# Assessment of the Effectiveness of M&E System in Chicken Farming Projects in Samia Sub County, Busia County, Kenya

**Caroline Stella Makokha[1], Dr. Kamwele Hellen, PhD[2]**

**[1]MA Candidate, Maseno University**

**[2]Senior Lecturer, Maseno University**

**DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2023.1012007**

**Received: 24 October 2023; Revised: 20 November 2023; Accepted: 21 November 2023; Published: 30 December 2023**

## ABSTRACT

Monitoring and Evaluation as an integral practice in project management cycle assesses progress against set objectives for informed decision making. However, minimal focus has been given to the M&E system effectiveness in chicken farming project. The study sought to assess the effectiveness of M&E system in chicken farming projects in Samia sub County, Busia County in Kenya. The objectives of the study were: to determine the effect of technical capacity, to assess the effect of budgetary allocation and to examine the effect of stakeholders involvement on Effectiveness of M&E system in chicken farming projects. The study adopted Resource Based View Theory while descriptive survey design, questionnaire, interview guide and FGDs were used for collecting quantitative and qualitative data from a sample of 82 participants out of 794 for descriptive statistics. Findings showed that 78.56% of the respondents were of the opinion that Technical Capacity has a strong effect on M&E system; 76.46% were of the opinion that Budgetary Allocation moderately affected M&E system while 80.4% were of the opinion that Stakeholder involvement had a strong effect on M&E system in chicken farming projects. The study concluded that budgetary allocation, technical capacity and stakeholder involvement have a significant effect on Effectiveness of M&E in projects. It is therefore recommended that, stakeholders should be integrated in the M&E process and continuous capacity building on technical M&E skills done while the budgetary allocation unit should be autonomous. Further research should assess the effect of ICT integration on effectiveness of M&E system in projects.

**Key Words:** M&E System; Technical Capacity; Budgetary Allocation; Stakeholder Involvement

## INTRODUCTION

Globally, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is increasingly becoming an essential program management tool (Kihuha and Ngugi, 2018). In the 1950s, M&E practice was dominated by a strong emphasis on prudent utilization of resources, reflecting the social scientific trend of the era (Sibiya, Aigbavboa and Thwala, 2015). The focus of M&E sought to concentrate on lived experiences, and give voice to as many stakeholders in a consensus-shaping evaluation process (Phiri and Mbugua, 2015). At present however, many organizations view M&E as a donor requirement rather than a management tool for reviewing progress and identifying and correcting problems in implementation of projects (Kihuha and Ngugi, 2018). Developed countries like the USA, China and Russia have pursued results-oriented development initiatives by adopting more effective M&E practices institutionalization through policy and legal enactments (Ofori-Kuragu, Baiden and Badu, 2016). In Europe, infrastructure projects have performed due to manager's technical capacity in M&E for tracking progress (Mucheke & Paul, 2019). Equally, South Africa, Colombia,

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI | Volume X Issue XII December 2023

Spain, Australia and India have adopted inventive M&E tools in order to strengthen the budgeting and planning of their activities (Ofori-Kuragu et al., 2016). However, in Africa, about 68% of projects implemented by local firms experience cost and time overruns besides not meeting quality standards due to weaknesses in M&E during implementation (Sibiya et al., 2015). In Egypt, constraints of M&E of projects include shortage of trained staff, insufficient technical and financial resources for M&E and inadequate capacity development (Tengan & Aigbavboa, 2018).

In Kenya, M&E has been in use since 1980s, including, District Focus for Rural Development (DFRD) of 1983 created with beneficiaries having ability to monitor the funding activities while National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) of 2004 has been used in tracking project implementation during Economic Recovery Strategy period 2004-2007 and performance of Medium-Term Plans (MTPs) of Vision 2030 (Opulu and Muchai, 2021). The creation of the 47 counties has also increased the need for project M&E at the county level (Opulu and Muchai, 2021). As a result, several legislations such as the Public Service Commission Act, Public Procurement and Disposal Act, and Constitution of Kenya 2010, require M&E for all projects to ensure accountability and transparency (Makau, Mackenzi and Nicole, 2018). For effective M&E implementation, the determinants of its effectiveness such as budgetary allocation, technical capacity and stakeholder involvement must be considered.

Monitoring and Evaluation practices ensures that the project results along with input can be quantified for accountability and transparency and for informed decision making (Kithinji, Gakuu and Kidombo, 2017). In Kenya, chicken farming projects have experienced challenges ranging from poor disease control measures, low productivity due to lack of institutional support, poor management, inadequate and poor feeding, inappropriate housing and farmer's negative attitude (Thieme et al., 2014). All these can be traced to inadequate M&E of the projects for appropriate response. Policy documents are aligned with the Kenya Vision 2030, the Constitution, the Third Medium Term Plan 2018-2022 and the Climate Change Act 2016, which has enabled the development of M&E Framework to track on the implementation of the KCSAIF objectives, outcomes, and outputs to support optimal planning and efficiency in the utilization of resources, capacity building activities and stakeholders involvement (Chaiban et al., 2020). However, little has been realized on the effectiveness of the implementation of climate-smart agriculture M&E Framework as it requires a huge budget estimated at K Sh 25 billion in the next 10 years (Opulu and Muchai, 2021). Specifically, in Busia County, poultry production is largely extensive for both household consumption and commercial purposes (Chaiban et al., 2020). However, Monitoring and Evaluation during chicken farming projects has been hindered by various factors that are linked to inadequate budget allocation, staff technical skills and stakeholders' participation resulting into implementation time and cost overruns and poor quality of projects (Opulu and Muchai, 2021). Despite previous studies precision in understanding chicken farming projects' challenges (Ndegwa and Mead, 2015; Odongo, 2015; Thieme et al., 2014 and; Ndegwa, 2013), little has been realized on the effectiveness of M&E system with regards to budgetary allocation, technical capacity and stakeholder involvement in chicken farming projects in Samia sub-county, Busia County, Kenya, a gap which the current study intended to be filled through descriptive survey design and descriptive statistic. The study sought to assess the effectiveness of M&E system in chicken farming projects in Samia sub County, Busia County in Kenya. The objectives of the study were: to determine the effect of technical capacity, to assess the effect of budgetary allocation and to examine the effect of stakeholders involvement on Effectiveness of M&E system in chicken farming projects.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Theoretical Review

This study was grounded on Resource Based View Theory.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI | Volume X Issue XII December 2023

**Resource Based View Theory (RBV)**

The RBV Theory founded by Wernerfelt and Rumelt (1984) was adopted to explain the concept of effectiveness of M&E system in chicken farming projects. The theory is a managerial framework used to determine the strategic resources a project can exploit to achieve sustainable competitive advantage. The strategic resources include the tangible resources of budgetary allocation and intangible resources of technical skills and stakeholder involvement needed for implementation of effective M&E system in project task completion. The theory postulates that a project with adequate resources like funds, technical capacity and stakeholder involvement in M&E system is likely to have competitive advantage and superior performance of chicken farming projects in terms of quality feeds, veterinary services and poultry habitat for higher productivity. The theory was furthered by Barney (1991) while Might and Fisher (2011) used it to explain Causes of delays in Malaysian Construction Industry and noted that a firm that nurtures and develops its resources is able to sustain the firm's competitive advantage. It is therefore crucial to the management of a project to be committed to the necessary M&E resources to achieve better performance of chicken farming projects. This theory was used in the study to express the necessity of funds, technical capacity and stakeholder involvement for effective implementation of M&E system in chicken farming projects.

**Technical Capacity and Effectiveness of M&E System in Projects**

Human capital, with proper training and experience is vital for the production of M&E results (Safari and Kisimbii, 2020). Understanding the skills needed and the capacity of people involved in M&E system and addressing capacity gaps through structured capacity development programs (Rumenya and Kisimbi, 2020). However, it is not enough to simply create a highly-trained evaluation capacity and expect organizations to become more effective but ensure that trained staff and stakeholders understand their M&E roles, participate in M&E planning and development of related systems and tools (Njeru and Luketero, 2018). M&E capacity of employees should continuously be developed through training on current and emerging trends.

A study by Franz (2019) on improving sustainable agricultural education among 96 farmers' learning preference and 21 cooperative extension agents and specialists' in Virginia found that farmers preferred learning by hands-on, demonstrations and farm visit by the extension officers. While for the extension agents and specialists perceive that farm visits are what farmers prefer to learn and improve on their management skills. Broilers farmers thus would do the farm visits by the veterinary or broiler experts to give them a hands-on learning experience. The study was comprehensive but was done in a developed economy with advance technology and expatriate while the current study has been done in Kenya.

In Kenya, Ooko, Rambo and Osogo (2018) assessed Human Capacity for M&E Systems and Provision of Health Care Services in Public Health Institutions in Migori County, Kenya through descriptive survey and data collected using questionnaire from 285 respondents out of 997 while analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics of regression. Findings showed that capacity building on M&E increases access to provision of health services. Understanding the skills needed and the capacity of people involved in the M&E system and addressing capacity gaps is at the heart of the M&E system for sustainability. Though the study was comprehensive it focused on healthcare systems while the current study focused chicken farming projects which might yield a different result.

Similarly, Safari and Kisimbii (2020) assessed the influence of M&E training on performance of projects in Kwale County, Kenya through ex-post facto research design and data collected using questionnaire from a sample of 100 respondents out of a target population of 113 while analysis involved descriptive statistic. Findings showed that monitoring and evaluation training influences County funded projects performance. Continuous training of the various M&E implementers ensures that they are equipped with the changing and emerging trend in the whole process of M&E leading to effective implementation and better performance of

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI | Volume X Issue XII December 2023

projects. Thus, organizations should invest sufficiently in M&E to cater for development of M&E systems and training team members to enhance performance goals of the project.

Despite the comprehensiveness of the studies in linking technical capacity on effectiveness of M&E in projects, none touched Busia County an area addressed by the current study.

**Budgetary allocation and Effectiveness of M&E System in Projects**

It is fundamental for M&E specialists to consider M&E budget needs at the project design phase. The M&E budgetary allocation usually estimated to range between 5% – 10% of total project budget should have an autonomous unit to ensure its effectiveness (Chepkemoi and Otieno, 2020). Planning for M&E should approximate the costs of hiring staff and for conducting M&E tasks (Kioko and Kimutai, 2017). However, in Kenya the M&E budget for road construction and maintenance is small with allocation of Ksh 1,487,000.00 at every quarter of the financial year and is expected to take just 8 days for the entire road networks in the country (Opulu and Muchai, 2021). This is simply due to inadequate resources for undertaking M&E activities. A well-funded M&E process ensures collection of quality data for improved utilization (Kithinji, Gakuu and Kidombo, 2017).

A study by Mbogo and Mirara (2022) assessed budgetary allocation in M&E of humanitarian projects planning through descriptive survey and data collected using questionnaire from a census of 46 respondents while analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings showed that budgetary allocation in M&E had a significant influence on humanitarian project planning. Delineating M&E budget within the overall project budget and timely funds release save any delays in M&E for the smooth running of the project.

Further, Kithinji et al., (2017) assessed resource allocation for M&E activities and utilization of M&E result amongst CBO projects in Meru county, Kenya through descriptive survey and questionnaire for collecting data from 186 respondents out of 430 employees while analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics of regression. Findings showed that adequate resource allocation significantly increases M&E results utilization in a project. Finances are used to pay salaries for M&E personnel, Training in M&E related issues, buying software and hardware resources. A well-funded M&E process will leave little to chance in their effort to collect quality data that would help improve utilization. The study was comprehensive but failed to link to chicken farming projects, a gap filed by the current study.

In agricultural sector, Murei, Kidombo and Gakuu (2017) investigated allocation of resources for project M&E and performance of horticultural projects in Nakuru County, Kenya through descriptive survey and data collected using questionnaire, Interviews and Focus Group Discussions from 135 participants out of 152 members while analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics of correlation and regression. Findings showed that M&E budget significantly influences performance of horticulture projects. Monitoring and evaluation budget should be clearly delineated within the overall project budget to give the M&E function the due recognition it plays in contributing to high project performance. The results from agricultural research provide an impetus to the current study on poultry farming.

Despite the findings of the previous studies showing a significance of budgetary allocation on effectiveness of projects, none domesticated the findings to chicken farming projects in Busia, Kenya, a gap which informed the current study.

**Stakeholder Involvement and Effectiveness of M&E System in Projects**

Stakeholder engagement has to be rooted at the onset of M&E and should integrate key stakeholders along with other interested parties in making sure that the applied tool is effective (Chepkemoi and Otieno, 2020).

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI | Volume X Issue XII December 2023

Stakeholder's involvement enhances learning, strengthens ownership and encourages transparency among the actors involved in monitoring and evaluation (Kadurira and Nyagah, 2021). If the right persons are engaged in the whole process, there will be a great enhancement of the outcome with the recommendations being well perceived and corrective measures embraced and implemented on time (Nyabera and Mwangi, 2015). Effective participation of stakeholders in M&E of projects can improve transparency, accountability, project sustainability and ensure positive community level stakeholder attitude to projects (Kamau, 2017). Though monitoring and evaluation practices implementation have substantial cost, time as well as human resource implications, they are very vital for successful projects (Makau, Mackenzi and Nicole, 2018).

In Ghana, Sulemana, Musah and Simon (2018) assessed Stakeholder Participation in M&E of Projects through case study approach involving 196 participants. The study revealed that low stakeholder participation in M&E of projects has impacted negatively on the transparency, accountability and the sustenance of projects. Increased engagement of stakeholders in the planning, implementation, M&E process builds efficiency in reporting. Participatory M&E has been triggered by the value and need for basing development on the views and priorities of 'the local population' which has become widely acknowledged. Enhancing stakeholders' perceived ownership and empowerment can directly link to project sustainability.

Similarly, Kiumbe, Wambugu and Luketero (2018) assessed Stakeholder Participation in Utilization of M&E Results and Performance of Fish Farming Projects in Nyeri County, Kenya through descriptive survey and questionnaires used to collect data from 271 respondents out of 1198 participants while analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics of correlation and regression. Findings showed that stakeholder participation in utilization of M&E results significantly influences performance of projects. Monitoring and evaluation of the performance of projects should involve all stakeholders throughout the process of generating objectives, defining indicators and crafting local solutions.

Despite previous studies precision in explaining stakeholders' involvement on effectiveness of M&E in projects, none domesticated their study to chicken farming in Busia County for conclusive generalization, a gap bridged by the current study.

## METHODOLOGY

The study adopted Resource Based View Theory while descriptive survey design, questionnaire, interview guide and FGDs were used for collecting quantitative and qualitative data from a sample of 82 participants out of 794 for descriptive statistic of Mean, Standard Deviation and Percentages.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings showed that 78.56% of the respondents were of the opinion that Technical Capacity has a strong effect on M&E system; 76.46% were of the opinion that Budgetary Allocation moderately affected M&E system while 80.4% were of the opinion that Stakeholder involvement had a strong effect on M&E system in chicken farming projects.

### Technical Capacity and Effectiveness of M&E System in Chicken Farming Projects

The first study objective sought to establish the effect of Technical Capacity on Effectiveness of M&E System in Chicken Farming Projects. Technical Capacity on Effectiveness of M&E System in Chicken Farming Projects was measured using four indicators of M&E skill relevance in maintaining records on treatment adherence, feeding programs, production records and sales records; capacity development; and experience and staffing adequacy.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI | Volume X Issue XII December 2023

Table 4.3: Technical Capacity

| Technical Capacity | SD | D | N | A | SA | Mean | STDev |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The group officials have relevant skills in record keeping on treatment ,feeding ,production and sales . | 0 | 6 | 7 | 38 | 26 | 4.08 | 0.862 |
| | (0.0%) | (7.8%) | (9.9%) | (48.9%) | (33.3%) | | |
| There is adequate capacity building on critical M&E systems of work scheduling, partnership and cooperation | 2 | 4 | 11 | 32 | 27 | 4.01 | 0.996 |
| | (2.8%) | (5.7%) | (14.9%) | (41.1%) | (35.5%) | | |
| The group officials have adequate experience in implementation of M&E systems | 0 | 7 | 14 | 38 | 18 | 3.87 | 0.880 |
| | (0.0%) | (9.2%) | (18.4%) | (48.9%) | (23.4%) | | |
| The M&E staff are adequate in number from the sub-county livestock department | 0 | 5 | 16 | 38 | 18 | 3.89 | 0.834 |
| | (0.0%) | (6.4%) | (21.3%) | (48.9%) | (23.4%) | | |
| **Composite Mean and Standard Deviation** | | | | | | **3.928** | **0.896** |

The finding in Table 4.3 indicate that 82.2% of the study participants agreed that the group officials had relevant skills of maintaining records on treatment, feeding programs, production records and sales records for effective M&E system in chicken farming projects while only 7.8% were of the contrast opinion. The findings are in tandem with Rumenya and Kisimbi (2020) observation that technical capacity among stakeholders in a project enhances the skills needed, helps in understanding of M&E roles, M&E planning and development of related systems and tools. Thus, understanding the skills needed and the capacity of people involved in M&E system and addressing capacity gaps through structured capacity development programs is at the heart of the M&E system.

Similarly, 76.6% of the participants agreed that there is adequate capacity building on critical M&E systems of work scheduling, partnership and cooperation with only 8.5% disagreeing giving an overall level of agreement which implies that farmers have been equipped with emerging M&E practices for effective M&E system in chicken farming projects. The findings were similarly to observation by Hailer et al., (2017) that M&E training encourage partnership and cooperation among stakeholders towards achievement of set implementation objectives for better performance of projects.

Further, 72.3% of participants cumulatively agreed that the group officials have adequate experience in implementation of M&E systems for effective M&E in chicken farming projects with only 9.2% disagree. This implies that a majority of the chicken farmers have exercised M&E systems over a long period of time and are therefore well versed with record keeping skills, vaccination schedule and feeding programs for effective M&E system in chicken farming projects. In support, Muumbi and Chege (2021) showed that experience and technical expertise engagement significantly influences projects' performance without projects experience failures.

Similar, 72.3% of the participants were of the opinion that M&E staff from the sub-county livestock department is adequate in number while only 6.4% disagreed. This shows that adequacy of M&E staff

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI | Volume X Issue XII December 2023

positively affects implementation of M&E in chicken farming projects by ensuring that progress reports are generated in time for corrective action.

Generally, regarding Technical Capacity on effectiveness of M&E system in Chicken Farming Projects, 78.56% of the participants agreed that technical capacity positively affects effectiveness of M&E in chicken farming projects. The technical capacity enabled the production of quality M&E reports in terms of maintenance of records on treatment adherence, feeding programs, production records and sales records which had a positive effect on implementation of chicken farming projects. Quality M&E reports act as an essential program management tool for prudent utilization of resources, a fact that was also observed by Kihuha and Ngugi (2018). Similarly, Franz (2019) found that farmers prefer learning by hands-on, demonstrations and farm visit by the extension officers. Successful M&E is characterized by skillful, experienced and capable team players equipped with the necessary tools and systems for it to contribute to project performance.

Human capital, with proper training and experience is vital for the production of M&E results. Understanding the skills needed and the capacity of people involved in M&E system and addressing capacity gaps through structured capacity development programs is at the heart of the M&E system in ensuring that trained staff and stakeholders understand their M&E roles, participate in M&E planning and development of related systems and tools.

**Budgetary Allocation and Effectiveness of M&E System in Chicken Farming Projects**

The second study objective assessed the effect of Budgetary Allocation on Effectiveness of M&E system in Chicken Farming Projects in Samia Sub-County, Busia County. Budgetary Allocation for Effectiveness of M&E System in Chicken Farming Projects was measured using four indicators of budget autonomy, accessibility, disbursement timeliness and adequacy.

Table 4.4: Budgetary Allocation

| **Budgetary Allocation** | **SD** | **D** | **N** | **A** | **SA** | **Mean** | **STDev** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The M&E has a dedicated financial allocation from the main project budget | 0 | 6 | 13 | 35 | 23 | 3.98 | 0.882 |
| | (0.0%) | (7.8%) | (16.3%) | (46.1%) | (29.8%) | | |
| The money for M&E is readily accessible to the officials whenever the exercise falls due | 0 | 4 | 9 | 37 | 27 | 4.13 | 0.809 |
| | (0.0%) | (5.0%) | (12.1%) | (48.2%) | (34.8%) | | |
| The money for M&E is usually disbursed on time | 3 | 6 | 14 | 34 | 20 | 3.83 | 1.014 |
| | (3.5%) | (7.1%) | (18.4%) | (44.7%) | (26.2%) | | |
| The funds allocated for M&E exercise is adequate | 6 | 15 | 16 | 26 | 14 | 3.35 | 1.190 |
| | (7.1%) | (19.9%) | (21.3%) | (34.0%) | (17.7%) | | |
| **Composite Mean and Standard Deviation** | | | | | | **3.823** | **1.024** |

The results in Table 4.4 show that 75.9% of participants agreed that M&E has a dedicated financial allocation from the main project budget while 7.8% disagreed. This implies that the autonomy in M&E budgetary allocation enhances planning on costs of staff hiring and M&E implementation in chicken farming projects. The findings concurred with observations by Chepkemoi and Otieno (2020) that the M&E budgetary allocation should have an autonomous unit to ensure its effectiveness in planning cost approximation of hiring staff and for conducting M&E tasks.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI | Volume X Issue XII December 2023

Similarly, 83% of participants cumulatively agreed that the money for M&E was readily accessible to the officials whenever the exercise falls due. Thus, the financial availability and accessibility facilitated effectiveness of M&E system in chicken farming projects.

The findings also show that cumulatively 70.9% of the participants agreed while only 10.6% disagreed that the money for M&E is usually disbursed on time. The finding shows that timely disbursement of M&E funds facilitates effective M&E system in chicken farming projects. Similarly, Mbogo and Mirara (2022) suggested that timely funds release save any delays in M&E for the smooth running of the project.

Further, the results show that a moderate of 51.7% of participants agreed the funds allocated for M&E exercise is adequate while 17% disagreed. This shows that adequate financial allocation facilitates effectiveness of M&E system in chicken farming projects in terms of hiring adequate staff, purchasing M&E materials and tracking progress through generation of reports for review and action. The findings were supported by Kithinji, Gakuu and Kidombo (2017) that a well-funded M&E process ensures collection of quality data for improved utilization in projects.

Overall, the findings indicate that Budgetary Allocation affects implementation of M&E in chicken farming projects as indicated by a composite mean = 3.823 (STDEV = 1.024). This shows that the 76.46% participants overall agree with the views that adequate Budgetary Allocation positively affects effectiveness of M&E system in chicken farming projects.

It is fundamental for M&E specialists to consider M&E budget needs at the project design phase. Delineating M&E budget within the overall project budget and timely funds release save any delays in M&E for the smooth running of the project. Adequate financing ensures salary payment for M&E personnel, training in M&E related issues, buying software and hardware resources. A well-funded M&E process facilitates quality data collection that would help improve utilization. Inadequate resources is an impediment to the success of the M&E processes and project implementing teams should ensure they have set aside sufficient resources to support M&E.

**Stakeholder Involvement and Effectiveness of M&E System in Chicken Farming Projects**

The third study objective sought to establish the effect of Stakeholder Involvement on implementation of M&E system in Chicken Farming Projects. Stakeholder Involvement on Effectiveness of M&E System in Chicken Farming Projects was measured using four indicators of choosing indicators of participatory objective setting, designing M&E tools, data management and results dissemination.

Table 4.5: Stakeholder Involvement

| **Stakeholder Involvement** | **SD** | **D** | **N** | **A** | **SA** | **Mean** | **STDev** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stakeholders participated in setting M&E objectives for the projects | 1 | 7 | 9 | 38 | 22 | 3.94 | 0.950 |
| | (1.4) | (9.2) | (12.1) | (48.9) | (28.4) | | |
| Stakeholders participated in designing M&E tools | 0 | 1 | 9 | 35 | 32 | 4.26 | 0.724 |
| | (0.0) | (1.4) | (12.1) | (45.4) | (41.1) | | |
| Stakeholders participated in management of M&E data | 0 | 4 | 11 | 34 | 27 | 4.11 | 0.834 |
| | (0.0) | (5.0) | (14.9) | (44.7) | (35.5) | | |
| Stakeholders participated in M&E results dissemination | 1 | 13 | 14 | 26 | 23 | 3.77 | 1.078 |
| | (0.7) | (16.3) | (18.4) | (34.0) | (30.5) | | |
| **Composite Mean and Standard Deviation** | | | | | | **4.020** | **0.922** |

The finding in Table 4.5 shows that 77.3% of the participants cumulatively agreed while 10.6%

cumulatively disagreed that Stakeholders participated in setting M&E objectives for the chicken farming projects. This shows that there was adequate stakeholder participation in setting M&E objectives which ensured effective implementation of M&E in chicken farming projects by maintaining record track on treatment adherence, feeding programs, production records and sales records. Similarly, Kiumbe et al., (2018) postulate that M&E of projects should involve all stakeholders throughout the process of generating objectives, defining indicators and crafting local solutions.

Similarly, 86.5% of the participants cumulatively agreed that Stakeholders participated in designing M&E tools with only 1(1.4%) disagreeing. This shows that stakeholder participation in designing M&E tools ensures farmers inputs are considered, correct project indicators are captured and appropriate M&E tools utilization is exercised which culminates into effective implementation of M&E in chicken farming projects for a better performance. Similarly, Chepkemoi and Otieno (2020) observed that Stakeholder involvement has to be rooted at the onset of M&E and should integrate key stakeholders along with other interested parties in making sure that the applied tool is effective.

Equally, 80.2% of the participants agreed that Stakeholders participated in management of M&E data while only 5.0% disagreed. This result underlines the importance of imparting financial management skill to stakeholders for effective M&E system in Chicken Farming Projects for their sustainability. Inadequate management of M&E data has negative effect on M&E system in chicken farming projects due to low quality data generation that fails to comprehensively capture feeding program, treatment observation and production records. This in the long run can lead to project failure as gaps remain not captured in M&E reports.

The results show that moderately, 64.5% of the participants agreed that Stakeholders participated in M&E results dissemination while 17% disagreed. This is attributable to the understanding that Stakeholders participation in M&E results dissemination ensures understanding of the implementation gaps and how they should be filled based on the M&E results recommendations. Similarly, Kiumbe et al., (2018) postulate that stakeholder participation in M&E results dissemination significantly influences performance of projects.

Regarding Stakeholders involvement on implementation of M&E in chicken farming projects, the finding shows a composite mean = 4.02 (STDEV = 0.922). This shows that 80.4% of the participants generally agree that Stakeholder involvement positively affects implementation of M&E system in chicken farming projects through timely feedback on the M&E reports for action. Participatory M&E is triggered by the value and need for basing development on the views and priorities of 'the local farmers' which has become widely acknowledged as it enhances implementation of key decisions, hasten decision making process and correct deviations to survivability of the projects. Stakeholder involvement in M&E feedback reporting ensures reviewing of progress and identifying and correcting gaps in implementation of projects. The findings are supported by Kithinji et al., (2017) observation that stakeholder involvement in M&E feedback system ensures project results along with input are quantified for accountability and transparency and for informed decision making.

Benefits of stakeholder involvement in M&E of chicken farming projects include provision of market linkages, promotion of teamwork spirit, project ownership, resource mobilization and project sustainability.

Lastly, as postulated by Resource Based Theory, the adequacy of vital resources like funds for M&E, technical capacity for M&E and stakeholder involvement in M&E have shown a positive effect on M&E system in chicken farming projects for better performance within cost, time and quality.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On Technical Capacity, the study concludes that the group officials had relevant skills in M&E and there

was adequate capacity building on critical M&E systems. However, in moderate terms the group officials had moderately experience in M&E systems as well as moderate number of M&E staff from the sub-county livestock department. Thus, technical capacity had a moderate positive effect on implementation of M&E in chicken farming projects as it facilitated quality reports generation for action..

On Budgetary Allocation, the study concludes that M&E task had a dedicated financial allocation from main project budget; money for M&E was readily accessible to the officials for the exercise falls due as well as its timely disbursement for M&E. However, the funds allocated for M&E exercise was inadequate which has a negative effect on implementation of M&E in chicken farming projects. Overall, the findings indicate that Budgetary Allocation had a positive effect on implementation of M&E in Chicken Farming Projects since funds were readily available for M&E execution, review and corrective actions.

On Stakeholder Involvement, the study concludes that Stakeholders participated in setting M&E objectives for the projects; Stakeholders participated in designing M&E tools, and Stakeholders participated in M&E results dissemination. However, Stakeholder participation in management of M&E data was minimal. Overall, Stakeholder involvement had a positive effect on Implementation of M&E in Chicken Farming Projects by ensuring that farmers' inputs are considered, necessary skills are propagated and transparency in resource utilization is done for sustainability and ownership of the projects.

The study recommends as follows:

1. Continuous Technical Capacity Building on M&E systems should be done to all stakeholders to equip them with necessary skills in M&E objective setting, tools development, data management and results dissemination and utilization. This will enhance identification of M&E systems capacity gaps for adjustments through trainings. This can be achieved through farm exchange programs, seminars, conferences and workshops besides field visits.
2. Budgetary allocation to sub-county and farmers group levels should be autonomous, adequate, accessible and appropriated to facilitate M&E of extension services, employment of more skilled M&E extension officers and training farmers on M&E systems in chicken farming projects.
3. Funding for M&E should cater for stationery expenses , training and travel expenses and this should be done in consultation with all the stakeholders regardless of their rank in the M&E system for a holistic capture.
4. A structured stakeholders' involvement from government extension officers, development partners, Cooperative societies and farmers should be extensively trained on M&E systems for proper understanding of roles in effective implementation of M&E in the projects.
5. Stakeholder inclusion should begin from planning stage, budgeting, funding, execution and review, results dissemination and utilization. This requires strengthening governance structures, forming of M&E management committees amongst farmers and sensitization of farmers.

## REFERENCES

1. Amai, P.T. and Ruguru, F. (2022). Effects of Budgetary Allocation on Monitoring and Evaluation of Nature-Based Enterprises Projects In Kenyan Water Towers. International Journal of Project Planning and Management Vol. 5, Issue 2, pg. 160-171
2. Basheka, B.C., and Byamugisha, A. (2015). The state of Monitoring and Evaluation as discipline in Africa. African Journal of Public Affairs8(3), 75–95.
3. Chaiban, C., Robinson, T., Fèvre, E., Ogola, J., Akoko, J., Gilbert, M., and Vanwambeke, S. (2020). Early intensification of backyard poultry systems in the tropics: a case study. Animal (2020), 14:11, pp. 2387–2396 doi:10.1017/S175173112000110X
4. Chepkemoi, W. and Otieno, M. (2020). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems on Performance of Infrastructural Projects in Kenya: A Case of Bomet County, Kenya. International

Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS), Vol. IV, Issue X, ISSN 2454-6186
5. Franz, K. N (2009): How farmers learn: Improving Sustainable Agricultural Education. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. 29-04-1291
6. Ike, L. A., Diallo, A. &Thuillier, D., (2015). Critical Success Factors: An Empirical Investigation. International Journal of Project Management, 30 (2012) pp. 105
7. Kadurira, P. and Nyagah, J. (2021). Influence of stakeholder's involvement in project monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of community projects in Kenya: Case Study of Kenya Red Cross Integrated Community Projects in Tana River County. Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project management, 5 (3), 15-25
8. Kadurira, P. and Nyagah, J. (2021). Influence of stakeholder's involvement in project monitoring and evaluation on sustainability of community projects in Kenya: Case Study of Kenya Red Cross Integrated Community Projects in Tana River County. Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project management, 5 (3), 15-25
9. Kihuha, P. and Ngugi, L. (2018). Monitoring and Evaluation Practices and Performance of Global Environment Facility Projects in Kenya, A Case of United Nations Environment Programme. Unpublished MBA Report, Kenyatta University, Kenya
10. Kithinji, C., Gakuu, C. and Kidombo, H. (2017). Resource Allocation, Evaluation Capacity Building M&E Results Utilization among Community Based Organizations in Meru County in Kenya. European Scientific Journal Vol.13, No.16
11. Kothari .C.R. (2004).Research methodology. Methods and techniques (2nd edition) New age international (P) Limited Publishers, New Dheli.
12. Makau, J. N., Mackenzi, I. O., and Nicole, D. (2018). The Effect of Stakeholders' Participation on Project Monitoring and Evaluation. The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management, Vol. 5, Iss. 4, pp. 2222 – 2229
13. Mbogo, F. W. and Mirara, A. (2022). Influence of budgetary allocation in monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian projects planning: A case of International Rescue Committee. International Academic Journal of Information Sciences and Project Management, 3(7), 88- 101.
14. Murei, L.C., Kidombo, H. and Gakuu, C. (2017). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Budget on Performance of Horticulture Projects in Nakuru County, Kenya. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management Vol. V, Issue 12
15. Mushori, J., Machira, F.A. and Matu, J. (2020). Determinants of Effective Monitoring and Evaluation: Pre- requisite for County Government Funded Infrastructural Development Projects. International Journal of Innovative Research & Development Vol. 9 Issue 4
16. Muumbi, C.M. and Chege, W.P. (2021). Effect of Technical Expertise Engagement in Monitoring and Evaluation on Performance of Residential Construction Projects in Kajiado County, Kenya. International Journal of Business Management, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Vol. 3, Issue 3, 2021, PP 72-81
17. Ndegwa, J. M, and Mead, R. (2015). Evaluating characteristics of indigenous chicken system with flock size trends in a participatory research on improved management practices in Kenya. Journal of Agricultural Studies. 3(2), 97.
18. Ooko, S.o, Rambo, C.M and Osogo, J.A. (2018). Influence of Human Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation Systems on Provision of Health Care Services In Public Health Institutions in Migori County. IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) Vol. 20, Issue 8, PP 62-71
19. Opulu, A. and Muchai, S. (2021). Effects of Monitoring and Evaluation on Implementation of Infrastructural Projects Funded by Vihiga County Government, Kenya. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Vol. 11, Issue 4
20. Phiri, B. and Mbugua, J. (2015). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on Project Performance: A Case of African Virtual University, Kenya. Unpublished MA Project, University of Nairobi, Kenya
21. Reginah, W. and Gakuu, C. (2015). Influence of the Utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation Tools on the Performance of Small Scale Broiler Poultry Farming Projects: A Case of Nyeri County, Kenya. Unpublished M.A. Project, University of Nairobi, Kenya

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI | Volume X Issue XII December 2023

22. Rumenya, H. and Kisimbi, J. (2020). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems on Performance of Projects in Non-Governmental Organizations: A Case of Education Projects in Mombasa County, Kenya. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management ISSSN 2520-0852, Vol. 5, Issue No.2, pp. 46 – 66, 2020
23. Safari, N., V. and Kisimbii, J. (2020). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on the Performance of County Government Funded Projects; A Case of Kwale County. Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management, 4(1), 42-58