

# INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PRACTICES IN COUNTY GOVERNMENTS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON SERVICE DELIVERY: A CASE OF MOMBASA COUNTY, KENYA

<sup>1</sup>Omar Adan Mohamud, <sup>2</sup>Johnbosco Kisimbii

<sup>1</sup>Master of Arts in Project Planning and Management- University of Nairobi

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, University of Nairobi.

[creativityglobalconsultancy@gmail.com](mailto:creativityglobalconsultancy@gmail.com)

---

**Abstract:** Studies have indicated a situation where despite the existence of monitoring and evaluation in various countries including Brazil, Colombia, South Africa and in Kenya, the practice has not been fully institutionalized. The purpose of this research was to establish the factors that contributed towards the institutionalization of M&E system in county governments with a special reference to Mombasa County. This was because current literature on M&E had not fully explored how to have a sustainable and fully institutionalized monitoring and evaluation system by way of ignoring some fundamental issues such as institutional pressures and leadership styles. The research was founded on four research objectives; establishing the relationship between institutional pressures and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa County, establishing the relationship between leadership styles and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa County as well as examining the relationship between resource characteristics and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa County. Further, the research sought to establish if top county management support had a bearing on institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa County. Institutionalization is an aspect deeper than mere implementation. The research is descriptive in nature. Data was collected by means of questionnaires through filling Likert type items. Analysis was done by SPSS software and MS excel. The findings on the first objective were that both internal and external pressures are associated with institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation and this is congruent with other studies. On the second objective it was established that transformational leadership style was more appropriate than transactional leadership style in support of some studies and contrast to others. On the third objective, both resources were appropriate but tangible resources were more relevant in institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices. Top management moderated the effect. Its recommended that adequate pressure should be exerted onto the institution by the stakeholders, transformational leadership style should be dominant, adequate resources should be made available and top management of the county must positively influence the process of M&E institutionalization.

**Keywords:** Normative pressures, coercive pressures, mimetic isomorphism, transactional leadership styles, transformational leadership, resource characteristics, institutionalization.

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is considered as an essential and crucial aspect in projects and programmes management. The process of monitoring and evaluating projects is a key practice for managing projects and programmes performance in terms of planning, decision making and as an economic policy management tool (Mugo and Oleche,

2015). Monitoring and evaluation play a significant role of improving project effectiveness, accountability and transparency on the use of public resources (IFRC, 2010). Leautier (2005) observed that monitoring and evaluation is apparently indispensable for it allowed for tracking of projects for corrective purposes thereby learning on the job as is also beneficial in the long term.

According to World Bank (2005), institutionalization is concerned with implementing systems that do perpetuate sustainable policies. It mainly answers the questions that include first, the degree to which the information commissioned by the primary stakeholders is useful to other stakeholders and the barriers therein if any, secondly, the kind of tools used i.e. type of performance indicators, frequency of reviews, performance audits, thirdly the issue of data reliability and validity and fourthly the sustainability of the monitoring and evaluation system. This is in tune with monitoring and evaluation adhering to the Project Management Maturity Model that considers the use of a common language, application of common processes, use of a similar methodology, benchmarking and continuous improvements as part of monitoring and evaluation (Kerzner, 1998)

In Africa, several countries have made good progress in institutionalizing monitoring and evaluation. South Africa is considered one of African countries with established M&E systems, established between 1980 and 1994 (Eitu, 2016). According to Charline (2010), this followed the increase in need for accountability from the South African public sectors. In 2009, the South African government introduced the outcome approach whose cardinal focus was to ensure improved performance through measurement of outcomes (Eitu, 2016). In Ghana, the monitoring and evaluation system focuses on direct observation of program results. The monitoring and evaluation system recognizes the entire results chain from inputs to outputs and includes indicators. In this system the results are the outputs or changes that may be attributed to a specific program. Thus, only where a causal link can be established is the observed change attributable to the program. In Tanzania performance management systems were mainstreamed between 2000 and 2006 in public sector institutions and monitored every six months. The tool was however not fully utilized for as in 2008, the tool was achieving 75% success. However, according to UNDP (2004), the information generated by tradition and participatory monitoring and evaluation do not demonstrate value for donor funds being invested to benefit poor communities.

#### **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:**

The purpose of this study was to establish the factors that contribute towards the institutionalization of Monitoring and Evaluation system in county governments with a special reference to Mombasa County.

#### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:**

- i. To establish the relationship between institutional pressures and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa County
- ii. To establish the relationship between leadership styles and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa County.
- iii. To examine the relationship between resource characteristics and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa County
- iv. To establish relationship between top county management support and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa County

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:**

#### **Institutional Theory:**

This relevance of this theory to institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices is as confirmed by Zhu et al., (2013) when they employed the theory to study the impact of institutional pressures on organizational performance. The theory contends that that the likelihood of an organization institutionalizing monitoring and evaluation principles and practices is based on the three aspects; need for legitimacy, coercion from authorities and copying successes. The Institutional theory gathered impetus in the 1970s after studies on the influence of institutional contexts on the structures of an institution (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). The theory got expounded so as to envelop a wide range of social researches. The theory is a framework for examining organizational phenomena. The theory contends that pressures from both inwards and outwards are the key drivers of an organization's move towards success. The theory suggests that for an organization to perform it must conform to their field's main practices (Scott, 2002).

**Leadership Theory:**

Cole (1996) defines leadership as a process whereby an individual influences followers towards contributing to the achievement of the group objectives. Kariuki (2015) studied the how various leadership styles influence project performance. A leader would influence followers by communicating his views, getting acceptance of the same and motivating the followers so that they support the implementation of the agreed views. According to Dulewicz & Higgs, (2005) leaders influence followers in different ways therefore a leader should have a combination of traits and skills.

Six schools of leadership theory exist; trait, behavioural, contingency, visionary, and emotional and competency school (Turner & Muller, 2005). This study is founded on the visionary theory which there is transactional and transformational leadership styles. The transactional leadership style puts on emphasis contingency rewards and management by exception. Contingency reward is whereby the leader agrees with follower's aspects such as goals, responsibilities, operating structure and reward to be received upon performance (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

**Resource Based View (RBV):**

According to Almarri and Gardiner (2014), Resource Based View of the firm got expounded in the 1980s through scholarly debates from various quarters including from Selznick in 1957. This theory contends that an organization's performance dependent on the exclusivity and rarity of the resources at the firm's disposal (Hart, 1995; Hart & Dowell, 2011). The RBV of the firm as a theory is widely used by project managers for it allows them to realign organizational resources strategically, identify the value of such resources and needful capabilities for the competitive advantage. It provides to project managers a snapshot of strength of an intervention. As applied in M&E institutionalization, the performance of the implementation of M&E process is a function of the resources; quality and quantity of human skills available, technology and funds. According to Musomba (2013) an organization's strength depends on her human skill capabilities. The UNDP (2009) handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluation for development results, emphasizes that human resource is vital for an effective monitoring and evaluation, by stating that staff working should possess the required technical expertise in the area in order to ensure high-quality performance.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE VARIABLES:****Institutional Pressures and Institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation:**

Zhu, Cordeiro and Sarkis (2013) did a study so as to establish the extent to which ISO 9000 mediates the relationship between domestic and international institutional pressures on one hand and the adoption of ISO 14001 management systems on the other. From a sample of 600 questionnaires to Chinese manufacturers from six main industrial sectors including chemical, electronic, automobile and pharmaceutical industries in various cities, 377 were returned duly filled. The sectors were chosen for their relatively high resource consumption levels as well as high level waste production. The questionnaire items were in form of Likert scales which are easy to analyze. A logic regression model was employed to test the mediating relationship. A logic regression model is suitable in the case of binary variables.

The findings were that both domestic and international institutional pressures lead to the successful implementation of ISO 14001. The findings concurred with the theory of institutionalization in that it indicated a relationship between internal capabilities and varied external pressures an organization faces. The research findings are significant in that it indicates that institutional pressures play a crucial role in driving organizational performance. However, the study was concerned with adherence to environmental issues and not monitoring and evaluation issues. Further, this study was based on private sector which is continuously embroiled in strict competitions.

**Leadership Styles and Institutionalization of Monitoring and Evaluation practices:**

Kusek and Rist (2004) note that successful implementation of a program is dependent on the type of leadership. Kissi, Dainty and Tuuli (2013) analyzed the impact of a manager's transformational leadership style on project success. The study used a sample of 350 project managers in the United Kingdom. The findings were that transformational leadership has a positive relationship with project performance. The study was however, based on a single case study which has a limited generalizability. In addition data was collected from project managers only.

In a similar study Tabassi and Babar (2010) examined the leadership style employed in construction industry. A sample of 107 sets of questionnaires respondent analyzed indicated that transformational leadership style is the common style in the Iranian construction industry. However, these results in contrast to the findings of Walker and Kalinowski (1994).

Further, the study was done on contractors only and hence suffers problem of generalizability. In 2005, Prabhakar (2005) examined the effect of transformational leadership style upon project performance. By use of data from 153 project managers out of 400 the study established that project manager's experience led to over half variance in the project performance. Even though the research observed that the project leader changes leadership styles during project execution, there was no indication of any relationship between the leadership styles adopted and project performance.

#### **Resource Characteristics and Institutionalization of Monitoring and Evaluation practices:**

Eitu (2016) conducted a research so as to establish the institutional factors that were responsible for successful implementation of Results based Monitoring and Evaluation in Uganda. The study had the specific objectives of first, examining how institutional factors determined the establishment of results based M&E, secondly to explore the relationship between organizational resources and the establishment of results based M&E and thirdly to establish how the organizational capacity affects the establishment of results based. The research employed a descriptive study design as the interest was only to understand the situation on the ground. The study used a sample of 34 from a population of 36. The study findings were thus; institutional factors had positive and a significant influence on the establishment of a results based monitoring and evaluation. The identified factors were carrying out baseline surveys, employee involvement, creation of indicators and top leadership support. These research results further established that the existence of a positively significant relation between organizational resources and the establishment of a results based monitoring and evaluation system. The resources were listed thus; availability of skilled M&E professionals, the availability and adequacy of the monitoring and evaluation budget and the presence of a fully functional monitoring and evaluation department. The study was however limited in generalizability because it was a case study.

#### **Top management Support and Institutionalization of Monitoring and Evaluation practices:**

Support from top management is expectedly a crucial factor in achieving project performance. Top management support is a critical success factor in project performance (Young & Jordan, 2008). Several studies have concurred on the value of top management support as an essential ingredient of project performance. According to Meredith and Mantel (2010) top management moderates the relationship between leadership styles and project performance. Boonstra (2010) observe that top management defines project scope. Iqbal (2014) contend that the influence of top level management in projects has not yet been accorded adequate. Kandelousi, Abdollahi and Ooi (2011) indicated that support from top management support is in various forms. Assisting teams when faced with hurdles, demonstrating dedication to a task and persuading the subordinates are the forms of support from the top management. Top management support lead to adequacy of resources needed for project performance, delegation of power to project leaders and project teams for performance. Iqbal, Long, Fei and Bukhari (2015) investigated the moderating influence of top management support on project performance. A total of 125 project managers were systematically sampled for the study. It was the finding of this study that top management has a positive relationship with project performance. The study however, just used the project manager's views which may have weakened the validity of the findings.

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **Research Design:**

This research adopted a descriptive and a cross-sectional study design. A descriptive design is appropriate for it describes the situation or phenomenon it is (Cooper and Schindler, 2014). Additionally, a cross sectional research design is appropriate since the study investigates a phenomenon that is static through the period of study. The design is suitable for it allows for the gathering of data at various points in time. The study entailed mainly the quantitative research methods. It is a systematic process to describe and test the relationship and also examine cause and effect interactions among variables.

#### **Target Population:**

According to Mombasa County website(2018), the county has ten departments namely Finance and Economic Planning department; Youth, Gender and Sports department; Tourism and Culture department; Trade, Investment & Industry department and Health department. Other department include Education and Children; Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries; Water & Natural Resources; Lands, Planning & Housing and Transport & Infrastructure. The county further has six administrative sub counties namely Mvita, Jomvu, Changamwe, Kisauni, Nyali, and Likoni.

**Sample Size and Sampling Design:**

According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2009) undertaking sampling ensures that the right sample is attained and this reduces the cost of data collection, improves preciseness and leads to speedy data collection and analysis. This study therefore used an appropriate sample as guided by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Accordingly the study is based on probability of committing type I error of less than 5 %, (i.e.  $p < 0.05$ ). The Krejcie and Morgan (1970) formula regularly used in social science studies is;

$$S = \frac{X^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2 (N-1) + X^2 P(1-P)}$$

Where;

S = Sample size

$X^2$  = table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level of 0.05 ( $X^2 = 3.841$ ).

N = population size.

P = *population* proportion (assumed to be 0.50 since this would provide the maximum sample size.

d = *degree* of accuracy expressed as proportion (0.05).

**Table 3.1: Sample Size**

Strata	Population(N)	Sample (S)
Departmental Heads	10	10
Departmental Deputy Heads	10	10
Sub county Heads	6	6
Sub county Deputy Heads	6	6
	<b>32</b>	<b>32</b>

**Data Presentation and Analysis:**

The IBM statistical software SPSS version 16 will mainly be used data analysis. This programme has been found reliable over many years and is easy to use. Data was presented as summaries in tables. A correlation analysis would then follow. A correlation analysis aims at describing the strength of an association between two variables by testing the degree of scatter of the data values. The less scattered the data values are the stronger the correlation is said to be (Kothari, 2014). Karl-Pearson's coefficient of correlation approach was employed for it is reliable and gives an indication of the strength of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

**4. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS****Association between Institutional Pressures and Institutionalization:**

Based on the research objectives the relationship between institutional pressures and institutionalization was done. The findings are as depicted in table 4.1.

**Table 4.1: Association between Institutional Pressures and Institutionalization**

		Normative Pressures	Coercive Pressures	Mimetic Isomorphism	Centralization	Acceptance	Methodology	Capacity Building
Normative Pressures	PePearson Correlation	1	.592**	.210**	.055	.246**	.005	.003
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.004	.452	.001	.944	.734
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Coercive Pressures	Pearson Correlation	.592**	1	.171*	.068	.061	-.134	-.240**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.020	.353	.412	.067	.001
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26

Mimetic Isomorphism	Pearson Correlation	.210**	.171*	1	.056	.051	.045	.581**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.020		.450	.497	.543	.000
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Centralization	Pearson Correlation	.055	.068	.056	1	.013	-.017	-1.01
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.452	.353	.450		.721	.813	.896
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Acceptance	Pearson Correlation	.246**	.061	.051	.013	1	-.023	-1.11
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.412	.497	.721		.957	.988
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Methodology	Pearson Correlation	.005	-.134	.045	-.017	-.023	1	-1.46
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.944	.067	.543	.813	.957		.991
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Capacity Building	Pearson Correlation	.003	-.240**	.581**	.057	-1.11	-1.46	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.734	.001	.000	.896	.988	.991	
	N	26	26	26	26	26	26	26

#### Association between Leadership Styles and Institutionalization:

Based on the second objective leadership styles were correlated with institutionalization. Table 4.2 displays the correlates of the association.

**Table 4.2: Leadership styles and Institutionalization**

		Transactional	Transformational	Acceptance	Capacity Building
Transactional	Pearson Correlation	1	.199**	.237	.393**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.442	.001
	N	26	26	26	26
Transformational	Pearson Correlation	.199**	1	.741**	.462**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.001	.001
	N	26	26	26	26
Acceptance	Pearson Correlation	.237	.741**	1	.056
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.442	.001		.450
	N	26	26	26	26
Capacity Building	Pearson Correlation	.393**	.462**	.056	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.450	
	N	26	26	26	26

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.2 shows that transformational style correlates with acceptance ( $r = .741$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ) and with capacity building ( $r = .462$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ). The research hypothesis tested was that there was a relationship between leadership style and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in Mombasa county. The findings were that both types of leadership were positively and significantly related to institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation. However, transformational



leadership had a stronger association with institutionalization. Again the researcher rejected the null hypothesis on the second objective and accepted the alternative hypothesis. Leadership style had a relationship with institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in Mombasa county. Transformational leadership had a higher association with institutionalization. The findings are consistent with Kusek and Rist (2004) assertions that leadership influences institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation. They are also consistent with Tabassi and Babar (2010) and Kissi, Dainty and Tuuli (2013) on transformational leadership being related to institutionalization to some extent.

#### Relationship between Resource Characteristics and Institutionalization:

The next objective was geared at finding out any association between resource characteristics and institutionalization. Resource characteristics are indicated by whether they are tangible or they are intangible. The indicators of institutionalization used are centralization, acceptance, and capacity building. Table 4.3 summarizes the analysis.

**Table 4.3: Correlations between Resource Characteristics and Institutionalization**

		<b>Tangibility</b>	<b>Intangibility</b>	<b>Centralization</b>	<b>Acceptance</b>	<b>Capacity Building</b>
<b>Tangibility</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	.256**	.496**	.530**	.690**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.001	.000
	N	26	26	26	26	26
<b>Intangibility</b>	Pearson Correlation	.256**	1	.388**	.430	.472
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.001	.076	.958
	N	26	26	26	26	187
<b>Centralization</b>	Pearson Correlation	.496**	.388**	1	.351**	.333
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001		.000	.637
	N	26	26	26	26	26
<b>Acceptance</b>	Pearson Correlation	.530**	.430	.351**	1	.294
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.076	.000		.046
	N	26	26	26	26	26
<b>Capacity Building</b>	Pearson Correlation	.690**	.472	.333	.294	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.958	.637	.046	
	N	26	187	26	26	26

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed).

Table 4.3 displays that tangible resources were significantly and highly correlated to centralization of monitoring and evaluation ( $r = 0.496$ ,  $p = .000$ ), to stakeholder acceptance ( $r = 0.530$ ,  $p = .001$ ) as well as to capacity building ( $r = 0.690$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). Intangible resources are also correlated to institutionalization ( $r = 0.388$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) for centralization. The alternative hypothesis that there is a relationship between resource characteristics and institutionalization is therefore accepted. However the correlations for intangible resources were weaker than those of tangible resources. These findings were partly consistent with Eitu (2016) who established a relationship between intangible resources and implementation of Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation and Katou (2008) who found a positive relation between human resource and performance.

#### Association between Top Management and Institutionalization:

Top level management is a moderating variable as per several studies. Top level management is indicated by three indicators; dedication to institutionalization by the top level management, levels of persuasion by the management as well as the kind of support top management offer. Respondents were asked to indicate by the Likert scale the extend of top level dedication, persuasion and support have on institutionalization. The responses are summarized in table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Correlations between Top Management Influence and Institutionalization

		Management Influence	Institutional Pressures	Leadership Styles	Resource Characteristics
<b>Management Influence</b>	Pearson Correlation	1	.274**	.289**	.324**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.001
	N	26	26	26	26
<b>Institutional Pressures</b>	Pearson Correlation	.274**	1	.058	.130
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.433	.076
	N	26	26	26	26
<b>Leadership Styles</b>	Pearson Correlation	.289**	.058	1	.592**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.433		.000
	N	26	26	26	26
<b>Resource Characteristics</b>	Pearson Correlation	.324**	.130	.592**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.076	.000	
	N	26	26	26	26

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed).

Table 4.4 indicates that management influence has a positive and significant relationship with the three independent variables; institutional pressures ( $r = .274, p < 0.000$ ), leadership styles ( $r = .289, p < 0.000$ ) and resource characteristics ( $r = .324, p < 0.000$ ). The same findings are mirrored by the descriptive analysis in table 4.5. The findings imply that top management moderated the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable. The alternative hypothesis is therefore accepted that top management moderates the relationship between the independent variables and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in Mombasa county projects.

Table 4.5: Top Management Influence

Participation Type	Responses						
	N	Never Freq(%)	Little extend Freq(%)	Unsure Freq(%)	Great extend Freq(%)	Very Extend Freq(%)	Great Mean( $\mu$ )
Dedication	26	0 (0%)	1(2.6%)	4(15%)	11(43.6%)	10(38.8%)	4.07712
Persuasion	26	5(18.5%)	4(18.1%)	7(27%)	5(25.1%)	5(25.1%)	3.03846
Support	26	1(0.04%)	1(4.8%)	3(10.0%)	12(44.5%)	11(41%)	4.42308

According to the summary in Table 4.5 management influence has a bearing on the three independent variables. Dedication as well as support influences were gauged as being above great extent while persuasion is at least above unsure. On average all dimensions of management have a more than average impact on the independent variables. The findings captured here reflect Meredith and Mantel (2010) claim that top management is a moderator of leadership styles and performance. The findings also support Iqbal, Long, Fei and Bukhari (2015) who established that top management influence was indeed a moderating variable.

## 5. SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The main purpose of this study was to establish the factors responsible for success in institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices in Mombasa county government. Descriptive research study was adopted in an attempt to attain the research objectives and goal. Research data was gathered from 26 officers out of a target of 32; county departmental heads and their deputies together with sub county heads and their deputies. These officers were chosen because it is believed that they had adequate knowledge on the subject of research. The research had a response rate of above 80 percent.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is considered as an essential and crucial aspect in projects and programmes management. The process of monitoring and evaluating projects is a key practice for managing projects and programmes performance in terms of planning, decision making and as an economic policy management tool (Mugo and Oleche,



2015). Monitoring and evaluation play a significant role of improving project effectiveness, accountability and transparency on the use of public resources (IFRC, 2010). Leautier (2005) observed that monitoring and evaluation is apparently indispensable for it allowed for tracking of projects for corrective purposes thereby learning on the job as is also beneficial in the long term.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The research aimed at establishing the relationship between various variables and institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation using various research objectives. Based on results of the relevant hypothesis tests the research concludes as follows; that first both internal and external pressures are associated with institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation and therefore it is beneficial to have pressure to an organization. Second, transformational leadership style as well as tangible resources areas relevant in institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation practices. Third top management moderates the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the study findings this research recommends that for monitoring and evaluation practices to be meaningful by way of becoming mature, adequate pressure should be exerted onto the institution by the stakeholders. In addition, transformational leadership style should be dominant as far as monitoring and evaluation issues are concerned. Further, resources must be availed. The research also concludes that top management of the county must positively influence the process of M&E institutionalization.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bamberger, M. (2009). *Institutionalizing Impact Evaluation within the Framework of a Monitoring and Evaluation System*. Washington, D.C. Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank
- [2] Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press, Collier Macmillan.
- [3] Casley, D. and Kumar K., (2008). *The collection, Analysis and use of Monitoring and Evaluation Data*. Maryland: World Bank.
- [4] Charline Mouton. (2010). *The history of program evaluation in South Africa*, MPhil thesis, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa
- [5] Christmann, P., Taylor, G., (2001). Globalization and the environment: determinants of firm self-regulation in China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 5(7), 23 – 29
- [6] Cole, G. A. (1996). *Management: Theory and practice*, 5th Ed. Ashford Color Press: London
- [7] Cooper, D., & Schindler, P. (2014). *Business Research Methods* (12th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- [8] Cordeiro, J.J. et al. (2009). International and Domestic Pressures and Chinese Organizational Responses to Greening. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, 2(6), 52 - 66
- [9] Eitu, I. (2016). *Success Factors for Establishment of a Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation System at Advocacy for Vulnerable Children's Rights (AVCR), Uganda*; M.A Thesis
- [9] Gomes, J & Romão, M, (2015). Maturity, Benefits and Project Management Shaping Project Success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 5(7), 1 - 14.
- [10] Ibanga, G. V. (2016). Effect of Human and Non Resources Monitoring and Evaluation institutionalization in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 4(2), 334- 349
- [11] IFRC. (2011). *IFRC (2011). Project/programme monitoring and evaluation (M&E) guide*. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Geneva. Geneva: IFRC.
- [12] Iqbal, J., Long, C.S., Fei, G.C. & Bukhari (2015). Moderating Effect of Top Management Support on Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Project Success. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*. 9 (2), 540-567
- [13] Jugdev, K. (2004). Through the looking glass: examining theory development in project management with the resource-based view lens. *Project Management Journal*, 35(3), 15–26.

- [14] Kanda, E. (2014). Impact of Top Level Influence on Project Performance in Community Projects. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development*, 2(7), 7 - 13.
- [15] Kandelousi, N. S., Ooi, J., & Abdollahi, A. (2011). Key success factors for managing projects. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 59, 1826-1820.
- [16] Kariuki, J. (2015). Project manager leadership style, teamwork, Project characteristics and performance of Water projects in Kenya; PhD Thesis.
- [17] Kerlinger, Fred N. (2012). *Foundations of Behavioural Research*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- [18] Kerzner, H. (1998). *Applied Project Management: Best Practices on Implementation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [19] Kissi, J., Dainty, A., & Tuuli, M. (2012). Examining the role of transformational leadership of portfolio managers in projects performance. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(4), 485-497.
- [20] Kothari, C. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- [21] Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607 - 610.
- [22] Kusek, J. Z., & Rist, R. (2010). *A Hand Book for Development Practitioners; Ten Step to a Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation Systems*. Washington D.C: World Bank.
- [23] Mackay, Keith. (2007). *How to Build monitoring and evaluation Systems to Support Better Government*. Washington D.C: World Bank.
- [24] Mackay, K. Rojas, F. & Saavedra, J. (2006). Towards the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation systems in Latin America and the Caribbean: *proceedings of a World Bank/inter-American Development bank conference*
- [25] Manuel Fernando Castro (2008), *Building a Results-Based Management and Evaluation System in Colombia*, Independent Working Group , World Bank. Revised No. 1, South America
- [26] Meredith, J. R., & Mantel, S. J. (2010). *Project Management A Managerial Approach* (7th ed.): John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [27] Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2008). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Techniques*. Nairobi: ACTS Press.
- [28] Mugo, P. M., & Oleche, M. O. (2015). Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Projects and Economic Growth in Kenya. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences*, 2(6), 52 - 63.
- [29] Musomba, T. (2013). Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation of Constituency Development Fund (CDF) in Chagamwe Constituency Kenya. *JiARM*, 1(8), 32- 37.
- [30] Nduati, R. N (2011), "Development Plans in Kenya: Factors influencing Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Projects," M.A Economics Thesis. Nairobi: University of Nairobi Press.
- [31] OECD. (2003) *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. Paris: OECD.
- [32] Serra, C.E. M & Kunc, M. (2014). Benefits Realisation Management and its Influence on Project Success and on the Execution of Business Strategies. *International Journal of Project Management*, 5(7), 1 - 14.
- [33] Tabassi, A. A., & Babar, S. (2010). Towards assessing the leadership style and quality of transformational leadership. The case of construction firms of Iran. *Journal of Technology Management in China*, 5 (3), 245-258.