Examining stakeholder involvement in the evaluation process for program improvement

Edwin Ochieng Okul^(a), Raphael Ondeko Nyonje^(b)

^(a) The University of Nairobi, Kenya P.O Box 84 - 40123, Kisumu, Kenya

^(b) School of Open, Distance and eLearning, The University of Nairobi, Kenya P.O Box 30197- 00100, Nairobi, Kenya.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 13 August 2020

Received in rev. form 15 Sept. 2020

Accepted 18 September 2020

Keywords:

Project Evaluation, Evaluation

Utilization, Stakeholder Involvement

JEL Classification:

O22

ABSTRACT

The results of an evaluation should be used for the envisioned goal and the evaluation process and/or outcomes should be used in practice and decision making. This article presents research whose objective was to establish the extent to which stakeholder involvement in evaluations impacts the utilization of evaluation findings for program improvement. Guided by the pragmatic paradigm and supported by the Utilization-Focused Evaluation Model and Knowledge Use Theory, the researchers assumed a descriptive and correlational design using mixed methods. The sample size for this study was 232 project staff from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Kisumu Central Sub-County, Kenya. To analyse qualitative data, the open-ended responses from key informant interviews were recorded and coded appropriately for further analysis for themes through content analysis and comparative analysis. Frequencies and percentages were calculated to describe the basic characteristics of the quantitative data. To ensure the validity and reliability of the research instruments, pilot testing was conducted. Cronbach's alpha at $\alpha = 0.908$ was attained as the reliability coefficient of the pre-test instruments. Tests of statistical assumptions were carried out before data analysis to avoid invalidation. A hypothesis was tested at the $\alpha = .05$ level of significance and was rejected. The findings demonstrate that there is a significant relationship between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and the utilization of evaluation results. This research, therefore, reinforces literature and helps to understand the ways in which stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences the utilization of evaluation results. It informs the evaluation field of study, fills gaps in the evaluation use literature, and contributes to the appreciation of factors that predict and enhance the utilization of evaluation results

© 2020 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

One of the utmost worries in the field of evaluation has been how to guarantee the evaluation results are truly being utilized. If evaluation results are not utilized, then evaluations are unable to attain their main objective, which is social betterment (Henry, 2003; Mark, Henry & Julnes, 2000). After UNDP spent more than \$8.5 billion on activities of anti-poverty between 2004 and 2011; it was a challenge for it to show major impact on the lives of the people it was trying to change (Warah, 2013). Even as funds are expended on the evaluation of development programmes, little is known about the utilization of the results. Utilization Focused Evaluation is a result of an aspiration in the evaluation field for evaluations that are in principle useful. Whereas this may appear simple, its application may be hindered by some limitations, among them organizational challenges (Ramírez, Kora, & Shephard, 2015).

Lately, organizations and governments worldwide have witnessed a rising surge of demand for evaluations. Indeed, evaluations practices have become more extensive in the last 30 years (Hojlund, 2014). The progress of evaluation practice and attention to its use is altogether wide-ranging. In the U.S. for example, evaluation became principally pertinent in the 1960s when large amounts of money were devoted to social programmes, but the effects of these investments were mostly unidentified (Stufflebeam, Madaus & Kellaghan, 2000). In Europe evaluation practice has progressed to numerous levels across nations, with Sweden, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Germany, Denmark, Norway, France and Finland currently in the lead (Tall, 2009). The use of evaluation in Europe is most evident and obvious at an operational level, i.e. within and between different stages of expenditure programmes (EPEC,

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9794-4291

© 2020 by the authors. Hosting by SSBFNET. Peer review under responsibility of Center for Strategic Studies in Business and Finance.

<https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v9i5.835>

2005). Here, evaluation use is manifest in the plan and operation of interventions. South Eastern Asian countries have for long had recognised provisions for development planning and implementation (Magno and Gonzalez, 2011). While systems for planning and implementation of development projects have been instituted by the governments, strong evaluation practice is still lacking (Lowden, 2005). In Malaysia, impact evaluation processes have been institutionalized and the level of competence of staff has been raised (Khan, 1992). It is nonetheless still deficient in policy directions, leading to them undertaking studies on an as and when basis. There is no clear definition of scope and degree of involvement in evaluations, i.e. what should be evaluated, who should evaluate and what use would be made of evaluation studies. In Indonesia, more emphasis is on monitoring and mostly of foreign-aided projects, and as a result, more of execution monitoring, and especially for foreign-aided projects than nationally funded programmes (Khan, 1992). Project evaluation in South Africa first arose as a practice in which project activities and results needed to be evaluated in the non-government (NGO) sector as a requirement for more donor investment (Mouton, 2010). Essential funding via authorities in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) began in the 2000s (Goldman, et al., 2015). The earliest M&E system in government began when the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) was established. This was mostly a compliance-based structure, particularly in relation to accountability to the National Treasury and the Auditor General (Phillips et al., 2014). To ensure that evaluations were used, it was critical to alter this custom. Likewise, the likelihood of those in authority to use evaluations was limited (Mouton, 2010). In Uganda, the Malaria Eradication Programme has utilised evaluations to provide useful lessons for current elimination attempts (Najera, Gonzalez-Silva & Alonso, 2011). The use of evaluations in the region remains a relatively new practice, to the degree that all countries within this region are labelled as being in a Monitoring and Evaluation formative stage (Porter & Goldman, 2013)

Comparable to most developing countries, in Kenya, programme evaluation in the public sector in government has not yet reached acceptable levels of use (Republic of Kenya, 2014). Nevertheless, there have been determinations to execute some monitoring and evaluation. For example, in 1983, a Monitoring and Evaluation framework was suggested for the District Focus for Rural Development strategy and in the 1990s Monitoring and Evaluation use became manifest in the Poverty Eradication Strategy (Kirori, 2015). The latest government work in evaluation was the development of a National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System to monitor progress of the Economic Recovery Strategy (Republic of Kenya, 2007). In most sectors within the government, counting at the county level, central monitoring and evaluation of programmes and projects is consequently only a new development (Republic of Kenya, 2017). In 2004, the government added results based management (RBM) within the Public service as a planning policy with a view to enhancing general performance, service delivery and governance. Performance contracts have been then added as a control device for measuring overall performance against negotiated performance targets (Ochanda, 2005). Currently, evaluation results offer government officials, project managers, and civil societies with better means for learning from past experience, improving service delivery, planning and allocating resources, and demonstrating results as part of accountability to key stakeholder (Owen, 2013).

Non-Governmental Organizations in Kisumu have carried out evaluation undertakings, and even though some of the evaluations are utilized mainly to analyse the effect of projects, they are also a mandatory obligation for most donor funded projects. Donors use them to define effective usage of funds by NGOs (USAID, 2014; African Water Facility; 2014, Concern Worldwide; 2014). The utilization of the evaluation results for that reason remains a significant conclusion of any evaluation for most evaluators.

Past research studies have established the different factors that influence evaluation use. Johnson *et al.* (2009) affirmed that stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences evaluation use but not how it weighs on the relationship with institutional factors. An earlier study by Shea & Lewko (1995), concluded that the involvement of stakeholders leads to increased use of evaluation findings. This was a participatory and quasi experimental design that lacked random assignment, thus internal validity was reduced; and causal claims may be difficult to make from their study.

From the shortcomings of the above studies, and the failure among NGOs to utilize evaluation results, this study seeks to fill the research gap on the nature of evaluation results utilization among NGOs in Kisumu Central sub-county. The study, which sought to determine the level at which stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County, Kenya, also highlights the nature and level of stakeholder involvement in evaluations, in the utilization of evaluation results.

Literature Review

Theoretical Review

This study was guided by Utilization Focused Evaluation Model; and supported by Knowledge Use Theory.

Utilization Focused Evaluation Model: The study was hinged on Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE) model. What are typically termed “theories” in evaluation are more precisely labelled as models or frameworks (Alkin, 2004). Evaluation use theories lay emphasise on how information will be used and by whom the evaluation results will be used (Christie & Alkin, 2008; Alkin, 2004). Patton’s Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE) is one of the most exceptional theoretical accounts of use. Accordingly, it is the foundation for much of the evaluation use research (Alkin, 2004; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The basis of Utilization Focused Evaluation is the principle that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use. To that end, evaluators should enable the evaluation process and design any evaluation with careful consideration of how everything that is done, from start to finish, will

impact use (Nyonje, Kyalo & Mulwa, 2002). The spotlight in utilization focused evaluation is therefore, on intended use by intended users (Patton, 2008).

Knowledge Use Theory: Evaluation results, like all organizational experiences, are also knowledge. Knowledge use, as identified by Shadish, Cook, & Leviton (1991), is one of the five central concerns that undergird practical evaluation theory. They proposed a model of evaluation theory that encompasses five constituents. Among the constituents are knowledge construction and knowledge use. Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, (1991) contend that the knowledge generated from evaluation should be useful in addressing social problems. They reason that the resources spent on evaluation should be vindicated by the usefulness of the new knowledge that derives from evaluation. Evaluation, in their view, should inform how, when, where, and why useful results can be produced.

Empirical Review

Project evaluation: Project evaluation is the determination of the worth or merit of a project or its product or method. It is a systematic practise used to decide the value of a particular project in a specific context. Organizational decision-makers including the project sponsors, donors and stakeholders want to judge the worth or merit of their programmes to ensure that the programmes are accomplishing the intended purpose (Guskey, 2000).

Insights picked up during the process of conducting an evaluation, regardless of any reports or findings being generated can be regarded as evaluation use. This type of evaluation use is about how individuals and organizations are impacted upon as a result of participating in an evaluation.

Evaluation utilization: The term “utilization” is often treated interchangeably with the term “use” (Gary and Melvin, 2003). These two terms have been used in closely identical ways in the evaluation literature and this study did not try to differentiate between the two. Empirical research on evaluation use have recognised several types of evaluation utilization; Conceptual use, Instrumental use, Persuasive use and Process use. Conceptual use happens when the evaluation results assist the programme staff or key stakeholders to think about and understand the programme in a new way (Fleischer and Christie, 2009). Persuasive use involves persuading, informing or educating others, such as decision makers or stakeholders (Johnson et al., 2009). Process use denotes the cognitive, behavioural, programme, and organizational changes resulting, either directly or indirectly from engagement in the evaluation process and learning to think evaluatively (Patton, 2008). Instrumental use of evaluation occurs when decision makers use the findings to change or modify the programme in some way (McCormick, 1997; Shulha and Cousins, 1997).

This study took into consideration multiple definitions in exploring the effect of stakeholder involvement in evaluations and three explanations that echoed for the researcher are those of Alkin, Daillak & White (1979) who reported that use is “the ways in which an evaluation and information from the evaluation impacts the programme that is being evaluated”; Patton (2008) who identified use as “how real people in the real world apply evaluation findings and experiences” and Johnson et al. (2009) who described use as “the application of evaluation process, products, or findings to produce an effect”.

Stakeholder involvement in Evaluations: A stakeholder is one who has substantial ego, credibility, power, futures, or other capital invested in the program, and thus can be held to be to some degree at risk with it (Scriven, 1991). These include program staff and many others who are not actively involved in the day-to-day operations. They include also the funding agencies and donors, those responsible for the planning and designing the project and the beneficiaries. These are the people who have a stake in the program or projects being evaluated and thus also have a stake in the evaluation (Greene, 1988).

Stakeholder involvement in evaluations means the inclusion of stakeholders in one or more components of the evaluation (the evaluation design, data collection, validating evaluation results, etc.). This, it has been suggested, increases utilization and promotes evaluation development (Patton, 2008). Another typical assumption is that the more stakeholders are involved, the greater sense of ownership stakeholders will have in the evaluation, thus increasing the likelihood of the use of evaluation results (Cousins and Earl, 1992). The potential areas for stakeholder involvement in evaluations include focusing the evaluation, identifying people to serve on the evaluation team, planning, designing, collecting data, analysing data, interpreting data, writing reports, communicating findings and monitoring utilization.

Being involved in an evaluation may lead to changes in the thoughts and behaviors of individuals, which can then lead to change in how the individuals make decisions about the project, program or policy evaluated (Preskill, Zuckerman & Matthews, 2003). The extent of involvement here is on the technical tasks of the evaluation process as well as on the task of initiating (or not) an evaluation, writing the terms of reference, or using the results. Stakeholders may define the evaluation terms of reference, provide payment for the evaluation, and use the findings (King, 2005).

Patton (1997) posited that the most important deciding factor in the extent to which evaluation is utilized is the level to which program stakeholders take ownership of the evaluation process and actively work to ensure that evaluation findings are utilized as intended. Patton’s (1997) study used a learning process involving a co-dependent scheme of stakeholder participants to clarify evaluation use. The study regarded insights picked up by stakeholders during the process of conducting an evaluation as evaluation use. Patton’s findings agreed with a research on evaluation utilization conducted in Canada by Shea & Lewko (1995). The researchers formed a stakeholders group to help in the formulation of evaluation questions, planning which findings would be used at each level, revising the draft report and tracking the utilization of findings. This extensive involvement of stakeholders led to extensive use of evaluation

findings in the development of site-level operational policies for the program. They concluded that the involvement of stakeholders leads to increased use of evaluation findings. Working with program staff therefore enlists their attention, knowledge, and commitment to using the results. This is process use, which is the impact upon individuals and organizations as a result of participating in an evaluation. This was a participatory and quasi experimental research design. In general, this research design was more feasible, given the typical time and logistical constraints (Guba, 1990). The research may have however lacked random assignment, without which internal validity is reduced. Subsequently, causal claims are difficult to make (Freedman, Pisani & Purves, 2007). While quasi-experimental designs also tend to have fewer variables which are easier to control, this limits the ability to make causal claims (Morse, 2000). But since quasi-experimental designs tend to present the situation under investigation in real-world conditions, the external validity is increased (Palys & Atchison, 2008).

Nyonje *et al.* (2012) posit that in order to enhance the impact of an evaluation, stakeholders ought to be involved at the various stages of the evaluation. The extent to which the stakeholders are involved in the evaluation process for that reason influences the extent to which its findings will be utilized. The recognition, legitimatization and involvement of a stakeholder group in an evaluation are therefore critical to guarantee the collection of high quality data and the utilization of findings. There is for that reason a connection between involvement and use. This makes the quality of involvement a crucial concern in the evaluation that may lead to an improved use of findings.

In a study by Peck and Gorzalski (2009), 93.8% of the respondents strongly agreed that stakeholder participation is critical in conducting a program evaluation. The empirical study involved data collection through a survey and interviews. The target population were mainly non-profit organizations, a few university-community partnerships and two government agencies. Data came from 16 program evaluations conducted in the context of a graduate course on program evaluation. A short closed-ended survey, with a Likert response format was administered. In addition, an interview guide was used for in-person interviews with each agency contact person to collect information about how the agency used the evaluation. The open-ended questions elicited a more spontaneous response (Creswell, 1998).

Research and Methodology

This was a descriptive and correlational study using mixed methods and assumed the pragmatic paradigm. The use of the two designs were found suitable since the study relied on both descriptive and inferential data analysis. Most preceding studies on evaluation use have even so been either case studies or literature reviews (Johnson *et al.*, 2009; Goh & Richards, 1997; Shulha and Cousins, 1997; Preskill, *et al.*, 2003; Greene, J. G., 1988).

The sampling unit comprised of project staff drawn from a target population of 585 staff of 117 NGOs in Kisumu Central Sub-County, Kenya. The sample size for the study was 232, determined using Krejcie and Morgan tables (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970) and the hypergeometric distribution formula for small samples to confirm the sample size. The required sample size was purposively selected from executive directors, programme managers, project coordinators, project assistants and field assistants from the NGOs. The study then relied the simple random sampling approach to reach 2 members of staff from a list of 5 staff in each NGO. The questionnaire was the central tool but given the importance of reliability to this study, supplementary evidence was sought from key informants from the NGOs using interview schedules as a subsidiary tool.

The questionnaire was pre-tested with 23 project staff from non-participating NGOs in a neighbouring Sub-county. This was 10% of the sample size (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The pre-test was followed by correction of sections or questions that needed to be corrected. Cronbach alpha was used to test the reliability of the instrument (Cronbach and Azuma, 1962). The instrument had a reliability coefficient of 0.908 thus considered reliable and internally consistent. According to Cronbach and Azuma, (1962) an alpha coefficient of 0.7 indicates that the gathered data are reliable and have relatively high internal consistency which can be generalized to reflect views of all respondents in the target population.

Pearson product-moment correlations coefficients was computed to determine the relationships that exist between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and utilization of evaluation results in NGOs in Kisumu central sub-county. The Alternate Hypothesis, H_1 "There is significant relationship between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and utilization of evaluation results in NGOs in Kisumu central sub-county" was first changed into Null Hypotheses and the significance of the objective of the study tested at $\alpha=0.05$ significance level. Sekaran's (2006) decision criterion, according to which the Null Hypothesis is to be rejected if P-value < 0.05; or otherwise it is accepted using the Pearson correlation p-values under 2-tailed test was relied on. The following hypothesis was tested for possible rejection or otherwise;

Hypothesis; H_1 : There is significant relationship between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results in NGOs in Kisumu central sub-county.

Utilization of evaluation results = f (Stakeholder involvement in evaluations, random error)

$$Y_j = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \epsilon_i$$

Where β_0 is the Population's regression constant, X_1 is Stakeholder involvement in evaluations, β_1 is the regression coefficient of Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and ϵ is the Model error variable.

The regression model was used to make predictions or inferences about the population of study from observations and analyses of a sample. Simple linear regression was adopted to investigate how stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences Utilization of evaluation results.

Empirical data and analysis

Response rate

Out of the 232 questionnaires administered to project staff, 226 questionnaires were appropriately filled, giving a response rate of 97.4% as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Questionnaire response rate

Number of Project staff	Questionnaires issued	Total questionnaire returned	Percentage of Response
232	232	226	97.4

The 97.4% questionnaire return rate was considered sufficient for data processing and analysis as a response rate above 50% is sufficient for data that could be generalized to represent the opinions of respondents about the study problem in the target population (Orodho, 2009).

Utilization of Evaluation Results

Ten statements were used to measure the project staff's opinions on utilization of evaluation results in their organizations, the dependent variable of the study. The participants were invited to respond to the items in the Likert scale of 1-5 whereby: Strongly agree (SA) = 5; Agree (A) = 4; Neutral (N) = 3; Disagree (D) = 2 and Strongly disagree (SD) = 1.

The answers as per separate indicators as well as aggregate indicators of utilization of evaluation results are presented in Table 2

Table 2: Utilization of Evaluation Results

ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Std. Dev
<u>INSTRUMENTAL USE</u>	60(26.5%)	79(35.0%)	48(21.2%)	31(13.8%)	8(3.5%)	3.67	1.115
My organization used evaluation results to increase funding							
My organization used evaluation results to scale up our project	74(33.1%)	88(38.5%)	40(17.7%)	19(8.5%)	5(2.2%)	4.09	2.854
My organization used evaluation results to restructure our project	82(33.6%)	94(41.6%)	30(15.9%)	15(6.7%)	5(2.2%)	3.98	0.982
<u>CONCEPTUAL USE</u>	75(33.2%)	85(37.6%)	53(23.4%)	4(1.8%)	9(4.0%)	3.96	0.942
From the findings of our last evaluation I understand the project differently							
From the findings of our last evaluation I have learnt more about the project	83(36.7%)	84(37.2%)	33(14.6%)	22(9.7%)	4(1.8%)	3.97	1.032
From the findings of our last evaluation I understand other's perception of the programme better	75(33.2%)	96(42.5%)	26(11.5%)	12(5.3%)	17(7.5%)	3.88	1.153
<u>PERSUASIVE USE</u>	71(31.4%)	86(38.1%)	35(15.5%)	18(8.0%)	16(7.0%)	3.79	1.177
Results from our last evaluation have persuaded others to be interested in our project							
Results from our last evaluation have persuaded others to fund raise for our project	50(22.1%)	72(31.9%)	52(23%)	30(13.3%)	22(9.7%)	3.43	1.243
I applied a new skill(s) learned as a result of conducting the evaluation	76(33.6%)	86(38.1%)	28(12.4%)	26(11.5%)	10(4.4%)	3.85	1.141
I applied lesson learned as a result of conducting the evaluation	79(35%)	80(35.4%)	38(16.8%)	20(8.8%)	9(4.0%)	3.88	1.106
COMPOSITE UTILIZATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS	72(31.6%)	85(37.6%)	39(17.3%)	20(8.8%)	10(4.4%)	3.85	1.382

The results in the above table designate that 72(31.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed that evaluation results were utilized in their organization, 85(37.6%) of the respondents agreed, 39(17.3%) of the respondents were neutral, 20(8.8%) disagreed and 10(4.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that evaluation results were utilized in their organization. The composite mean of utilization of evaluation results was found to be 3.85 with a standard deviation of 1.382.

Stakeholder involvement in Evaluations

Ten statements were used to measure project staff views on the extent to which Stakeholder involvement in evaluations influence Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County on a five point Likert scale of 1-5 whereby; Strongly agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4, Neutral (N) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2 and Strongly disagree (SD) = 1. The responses as per individual stakeholder involvement in evaluations indicators as well as aggregate indicators of utilization of evaluation results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of Evaluation Results

STATEMENTS	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Std. Dev.
In our last evaluation, stakeholders were involved in discussion that focused the evaluation purpose and questions	73(32.3%)	78(34.5%)	37(16.4%)	27(11.9%)	11(4.9%)	3.77	1.165
In our last evaluation, stakeholders were in involved in identifying evaluation team members	67(29.6%)	77(34.1%)	35(15.5%)	37(16.4%)	10(4.4%)	3.68	1.187
In our organization, stakeholders are involved in developing the evaluation design and plan	76(33.6%)	75(33.2%)	36(15.9%)	23(10.2%)	16(7.1%)	3.76	1.220
In our organization, stakeholders are involved in developing evaluation data collection tools	75(33.2%)	73(32.3%)	39(17.3%)	20(8.8%)	19(8.4%)	3.73	1.245
In our organization, stakeholders are involved in collecting evaluation data	75(33.2%)	80(35.4%)	30(13.3%)	26(11.5%)	15(6.6%)	3.77	1.215
In our organization stakeholders are involved in analysing evaluation data	78(34.5%)	74(32.7%)	34(15%)	24(10.7%)	16(7.1%)	3.77	1.229
In our organization, stakeholders are involved in interpreting evaluation data	68(30.1%)	70(31%)	38(16.8%)	29(12.8%)	21(9.3%)	3.60	1.290
In our organization, stakeholders are involved in writing evaluation reports	70(31%)	72(31.9%)	35(15.5%)	27(11.9%)	22(9.7%)	3.62	1.298
In our organization, stakeholders are involved in presenting evaluation findings	73(32.3%)	71(31.4%)	40(17.7%)	24(10.6%)	18(8.0%)	3.69	1.247
Since the last evaluation, stakeholders have been monitoring the utilization of the evaluation findings	72(31.9%)	78(34.5%)	37(16.4%)	21(9.2%)	18(8.0%)	3.73	1.227
Overall composite stakeholder involvement	73(32.3%)	75(33.2%)	36(15.9%)	26(11.5%)	16(7.1%)	3.72	1.228

The results revealed that 73(32.3%) of respondents strongly agreed that stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County, 75(33.2%) of the respondents agreed, 36(15.9%) were neutral, 26(11.5%) disagreed and 16(7.1%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. The composite mean was found to be 3.72 with a standard deviation of 1.228.

The study also sought to establish the extent to which project staff agreed or disagreed with statements about stakeholder involvement in their last evaluation. The findings on Table 3 indicates that 73(32.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed, 78(34.5%) agreed, 37(16.4%) were neutral, 27(11.9%) disagreed and 11(4.9%) strongly disagreed that in their last evaluation, stakeholders were involved in discussion that focused the evaluation purpose and questions.

The respondents' view on stakeholder involvement in identifying evaluation team members in their last evaluation indicate that 67(29.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed, 77(34.1%) agreed, 35(15.5%) were neutral, 37(16.4%) disagreed and 10(4.4%) strongly disagreed that stakeholders were involved in identifying evaluation team members in their last evaluation.

The study also needed the respondents' view on stakeholder involvement in developing the evaluation designs and plans and 76(33.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed, 75(33.2%) agreed, 36(15.9%) were neutral, 23(10.2%) disagreed and 16(7.1%) strongly disagreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in developing the evaluation design and plan.

The study sought the respondents' view on influence of stakeholder involvement in developing the data collection tools and 75(33.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in developing the data collection tools, 73(32.3%) agreed, 39(17.3%) were neutral, 20(8.8%) disagreed and 19(8.4%) strongly disagreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in developing the data collection tools.

The fifth statement which required the respondents' view on stakeholder involvement in data collection had 75(33.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in the collection of evaluation data, 80(35.4%)

agreed, 30(13.3%) were neutral, 26(11.5%) disagreed and 15(6.6%) strongly disagreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in the collection of evaluation data.

On stakeholder involvement in analysing evaluation data, 78(34.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in analysing evaluation data, 74(32.7%) agreed, 34(15%) were neutral, 24(10.7%) disagreed and 16(7.1%) strongly disagreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in analysing evaluation data.

The respondents' view on influence of stakeholder involvement in interpreting evaluation data showed that 68(30.1%) of the respondents strongly agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in interpretation of evaluation data, 70(31%) agreed, 38(16.8%) were neutral, 29(12.8%) disagreed and 21(9.3%) strongly disagreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in the interpretation of evaluation data.

The study also required the respondents' view on stakeholder involvement in writing the evaluation reports and 70(31%) of the respondents strongly agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in writing evaluation reports, 72(31.9%) agreed, 35(15.5%) were neutral, 27(11.9%) disagreed and 22(9.7%) strongly disagreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in the writing of evaluation reports.

The respondents' view on stakeholder involvement in presenting evaluation findings was also sought and 73(32.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are usually involved in presenting evaluation findings, 71(31.4%) agreed, 40(17.7%) were neutral, 24(10.6%) disagreed and 18(8.0%) strongly disagreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in the presenting evaluation findings.

The study required the respondents' view on stakeholder involvement in monitoring the utilization of the evaluation findings had 74(31.9%) of the respondents who strongly agreed that since the last evaluation in their organization, stakeholders have been involved in monitoring the utilization of the evaluation findings, 78(34.5%) agreed, 37(16.4%) were neutral, 21(9.2%) disagreed and 18(8.0%) strongly disagreed that since the last evaluation in their organization, stakeholders have been involved in monitoring the utilization of the evaluation findings.

Pearson correlation coefficient

The research sought to establish the relationship between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results and to test the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant relationship between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. Using the aggregate scores for items in the stakeholder involvement in evaluations and utilization of evaluation results scale, Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) was run in SPSS to examine if a significant relationship existed between the two variables on the sample data at 95% confidence level. The result is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Correlation between Stakeholder involvements in evaluations on Utilization of evaluation results

		Utilization of evaluation results
Stakeholder involvement in evaluations	Pearson correlation coefficient	0.965*
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0.000
	N	226

* $p < .05$

The correlation output table 4 indicated that $r = 0.965$ implying that there was a strong positive linear correlation between Stakeholder Involvement in Evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results.

Hypothesis Testing

The study sought to test the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant relationship between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County as follows:

H01: There is no statistically significant relationship between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County.

Regression Analysis

Simple linear regression was adopted to investigate how Stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences utilization of evaluation results. The rationale for using the simple regression model was to establish how stakeholder involvement in evaluations as a predictor significantly or insignificantly predicted Utilization of evaluation results. The regression results are presented in table 5.

Table 5: Regression output of Utilization of evaluation results on Stakeholder involvement in evaluations

Model summary	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. error of the estimate		
	0.965	0.930	0.930	0.292		
ANOVA						
		Sum of squares	d.f	Mean square	F	Sig.
	Regression	255.834	1	255.834	2999.001	0.000
	Residual	19.109	224	0.085		
	Total	274.942	225			
Model co-efficient						
	Model	Un-standardized co-efficient		Standardized co-efficient		Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta	T	
	Constant	0.606	0.062		9.751	0.000
	Stakeholder involvement in evaluations	0.868	0.016	0.965	54.763	0.000

R = 0.965, R² = 0.930, R² adjusted = 0.930, Se = 0.292, F-stat: 2999.001 on 1 and 224 df, p-value = 0.000

The ANOVA results indicated that (F-statistics (1,224) = 2999.001, is significant at P value 0.000 < 0.05 implying that the regression model results in significantly better prediction of Utilization of evaluation results. The coefficients table presented p-values (0.000) less than the level of significance (0.05) hence the simple regression model is given as;

$$Y = 0.606 + 0.868X_4$$

Where:

Y is Utilization of evaluation results and

X_4 is Stakeholder involvement in evaluations

Results and Discussions

The composite mean score of the project staff's opinions on utilization of evaluation results in their organizations implies that the respondents agreed that there was utilization of evaluation results in their organization. The organizations tend to use results mostly to scale up projects (mean = 4.09), to restructure projects (mean = 3.98) and staff learn more about their projects (mean = 3.97) as a result of evaluations. The least common uses of evaluation results among organizations are to persuaded others to fund raise for projects (mean = 3.43), to increase funding (mean = 3.67) and to persuaded others to be interested in projects (mean = 3.79).

These findings agree with comparable findings by Burr, E. M. (2009) who found out that there is indication of utilization of evaluation results in the organization studied. In Burr's study, 80% of the project directors used the results of their evaluation for making programme-related decisions, 70% used the results of their evaluation for educational purposes, and 50% used the results of their evaluation for persuasive purposes. These conclusions are also similar to findings by Bourgeois and Whynot (2018) who found that evaluations are methodically used in organizations for instrumental and conceptual purposes at the programme level to authenticate prevailing programme management concerns and to enhance changes in programme strategy and delivery. Some cases cited by respondents in their study included improvements in processes, changes in grant and contribution amounts, clarification of program theory, and learning about target audiences. Likewise Burr (2009) established that project directors are applying their programmes' evaluations for instrumental, conceptual, symbolic, and process-related purposes. Ramírez, *et al.* (2015) also confirmed that evaluation findings inform organizational strategic and operational decisions throughout the life of the evaluation.

In this study, stakeholder involvement in an evaluation was conceptualised as their inclusion in one or more components of the evaluation. This was determined by assessing their inclusion in the design, data collection, interpreting and utilization of evaluation results. The overall composite score of all indicators of influence of Stakeholder involvement in evaluations on the utilization of evaluation results implies that the respondents agreed that stakeholder involvement in evaluations influenced the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County.

The study established that the majority (66.8%) of the project staff at least agreed that in their last evaluation, stakeholders were involved in discussions that focused the evaluation purpose and questions. The mean score of 3.77 and standard deviation of 1.165

was above the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in discussions that focused the evaluation purpose and questions positively influenced the utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The findings on project staff's view on stakeholder involvement in identifying evaluation team members implied that the majority (63.7%) of the project staff at least agreed that in their last evaluation, stakeholders were involved in identifying evaluation team members. The mean score of 3.68 and standard deviation of 1.187 in this item were below the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228, implying that stakeholder involvement in identifying evaluation team members moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

Majority (66.8%) of the project staff agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in developing the evaluation design and plan. The mean score of 3.76 and standard deviation of 1.220 in this item were above the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in evaluations positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

Results on stakeholder involvement in developing data collection tools implied that most (65.5%) of the project staff at least agreed that in their organizations, stakeholders are involved in developing the data collection tools. The mean score of 3.73 and standard deviation of 1.245 in this item were above the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in evaluations moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The findings further implied that the majority (68.6%) of the project staff at least agreed that in their organization stakeholders are involved in the collection of evaluation data. The mean score of 3.77 and standard deviation of 1.215 in this item were above the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in evaluations positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

Most (67.2%) of the project staff at least agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in analysing evaluation data. The mean score of 3.77 and standard deviation of 1.229 in this item were above the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in evaluations positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

It was also found that most (61.1%) of the project staff agreed that in their organization stakeholders are involved in the interpretation of evaluation data. The mean score of 3.60 and standard deviation of 1.290 in this item were below the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in evaluations moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

Most (62.9%) of the project staff at least agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in the writing of evaluation reports. The mean score of 3.62 and standard deviation of 1.298 in this item were below the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in evaluations moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization

Majority (63.7%) of the project staff agreed that in their organization, stakeholders are involved in the presentation of evaluation findings. The mean score of 3.69 and standard deviation of 1.247 in this item were below the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in evaluations moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization

It was also established that the majority (66.4%) of the project staff agreed that since the last evaluation in their organization, stakeholders have been involved in monitoring the utilization of the evaluation findings. The mean score of 3.73 and standard deviation of 1.227 in this item were above the composite mean score of 3.72 and standard deviation of 1.228 implying that stakeholder involvement in evaluations positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

In most of the organizations, stakeholders were involved in discussion that focused the evaluation purpose and questions (mean = 3.77), in collecting evaluation data (mean = 3.77), in analysing evaluation data (mean = 3.77) or in developing the evaluation design and plan (mean = 3.76) in their last evaluations. On the other hand, in fewer of the organizations were stakeholders involved in interpreting evaluation data (mean = 3.60), identifying evaluation team members (mean = 3.68), or in writing evaluation reports (mean = 3.62) in their last evaluations.

These findings on the influence of stakeholder involvement in evaluations on utilization of evaluation results are in agreement with similar findings by Johnson *et al.* (2009) who established that the three important factors influencing evaluation use are evaluation context, decision/policy setting and stakeholder involvement. These findings are as well similar to findings by Shea and Lewko (1995) who also found that stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences utilization of evaluation. The findings also confirm those by Nyonje *et al.* (2012) that in order to enhance the impact of an evaluation, stakeholders ought to be involved at the various stages of the evaluation. Similarly, Henry & Melvin (2003) observe that an organization can promote evaluation use by first setting the agenda.

The positive correlation obtained is in agreement with the descriptive statistics discussed from Table 3 which indicated that the project staff who participated in the study agreed (Mean=3.72) that stakeholder involvement in evaluations increases utilization of evaluation results in an organization.

These results infer that the utilization of evaluation results among NGOs in Kisumu Central Sub-county is correlated with stakeholder involvement in evaluations. The findings are consistent with those by Nyonje *et al.* (2012) who also suggest that in order to improve the influence of an evaluation, stakeholders must to be involved at the various stages of the evaluation. Similarly, the study by Peck and Gorzalski (2009), concluded that stakeholder participation is critical in conducting a program evaluation.

The p value was found to be 0.000 at 0.05 level of significance. This was less than 0.05 implying that there is a significant relationship among the variables. This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis and adoption of the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County.

The research findings therefore concludes that there is a significant relationship between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. The findings resembles those of Kiumbe, Wambugu & Luketero (2018), who also found a significant relationship between Stakeholder involvement and Utilization of evaluation results.

The model summary table suggest that there is a positive correlation ($R = 0.965$) between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results and those predicted by the regression model. In addition, the regression analysis revealed that the coefficient of determination is ($R^2 = 0.930$); suggesting that the amount of variance in the Utilization of evaluation result is explained by Stakeholder involvement in evaluations is 93%. The results are consistent with the findings of studies done by Shea and Lewko (1995) that suggest significant relationships between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation result. They found that the involvement of stakeholders leads increased use of evaluation findings.

The ANOVA model shows that Stakeholder involvement in evaluations, had statistical significance (P-value $0.000 < .05$; t-statistics $9.751 > 1.96$), leading to a unit change of 0.868 in Utilization of evaluation results. The results are consistent with the findings of studies done by Kiumbe *et al.* (2018) that suggest significant relationships between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and Utilization of evaluation results. It can therefore be deduced that stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County.

Through informant interviews with respondents, their understanding and cognizance of the influence of stakeholder involvement in evaluations on utilization of evaluations was sought and a respondent had this to say;

“Stakeholders in our organization are occasionally involved in developing the evaluation designs and are usually part of the dissemination of evaluation findings. This makes them ready to support the findings thus use of the results” [Project staff respondent]

Another respondent echoed comparable sentiments that;

“Stakeholder involvement in evaluations in our organization is most evident during the collection of evaluation data. They then feel part of the process whose results they accept and approve. Every time we have carried out an evaluation, stakeholders are invited to a dissemination workshop where the results are discussed and validated. This makes them own the results which encouraged the utilization of the same” [Respondent]

Conclusions

The study examined the influence of stakeholder involvement in evaluations on Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. The study found that majority of the project staff agreed that Stakeholder involvement influenced the Utilization of evaluation results. Additionally, there was a statistically significant relationship between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and utilization of evaluation results. There is also a positive correlation between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and utilization of evaluation results. In addition, the variance in the utilization of evaluation result is explained by stakeholder involvement in evaluations.

Having analysed and interpreted the findings obtained from the data collected, based on the objective which sought to establish how stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County, it was concluded that stakeholder involvement in evaluations influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. The correlation between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and utilization of evaluation results was statistically significant. This means that, as stakeholder involvement in evaluations was being augmented, the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County also increased.

The study validates the notion that utilization focused evaluation theory can assist project staff to strengthen the use of evaluation results in their organizations by revealing the relationship between stakeholder involvement in evaluations and utilization of evaluation results. The findings further confirms the idea that stakeholder involvement in evaluations stimulate the acceptance of results which in turn encourages monitoring of the utilization of evaluation results.

This study was nonetheless limited by inability to access all project records on the projects implemented, in which case the study sought additional information from the internet and through triangulation of the respondent's opinion. As well, this study was based on self-reports by project staff of their evaluation activities which may have been subject to positive response bias and thus may over-report use. The study thus corroborated responses and the validity of responses assessed. Self-report being retrospective relies on the memories of the respondents which may or may not be reliable. Limited information was enhanced through employing qualitative approaches to enable an in-depth understanding of the variables under investigation. Project documents were examined where information gaps existed in the project staff's responses. Another major limitation of this study could have been the participation rate. The study sought to reach only those project staff known to understand the concept and practice of evaluations. Not many project staff met these criteria. Furthermore, contact with potential participants was subject to their availability. The research team made several visits until all potential respondents were reached.

NGOs should therefore use utilization focused evaluation to clearly articulate envisioned uses for both the organization and the staff involved in the evaluation. Project stakeholders should be fully involved in the evaluation process, from the beginning to the end so that they own and use the results, besides monitoring utilization of the results to improve performance of their projects. This recommendation is based on the finding that stakeholder involvement had a strong moderating influence on the relationship between institutional factors and utilization of evaluation results. The findings reveal a positive correlation between Stakeholder involvement in evaluations and the relationship between Institutional factors and Utilization of evaluation results. The amount of variance in the moderating influence of Stakeholder involvement in evaluations on the relationship between Institutional factors and utilization of evaluation results is also high. Organizations desiring to enhance utilization of evaluation results therefore ought to focus organizational support on developing positive attitudes toward evaluation among stakeholders. Stakeholder involvement in all facets of the evaluation process must be stimulated to increase utilization of evaluation results for program improvement. Currently, efforts of stakeholder involvement appear to be fixated more on focusing the purpose of the evaluation and collection of evaluation data than developing the data collection instruments and writing evaluation reports. Whereas this is vital, more efforts to involve stakeholders in all parts of the evaluation process may lead to program improvement.

There is need to carry out more empirical studies on process use since this can be improved through stakeholder involvement in evaluations. The interviews with the NGO staff suggests the need for evaluation work beyond documenting positive results to donors. This calls for more research on how to increase use of evaluation findings beyond reporting project results.

References

- African Water Facility. (2014). Project Appraisal Report, Innovative Sanitation Value Chain for the Un-sewered Urban Poor in Kisumu, Kenya. <https://www.africanwaterfacility.org/fileadmin/uploads/awf/Projects/AWF Project-Appraisal-Report-KENYA-KIWASCO.pdf>.
- Alkin, M. C., Daillak, R., White, P., & White, P. (1979). Using evaluations: Does evaluation make a difference?
- Alkin, M. C., & Christie, C. A. (2004). An evaluation theory tree. *Evaluation roots: Tracing theorists' views and influences*, 2(19), 12-65.
- Tall, O. K. B. (2009). The role of national, regional and international evaluation organizations in strengthening country-led monitoring and evaluation systems. *Country-led monitoring and evaluation systems*, 119.
- Burr, E. M. (2009). Evaluation use and influence among project directors of state GEAR UP grants. *Doctoral Dissertations*, 15.
- Bourgeois, I. and Whynot, J. (2018). Strategic Evaluation Utilization in the Canadian Federal Government. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation* 32.3 (Special Issue), 327–346. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjpe.43178>
- Christie, C. A. & Alkin, M. C. (2008). Evaluation theory tree re-examined. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 34, 131-135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2008.07.001>
- Concern Worldwide. (2014) Squeac Report, Otp Program Kisumu East District, Kisumu County, Kenya Samuel Kirichu, February 2013. http://www.coverage-monitoring.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Kisumu-East-OTP_-Feb-2013_-Kenya_-SQUEAC.pdf.
- Cousins, J. B., & Earl, L. M. (1992). The case for participatory evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 397-418. <https://doi.org/10.1.1.462.3344>
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Azuma, H. (1962). Internal-consistency reliability formulas applied to randomly sampled single-factor tests: An empirical comparison. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 22(4). 645–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316446202200401>
- European Policy Evaluation Consortium (EPEC) (2005). *Study on the Use of Evaluation Results in the Commission*. Final Report, Dossier no.1: Synthesis Report and Annexes
- Fleischer, D. N. & Christie, C. A. (2009). Evaluation use: Results from a survey of U.S. American Evaluation Association members. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(2). 158-175. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214008331009>
- Freedman, D., Pisani, R., & Purves, R. (2007), *Statistics*, 4th edition, New York: Norton Publications
- Gary, T. H. & Melvin, M. (2003). Beyond Use: Understanding Evaluation's Influence on Attitudes and Actions. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(3) 293-314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821400302400302>

- Goh, S. C., & Richards, G. (1997). Benchmarking the learning capability of organizations. *European Management Journal*, 15(5). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373\(97\)00036-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(97)00036-4)
- Goldman, I., Mathe, J.E., Jacob, C., Hercules, A., Amisi, M., Buthelezi, T. (2015). Developing South Africa's national evaluation policy and system: First lessons learned. *African Evaluation Journal* 3(1), <https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v3i1.107>
- Greene, J. C. (1988). Stakeholder participation and utilization in program evaluation. *Evaluation Review*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X8801200201>
- Guba, E. G. (1990). *The Paradigm Dialog* (edited by Egon G. Guba).
- Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Corwin press.
- Henry, G. (2003). Influential evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821400302400409>
- Henry, G.T., & Melvin, M.M. (2003). Beyond use: Understanding Evaluator's influence on attitudes and actions, *American journal of Evaluation*, volume 24(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821400302400302>
- Højlund, S. (2014). Evaluation use in evaluation systems—the case of the European Commission. *Evaluation*, 20(4), 428-446.
- Johnson, K., Greenesid, L. O., Toal, S. A., King, J.A., Lawrenz, F. & Volkov, B. (2009). Research on evaluation use: A review of the empirical literature from 1986 to 2005. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(30). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214009341660>
- Khan, M. A. (1992). *Monitoring and evaluation of development projects in South East Asia: The experience of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand* (No. 19697, p. 1). The World Bank.
- King, J. A. (2005). Participatory evaluation. In S. Mathison (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kirori, G. N., (2015). Rural Development Policies in Kenya: A Descriptive Analysis Over 1970-2001 Period. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accountancy* 3(1).
- Kiumbe, P., Wambugu, L. and Luketero, S. (2018). Influence of Stakeholder Participation in Utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation Results on the Performance of Fish Farming Projects in Kenya. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 23, Issue 9, Ver. 5* 65-70 <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2309056570>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Lowden, C. 2005. Evaluating the impact of professional development. *Journal of Research in Professional Learning*, (National Staff Development Council). Available online at http://institute.nsta.org/learningcenter/pdp/NSDC_Evaluating_Impact_PD.pdf (accessed 3 December 2019)
- Magno, C., & Gonzales, R. D.L.C. (2011). *Measurement and evaluation in the Philippine higher education: Trends and development*. In E. Valenzuela (Ed) UNESCO Policy Studies: Trends and development in Philippine Education. Manila: UNESCO.
- Mark, M. M., Henry, G. T. & Julnes, G. (2000). *Evaluation: An integrated framework for understanding, guiding and improving policies and programmes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCormick, E. R. (1997). *Factors influencing the use of evaluation results*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: The Humanities and Social Sciences, 58.
- Morse, J. M. (2000). *Determining sample size*. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(1), 3-5.
- Mouton, C. 2010, 'The history of programme evaluation in South Africa', MPhil thesis, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Sociology and Social Anthropology Department, University of Stellenbosch.
- Mugenda, O. M. and Mugenda, A.G. (2003). *Research methods, qualitative and quantitative approaches*: Nairobi: ACTS Press.
- Najera, J. A., Gonzalez-Silva, M., & Alonso, P. L. (2011). *Some Lessons for the Future from the Global Malaria Eradication Programme (1955–1969)*. *PLoS Medicine*, 8(1)
- Nyenje, R. O., Ndunge, K. D., & Mulwa, A. S. (2012). Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects and Programs-A Handbook for Students and Practitioners. *Nairobi, Kenya: Aura Publishers*, 4(12), 45-99.
- Ochanda, J. (2005). *A study of strategic management practices in the Kenya public sector*. Nairobi: Unpublished MBA project, School of Business, University of Nairobi.
- Orodho, J. A. (2009). *Techniques of writing research proposals and reports in education and social sciences*. Nairobi. Kanezja publishers.
- Owen, John M (2013). *Evaluation Utilization and Communication' Program Evaluation: Forms and Approaches*. Australia. Allen & Unwin.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-Focused Evaluation: The New Century Text* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization Focused Evaluation* (4thed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Palys, T., & Atchison, C. (2008). *Research decisions: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives*. Toronto, Canada: Thomson Nelson.
- Peck, R.L & Gorzalski, M.L. (2009). An Evaluation Use Framework and Empirical Assessment. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, volume 6(12). ISSN 1556-8180
- Phillips, S., Goldman, I., Gasa, N., Akhalwaya, I. & Leon, B., (2014). A focus on M&E of results: An example from the Presidency, South Africa. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2014.966453>

- Porter, S., Goldman, I., (2013). A Growing Demand for Monitoring and Evaluation in Africa. *African Evaluation Journal*, 2013; 1(1) <https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v1i1.25>
- Preskill, H., Zuckerman, B. and Matthews, B. (2003). An Exploratory Study of Process Use: Results and Implications for Further Research. *American Journal of Evaluation* 24(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821400302400402>
- Ramírez, R., Kora, G. and Shephard, D. (2015). Utilization Focused Developmental Evaluation: Learning Through Practice. *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation* 11(24).
- Republic of Kenya, (2007). *Master plan for Implementation of NIMES*, Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya. (2014). *Second Annual Progress Report on the Implementation of the First Medium Term Plan (2008-2012)*. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya.
- Republic of Kenya. (2017). *Performance Management Framework for County Governments*. Council of Governors. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya.
- Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus* (4th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Leviton, L. C. (1991). *Foundations of program evaluation: Theories of practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shea, P.M and Lewko J.H. (1995). Use of a Stakeholder Advisory Group to Facilitate the Utilization of Evaluation Results. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 10(1), 159–62.
- Shulha, L. M., & Cousins, J. B. (1997). Evaluation use: Theory, research, and culture since 1986. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821409701800302>
- Stufflebeam, D.L., Madaus, G.F., & Kellaghan, T. (2000). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. (2nd Eds.). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, & applications*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- United States Agency for International Development- USAID (2014). *Capacity in Kenya*. End of Project Evaluation Final Report. http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pa00jrd2.pdf. Accessed on 15th March, 2017
- Warah, R. (2013). *UNDP's Shortcoming a Reflection of a Wider Failure with the UN System*. Daily Nation, P. 12