

# **INTERACTION BETWEEN MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK TARGETS AND STAKEHOLDERS' SATISFACTION: A CASE OF MIRIKI WATER PROJECT, MERU COUNTY, KENYA**

**Ngechu Margaret Njeri**

Master of Arts in Monitoring and Evaluation, Africa Nazarene University, Kenya

**Dr. Veronica Kaluyu**

Business School, Africa Nazarene University, Kenya

©2020

**International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management (IAJISPM) | ISSN 2519-7711**

**Received:** 26<sup>th</sup> June 2020

**Published:** 8<sup>th</sup> July 2020

Full Length Research

**Available Online at:** [http://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajispm\\_v3\\_i6\\_56\\_70.pdf](http://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajispm_v3_i6_56_70.pdf)

**Citation:** Ngechu, M. N. & Kaluyu, V. (2020). Interaction between monitoring and evaluation framework targets and stakeholders' satisfaction: A case of Miriki water project, Meru county, Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management*, 3(6), 56-70

## **ABSTRACT**

Project performance in terms of time, budget, accountability and overall satisfaction is key in measuring stakeholders' satisfaction. A monitoring and evaluation framework evaluates the performance of the project while giving the underlying issues. The study seeks to assess the interaction of selected monitoring and evaluation framework targets and stakeholders' satisfaction in a CDF water project at Miriki. The study was guided by stakeholder theory and program theory. A sample of 268 was derived using Yamane formula which comprised of beneficiaries of the project, CDF committee members, the project manager and national government representative. Data was collected using semi-structured questionnaires and an in-

depth interview schedule. Data analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 23. The hypothesis was testing at 0.95 confidence level showed that there was a positive and significant relationship between stakeholder involvement targets and stakeholders' satisfaction ( $0.682 \leq r \leq 0.868$ ), financial management targets and stakeholders' satisfaction ( $0.567 \leq r \leq 0.745$ ). The findings of this study may be useful to CDF committee, county governments and other organization that strive to improve project success and stakeholders' satisfaction.

**Key Words:** *monitoring and evaluation framework, stakeholders' satisfaction, stakeholder involvement, financial management*

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**

A framework is a planning tool which helps in creating and clarifying projects, theories, assumptions and activities thereby ensuring efficiency, transparency and straight forwardness. A monitoring and evaluation framework (M&E) is used to achieve goals and objectives by tracking and ensuring desired success for value. It comprises of a schedule or timetable for main activities, indicators and data collection methods, responsibilities for each component, reporting requirements including formats and frequencies and a budget. Pasanent and Shaxson (2016) indicated that the M&E framework areas shows strategy and direction (is the right thing being done), management and governance (is the plan being implemented as effectively as possible), outputs (do they meet the standards and are they appropriate) and outcomes and impacts (what kind of change has the project contributed). Parson, Gokey and Thornton (2013) also noted that M&E framework was used to track resources used in developing programs and activities of a project.

In a report by the Republic of Kenya (2016) on strategic investment framework for sustainable land management, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources formulated a M&E

framework designed to ensure that there was well documentation of intervention, outcomes and impacts at all levels, policy makers, an agreement on common set of indicators at community and national levels and realistic targets set for each indicator. However some M&E frameworks lack appropriate constructions like the one in Saudi-Arabia( Aloitaibi, 2011) while others were not functional due to lack of funds like the one in Mauritania (CEDARE, 2014) whereby the M&E framework formulated in 2009 for water supply stopped in 2011 due to lack of funds.

Logical framework (logframe) is the most commonly used approach in project management for the purpose of planning and monitoring of projects. According to Martinez (2011) logframe matrix is applicable for both governmental and non-governmental organizations that are involved in development activities. Logical framework shows key elements of a project design and relationship to make sure the project is on track while giving bases for what needs to be monitored during implementation, setting clear project objectives and define indicators and outlining assumptions on which the project is based on.

### **Stakeholder Satisfaction**

Satisfaction being a psychological phenomenon is difficult to measure (Yang & Zhu, 2016). Oliver (2012) defined the concept of satisfaction as “the consumer fulfilment response”. He argues that satisfaction is a form of reinforcement. Stakeholders’ satisfaction has been defined as a measure of performance against stakeholders’ demand. Obunwo (2013) while citing Leung et al (2008) indicated that stakeholders’ satisfaction focused on individual and inter-stakeholders’ skill, attitude and morale while carrying out the project. To emphasize this Alexanda et al (2005) opined that trust between stakeholders, fairness, equity and honesty been crucial for achievement of successful stakeholders’ satisfaction.

According to Rani (2016) satisfaction is assessed in terms of cost (the completion of project within budget costs), time (project carried out appropriately within the period time set) and quality (the output of activities meet the required criteria and specification). In water projects, stakeholder satisfaction is determined by assessing access to safe water, equitable access to sufficient and affordable quantity of water for drinking, cooking and personal hygiene and M&E reports which include the percentage of budget allocation. . Obunwo, Chinyio and Suresh (2013) stated that through effective planning, communication, knowledge management, training and post project review and evaluation, stakeholders are responsible for the satisfaction of other stakeholders’ as their independent activities have an overall to the nature of final project. In this case, stakeholder satisfaction will be determined by assessing access to safe drinking water, project completion, completion of the project within the allocated budget and accountability of funds.

## **Water Supply**

Access to water is an inalienable right of all persons. GLASS (2014) acknowledged that two third of countries globally recognize the human right to water and sanitation in their constitution. For instance in Kenya, the Bill of Rights under Article 43 of the constitution 2010 preserves the right for all persons in Kenya to clean and safe water in adequate quantity and reasonable standards of sanitation. According to UNICEF (2015), communities had fallen short of the MDG target of reducing by half the number of people not having access to safe water by 2015.

Despite rural water supply in India increasing from 73.9% to 77.2% between 2012 and 2016, Water Aid India (2017) noted that 75.8 million people in India were without access to clean water. The parameters they used in defining access to water was a water source within the vicinity of 1.6 kilometers to households. In a report by UNICEF/WHO (2015), 319 million people in sub- Sahara are without access to improved drinking water sources. Donnenfeld, Crookes and Hedden (2018) for instance, acknowledged that South Africa was a water scarce country. Kamara et al. (2017) in their study on understanding the challenges of improving sanitation and hygiene outcomes in a community based intervention; a case of rural Tanzania, found that majority of Tanzania population received water from unimproved sources without sufficient quality monitoring capacity.

The MDG target was to ensure that almost 72% of Kenyans have access to improved water supply by 2015. In 2007 Vision 2030 was rolled out. In the blue print, it aimed at reversing the decreasing trends of water availability and to elevate access to safe water. In the National Water Service Strategy (NWSS), the GoK aimed at achieving 80% and 75% access to safe water and reliable water in urban and rural areas respectively by 2015 (Ministry of Water and Irrigation, 2007). As at 2015, Kenya had achieved 63% water coverage which was below global MDG for developing countries. In a journal on challenges faced by Kenya Water Sector management in improving water supply coverage by Chepyegon and Kamiya (2018), facilities development in rural areas are normally handed over to community groups after installation who are expected to maintain and meet the maintenance and operation costs.

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Access to clean and affordable water by 2017 for Igembe North residents (Mwiti, 2014) has not been realized. Despite the lobbying for CDF funds and some community experts being involved in the venture through identifying areas where water points would be established, the residents of Miriki still do not have access to safe clean and affordable water within a distance of 2 kilometers or less. According to Mutua (2013), CDF projects are characterized by low level of stakeholder involvement in M&E, lack of or little information, lack of transparency and accountability among stakeholders in the M&E process. Even with an M&E framework to aid in assessing projects, many rural water supplies completed are dysfunctional, have stopped working or are not operating

optimally thus Kahilu (2010) raising the question as to whether M&E applied is effective enough to attain project success. The absence of a comprehensive M&E framework with appropriate targets in Kenya may cause failure to achieve its target of 100% of population having access to safe and clean water by 2025. The researcher has not come across any other study carried out in relation to the interaction between M&E framework targets and stakeholder satisfaction in Kenya on CDF projects particularly in Miriki.

## **GENERAL RESEARCH OBJECTIVE**

To establish the interaction of monitoring and evaluation framework targets and stakeholders' satisfaction in Miriki water project.

## **SPECIFIC RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

1. To establish the relationship between stakeholder involvement targets and stakeholders' satisfaction in Miriki water project.
2. To assess the relationship between financial management targets and stakeholders' satisfaction in Miriki water project.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **Stakeholder Theory**

According to Freeman (2010), stakeholder theory recognizes stakeholder group of any given project, designates and endorses methods through which management can use with regards to the interest of the group. Stakeholder theory has been used to identify and model groups which stakeholders of a project, describe and recommend methods aimed at meeting the interests of these groups. Mansuri and Rao (2004) suggested that stakeholders are identified in input-output model to also include their interests and claims of non-stake holding groups. In the view of Patton (2008), stakeholder theory enables managers to understand all stakeholders and strategically manage them. Stakeholder theory is relevant to this study as it offers descriptive (describes ways of identifying stakeholders and their relative influence), instrumental (gives the links between stakeholder management and financial performance, enabling factors to attaining the objectives) and normative (gives an explanation of how things ought to be done) perspective. Its application on CDF projects implies adhering to belief where all actors are involved.

### **Program Theory**

Program theory has been used as a guide to evaluation due its capacity to sort a problem by resolving the needs in the needs assessment. Program theory is a statement of the postulation about why the intended outcomes would be affected by interventions. To ascertain this, Chen (1990)

defined program theory as a specification of what ought to be done to attain the goals desired, what other vital impact maybe anticipated, how these objectives and impact would generated. This therefore implies that, program theory comprises of a set of statements describing a certain program/ project, explains the why, the how, and under what conditions the program/project effects happen, predict outcomes and to clarify requirements necessary to accomplish desired program effects (Sedani & Sechrest, 1999). Program theory has been found to management influence on M&E systems and involvement of all stakeholders in development projects. Donaldson (2012) noted that program theory acts as a guide on areas that need to be stressed on during evaluation while McClintock (1990) alluded that the theory aided in decision making and enlarging conception of solutions to problems in any project.

## **EMPIRICAL LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Relationship between Stakeholder Involvement Targets and Stakeholder Satisfaction**

Blackburn (2019) defined stakeholders as individuals or groups who will be impacted or can influence the success or failure of activities of an organization. Githua (2015) in her study on factors influencing performance of community water project in Njoro found that 82.5% of the respondents felt that community involvement is an important aspect to the success of a project. . Involvement according to Donald (2003) is a discussion of “how, what, and why” of a project. Chetere (2004) and Chambers (2009) alluded that involvement empowers beneficiaries in terms of need identification, planning on use of resources and implementation of development initiatives. However involvement should be managed carefully. Too little involvement makes it a one-sided affair while too much involvement would lead to unnecessary influence in monitoring and evaluation.

Pham (2016) noted that stakeholders were involved at different stages of the projects starting from project identification, implementation and operations. In Quand Tri, lack of stakeholder involvement in project activities not only influenced the quality of the project but also the poor performance of project sustainability thus did not meet the requirements of the beneficiaries. Ntaganda and Mulyungi (2018) in a study done on role of stakeholder participation on performance of savings groups projects in Rwanda emphasized that stakeholder participation is quite influential in project performance.

Mungatu and Mulyungi (2017) noted that failure to involve key stakeholders in the initial and planning stages of a project cycle led to project delay and also increase cost of project relocation and redesigning. They found that project outcomes and stakeholders involvement in project identification showed a positive coefficient of 0.571 with p- value of 0.02. The duo also found that stakeholders’ involvement in project implementation and the outcome of the project had a positive association where the correlation coefficient is 0.971 with p-value of 0.025.

Wamagu and Ogolla (2017) did a study on the role of stakeholder participation on performance of CDF projects in Mathira. They found that participation in the start of a project and the performance of the project are significantly related and had a positive correlation ( $r=0.593$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). Their findings also stipulate that participation in project planning and performance are significantly related ( $r=0.508$ ,  $p=0.000$ ). The duo recommended strengthening of stakeholder participation by the CDF management board.

### **Relationship between Financial Management Targets and Stakeholders' Satisfaction**

Financial management is a process of managing financial resources including budgeting, risk management, accounting and financial reporting. Most CDF projects are characterized by anomalies in procurement, lack or receipts issued, unaccounted for funds, inadequate funding, delayed funding and irregular monitoring and evaluation of the funds.

Countries like Jamaica have put in place mechanisms to ensure accountability and transparency. The government of Jamaica has allocated 0.5% of the national budget for CDF. The mechanism laid down includes monitoring processes, ensuring that no money is allocated directly to members of parliament (MPs), ensuring that projects being implemented are subjected to Jamaica Government's procurement guidelines and financial audit Act and administration. In a study by Calow et al. (2012), rural water supply in Ethiopia was characterized by a range of financial modalities set against backgrounds of political and administrative decentralization. They noted that measures like transparency in the allocation of block grants, funds disbursement in accordance to strict criteria seemed to be strictly controlled. They further noted that the financial statements and records for these projects were not easy to come by despite the theoretical aspect of that they should be available and recommended that financial reports should be compiled and well completed

In Kenya, financial management has been quite a challenge in CDF projects. Okungu (2008) stated that 70% of the constituencies had reported mismanagement, misappropriation of CDF, theft and fraud. The National Corruption Perception Survey put the misuse and misappropriation of public resources like the CDF in Kenya at 11.2 % (EACC, 2012). In a study by NTA (2012) on citizen's CDF report card for Kibwezi constituency, it indicated that 19.7 million shillings of taxpayers' money had been wasted on badly implemented projects in 2009/2010. In their report, 5.15million shillings or 8% of the allocated funds were not accounted for. Integrity of financial statements and reports are very crucial on the performance of any projects. Sanga (2009) maintains that proper financial records sustain a project and without them there are risks of hitting a cash flow crunches, wastage of money and missing deadlines. Mwanza (2013) did a study on the effects of corporate governance of financial management in constituency development funds in Kenya and found that 88% of the respondents indicated that financial reports are not easily accessible and available to stakeholders of the constituency.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This research adopted both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Cross-sectional design was used to collect data. The research also adopted a descriptive correlation study design. Descriptive research is a process of collecting data for the purpose of testing hypothesis that are important to the current state of the study subject (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It's concerned with conditions, structure practices differences or relationship that exist, opinions held, and processes or trends that are ongoing or that are evident. A correlation study shows the interrelationship among variables (Simon & Goes, 2011). The concept uses numerical data to explore the interconnection existing between variables; scores on one variable are related or vary with the scores of another variable.

### **Research Site**

A research site according to Given (2008) is a physical, social and cultural site in which researcher conducts a study. The research site was Miriki water project which is located in Miriki sub location, Igembe North sub-county in Meru County. It is located approximately 400kilometres from Nairobi and approximately 58 kilometers from Meru town. Miriki location has two CDF water projects both being dysfunctional, Miriki water project being one of the projects.

### **Target Population**

The target population for a research is the whole set of unit for which the study data are to be used for inferences (Lavrakas, 2008). The study target was the community of Miriki, the CDF project manager and members of the CDF committee. Miriki community has a population of 8000(Records from sub chief's office). The CDF committee is made up of 10 members and one project manager and one national government representative making the total population to be 8012.

### **Study Sample**

The sample size for  $\pm 6\%$  precision level where the confidence level is 95% and  $p = .5$  for the population of 8012 in the study was 268 subjects. This was because the number was manageable. The sample size was calculated using Yamane formula (Yamane, 1967).

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where: n = sample size; N = population; e = level of precision

$$n = \frac{8012}{1 + 8012(0.06)^2} = 268.46 = 268$$

## **Research Instrument**

The researcher used a semi-structured questionnaire and in-depth interview schedule. A semi-structured questionnaire consists of both open ended and closed ended questions (Pillar, 2014). Semi-structured questionnaires ensures gathering of both qualitative and quantitative information. The questionnaires also entailed the respondent's background information and have a Likert scale responses. According to Kothari (2004), a Likert scale usually shows the degree to which the respondents agree or disagree. An in-depth interview is a technique designed to deduce a clear picture of the respondents' perspective on the research topic (Adams and Cox, 2008). This means that interviewees were considered the experts while the interviewer was the student.

## **RESEARCH RESULTS**

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

The study sought to find out the opinions of the respondents on indicators measuring stakeholder involvement. A Likert scale was used where 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Not Sure (N), 4= Agree (A) and 5= Strongly Agree (SA). The results indicate that the respondents strongly disagreed that they were not involved in project identification (mean = 1.31; standard deviation = 0.552). On project implementation, the respondents strongly disagreed on the involvement in project implementation (mean = 1.27; standard deviation = 0.449). On project sustainability, the respondents strongly disagreed that they were not involved in the sustainability of the project (mean= 1.31; standard deviation = 0.552).

The study also sought to find out the opinion of the project managers and CDF committee members on indicators measuring stakeholder involvement. A Likert scale was used where 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Not Sure (N), 4= Agree (A) and 5= Strongly Agree (SA). The results indicated the respondents representing the CDF committee members and the project manager strongly agreed to the statement that stakeholders were involved in the project identification (mean = 4.25; standard deviation = 1.389). Pertaining involvement in project implementation, the respondents disagreed to the statement that that all stakeholders were involved in the project implementation (mean = 2.75; standard deviation = 1.035) and on stakeholder involvement in project sustainability, the respondents agreed to the statement that all stakeholders were involved in project sustainability (mean = 3.25; standard deviation = 1.035).

The study sought to find the opinion of beneficiaries in the focus groups on indicators measuring stakeholder involvement. According to the respondents in the focus groups on their involvement in project identification, they were not involved in the project identification (mean = 0.92; standard

deviation= 0.270), they were not involved in the project implementation (mean= 0.89; standard deviation= 0.311) indicated and on the statement on their involvement in project sustainability, the respondents indicated that were not involved in the project sustainability (mean= 1.00; standard deviation= 0.000).

## **Financial Management**

The study sought to find out the respondents opinion on indicators measuring financial management. A Likert scale was used where 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Not Sure (N), 4= Agree (A) and 5= Strongly Agree (SA). The results indicate that the respondents were not certain of the budget allocations (mean =2.83; standard deviation= 0.595). When asked their opinion on financial reports and statements, the respondents were not certain if they were made available (mean= 2.38; standard deviation= 1.044). The respondents strongly disagreed to the statement that the funds were well accounted for (mean= 1.88; standard deviation= 1.123). On the statement on resource allocation being made available on time, the respondents were not certain (mean= 2.83; standard deviation =0.519).

The study also sought to find out the opinion of project manager and CDF committee members on indicators measuring financial management. A Likert scale was used where 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Not Sure (N), 4= Agree (A) and 5= Strongly Agree (SA). The respondents indicated that they were not certain if the water project budget was adequate (mean= 2.63; standard deviation= 0.518) and if the resource allocation were made available to all stakeholders (mean= 2.63; standard deviation= 0.518). The respondents representing the CDF committee members and project manager disagreed to the statement that the financial statements and records were made available to all stakeholders (mean= 2.13; standard deviation= 0.354). The respondents agreed that there was transparency in procurement and tendering process (mean= 4.25; standard deviation= 0.463). When asked if the funds were well accounted for, the respondents agreed that the funds were well accounted for (mean= 4.13; standard deviation= 0.354). All the respondents concurred that there were cost overruns in the project (mean= 1.00; standard deviation= 0.000).

The study sought to find the opinion of the beneficiaries represented in the focus groups on indicators measuring financial management. A Likert scale was used where 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Not Sure (N), 4= Agree (A) and 5= Strongly Agree (SA). The results from the focus groups as shown in table 9 indicate that the respondents were not sure of the adequacy in project budgets allocations (mean= 2.74; standard deviation= 0.485), and disagreed that there was transparency in the tendering and procurement process (mean= 2.25; standard deviation= 0.739). The respondents also disagreed that the funds were well utilized (mean= 2.25; standard deviation= 0.680).

## **Stakeholder Satisfaction**

The study sought to find out the level of stakeholder satisfaction from the beneficiaries and the national government representative. A Likert scale was used where 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Not Sure (N), 4= Agree (A) and 5= Strongly Agree (SA). The results from the beneficiaries and national government representative indicate that the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that safe drinking water was accessible (mean= 1.25; standard deviation= 0.838). The respondents also strongly disagreed with the statement that they were happy with the quality of workmanship (mean=1.52; standard deviation= 0.922). On the statement that they were happy with the sufficient and workable budget, the respondents strongly disagreed (mean= 1.58; standard deviation= 0.647). The respondents also strongly disagreed with the statement that they were content with degree of accountability (mean=1.31; standard deviation= 0.689).

The study sought to find out level of satisfaction of the stakeholders from the project implementers who are the CDF committee members and project manager. A Likert scale was used where 1= Strongly Disagree (SD), 2= Disagree (D), 3= Not Sure (N), 4= Agree (A) and 5= Strongly Agree (SA). The findings indicates that the respondents agreed that beneficiaries had access to safe drinking water (mean= 3.13; standard deviation= 0.991). However, the respondents were not certain if all stakeholders were satisfied with the quality of workmanship (mean= 3.00; standard deviation= 0.000). Pertaining a sufficient workable budget allocation, the respondents were not sure if all stakeholders were satisfied (mean=3.000; standard deviation= 0.000). The respondents were also not sure if all stakeholders were satisfied with degree of accountability (mean= 3.00; standard deviation= 0.000).

The study sought to find out the level of satisfaction of the beneficiaries represent in the focus groups. From the findings, the respondents indicated that they did not have access to safe drinking water (mean= 0.60; standard deviation= 0.492). They also indicated that were not happy with quality of workmanship (mean=0.98; standard deviation= 0.139), they were not content with the degree of accountability and were not pleased with the budget (mean= 0.99; standard variation= 0.099). The study sought to find out if Miriki water project was a successful project. The beneficiaries, national government representative, project manager and CDF committee members unanimously agreed that Miriki water project was not a successful project.

## **INFERENCE STATISTICS**

According to Hair et al. (2010), multicollinearity is the extent to which variable's influence can be explained and are identified through correlation which are close to or equal to 1. The assumptions of multicollinearity are tested through correlation matrix. The study sought to find out the relationship between M&E framework targets and stakeholders' satisfaction. The correlation values in the matrix range from 0.545 to 1.000 with the correlation between stakeholder

involvement and stakeholders' satisfaction being the most significant at  $r = 0.869$ ,  $p < 0.05$ . This implies that there is a positive and strong relationship between stakeholder involvement targets and stakeholders' satisfaction, financial management targets and stakeholders' satisfaction.

In this study, the correlation values in the matrix representing focus groups were also computed. The correlation values in the matrix range from 0.525 to 1.000 as shown in table 13. This indicates that there is a strong and positive relationship between stakeholder involvement targets and stakeholders' satisfaction, financial management targets and stakeholders' satisfaction.

In this study, the correlation values in the matrix representing project manager and CDF committee members were computed and the correlation values in the matrix range from 0.518 to 1.000. This implies that there is a positive and strong relationship between stakeholder involvement targets and stakeholder satisfaction, financial management targets and stakeholders' satisfaction.

Path coefficient was used to determine the direction and strength of the factor. Path coefficient for the beneficiaries and national government representative ranged from .045 to .324 at  $p < .05$ . This implies that there is a direct relationship between stakeholder involvement targets, financial management targets and stakeholders' satisfaction.

The path coefficient representing the focus groups who are also beneficiaries ranged from .203 to .437 and  $p < .05$ . This indicate that there is a direct and positive relationship between stakeholder involvement targets, financial management targets and stakeholders' satisfaction.

The path coefficients values representing the project manager and CDF committee members ranged from .241 to .435 at  $p < .05$ . This implies that there is a direct relationship between stakeholder involvement targets and stakeholders' satisfaction, financial management targets and stakeholders' satisfaction.

## **THEMATIC ANALYSIS**

Thematic analysis identifies patterns within qualitative data (Maguire & Delahunt, 2017). According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is not tied to a particular theoretical perspective. While conducting focus discussion, data was saturation was achieved and five themes extracted from the content of focus discussion groups on monitoring and evaluation framework targets on stakeholders' satisfaction.

**Stakeholder Involvement:** This refers to participation in the identification, implementation and sustainability of the project. In reference to project identification participant 7, group 3, *"The community members are well capable of identifying a project and where it should be located which did not happen for Miriki water project. We just saw something being constructed later got to know it was a water project"*. With regard to project implementation, participant 1, group 13 stated, *"I feel we should have been given jobs as unskilled labourers to get some earnings and feel as part*

of Miriki water project.” While participant 8 group 9 stated, “*There is no need to be involved in sustaining a project that is not functional*”

**Financial Management:** This refers to involvement in planning, organizing directing and controlling financial undertakings. In reference to adequate budgets participant 5 group 21,” *I do not have a clue of the budget estimates, so I can’t say if the budget was adequate or not.*” On tenders and procurements and accountability of funds, participant 8 group 19 stated, “*No one tells us when tendering and procurement process is being undertaken. Anywhere involving money we can’t be involved so that we don’t ask questions on how they have used it*”

**Stakeholders’ Satisfaction:** This involved asking the stakeholders to rate of fulfillment. In response to satisfaction, participant 8 group 16 stated,” *I can’t say that am satisfied with Miriki water project since I do not benefit from it.*” Participant 5 group 1 stated, “*I am not satisfied with the project since there is nothing on the project that I was involved in and is till walk for more than 1km to get water*”

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Stakeholder Involvement Targets on Stakeholders’ Satisfaction**

The study found out that stakeholder involvement targets are important factors that contribute to more than half of the stakeholders’ satisfaction. The project managers and CDF committee members who are tasked with overseeing of CDF projects should ensure inclusion of all stakeholders in the identification of the community projects, in the implementation as well as in the sustainability of the projects.

### **Financial Management Targets on Stakeholders’ Satisfaction**

The study findings indicated that the financial management targets are important factors that contribute greatly to more than half of the stakeholders’ satisfaction. The project manager and CDF committee members should give adequate budgets for projects. They should also ensure that the monies are well accounted for and the financial statements presented to the relevant stakeholders. The funds should be released on time to avoid budget overruns.

## **REFERENCES**

- Agnew, C & Woodhouse, P. (2011). *Water Resources and Development*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Blackburn, M. (2019). What is Stakeholder Theory? [Online]: Available <http://www.projectmanagement.com/blog/whatisstakeholdertheory> (Mar 5, 2019).
- Bourne, L. (2010). *Stakeholder Relationship Management and the Stakeholder Circle*. Saarbrücken, Germany, LAP.

- CEDARE. (2014). “*Mauritania Water Sector Monitoring and Evaluation Rapid Assessment Report*” *Monitoring and Evaluation for Water in North Africa (MEWINA) Project, Water Resources Management Program*; CEDARE.
- Chen, H.T. (1990b). Issue in Constructing Program Theory. *A New Direction for Evaluation* 47, 7-18.
- Cheyegon, C. & Kamiya, D. (2018). Challenges Faced by Kenya Water Sector Management in Improving Water Supply. *Journal of Water Resources and Protection*, 10, 85- 105 Retrieved from <http://www.scirp.org/journal/jwarp> .
- Constituency Development Fund Board. (2011). *2010- 2014 Strategic Plan, Equitable Development for Kenyans*, Government Press, Nairobi.
- Freeman, E. (2010). *Strategic Management: A shareholders Approach*. Cambridge University press
- Githua, W.R. (2015). Factors Influencing Performance of Community Water Projects in Njoro Sub-County. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, iii (2015), 967-990.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W.C., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Idowu, A. H. & Ipaye, T.O. (2016). Project Delivery Delay: The Nigeria Experience, *IOSR Journal of Mechanical and Civil Engineering*, 13(5), 84-87.
- International Federation of Red Cross (IFRC). (2011). *Project Program Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Guide*, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Kanda, E.K, Mamandi, S & Muchelule, Y. (2016). Factors Influencing Completion of Water Project in Kakamega County, Kenya, *International Journal of Research in Management, Science & Technology*, 4(2), 2321-2327.
- Kenya Bureau of Statistics. (2015). *Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2014*. Kenya national Bureau of Statistics, Nairobi.
- Kinyingi, M. (2018). *Factors Influencing Customer Satisfaction in Hotel Industry in Kenya*. United States International University-Africa.
- Kothari, C.R. (2<sup>nd</sup> Revised Edition). (2005). *Research Methodology Methods and Techniques*, New Delhi; New Age International.
- Magure, M. & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a Thematic Analysis: A Practical Step-by- Step for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 8(3), 3351-33514.
- Martey, E.M. (2014). Impact of Good Governance Practices on Stakeholder Satisfaction in Ghanaian Companies. *Journal of Educational Policy and Entrepreneurial Research*, 1(12), 279-291.
- Manyalla, M. (2015). *Management of Strategic Change of Stakeholder Satisfaction at Kenyatta National Hospital Kenya*, Masters in Business Administration, University of Nairobi.
- Mburu, S & Muturi, W. (2016). Factors Affecting Timely Completion of Constituency Development Fund Financed projects: A Case of Water Supply Projects in Kinangop; *International Journal for Science and Information Technology*, 2(3), 1-16.
- Mimrose, D.M, Gunawardena, E.R & Nanyakakorala, H.B. (2011). Assessment of Sustainability of Community Water Supply Projects in Kandy district, *Topical Agriculture Research*, 23(1), 51-60.

- Ministry of Water and Irrigation (2007). *The National Water Services Strategy* (NWSS), (2007-2015). Ministry of Water and Irrigation Nairobi.
- Mugenda, A.G, & Mugenda, O. (1999). *Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*; African Centre of Technology Studies, Nairobi.
- Mugenda, O.M & Mugenda, A. G. (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). (2003). *Research Methods; Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi Acts Press.
- Mungata, J.K. & Mulyungi, P. (2017). Influence of Stakeholder Involvement on Project Outcome. A Case of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Project in Rwanda. *European Journal of Business and Social Science*, 6(6), 195-20.
- Mutua, N. (2013). Factors Affecting the Effectiveness Monitoring and Evaluation of Consistency Development Fund Projects in Changamwe Constituency, Kenya. *Journal of International Academic Research for Multidisciplinary*, 1(8), 175-216.
- National Taxpayers Association (2012). *Citizen's Constituency Development Fund Report Card for Kibwezi Constituency, Makueni County, NTA*, Nairobi. *Management*, 1(11), 384-404.
- Ntaganda, A. & Mulyungi. P. (2018). Role of Stakeholders Participation on the Performance of Savings Groups Projects in Rwanda; A Case of Care International Promoted Savings Groups in Bugesera District. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 7(10), 773-777.
- Obunwo, C., Chinyio, E. & Suresh, S. (2014). Quality Management Practices and Customer Satisfaction Antecedents in Government Construction Projects. *International Journal of Engineering Science & Management*, 4(4), 105-111.
- Pham, X.H. (2016). *Investigating the Success of Rural Infrastructure Development Project in Vietnam*: Thesis Doctor of Philosophy, RMIT University.
- Republic of Kenya. (2016). *Kenya Strategic Investment Framework for Sustainable Land Management 2017-2027*. Ministry of Environment Natural Resources.
- Simon, M. K & Goes. (2013). *Dissertation and Scholarly Research: Recipes for Success*. Seattle, WA, *Dissertation success*, LLC.
- UNDP (2006). *Human Development Report: Beyond Scarcity: Power, Poverty and Global Water Crisis*, UNDP.
- UNEP (2012). *The UN- Water Status Report on Application of Integrated Approaches to Water Resources Management* UNEP.
- Wamugu, J. W. & Ogollah, K. (2017). Role of Stakeholder Participation on Performance of Constituency Development Fund Projects in Mathira East Constituency in Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Information Science and Project Management*, 2(1), 104-125.
- Wanjiru, G. (2008). *The CDF Social Audit Guide: A Handbook for Communities*, Open Society Initiative for East Africa, Nairobi.
- Yamane, T. (1967). (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) *Statistics. An Introductory Analysis*, New Y; Harper and Row.
- Yee-Chin, L.C. (2004). Performance Measurement and Adoption of balances Score Cards. A Survey of Municipal Government in the USA and Canada. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 17(3), 204-221.