



Influence of budgetary allocation and Capacity Building on Performance of Irrigation Projects in Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya

Mbuba Martin Mbae¹, Joshua Tumuti²

¹Masters Student, School of Business, Economics and Tourism

²PhD, School of Business, Department of Management Science

Abstract – This study examines the influence of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices on irrigation project performance in Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya, focusing on baseline surveys, stakeholder participation, budgetary allocation, and capacity building. Employing a descriptive and explanatory research design, data were collected from 126 respondents across three major irrigation schemes using structured questionnaires. Multiple regression analysis revealed that these M&E practices collectively account for 24.5% of the variance in project performance ($R^2 = 0.245$, $p < 0.001$). Budgetary allocation emerged as the most significant predictor ($\beta = 0.807$, $p < 0.001$), demonstrating a strong positive correlation with project success. Stakeholder participation showed marginal significance ($\beta = 0.135$, $p = 0.053$), while baseline surveys exhibited minimal impact. Capacity building presented a complex relationship requiring further investigation, showing a positive bivariate correlation but a negative regression coefficient. The findings emphasise the critical importance of adequate M&E funding and integrated frameworks for achieving sustainable irrigation outcomes and addressing Kenya's persistent food security challenges in semi-arid regions.

Keywords – Monitoring and Evaluation, Irrigation Projects, Project Performance, Stakeholder Participation, Baseline Surveys, Budgetary Allocation, Capacity Building, Food Security, Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya.

I. INTRODUCTION

Food insecurity represents one of the most pressing challenges confronting Kenya, particularly affecting regions characterised by erratic rainfall patterns and increasingly severe climate variability. The Kenyan government has responded to these challenges by substantially increasing investments in irrigation infrastructure as a strategic intervention to combat persistent food shortages throughout the country (Government of Kenya, 2018). However, a significant number of irrigation schemes have failed to achieve their anticipated outcomes, primarily attributable to deficiencies in planning processes and implementation practices during project initiation phases (Bornd, 2013).

Agriculture constitutes the backbone of Kenya's food security architecture and economic stability. Recent assessments indicate that approximately 5.4 million Kenyans experienced acute hunger in 2023, with projections suggesting continued increases driven by environmental factors, including floods, prolonged droughts, and broader economic challenges affecting household purchasing power (Kenya Food Security Steering Group [KFSSG], 2023). The situation proves particularly severe in semi-arid regions, where traditional rain-fed agricultural systems have become progressively unreliable due to the impacts of climate change.

The global context further underscores the need to address food security. According to the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO, 2021), the world's population is expected to increase from 6.2 billion to 8.7 billion by 2030, placing unprecedented pressure on food production systems. In sub-Saharan Africa specifically, nearly 282

million people faced undernourishment by 2021, representing approximately 20% of the regional population (Global Hunger Index, 2022). This alarming statistic emphasises the critical importance of effective agricultural interventions, particularly irrigation systems that can provide a reliable water supply independent of rainfall variability.

Within this challenging context, Tharaka-Nithi County emerges as a focal point for irrigation development efforts. Located on the slopes of Mount Kenya in the upper eastern province, the county exhibits considerable geographical diversity. While the upper region receives adequate rainfall during both the long and short rainy seasons in April and November, respectively, the lower portion remains semi-arid, with limited agricultural productivity potential without irrigation infrastructure (GPRS Map, 2020).

In response to food security imperatives, the county government of Tharaka-Nithi, partnering with the national government and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), allocated 1.7 billion Kenyan Shillings for implementing three substantial irrigation projects: the Banana Muringa scheme, Jasho Prime project, and Mwetereri Irrigation Project (Government of Kenya, 2018). These ambitious initiatives aimed to provide sustainable water supply infrastructure serving approximately 2,000 farmers and irrigating 7,000 hectares of agricultural land, potentially transforming the county's food production capacity and contributing significantly to household incomes through agricultural commercialisation.

Despite these ambitious objectives and substantial financial commitments, serious concerns have emerged regarding critical implementation aspects. Issues related to



ISSN:3048-7722

stakeholder integration, monitoring and evaluation staff training, baseline data collection procedures, and resource allocation patterns have raised questions about project sustainability and ultimate success (Kusmiarto, 2020). Evidence suggests that community awareness of these projects remains disappointingly low at approximately 7.5%, indicating potential deficiencies in stakeholder engagement processes (Okwengu, 2019). Furthermore, local communities have expressed concerns about the quality of output and complained about insufficient involvement in decision-making processes, leading the Tharaka-Nithi County Assembly to pass legislation mandating public participation before implementing any development project (Okwengu, 2019).

Monitoring and evaluation practices have become essential components of project management, enabling systematic collection and analysis of progress information (Dyason, 2018). According to the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD, 2020), effective monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices contribute to project success by ensuring a smooth project flow from initiation to closure. The World Bank Report (2019) suggests that M&E practices provide critical details about project implementation, with training setting project teams up for success by focusing on "what to do" and "why."

This study, therefore, examines how monitoring and evaluation practices influence the performance of irrigation projects in Tharaka-Nithi County, with particular focus on four critical dimensions: baseline surveys, stakeholder participation, budgetary allocation for M&E activities, and capacity building of M&E personnel. By systematically investigating these dimensions, the research aims to generate evidence-based insights that can inform policy development and enhance implementation practices for irrigation projects in Kenya and similar developing country contexts.

Study objectives

- To assess how stakeholder participation as an M&E practice affects the performance of irrigation projects in Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya.
- To investigate the effect of conducting effective baseline surveys as an M&E practice on the performance of irrigation projects in Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya.
- To analyse how budgetary allocation as an M&E practice impacts the performance of irrigation projects in Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya.
- To explore the effect of capacity building as an M&E practice on the performance of irrigation projects in Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya.

Research Gaps

Based on the extensive literature discussed, monitoring and evaluation practices are crucial in project implementation. Research has been conducted in the development, banking, and manufacturing sectors. The few studies in the agriculture sector focus on participative resource

mobilisation, strategies to make water supply sustainable, among others. However, attention has not been directed towards the influence of monitoring and evaluation practices on irrigation projects. Therefore, this study aims to examine the role of monitoring and evaluation practices, capacity building, effective baseline surveys, M&E training, and stakeholder participation in the M&E team of irrigation projects.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theoretical foundation

Stakeholder Theory, articulated initially by Richard Edwin Freeman in 1984, posits that maximising stakeholder value enhances organisational output and project success (Freeman, 1984). This framework emphasises identifying and meaningfully engaging individuals or groups affected by organisational operations or project activities (Milles, 2013). The theory proves particularly relevant for irrigation projects where success depends substantially on community buy-in, farmer participation, and collaboration among diverse actors, including government agencies, donors, and local leadership (Friedman, 2013). Effective stakeholder management involves more than mere consultation; it requires genuine participation in decision-making processes, transparent communication, and mechanisms ensuring stakeholder concerns influence project direction (Patton, 2010; O'Sullivan et al., 2014).

The Theory of Change, published by Carol Weiss in 1995, provides a framework for articulating how and why projects achieve their intended outcomes (Weiss, 1995). This approach maps logical sequences of activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts, clarifying causal pathways through which interventions produce change (Vogel, 2018). For irrigation projects, the Theory of Change helps stakeholders understand how improved water access leads to increased crop production, which in turn generates higher incomes, ultimately contributing to enhanced food security and poverty reduction (Msila & Setlhako, 2013). The theory emphasises establishing clear baselines and regularly assessing progress against these benchmarks, enabling project teams to determine whether interventions produce anticipated changes and adjust strategies when results diverge from expectations (Alcock, 2019; Rodgers, 2014).

Empirical Evidence on M&E Practices

Research by Mugo and Oleche (2015) on stakeholder participation found that it significantly influences project performance by enhancing ownership and sustainability. When community members actively engage in project planning, implementation, and monitoring, they develop a deeper commitment to the project's success. They are more likely to maintain infrastructure and sustain activities after external support concludes (Mulwa, 2018). However, Nyandika and Ngugi (2014) noted that superficial stakeholder involvement, without meaningful participation in decision-making processes, may limit the positive impacts. Their research suggested that tokenistic



ISSN:3048-7722

consultation—where stakeholders are informed about decisions rather than genuinely influencing them—fails to generate ownership and may actually breed resentment and resistance.

Budgetary Allocation

Kihuha (2018) found that proper budgetary allocation for M&E activities significantly enhances project performance by ensuring monitoring and evaluation functions receive adequate resources. Projects with dedicated, protected M&E budgets consistently outperform those that treat M&E as discretionary expenditure, which can be reduced when financial pressures emerge. Adequate funding enables the procurement of appropriate data collection tools and technologies, the hiring and retention of qualified M&E personnel, the conduct of regular monitoring activities, and the implementation of rigorous evaluation studies (Gyorkos, 2017).

Gwadoya (2012) reported similar findings, noting that projects allocating insufficient resources to M&E compromise their ability to generate quality information for management decision-making. The research found that underfunded M&E systems often resort to collecting minimal data, conducting superficial analyses, and producing reports that fail to provide actionable insights for project managers and stakeholders (Mushori, 2019).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive and explanatory research design that combined quantitative and qualitative elements to comprehensively examine the relationships between M&E practices and irrigation project performance (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). A descriptive research design enabled the systematic description of the study population's characteristics and variables under investigation, while explanatory elements allowed for the exploration of causal relationships between independent variables (M&E practices) and the dependent variable (project performance) (Kothari, 2014).

Study Population and Sampling

The target population consisted of stakeholders involved in three major irrigation projects in Tharaka-Nithi County: The Jasho Prime irrigation scheme in Chuka-Igambang'ombe sub-county, the Mwetereri Irrigation Project in Tharaka Sub-County, and the Banana Muringa Irrigation scheme in Maara sub-county (National Irrigation Authority, 2021). These projects were selected using stratified random sampling to ensure geographical diversity and representativeness of different irrigation contexts within the county (Krejcie & Morgan, 2011).

From an initial population of 184 potential respondents comprising farmers, county agricultural officials, and project monitoring and evaluation team members, the study employed Slovin's formula to determine an appropriate sample size (Sekaran & Bougie, 2019):

$$n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$$

Where n represents the sample size, N represents the total population, and e represents the margin of error (set at 0.05). This calculation yielded a sample size of 126 respondents, representing approximately 68% of the total population. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2009), samples representing 10-30% of the study population prove sufficient for descriptive analysis and drawing valid inferences, suggesting that this sample exceeded adequacy thresholds.

Data Collection

The study utilised structured questionnaires as the primary data collection instrument. According to McLean (2006), questionnaires offer several advantages for quantitative research, including efficiency in collecting data from large samples, standardisation enabling consistent measurement across respondents, and facilitation of statistical analysis. Sara and Armand (2018) confirmed that questionnaires are effective research tools when they meet the requirements of reliability and validity, enabling researchers to collect large amounts of data.

The questionnaires incorporated multiple sections addressing different research objectives. The first section collected demographic information, including gender, age, years of experience with irrigation projects or farming, and educational attainment. This information enabled the description of the sample characteristics and assessment of whether respondents possessed adequate knowledge and expertise to provide informed responses regarding M&E practices and project performance (Mellenbergh, 2008).

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) version 27, employing both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques (Hair et al., 2010). Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, characterised sample demographics, described levels of M&E practice implementation, and summarised perceptions of project performance. These descriptive analyses provided a foundational understanding of study variables and context before proceeding to more complex inferential analyses (Copper & Schindler, 2011).

Inferential statistics were used to examine the relationships between independent variables (M&E practices) and the dependent variable (project performance). Spearman's rank correlation coefficient assessed the bivariate relationships between each M&E practice and project performance, providing initial insights into the strength and direction of the association. Correlation analysis helps identify which variables show promise for predicting outcomes, though it does not establish causation or account for confounding variables (Field, 2013).

Multiple regression analysis enabled simultaneous examination of all four M&E practices, determining their



ISSN:3048-7722

combined explanatory power and assessing each practice's unique contribution to project performance while controlling for other variables (Hair et al., 2010). The regression model took the form:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \varepsilon$$

Where Y represents project performance,

X₁ through X₄ represent the four M&E practices (baseline surveys, stakeholder participation, budgetary allocation, and capacity building)

β_0 represents the constant term, β_1 through β_4 represent regression coefficients indicating each practice's effect on performance, and ε represents the error term capturing unexplained variance.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The investigation examined how monitoring and evaluation practices affect irrigation project outcomes in Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya, focusing on four key areas: stakeholders' participation, baseline surveys, budgetary allocation, and capacity building. Data from 126 project participants were analysed through correlation and regression methods. Results revealed that these four M&E practices account for approximately one-quarter of the variation in project success ($R^2 = 0.245$), with statistical significance confirmed ($F(4, 121) = 9.837, p < 0.001$). This indicates that while M&E practices are important contributors to project outcomes, additional factors beyond those studied also influence irrigation project success in the region.

Examining each practice individually, stakeholders' participation showed positive effects on project outcomes, though improvements in engagement quality could enhance its contribution. Baseline surveys demonstrated minimal impact on performance, possibly due to challenges in data quality or application. Budgetary allocation emerged as a particularly influential factor, with adequate M&E funding strongly associated with improved project performance through enabling essential functions like data collection, analysis, and personnel recruitment. Capacity building presented complex results, showing positive correlation with outcomes but a negative regression coefficient, suggesting intricate interactions with other variables, particularly budgetary allocation, and indicating the need for more strategic implementation approaches to maximize its effectiveness in enhancing irrigation project performance.

V. DISCUSSION

The study achieved a response rate of 70.3% (126 complete responses from 179 distributed questionnaires), exceeding thresholds for statistical significance and enabling confident generalisation to the broader population of irrigation project stakeholders in Tharaka-Nithi County.

Descriptive Analysis

Budgetary Allocation

Analysis of budgetary allocation for M&E activities revealed strong agreement among respondents regarding its importance for project success. The aggregate mean score of 4.01 on a five-point Likert scale indicated that stakeholders recognise adequate M&E funding as essential for effective project implementation.

Examining specific dimensions, respondents most strongly agreed that the availability of the M&E budget influences project performance (mean = 4.31, standard deviation = 0.623). This finding suggests that stakeholders have observed direct relationships between resource availability and the effectiveness of the M&E system. When dedicated budgets are in place, M&E teams can procure necessary equipment, conduct regular monitoring visits, hire qualified personnel, and produce timely reports that inform management decisions.

Respondents also strongly agreed that maintaining financial records for M&E activities influences project performance (mean = 4.08, standard deviation = 0.765). Systematic financial documentation enables transparency regarding resource utilisation, facilitates accountability to donors and stakeholders, and provides information for planning future monitoring and evaluation (M&E) investments. Without clear financial records, determining whether M&E resources are being used efficiently and effectively becomes extremely difficult.

Slightly lower but still substantial agreement characterised the statement that adequate budgets are allocated for M&E activities (mean = 3.65, standard deviation = 0.894). The lower mean and higher standard deviation suggest more variability in respondents' experiences and perceptions regarding actual budget adequacy. While most recognise that adequate funding matters, experiences with whether projects actually allocate sufficient resources appear more mixed, potentially reflecting genuine variation across the three irrigation projects or different stakeholder perspectives on what constitutes "adequate" funding.

Budgetary Allocation

Several mechanisms explain why budgetary allocation shows such strong positive effects on irrigation project performance:

- **Resource Availability:** Adequate M&E budgets enable procurement of essential equipment and technologies, including water flow meters, soil moisture sensors, weather monitoring stations, GPS devices for mapping, data management software, and communication equipment. These tools enhance the accuracy, timeliness, and comprehensiveness of data collection, providing better information for informed management decisions.
- **Human Resource Quality:** Sufficient funding enables the hiring and retention of qualified M&E personnel with the appropriate technical skills, educational backgrounds, and experience. Competitive compensation attracts capable professionals, while



ISSN:3048-7722

adequate budgets for professional development enable ongoing skill enhancement and growth. High-quality personnel generate higher-quality M&E information and provide more valuable support to project managers and stakeholders.

- **Monitoring Frequency and Consistency:** Dedicated budgets facilitate regular monitoring activities throughout project lifecycles rather than sporadic, ad hoc assessments. Consistent monitoring enables the early detection of implementation problems, the timely identification of emerging issues, and the rapid implementation of corrective actions before minor problems escalate into major crises that significantly compromise project outcomes.
- **Evaluation Rigour:** Adequate funding supports rigorous evaluation studies that employ appropriate methodologies, have sufficient sample sizes, and utilise experienced evaluators. Quality evaluations generate credible evidence regarding project effectiveness, identify factors contributing to success or failure, and provide actionable recommendations for improvement.
- **Stakeholder Engagement:** M&E budgets enable meaningful stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation processes through resources for facilitating participatory meetings, compensating community data collectors, producing accessible reports, and holding feedback sessions to share findings with communities. Enhanced stakeholder engagement strengthens ownership, accountability, and responsiveness to local needs and priorities.

The strong relationship between budgetary allocation and project performance suggests that treating M&E as discretionary expenditure represents a false economy. While reducing M&E budgets may appear to save resources in the short term, the resultant information deficits, delayed problem detection, and compromised decision-making are likely to generate far greater costs through project failures, inefficiencies, and missed opportunities for learning and improvement.

Comparison with Other M&E Practices

While budgetary allocation emerged as the strongest predictor, other M&E practices showed different patterns. Stakeholder participation displayed a positive effect approaching significance, suggesting potential benefits when implemented systematically alongside adequate funding. However, its weaker effect compared to budgetary allocation implies that participation alone, without adequate resources supporting M&E functions, may prove insufficient for maximising project performance.

Baseline surveys revealed a minimal impact, despite a strong theoretical rationale and respondents' recognition of their importance. This disconnect between perceived importance and measured impact suggests possible issues with implementation quality. Perhaps baseline surveys in Tharaka-Nithi irrigation projects are conducted superficially, capture inappropriate indicators, or fail to inform ongoing monitoring and evaluation activities.

Alternatively, the cross-sectional study design may inadequately capture baseline survey effects that manifest primarily over longer timeframes.

The negative coefficient for capacity building presents the most puzzling finding. While bivariate correlation showed a positive relationship ($r_s = 0.297$, $p = 0.001$), the regression analysis revealed a significant adverse effect when controlling for other variables ($\beta = -0.541$, $p = 0.008$). This apparent contradiction likely reflects complex interactions between M&E practices not fully captured by linear models. Potential explanations include:

1. **Multicollinearity:** A high correlation between capacity building and budgetary allocation may produce unstable regression coefficients, with budgetary allocation absorbing variance that is actually attributable to both factors.
2. **Time Lag Effects:** Capacity building benefits may materialise over more extended periods than captured by cross-sectional analysis, with short-term productivity losses during training periods potentially outweighing longer-term gains.
3. **Quality Issues:** If capacity building initiatives in these projects emphasise theoretical knowledge over practical application, consume resources without enhancing relevant skills, or fail to align with actual job requirements, they might genuinely reduce performance rather than improve it.
4. **Suppression Effects:** Statistical suppression occurs when controlling for other variables reveals relationships that were previously masked in bivariate analyses. The negative coefficient may reflect complex causal pathways that are not immediately apparent.

V. CONCLUSION

The findings of this study reveal that monitoring and evaluation practices collectively explain 24.5% of the variance in irrigation project performance in Tharaka-Nithi County, Kenya. Among the M&E practices examined, budgetary allocation emerged as the most significant predictor of project performance, demonstrating a strong positive relationship with project outcomes. This indicates that adequate funding for M&E activities is critical for enhancing project effectiveness.

The study further reveals that stakeholder participation, baseline surveys, and capacity building, while theoretically important, showed varying degrees of influence on project performance. The minimal effect of baseline surveys, despite strong descriptive ratings from respondents, suggests potential implementation quality issues rather than fundamental irrelevance. The collective operation of these M&E practices demonstrates synergistic effects, indicating that integrated approaches yield better results than isolated implementation of individual practices.

These findings underscore the importance of treating M&E as a strategic investment rather than discretionary expenditure, particularly in resource-constrained



ISSN:3048-7722

environments where budget cuts often target M&E activities first.

Recommendations

Based on the study findings, the following recommendations are proposed for policymakers, project managers, and development practitioners:

1. Establish Minimum M&E Budget Requirements

Government agencies, donors, and development organisations should establish guidelines that mandate minimum budgetary allocations for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities in irrigation projects. Given the strong evidence that adequate funding significantly enhances project performance, policies should ensure M&E receives protected funding typically ranging from 5-10% of total project costs. These budgets should be determined during project design phases, clearly specified in project documents, and protected from arbitrary reductions when financial pressures emerge.

Budget guidelines should specify what M&E funding should cover, including personnel costs, equipment and technology, data collection activities, analysis and reporting, evaluation studies, stakeholder engagement, and capacity building. Detailed budget line items enhance transparency and accountability, ensuring that all essential M&E functions receive adequate resources.

2. Develop Integrated M&E Frameworks

Rather than implementing M&E practices in isolation, organisations should develop comprehensive frameworks integrating baseline surveys, stakeholder participation, budgetary allocation, and capacity building. The finding that these practices collectively explain 24.5% of the variance in performance suggests that synergistic effects emerge when multiple practices operate together.

Integrated frameworks should specify how different monitoring and evaluation (M&E) components connect and reinforce one another. For example, adequate budgetary allocation enables quality baseline surveys and meaningful stakeholder participation, while capacity building enhances the ability to utilise allocated resources effectively. Clear frameworks provide roadmaps guiding M&E implementation from project inception through closure.

3. Prioritise M&E Funding in Resource Allocation Decisions

When budget constraints force difficult prioritisation decisions, M&E funding should receive protection rather than treatment as easily reducible discretionary expenditure. The strong relationship between budgetary allocation and project performance indicates that cutting M&E budgets to fund other activities represents false economy, likely to compromise overall project effectiveness.

Project managers should advocate for adequate monitoring and evaluation (M&E) resources during budget negotiations, presenting evidence regarding the value of

quality information for informed management decisions. Demonstrating how M&E investments generate returns through enhanced project performance may help secure necessary funding even in resource-constrained environments.

4. Improve Baseline Survey Quality and Utilisation

While baseline surveys showed a minimal effect in this study, their theoretical importance and strong descriptive ratings from respondents suggest that implementation quality issues may be at play rather than fundamental irrelevance. Organisations should invest in comprehensive baseline studies that capture relevant indicators using sound methodologies and ensure that the collected data is accurate and properly utilised throughout the project lifecycle.

REFERENCES

1. Atkinson, R. (2014). Project management: cost, time, and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon; it's time to accept other success criteria. *International Journal of Project Management*, 17(6), 337–342
2. Babbie, E., & Mouton, J. (2006). *The Practice of Social Research*. U.K.: Oxford University
3. Barney, J. (1916). Strategic factor markets: Expectation, luck, and business strategy.
4. Barney, J. (2018). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*,
5. Evaluation capacity building in response to the agricultural research impact agenda: Emerging insights from Ireland, Catalonia (Spain), New Zealand, and guidebook and resource. John Wiley & Sons.
6. Kengera, Z., & Mromba, C. (2023). Opportunities and Challenges for Professionalising Monitoring and Evaluation Practice: A Global Overview and Perspectives. *Tanzania Journal for Population Studies and Development*, 30(2), 113-129.
7. Kihuha, P. (2018). Monitoring and evaluation practices and performance of global environment facility projects in Kenya [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi].
8. Kimweli, J. M. (2013). The role of monitoring and evaluation practices to the success of donor-funded food security intervention projects: A case study of Kibwezi District. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(6), 9-19. *Management Science*, 32, 1231-1241.
9. Mugenda, O. & Mugenda, A. (2003). *Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative*
10. Mugo, N. J. (2017). Monitoring and evaluation practices, ethics, and sustainability of agricultural food crop projects in Nyeri County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
11. 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.
12. Suprpto, M., Bakker, H. L., Mooi, H. G., & Hertogh, M. J. (2016). How do contract types and incentives



ISSN:3048-7722

matter to project performance? International Journal of Project Management,

13. Taylor, S. J., Bogdan, R., & DeVault, M. (2015). Introduction to qualitative research methods: A
14. Turner, J. A., Guesmi, B., Gil, J. M., Heanue, K., Sierra, M., Percy, H., ... & Milne, C. (2022). Uruguay. Evaluation and Program Planning, 102127.