions may equally be caused by stakeholders’ resistance (Patton, 1997).

Rist (2009) posited that evaluation appears to be entertained when employees agree that changes might happen and that they are required. For example, if project operations are not proceeding according to plan, then without a doubt, changes have to take place in order to effectively steer the project, when employees agree to risk failure in trying to implement changes, in spite of the current situation being viewed as more rewarding or predictable and also when employees agree to the evaluation outcomes as guidelines for making decisions, even if they may not be consistent with the existing values and beliefs. At that point, decision making informed by M&E findings may be a need to review the budget, a need to a different approach to the project and maybe a need to improve human resource
capacity. Brauns (2003) emphasizes on the significance of suitable philosophy and value bases, for instance, Positivism vs. humanism between the team doing the evaluation and clients, particularly in the case of negative study outcomes.

In his study, Hunter (2009) provided an analysis of the resistance challenge. In his opinion, resistance is mostly linked to the fear evaluation often triggers, especially the fear of an individual losing a job or being criticized and the fear to lose power and self-esteem. Brauns (2003) stated that previous experiences with evaluation have a huge effect on perceptions. If employee experience is largely negative, the likelihood of resistance in future toward the process of evaluation heightens and the reverse is true. Stakeholders may also embrace other people’s negative opinions on the evaluation process. Experience as a perception influencer was utilized in the study since it has a huge effect on perceptions. It comes in as an independent variable influencing the success or failure of a M&E process.

Sacks and John (2011) brought in the issue of power in the M&E equation. The authors described power as a special aspect of social influence emanating from a disproportionate sharing of resources. Power is premised on the control over rewarding and punishing stimuli. The person who wields power has control over outcomes suffered by others people (Herkner, 2001). For instance, in the evaluation context, information may confer power. The teams or person doing the evaluation gathers information that the stakeholders view as a cause, reinforcement or punishment. Evaluation, therefore, contains a potential to heighten or decrease stakeholder power. For instance, stakeholders may anticipate to close expert status that legitimized their position of power in the past. In such a scenario, the concerned stakeholders’ resistance only comes naturally.
Stakeholders may resist the M&E process if in their opinion in the evaluation process has a potential to alter the existing power structure, and if, as a consequence, they consider their own position and degree of influence to be endangered. The Fear of change theory can be applied in such a situation. Additionally, stakeholders may view the data collected through the M&E process as a source of power that can be used to confer non-negotiable negative outcomes and vice versa.

Empirical Literature Review

Studies done in the past about the question of perception towards M&E have dwelt on the resistance aspect. For example, Rist (2009) found resistance to evaluation outcomes when employees feel they have to defend the status quo, on the basis of personal or organizational values and goals. In another research, Weiss and Bucuvalas (2000) revealed that M&E reports were utilized most when they confirmed an already available knowledge or challenges existing procedures to only a lower degree. Monsen (2002) posited that too much external pressure on lectures to carry out school-based evaluation was counter-productive since it triggers suspicion of unclear agenda and is linked with a loss of control over professional issues.

In their study, Brehm and Brehm (2001) revealed that when evaluation is viewed as an exertion of authority or as a control intervention, reactance may be experienced by stakeholders. Reactance describes an aversive situation occasioned by the perceived restriction of, or threat to the autonomy of making a choice and making decisions. Threats to autonomy (or perceived loss of authority) happen when people view the connection between behavior and consequences to be out of their influence, or is not predictable.
Authority over, and predictability of, the relevant people environment, are considered as basic human needs (Fischer & Wiswede, 2007).

In his research, Horton (2001) established that in the case of M&E, people impacted in a way or another by the evaluation outcomes may suffer loss of authority if they did not participate in procedural decisions making throughout the entire process of evaluation and thus form a negative perception. The author concluded that situations that are not pleasant, which individuals choose voluntarily, are viewed as less aversive than unpleasant conditions in which subjects did not choose. Stakeholders may suffer reactance if they have to agree with evaluation queries, plan, measurement tools, and the basis of judgment as decided by an external individual, particularly if they are afraid that their performance will not be measured properly.

Patton’s (1997) study shows that perceptions on monitoring and evaluation are positive and may lead to utilization of results when the process is geared towards ownership and participation by all stakeholders. Patton stressed that intended project beneficiaries are most likely to utilize monitoring and evaluations outcomes if they understand and own evaluation the process and outcomes; they are most likely to understand and feel ownership if they actively participated in the process; and by actively engaging primary intended project beneficiaries, the individuals evaluating are training users on how to use the project, preparing the groundwork for use, and reinforcing the intended utility of the evaluation every step along the way.
Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework refers to a diagrammatic illustration that explains the link between study variables that are pertinent to the study. This is depicted in Figure 2.1.
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*Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework*

Source: Author (2020)

Discussion

The perception influencers including past experiences, power, reactance and stakeholder involvement. The announcement of the monitoring and evaluation process may make the involved employees to remember past negative experiences with evaluation and this may be influences by whether their expectations and needs were met in past M&E processes or not. If in the past M&E exercises employee needs and expectation were met or their ideas...
were considered, then they will support the process making it effective or resist it if they were not met making it ineffective. Management support will also influence the perception that employees hold on the process by giving it power as it will seen as the position that management holds not what the M&E staff holds and this neutralize any resistance.

Also, the M&E staff attitude towards influences effectiveness of the process. If for example the M&E staff have a positive attitude towards the M&E process, they will support the process making it effective. M&E staff attitude towards the M&E influences how well or otherwise employees will react to the M&E exercise. If M&E staff motives are perceived to be good and they possess unique expertise, then employees will react by supporting and trusting them and hence the M&E process will be effectively carried out. Similarly, with power, stakeholders may express agreement or resistance to the M&E process if the evaluation is viewed as potentially altering the power structure in existence, and if as a consequence, they adopt their own position and degree of influence over their environment either favored or endangered.

Summary

This chapter has presented the literature review that is pertinent to the study. It comprises of the theories on which the study was based, namely, the top-down theory and the theory of change. Also included in the chapter include the general literature review which offered a discussion of the perceptions and how they relate to M&E as a tool for project implementation. The chapter also provided a review of the empirical literature which consisted of past studies done on the topic of the study. The chapter lastly presented the study’s conceptual framework.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Research methodology describes the steps or order of occurrences required to design what
data is to be analyzed. It offers a framework of how the study is to be conducted (Kothari, 2014). Research methodology encompasses research design, data gathering approaches and data analysis to be used in conducting a research study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Research methodology is helpful in describing the research design to be applied which then determines the data gathering procedures used and analysis adopted. It is an approach of methodically solving a research problem. It may be interpreted as a science of studying how research is scientifically carried out. With a research methodology, different stages are considered that are generally used in exploring the research problem together with the logic behind them.

Research methodology responds to the following concerns; why a study was conducted and what definition is given to a research problem. It also guides and explains why the hypothesis has been formulated. It also provides the kind of data to be collected and what specific approach has been adopted. It equally centers on analysis and provides answers as to why specific technique of data analysis has been used (Kothari, 2014).

This chapter covers the research approach the study used including the research design and how the data was gathered. In addition, it presents the justification behind the methodology adopted and the validity and reliability of the selected research methods. It similarly gives
a description of the method applied by the researcher used to analyze employee perceptions on M&E as an instrument for measuring project implementation effectiveness.

Research Design

This describes the procedure that the researcher used to realize the objectives of the study. A research design is the conceptual framework within which a study is done and it includes the blueprint for data collection, measurement and analysis (Kothari, 2014). It is an approach of meeting research objectives through scientifically proven approaches. Cooper and Schindler (2003) viewed a research design as a structure for explaining the relationship among the variables of a research and provides procedures for every research operation, spanning from sampling procedures to data collection, analysis and presentation of results. Several research designs exist that can be applied in a study, namely exploratory, causal, descriptive, experimental, survey and case study designs (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). For the purpose of this study, a descriptive research design involving both quantitative and qualitative approaches was used.

Descriptive Research Design

Descriptive research design purposes to describe the state of affairs as they are at the present as the researcher holds no control over the variables and can only provide a report on what is exactly happening (Kothari, 2014). On the other hand, Cooper and Schindler (2003) defined a descriptive research as being designed to offer a picture of the situation as it naturally occurs. It may be employed to justify present practice and draw judgment and also develop theories. The design purposes to observe, describe and report element of a situation as it occurs naturally (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It does not consider any two
particular relationships, nor relate two or more variables. Descriptive research design seeks to secure the general overview of the phenomenon.

Further, Kothari (2014) stated that a descriptive research design describes the characteristic features of a specific individual, a group or a situation. It is best employed in illustrating attitudes towards a given issue or occurrence. The researcher settled on this research design as the study sought to establish perceptions held by staff at KeNHA in regard to M&E as a project implementation instrument, look at the basis for the established perceptions and determine how those perceptions influenced project implementation at KeNHA. It simply described the situation as it was.

Population
A population involves all items or cases in the research area under study. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) described a population as comprising all the people or items a research is going to be conducted on prior to sample size selection. However, the population must be carefully selected and described so as to come up with the best findings. This is because of the fact that a population that lacks the characteristics of the study may lead to different findings. The population of this study included all the 700 employees working at Kenya National Highway Authority in all 10 regions mainly: Central, North Rift, Lower Eastern, Upper Eastern, Nairobi, Nyanza, South Rift, Western, Coast and North Eastern

Target Population
A target population refers to a set of items having observable features that can be used to generalize the findings of a study (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It is a collection of subjects for which the study information are to be applied in making inferences. Hence, the
target population describes those items for which the results of the study are to be generalized. This differentiates it from the population which is the total population that the study is focused on. It is also called the accessible population (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008). For the purpose of this study, the target population was all the 500 employees at the KeNHA headquarters in Nairobi. The researcher considers that the information being sought to inform the study was best given by the mentioned target respondents. Table 3.1 illustrates the target population.

Table 3.1: Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Environment</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special projects</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample Size

A sample is a section taken from the target population (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Study of samples as opposed to the whole population led to economy in terms of funds and time (Stringer, 2008). The overall principle in research is to apply the largest sample so as to represent and generalize findings on the whole population (Gall, 1996). For a research to be representative of the population, Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) recommended a sample size of 10%-30% of the target population. Hence, 25% of the target population was adopted in constituting sample size for the study, which resulted in a sample size of 125 employees. Keya National Highway Authority had five departments and therefore the
researcher randomly selected 25 respondents from each department including the manager for each department to provide the required data for the study.

Sampling Techniques

According to Kothari (2014), two kinds of sampling techniques including probability and non-probability sampling. Probability sampling is premised on the idea of random selection which is an approach which ensures that each component of the population is considered and hold an equal chance of being selected (Bless & Smith, 2008). On the other hand, non-probability sampling is non-random and therefore subjective in nature as every subject or case in the population does not hold a known opportunity of selection. This study employed probability sampling and specifically stratified random sampling. It was most suitable as it gave all the study’s target employees an equal chance of being selected and therefore not biased.

Stratified sampling refers to a sampling approach whereby study participants are first categorized into classes called strata prior to the selection of those to respond to the research tool (Cooper & Schindler, 2003). The sampling method was applied to categorize the participants into five strata, namely planning and environment, design and construction, special projects, maintenance and finance departments. Simple random sampling method was then applied in the selection of the sample size from the different strata. The sampling method was applied due to the fact that it provided every employee in the target population an opportunity of being chosen to form the sample size. This sampling method was preferred since at KeNHA, every department undergoes monitoring and evaluation. Characteristics of the sample must be those employees that are on
permanent terms at KeNHA and must have taken part in monitoring and evaluation at any one time.

In using simple random sampling method, the researcher selected every 9th member after randomly selecting the first through 9th element as the starting point. Then 5 managers were interviewed separately through in-depth interviews. Table 3.2 illustrates the sampling process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Sample Size (25% of Target population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Environment</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Construction</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special projects</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Instruments

Cooper and Schindler (2003) defined data gathering tools as instruments employed in collecting empirical evidence so as to gain new understanding on a situation and answers questions on which a research is based. They encompass observations, focus group discussions, questionnaires, and interviews. The tools employed in gathering data mainly depends on the type of data, be it primary or secondary data (Kothari, 2014). The questionnaire and interviews were used in data collection for the study.

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) defined a questionnaires as written questions regarding of variables being investigated and in regard to which viewpoints of study participants are sought. A questionnaire can contain both open-ended or unstructured questions. Chandran (2004) posited that open-ended questions/ unstructured questions provide alternatives for
the study participants. Close-ended questions or structured questions on the other hand do not offer alternatives for the study participants to select from. For the purpose of this study, questionnaires had both open and closed ended questions and research assistants helped in their administration.

The suitability of questionnaire use in this study was based on the fact that they tend to encourage accurate answers from respondents thereby eliminating bias. They are also less expensive and an impersonal mode of data collection (Cannoway & Powell, 2010). The questionnaire is deemed useful by the researcher because it is time saving and it is easy to administer. On the other hand, use of interview schedules was justified because of the fact that they improve that quality data by allowing further probing to gain in-depth information and explanations behind the responses given which is not possible to get using a questionnaire (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016).

Types of Data

Cannoway and Powell (2010) defined data as the facts gathered by the researcher and it encompasses both primary and secondary data. Chandran (2004) defined primary data as one which is original in nature and constitutes the research work done previously or raw data that has not undergone interpretation or pronouncements that illustrate an official view or position. Secondary data on the other hand refers to data sources that includes the gathering and analysis of the secondary data (Bless & Smith, 2008). It’s a review of the existing literature in books, journals, reports and other written resources.

To realize the study’s objectives, primary and secondary information was employed. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) posited that data can be categorized into two, namely,
qualitative or quantitative data. Qualitative data is one that is in words and is about emotions and attitude. Quantitative data on the side is one that is measure in numerical terms (Kothari, 2014). Questionnaires were used to collect quantitative data, while interviews were used in collecting qualitative data.

Data Collection Procedures

Two research assistants were recruited and trained to help in data collection. The training centered on the steps to take prior to questionnaire administration, namely securing consent from KeNHA management and the participants, explaining to the participants the purpose of the study and its objectives, informing the participants that the data they were to volunteer was to be kept confidential and that their identity was to be anonymous. The questionnaires were then administered face to face, after which they were collected for analysis. A letter of introduction from Daystar University and a research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) was provided to management and respondents before administration of questionnaires.

For data collection using in-depth interviews, the researcher did not use research assistants, instead the researcher individually conducted them by visiting the interviewees’ offices and booking appointments for the interviews and the appropriate time convenient for them agreed. Face to face approach was used to conduct the interview. Consent from the respondents was sought prior to carrying out the interviews.

Pretesting

The questionnaires needed to be pre-tested before data collection for reliability. Pre-testing was done to identify weaknesses in the questionnaire. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) stated that pre-testing of research instruments helps the researcher measure their efficiency.
and improve clarity of the tools and their use. Cooper and Schindler (2003) further explained that pretesting enables errors to be noted and corrected. It equally serves as an instrument for training the research assistant before the actual data collection comes. Questionnaires were pretested on 10% of the sample size of 125 resulting in a pretest sample of 13 respondents in concurrence with Kothari’s (2014) recommendation. The researcher guarded the pre-test results from affecting the rest of the pool of data by only limiting their use to streamline the data collection tools. Care was taken not to include them in final data computation.

Data analysis Plan

During the process of data analysis, data was cleaned, numbered, and tabulated into manageable summaries (Kothari, 2014). The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0 was employed in quantitative data analysis. On the other hand, qualitative data was processed using thematic analysis methodology, whereby the collected data was classified into themes based on the study’s objectives. The findings were presented in form of frequency tables and figures.

Ethical Considerations

The objective of ethical considerations in a study is to facilitate the researcher to adhere to the correct procedures data collection and analysis. A clearance and an introduction letter was obtained from the Daystar University’s School Human and Social Sciences. A research permit was also obtained from the National Council of Science Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) to proceed to the field. Participation was an exercise of one’s own choice without manipulation. The respondents were informed on the nature and importance of this study and their consent was sought to participate the study. They were assured that
the information sought was to be used for the study and that they did not need to give their names. The researcher further assured them of the confidentiality with which the information they would give was to be held.

This study upheld the right to confidentiality. The researcher ensured the confidentiality of the information collected. The collected data was maintained in a secure place and was not used for other purposes other than for this study. Confidentiality offered had a positive impact of more open and honest responses. The respondents remained nameless. The identity of the participants was not disclosed on the questionnaires and also to other parties that were not involved in the research. This was achieved by use of codes on the questionnaires.

Summary

This chapter has presented a short overview of the research design used in the study. Descriptive research design was employed in the study. Primary data was used as the source of data, while KeNHA staff around the country served as the population. The target population was staff in 5 departments at KeNHA, Nairobi headquarters. The study employed random sampling as the sampling method. Additionally, it discussed the tools of data collection namely closed ended questionnaires and in-depth interviews. Approaches used in collection and analysis together with ethical principles observed in the study were also outlined.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

In this section, the collected data was processed and analyzed using SPSS version 21. The analyzed data is then presented and interpreted and inferences are made and conclusions made. These information is depicted in form of tables and figures for quantitative information generated from SPSS. Qualitative data transcribed and interpreted is presented in form of narratives.

Analysis and Interpretation

Response Rate

This research targeted 125 respondents from KeNHA headquarters in Nairobi County. From the 125 participants, 90 duly responded resulting in a response rate of 72%. According to Kothari (2012), a response rate that greater than 70% is very good. The 72% response rate was therefore adequate for analysis and reporting.

Demographic Characteristics

Gender of Respondents

The gender of the study participants was assessed so as to establish the gender representation in the study. Figure 4.1 shows the findings.
Results illustrated in Figure 4.1 indicated that 76% (68) of the study participants were male while 24% (22) were female. From the organization’s population the ratio was estimated to be three males to one female, an indication that both genders were well represented going by the simple random sampling in the study.

Period worked for KeNHA

The period that the participants had worked for KeNHA was investigated. From the responses, 72% (65) had worked at KENHA for 6 to 10 years and 28% (25) for between 0 to 5 years. The findings were in agreement with the reported data of the inauguration of the authority. Since it was established in 2008, all employees reported no more than 10 years work history in the authority. Table 4.1 depicts the outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of working (years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Education

The study participants’ level of education was examined, results of which are depicted in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results showed that the larger proportion of the study participants at 66% (59) had completed their undergraduate, 20% (18) were graduates, and 14% (13) had completed their secondary education. There was no respondent who had below secondary education. With such a distribution it indicates that the respondents were well educated to understand concepts in the study and be able to respond effectively.

Departments of the Respondents

The study further examined the department the study participants worked in. From the findings, 24% (22) of the respondents came from the finance department, 22% (20) from planning and environment, 20% (18) from design and construction, 18% (16) from special projects and finally 16% (14) from maintenance. These findings show a good distribution to get adequate responses from the target departments. Findings are shown in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Respondents’ Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and environment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and construction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special projects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position in the Department

The next question was about the position the respondents held in their departments, findings of which are depicted in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Position in Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position in Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Managers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service contractors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the findings, 6% (5) were managers, 10% (9) were assistant managers, 27% (24) were supervisors, 46% (42) were project officers and 11% (10) were service contractors. Such a distribution was adequate to respond to concepts regarding perception of M&E at KeNHA.

Keya National Highway Authority Staff Perceptions on M&E

Similarly, the researcher examined the employee perceptions about M&E at KeNHA. First, the participants were requested to state whether they knew M&E. Results showed that
100% (90) of the participants knew of M&E. This is an indication that the respondents were well versed with the dependent variable.

Use of M&E Departments

Results regarding the use of M&E departments are presented in Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct M&amp;E</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the interviews, the managers at KeNHA were required to indicate whether their departments conducted M&E. From the findings, 60% (3) said their departments conducted M&E. These department heads were from the planning and environment, design and construction and special projects departments. Similarly, 40% (2) of the participants stated that they did not conduct M&E. It was also revealed that exercises close to M&E at the finance and maintenance department were called appraisal and assessment. They related to M&E because they all dealt with issues of measurement and gauging fit between goals and practice.
Respondents’ Awareness of M&E

The respondents were subjected to statements that best described the respondents’ awareness of M&E and the findings are presented in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Respondents’ Awareness of M&E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For me M &amp; E is about;</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of project goals and objectives</td>
<td>91.0 (82)</td>
<td>9.0 (8)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making informed decisions about project intervention</td>
<td>96.0 (86)</td>
<td>4.0 (4)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the most effective and efficient use of resources</td>
<td>100.0 (90)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something going wrong in project implementation</td>
<td>98.0 (88)</td>
<td>2.0 (2)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of jobs</td>
<td>86.0 (77)</td>
<td>14.0 (13)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress and emotional fatigue</td>
<td>89.0 (80)</td>
<td>11.0 (10)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased workload</td>
<td>88.0 (79)</td>
<td>12.0 (11)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality in project implementation</td>
<td>96.0 (86)</td>
<td>4.0 (4)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate that 100% (90) of the respondents were of the view that M&E was about ensuring the most effective and efficient use of resources; an indication that they perceived M&E to be about program effectiveness. 98% (88) said M&E is about something going wrong in project implementation. This may suggest that they perceived M&E to be a fault finding exercise at KeNHA. 96% (86) said M&E is about making informed decisions about project intervention. Another 96% (86) said that M&E is a formality in project implementation. This could imply that M&E was more of an exercise that had to be carried out to fulfill program requirements rather than a necessity. 91% (82) of the respondents indicated that M&E was more about achievement of project goals and objectives. This could suggest that the respondents perceived M&E to be more objective oriented and goal oriented. Further, 89% (80) of the respondents said that M&E was about
stress and emotional fatigue. This indicates that the respondents perceived M&E to be a burn out exercise where there was likelihood to experience physical or mental collapse due to work related tasks. Similarly, 88% (79) of the respondents said M&E was about increased workload. This could imply that M&E was an additional task to what the respondents were required to complete in normal work time frame hence could be considered strenuous. Lastly, 86% (77) of the respondents said that M&E was about loss of jobs an implication that at KeNHA M&E was perceived as an exercise that costs people their jobs. This came up exclusively after the interviews.

The same information was sought from the key informants in the interviews. All 100% (5) said M&E is beneficial in program implementation. One of the key informants said as follows:

"Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems are very effective as project implementation tools. They inform project managers whether or not the implementation is going as expected, that project inputs, outputs and other factors are taking place as planned and if corrective measures are required to adjust implementation plans. Also M&E provides a good justification for funding from the donor community and if well executed it would see project success recorded in most programs undertaken in the Sub-Sahara and specifically developing countries." a General Manager in one of the departments reported.

This could be an indication that the leadership at KeNHA perceives M&E as a positive component of program implementation. It could imply that such kind of leadership permeates into the process of planning in the organization, management structures and processes.

Similarly, the study sought to find out the respondents’ perception about M&E. From the findings, 69% (62) perceived M&E as positive. This indicates that M&E was regarded as beneficial to that fraction of respondents. Also, 19%(17) respondents remained neutral in
regard to M&E perceptions, an indication that to them, M&E was neither beneficial nor detrimental. Further, 12% (11) of the respondents perceived M&E as negative, an indication that to them, M&E was detrimental. Study results are depicted in Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E Perception</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general perception from most of the key informants, was positive, while a few remained neutral. Neutral in this study meant that there were mixed feelings depending on the nature of evaluation in question. One of the managers who felt it was neutral stated as follows:

*In my department, the perception is not for M&E or against. The reason for this is because my department is one where intensive programmatic focus happens. Most assessments take place in my department as it is where most operations happen. And they are well aware in such a department M&E is a requirement and so they are always prepared. Issues stem in when they feel they do not have ownership of the program. This arises when there is only partial involvement in the project; when the donor exerts power as a control measure. Only then do I see my staff experiencing reactance.*

Another manager who thought his staff perceived M&E positively stated that:

*Staff in my department perceive M&E as positive and this is attributed to the many in-house evaluations done before external evaluations are done. This enables the staff gain confidence to own all aspects of the project and introduces a control aspect to the project. Once they feel they are key decision makers in the program they tend to get closely attached to the intervention and would do everything possible for success.*

These responses were an indication of how involvement and ownership were important aspects in program indication.
Basis of Staff Perceptions of M&E and Project Implementation

The study then sought to find out the basis for staff perceptions on M & E as a tool for project implementation at KeNHA. From the findings, 96% (86) said their basis for perception on M&E is from past experiences. This is an indication that what the staff at KeNHA has gone through in the past with regard to M&E has greatly influenced how they perceive it. 92% (83) said their perception was influenced by the culture at KeNHA. This was an implication that KeNHA’s shared assumptions, values and beliefs govern the staff perception about M&E. 88% (79) said that personal and organizational expectations influence their perception about M&E. This was an indication that presumptions play a critical role in how staff view M&E at KeNHA. Finally 74% (67) said their M&E skills influence their perception. The low response could be an indication that majority of the respondents do not have M&E skills and hence those who have, are influenced in their perceptions. Results are illustrated in Table 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past experience</td>
<td>96.0 (86)</td>
<td>4.0 (4)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and organizational expectations</td>
<td>88.0 (79)</td>
<td>12.0 (11)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The culture at KeNHA</td>
<td>92.0 (83)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My M&amp;E skills</td>
<td>74.0 (67)</td>
<td>26.0 (23)</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same information was sourced from key informants. One of the managers indicated that;
Past experiences with M&E at KeNHA have influenced greatly how the general staff has been acting every time it comes up. Most feel it comes in to introduce negative issues to the program. It is with this that the organization has set up a culture of accountability in all its operations and embraced names like assessment rather than M&E for comfort of the employee. Such assessments are imposed very early into any program so that it might not get the employees by surprise mid-stream or when the donor comes in to evaluate independently.

Perceptions on Influence of M&E on Project Implementation

In this section, there was need to find out how perceptions on M & E tools influence project implementation at KeNHA. From the findings, most responses revealed mixed feelings with responses ranging between neutral and agree/disagree. All the respondents agreed that their perception provided a way of assessing the vital relationship between implementers of the project, those set to benefit from the project and makers of decisions. This was an indication that their perception helped them understand how important relationships between the stakeholders were for successful program implementation.

Further, 78% (70) of the respondents agreed that their perception provided a forceful basis for raising funds and manipulating policy. This was an indication that when accountability and transparency comes in during M&E, then donors were easily convinced that the program was taking the right direction and could easily inject more funding into the project.

Mixed feelings were experienced when respondents were asked whether their perception fostered reactance towards project implementation. At 36% (32), the respondents were neutral about this. This could imply that the respondents were not sure whether their perception towards M&E affected their freedom of choice and decision making in the programs. A further 38% (34) were neutral as to whether their perception towards M&E allowed for active involvement in project implementation through ownership and utilizing
of findings. This could be an indication that once M&E was introduced, the practitioner
did not feel a sense of ownership of findings but rather it became a product to be consumed
by the donor. It could also imply that there was manipulation of information once M&E
came into play.

At 29%(26), respondents were neutral as to whether their perception enabled sourcing of
information that has helped in showcasing the project progress. This could imply that once
M&E is introduced it demotivates the practitioners to find any information that would be
of help to the program success; an indication that maybe the information is never taken to
consideration or the staff perceives it to be non-beneficial. Findings are depicted in Table
4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My perception has;</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabled sourcing of information.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a basis for questioning and testing assumptions.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a forceful basis for raising funds and manipulating policy</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a way of assessing the important relationship between project</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementers and beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostered reactance towards project implementation</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed for active involvement in project implementation through</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownership and utilizing of findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of Monitoring and Evaluation at KeNHA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were required to indicate how Monitoring and Evaluation was in their organization and findings are presented in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generates reports for transparency and accountability</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a source of information showcasing project progress</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reveals mistakes and helped in learning and improvements</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acted as a basis for allocating project funds</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped in control and timely completion of projects</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that 69% (62) of the study participants stated that M&E generated reports for transparency and accountability, 55% (50) indicated that M&E was a source of information showcasing project progress, 60% (54) stated that it revealed mistakes and helped in learning and improvements, 72% (65) stated that it acted as a basis for allocating project funds, 75% (68) indicated it helped in control and timely completion of projects.

The key informants were also required to state whether the process of M&E was beneficial. From the findings, 100% (5) of them said that M&E had been beneficial. One of the managers stated that:

“One of the managers stated that; “M&E at KeNHA has enabled an increase in results management, and a demand for rigorous and evidence based assessments which have in turn enabled successful and timely completion of programs at the organization. It mainly brings out the issue of accountability which is beneficial for all stakeholders. The strengths and weaknesses of the program are also brought out through M&E and this enables to find best practices moving forward”.

This was an indication that monitoring and evaluation was a mechanism of enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the project, by availing to organizational management and
other stakeholders project implementation progress reports and realization of the set objectives within the set budget and timelines.

Lastly, the researcher asked the managers whether there was need for improvement when utilizing monitoring and evaluation as a tool for project implementation by KeNHA. From the findings they all 100% (5) agreed there was need for improvement. Reasons for improvement that were coming out repeatedly were that staff perception should be enhanced to shun away the notion that M&E is a whistle blower mechanism. They also agreed that skills should be imparted on the staff by donor and continuous update of the same. Lastly according to them there was need to involve the staff from project inception for them to feel a sense of ownership and program entitlement.

Summary of Key Findings

Provided here below is a summary of major findings from the study;

1. Staff at KeNHA were aware of M&E and that they perceived M&E to be about program effectiveness. Further, it was found that the negative perception on M&E was about something going wrong in project implementation.

2. Sixty two (69%) of the respondents perceived M&E positively, indicating that M&E was regarded as beneficial. Similarly, 19% (17) were neutral on their perception to M&E, an indication that to them M&E was neither beneficial nor detrimental, 12% (11) perceived M&E negatively, indicating that to them M&E was detrimental.

3. The basis for the respondents’ perception on M&E was due to past experiences which greatly influenced how they perceived it. Further, perception was influenced by the culture at KeNHA in terms of shared assumptions, values and beliefs about
M&E. Personal and organizational expectations equally influenced the respondents’ perceptions about M&E and finally, M&E skills similarly influenced their perception about M&E.

4. All the respondents agreed that their perceptions on M&E provided a way of assessing the important relationship between programs implementers and those that to benefit from the project and makers of project decisions. This was an indication that their perceptions helped them understand how important relationships between the stakeholders were for successful program implementation.

Summary

In chapter four, data has been illustrated, analyzed and interpreted. Figures and tables were used in data presentation, while data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences was applied in data analysis. Chapter five provides the discussion of the study results, suggests recommendations, and draws conclusions from the study.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In this section, key findings are discussed, conclusions are made and the recommendations suggested made after the analysis and interpretation of data. The discussion is premised on the four objectives of the study. These objectives included to: analyze KeNHA’s staff perceptions on M&E as a tool for project implementation, to examine the basis for staff perceptions on M&E as a tool for project implementation at KeNHA, to explore how staff perceptions on M&E tool influence project implementation at KeNHA and finally to suggest recommendations premised on the results of the study.

Discussions of Key Findings

Staff Perceptions on M&E as a Tool for Project Implementation

The study found that the members of staff at KeNHA were aware of M&E and that they perceived M&E to be about program effectiveness. All the respondents view M&E as being about ensuring the most effective and efficient use of resources, an indication that they perceived M&E to be about program effectiveness. Further, 98% (88) respondents said that M&E was about something going wrong in project implementation. This may suggest that the respondents perceived M&E to be a fault finding exercise at KeNHA. Also, 96% (86) respondents indicated that M&E was about making informed decisions about project intervention. Another 96% (86) stated that M&E was a formality in project implementation. This could imply that M&E was more of an exercise that had to be carried out to fulfill program requirements rather than a necessity.
Similarly, 62(69%) of respondents perceived M&E positively, indicating that M&E was regarded as beneficial, while 19% (17) respondents were neutral on their perception of M&E, an indication that to them M&E was neither beneficial nor detrimental. Lastly, 12% (11) respondents perceived M&E negatively, indicating that to them M&E was detrimental.

A study by World Bank (2011) found that monitoring and evaluation was perceived as a way of enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of a project by availing organizational management and stakeholders with project progress reports and realization of its goals. Further, Schelle (2001) found that M&E systems are very effective as project implementation tools in that they inform project managers whether or not the implementation is going as expected, that project inputs, actions, outputs and external factors are taking place as planned and if corrective measures are required to adjust implementation plans. Schelle (2001) further found that M&E aims to enhance outcomes and effect. Additionally, Chottepanda (2011) perceived M&E to a systems that provides confirmation of project results and give reason for project funding allocations.

The findings of this study seem to be consistent with those of World bank (2011) and Schelle (2001) since all (100%) the staff at KeNHA were aware of M&E and that they perceived M&E to be about ensuring the most effective and efficient use of resources, an indication that they perceived M&E to be about program effectiveness.

On his part, Drewello (2001) examined the attitudes of project employees towards M&E and established factors that could explain the negative attitudes and resistance held by employees toward the evaluation process. The findings of this study are in concurrence
with Drewello (2001) since 98% (88) respondents perceived M&E to be about something going wrong in project implementation. This indicates that the respondents perceived M&E to be a fault finding exercise at KeNHA. This could be associated with sceptic factors that bring about negative attitude among staff. Similarly, Young (2007) stated that M&E is more of an exercise that has to be carried out to fulfill program requirements rather than a necessity, meaning that M&E had no bearing on the effectiveness of project implementation and therefore of no value and so a waste of resources. This assertion is consistent with finding of this study as 96% (86) respondents said that M&E was a formality in project implementation.

Horton (2001) asserted that M&E are ongoing processes and thus can reveal early signs of problems during project implementation. This information can be used by the project managers for corrective measures to ensure that the project goals and objectives are met and hence M&E tools are perceived as helpful and effective by the project managers (Horton, 2001). In this case it surpassed expectations as it was the general staff who gave such responses. Findings of this study are consistent with Horton’s (2001) assertion since 91% (82) respondents indicated that M&E was more about achievement of project goals and objectives. This was an indication that the respondents perceive M&E to be more objective oriented and goal oriented. With such responses it could be generally said the staff had some knowledge of what M&E was about.

United Nations Development Program (2009) posited that M&E is a mechanism for collecting and analyzing of information to ascertain project progresses. He argues that it is purposed at enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of a project and that it is based on set goals and planned actions throughout the planning stages of a project. Similarly, Meyer
(2004) indicated that M&E verifies whether progress is taking place against defined direction. Gitonga (2012) indicated that M&E offers management and the key stakeholders a continuing intervention with suggestions on the extent of objective achievement and progress in usage of allocated resources.

Basis for Staff Perceptions on M&E

The study found that the basis for perception on M&E was from past experiences (96%). This is an indication that what the staff at KeNHA had gone through in the past with regard to M&E had greatly influenced how they perceive it. Also, 92% respondents stated that their perceptions were influenced by the culture at KeNHA. This was an implication that KeNHA’s shared assumptions, values and beliefs governed the staff perceptions about M&E. Further, 88% of respondents said that personal and organizational expectations influenced their perceptions about M&E. This was an indication that presumptions played a critical role in how staff view M&E at KeNHA. Finally 74% respondents stated that their M&E skills influenced their perception. The low response could be an indication that majority of the respondents do not have M&E skills and hence those who have, are influenced in their perceptions.

According to Chikati (2009), past experiences are part of internal factors that affect perception and can be justified by the response. Also, Brauns (2003) stated that previous experiences with evaluation have a huge effect on perceptions. If employees’ experience is largely negative, the likelihood for future resistance toward evaluation heightens and the reverse is true. Findings of this study appear to be in concurrence with both Chikati (2009)
and Brauns (2003) as 96% (86) respondents indicated that their basis for perception on M&E was from past experiences.

Equally, Chikati (2009) and Young (2007) stated that perception begins with issues that capture our attention via the various sense organs. The authors added that the other things that could also influence our perception are things that we expect, previous experiences, customs, understanding and skills. The statement by Young (2007) are in agreement with findings of this study since 92% (83) respondents indicated that their perception was influenced by the culture at KeNHA. This implies that KeNHA’s shared assumptions, values and beliefs governed the staff perception about M&E. This means that what staff had experienced in the past over time in project implementation helped to shape how project activities were done in the organization. If what staff experience in project implementation was mostly positive, the possibility of repeating the same in the future towards evaluation increases and vice-versa is true. This then becomes the culture or the way of doing activities in the organization.

Further, 88% (79) respondents stated that personal and organizational expectations influenced their perception about M&E. This means that the staff had predetermined goals and performance expectation in mind when implementing projects, an indication that the predetermined performance expectations played a critical role in how staff viewed M&E at KeNHA. Finally, 74% (67) of the respondents said their M&E skills influenced their perception. This could mean that performance measurement in the past indicated that the staff members with M&E skills viewed M&E as contributing to effective project implementation. It can thus be deduced that perception is a combination of consciousness to stimuli and the interpretation of the same and this is what would determine how an
individual reacts. For the case of KeNHA organizational culture and staff expectations could explain this.

With the difference arising in regard to the basis of perceptions the respondents held on M&E, the study concludes that there are different assumptions, values and beliefs that governed the staff with regards to M&E and this definitely affects how they regard, understand and interpret M&E in the organization.

Staff Perceptions on M&E and its Influence on Project Implementation

Similarly, the researcher examined how the perceptions held by the staff at KeNHA about M&E influenced project implementation. From the findings, all the respondents agreed that their perception provided a way of assessing the fundamental relationship between individual implementing the project and those that are to benefit and those making decisions. This was an indication that their perception helped them understand how important relationships between the stakeholders were for successful program implementation. Further, 78% of the respondents agreed that their perception provided a forceful basis for raising funds and manipulating policy. This was an indication that when accountability and transparency comes in during M&E, then donors were easily convinced that the program was taking the right direction and could easily inject more funding into the project.

Mixed feelings were experienced when respondents were asked whether their perception fostered reactance towards project implementation, where 36% of the respondents were neutral about this. This could imply that the respondents were not sure whether their perception towards M&E affected their freedom of choice and decision making in the
programs. A further 38% (34) were neutral as to whether their perception towards M&E allowed for active involvement in project implementation through ownership and utilizing of findings. This could be an indication that once M&E was introduced, the practitioner did not feel a sense of ownership of findings but rather it became a product to be consumed by the donor. It could also imply that there was manipulation of information once M&E came into play.

Similarly, 29% (26) of the respondents were neutral as to whether their perception enabled sourcing of information that has helped in showcasing the project progress. This could imply that once M&E is introduced it demotivates the practitioners to find any information that would be of help to the program success; an indication that maybe the information is never taken to consideration or the staff perceives it to be non-beneficial.

Brauns (2003) stressed on the essence of agreeable philosophies and values between the person conducting the evaluation, clients and beneficiaries, particularly in regard to negative research outcomes. The same could be said to happen in the case of KeNHA since all respondents (100%) agreed that their perception provided a way of assessing the important relationship between individuals implementing the project, the project beneficiaries and those mandated with decision making. This was an indication that their perception helped them understand how important relationships between the stakeholders were for successful program implementation.

In his study, Horton (2001) found out that regarding M&E, the employees impacted by the evaluation can lose of control when they do not participate in decisions making during the
process of evaluation, hence, form negative perceptions. This, Horton said stems from exclusion from project stages and bring about accountability and transparency issues.

Horton (2001) also concluded that uncomfortable conditions which employees willingly opt for are viewed to be less aversive in that they are not easy to avoid than uncomfortable conditions that employees did not opt for. This means that people can handle well unpleasant situations that they choose rather than unpleasant situations forced on them since unpleasant situations voluntarily chosen stem from an informed background, hence, bearable. Another 78% of respondents agreed that their perceptions provided a forceful basis for fundraising and manipulating policy. This was an indication that when accountability and transparency came in during M&E then donors were easily convinced that the program was taking the right direction and could easily inject more funding into the project.

Mixed feelings were experienced when asked whether their perception fostered reactance towards project implementation. Thirty six percent (36%) of the respondents were neutral about this. This could be an indication that the respondents were not sure whether their perception towards M&E affected their freedom to choice and decision making in the programs.

A further 38% (34) were neutral as to whether their perception towards M&E allowed for active involvement in project implementation through ownership and utilizing of findings. This could be an indication that once M&E was introduced, the practitioner did not feel a sense of ownership of findings but rather it became a product to be consumed by the donor. It could also imply that there was manipulation of information once M&E came into play.
Patton’s (1997) study shows that perceptions on monitoring and evaluation are positive and may lead to utilization of results when the process is geared towards ownership and participation by all stakeholders.

Patton emphasized that intended users are more likely to use M&E results if they understand and have ownership of the evaluation process and findings. The intended users are more likely to understand and feel ownership if they have been actively involved. This could mean actively involving the primary users, training them on how to use the project, preparing the groundwork for use and reinforcing the intended utility of the evaluation every step along the way. Recording mixed feelings with this at KeNHA could mean program ownership for all stakeholders was not embraced fully.

Schelle (2001) indicated that M&E systems are very effective as project implementation tools in that they inform project managers whether or not the implementation is going as expected, that project inputs, actions, outputs and external factors are taking place as planned and if corrective measures are required to adjust implementation plans. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. Additionally, M&E systems provide confirmation of project results and give reason for project funding allocations (Chottepanda, 2011). According to a report by UNDP (2009), M&E is very effective as a project management tool in that it gives the only combined source of information showcasing the project progress, provides a basis for questioning and testing assumptions, provides a forceful basis for raising funds and manipulating policy and provides a way of assessing the important relationship between project implementers and beneficiaries on the ground and decision makers. These are among the few notable benefits of M&E.
Conclusion

Findings indicated that respondents viewed M&E as a tool for program effectiveness and that M&E was about making informed decisions about project intervention. The study therefore concludes that M&E was more about achievement of project goals and objectives. Further, since some respondents held negative perceptions with regards to M&E practice at KeNHA, the study concludes that objectives of project implementation will not be realized.

The study also concludes that past experiences, culture and M&E skills played a great role in forming the negative and positive perceptions held on the use of M&E as a measure of the effectiveness of project implementation. What the staff at KeNHA had gone through in the past in terms of accountability challenges and successes with regard to M&E had greatly influenced how they perceived it. If staff experience was mostly negative, the possibility for future resistance toward evaluation increases and vice-versa is true.

Further, it was found that personal and organizational expectations were factors that influenced staff perception about M&E. This means that the staff had predetermined goals and performance expectation in mind when implementing projects, an indication that the predetermined performance expectations played a critical role in how staff viewed M&E at KeNHA. The study therefore concluded that in order to effectively implement projects to the satisfaction of the members of staff and other stakeholders, it is critical to understand and consider their performance expectations in regard to the projects and by so doing, their maximum cooperation and goodwill will be guaranteed.
The study further concluded that the staff perceptions on M&E provided a way of assessing the relationship between project implementers and beneficiaries on the ground and decision makers, that is the importance of stakeholder relationships in project implementation towards project ownership and realization of goals and objectives. It was further concluded that M&E was seen as a basis for raising funds and manipulating policy. This is because accountability and transparency during M&E easily convinced donors that the program was taking the right direction and could easily inject more funding into the project.

Recommendations

1. The reviewed literature reveals that sceptic factors promote negative attitudes. It is on the basis of this revelation that this study recommends that KeNHA foster a positive culture while employing M&E in its programs. Such a positive culture would go a long way in ensuring M&E is adopted and perceived positively by its staff as literature shows that perception of something is based on how it tastes, it appears to the eyes, it tastes or how they heard about it. Such a culture would sharpen these stimuli points.

2. There is evidence that when perceptions on M&E are positive, they lead to ownership of the M&E results (Patton, 1997). The study therefore recommends that KeNHA should engage all staff more in all stages of program implementation to inculcate a sense of ownership. This will lead to embracing and utilizing of results for program success. Such inclusivity will reduce the aversive state brought about by the perceived restriction of, or threat to, the freedom of choice and decision making by the staff.
3. The study recommends that positive attitude towards M&E should stem from KeNHA’s leadership. If M&E at KeNHA is championed by the leadership in a project then it will be reflected in the organization’s planning and management systems and processes. If the leadership is negative about M&E or does not clearly understand its benefits to run a project better then it will be reflected in funding levels for M&E on whether there are dedicated posts for M&E in the project structure and in the level of attention that M&E receives.

Recommendations for Further Studies

The study recommends further studies as follows:

1. This study was a descriptive study that focused on the public sector. The researcher recommends a comparative study on government and the private sector to compare what perceptions each holds in regard to monitoring and evaluation of projects.

2. This study used both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The researcher recommends a similar descriptive study which is qualitative in design to allow comparison of the findings.

3. Another study could delve on the perceptions that project donors hold in regard to M&E in KeNHA and findings compared with those of primary beneficiaries and practitioners.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Research Questionnaire

Dear participant,

I am a Daystar University student. So as to satisfy the Masters of Arts in M&E requirements; I am conducting a study on “An analysis of staff perceptions on monitoring and evaluation as a tool for measuring effectiveness of project implementation- A case study of Kenya National Highway Authority. I request your support in volunteering information by completing the questionnaire here below. This is an academic research and therefore the information you would provide will only be used for academic purposes and will be maintained in confidence.

Questionnaire

Section A: Personal Information
1. Gender
   Male [ ]
   Female [ ]
2. For how long have you worked at KeNHA?
   1-5 years [ ]
   6-10 years [ ]
   11-15 years [ ]
   more than 15 years [ ]
3. (a) What is your highest Level of education?
   Primary [ ]
   Secondary [ ]
   Undergraduate [ ]
   Graduate [ ]
4. In what department in KeNHA do you work?
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(b) What position do you hold in the department?

Manager  [ ]  Assistant manager  [ ]  Supervisor  [ ]

Officer  [ ]  Other (specify) ______________________

SECTION B

5. Are you aware of monitoring and evaluation?

   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

6. If yes, which of the statements below best describe how you view monitoring and evaluation? (Tick as appropriate)

   Statement  
   For me M & E is about:  

   Achievement of project goals and objectives
   Making informed decisions about project intervention
   Ensuring the most effective and efficient use of resources
   something going wrong in project implementation
   Loss of jobs
   Stress and emotional fatigue
   increased workload
   Formality in project implementation

   Tick

7. Generally, what is your perception about/of Monitoring and Evaluation? (Tick as appropriate)
SECTION C

8. With reference to question 6 above, what is the basis for your perception about monitoring and evaluation as a tool for project implementation? (Tick as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>It’s based on:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>past experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal and organizational expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the culture at KeNHA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my M&amp;E skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other_________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D

9. How has your perception towards M&E influenced project implementation at KeNHA? (On a scale of 1 to 5. Where 5= Strongly disagree, 4=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 2=Agree and 1= Strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabled sourcing of information that has helped in showcasing the project progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a basis for questioning and testing assumptions in project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided a forceful basis for raising funds and manipulating policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided a way of assessing the important relationship between project implementers and beneficiaries on the ground and decision makers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fostered reactance towards project implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowed for active involvement in project implementation through ownership and utilizing of findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix B: In-Depth Interview

Section A: Personal Information

1. Gender
   Male [ ]
   Female [ ]

2. For how long have you worked at KeNHA?
   1-5 years [ ]  6-10 years [ ]  11-15 years [ ]  more than 15 years [ ]

3. (a) What is your highest Level of education?
   Primary [ ]  Secondary [ ]  Undergraduate [ ]
   Graduate [ ]

4. In what department in KeNHA do you work?

   (b) What position do you hold in the department?
   Manager [ ]  Assistant manager [ ]  Supervisor [ ]
   Officer [ ]  Other (specify) _______________________

5. Are you aware of monitoring and evaluation?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

6. Does your department conduct monitoring and evaluation?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Your interview guide should begin here.
1. what is your perception of monitoring and evaluation?

2. What is your basis for the perception you have mentioned in question 7 above?

7. In your opinion, what is the perception of monitoring and evaluation by staff in your department?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
________

8. Basing your answer on question 9 above, why do you think such is the staff perception towards monitoring and evaluation?

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
________

9. In your opinion has monitoring and evaluation been beneficial in KeNHA project implementation? Explain.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
________

10. In your opinion is there need for improvement when utilizing monitoring and evaluation as a tool for project implementation by KeNHA? Explain.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
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