

Implementing Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan with Beneficiaries for Improving Performance: Evidence from Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer

Bernard Katerengabo^{1,*}, Christopher Gakuu², Harriet Kidombo²

¹Ministry of Health, National Health Insurance Fund, Dodoma, Tanzania

²Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

Email address:

bkaterengabo@gmail.com (Bernard Katerengabo), cmgakuu@uonbi.ac.ke (Christopher Gakuu), hkidombo@uonbi.ac.ke (Harriet Kidombo)

*Corresponding author

To cite this article:

Bernard Katerengabo, Christopher Gakuu, Harriet Kidombo. Implementing Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan with Beneficiaries for Improving Performance: Evidence from Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer. *International Journal of Sustainable Development Research*. Vol. 9, No. 1, 2023, pp. 11-17. doi: 10.11648/j.ijdsr.20230901.12

Received: January 16, 2023; **Accepted:** February 13, 2023; **Published:** February 27, 2023

Abstract: The beneficiaries' involvement in Monitoring and Evaluation is one of the key drivers for the performance of development projects. The Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer is a neediness decrease project carried out in all the districts. The motivation behind the study was to lay out the influence of households' associations in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan on the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. The study took on a pragmatic paradigm with a blended research design strategy. Yamane formula was used to obtain a sample size of 400 heads of households while eight Village Committees and eight Monitoring Officers were selected by using purposive sampling. Quantitative data was analyzed using Pearson's correlation and regression models while qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis. The study established a significant influence between households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan ($t = 8.472$, $p\text{-value} = .000$) on the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. In this manner, it was evidenced that households' contribution to Monitoring and Evaluation significantly influenced the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. It was recommended therefore that the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project Monitoring and Evaluation policy should be reviewed in order to ensure it is people-centered and make it vital for households' involvement in the Monitoring and Evaluation cycle. The review must define the Monitoring and Evaluation team that is composed of households' representatives. Further investigations ought to look at the organizational practice of Monitoring and Evaluation and level of use of Monitoring and Evaluation information for further improving performance.

Keywords: Household, Monitoring and Evaluation, Poverty, Performance, Conditional Cash Transfer

1. Introduction

The Conditional Cash Transfer was introduced in Tanzania in 2012 as an endeavor to reduce poverty among poor households through financial help. Poverty has been a global problem that is mostly affecting developing countries whereby in the 1990s, 36% of the World's population lived in poverty. Poverty affected the ability of people to generate income and as a result, they were earning less than US\$1.90 per day [20, 29]. Later in 2018, about 1.3 billion of the World's population lived in multidimensional poverty [27]. Unlikely other developing countries, Asia and the Pacific had

success reports, as World Bank [29] reported China as among the country that uplifted millions of people out of poverty from 62% in 1990 to less than 3% by the year 2015. The percentage of the African population living in poverty according to the World Bank [29] was 54% in 1990. The percentage dropped in 2015 to 41%. Due to the rapid population increase at the rate of 2.7% annually, extreme poverty shot from 278 million in 1990 to 413 million in 2015 [6]. The increase in poverty rate affected the efforts to end or rather reduce it and it was estimated that 82% of poor households who lives in rural areas depended on agriculture [7]. The daily spending of 26 million Tanzanians was below

\$1.90 per person. The poverty reduction underperformances were due to the top-down project implementation strategies failure as highlighted by Mansouri and Rao [13] and the main reason being the disengagement of local people at all stages. Therefore, while the involvement of beneficiaries in some countries was the catalyst for project performance, in Tanzania beneficiaries were excluded from the implementation and only remained as recipients. Despite the existence of poverty reduction projects run by local and international agencies, Valentine, Shukla, and Eugene [28] revealed that beneficiaries were neither consulted nor involved in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation. Poverty, therefore, increases as UNDP [26] ranked Tanzania as among the countries with a high poverty rate. A large number of poor people in Tanzania according to the World Bank [30] lived in rural areas. Therefore, despite the implementation of the Conditional Cash Transfer project, researchers have not researched the extent of households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan. Therefore, the study assessed the influence of households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and evaluation plan on the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

The goal of implementing the Conditional Cash Transfer project was to ensure it covers an average of 15% of Tanzanians living in extreme poverty by 2025 [14]. Despite the existence of various efforts to meet the goal, the performance indicators show the underperformance whereby Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessment report [10] highlighted that up to 2015, beneficiaries of the Conditional Cash Transfer project were only 1.1 million. Among other factors for underperformance was the disengagement of households in the preparation and implementation of projects. The report from the World Bank [30] revealed that in 2018, the poverty rate in Tanzania was 26.4%. The other report from the World Bank [31] showed that in 2020, the poverty rate increased to 27.1%, and in 2021 it decreased to only 27% which was a slight decrease. Despite the Government's good plan for reducing the poverty among households in Tanzania as explained by the World Bank [31], data shows that poverty is increasing. The total number of people who lived in extreme poverty in 2018 in Tanzania as reported by the World Bank [30] was 14 million and 26 million people (49%) lived below \$1.90 daily. Human Development Index and Multidimensional Index ranked Tanzania with the highest level of poverty [26]. Studies including Noori [17], Rimberia [23], Mutale *et al.* [15], Thwala [25], Nyaguthii & Oyugi [18], and Ahenkan, Bawole & Domfer [1] evidenced that the involvement of local people in the Monitoring and Evaluation influenced the performance of their projects. These authors, however, studied the general scope of Monitoring and Evaluation than specific areas under this study on households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan on the performance of the project. Conversely, the other authors including Nyonje, Ndunge & Mulwa [19],

Barasa & Jelagat [5], Aupe, Awiti & Aketch [3] Tengan & Aigbavboa [24] and Kananura *et al.* [11] studied on the community involvement in their projects and its influence on the performance. These authors investigated on the involvement of local people in the performance of projects and not specifically on Monitoring and Evaluation. Therefore, this research is specifically investigating on households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation on the performance of the Conditional Cash Transfer project.

1.2. Objective of the Study

To examine the extent to which households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan influences performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

1.3. Hypothesis of the Study

H_0 : There is no significant influence between households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

2. Literature Review

It is of paramount importance to ensure that the community takes part in the governance of their project through Monitoring and Evaluation for improving performance. The local people also should attain skills and knowledge of implementing the projects and ensuring it does not die after the external financial support ceases [4]. During the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation, beneficiaries are supposed to receive training in Monitoring and Evaluation first because this is the technical aspect of the management of projects. Ahenkan *et al.* [1] added that the exclusion of the beneficiaries in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation paralyzes the effectiveness of the projects because the local authorities would not be able to measure the level of attainment of the set goals and targets. A study by Alfred [2] revealed a case where beneficiaries were excluded and the Monitoring and Evaluation framework was performed only by the project Monitoring and Evaluation team. Community is regarded ignorant and vulnerable hence unable to participate in the technical aspects of implementing Monitoring and Evaluation. However, when they receive capacity building in terms of public education, they can do a participatory Monitoring and Evaluation with project Monitoring and Evaluation teams. When Monitoring and Evaluation is implemented in a participatory way, Coupal [8] acknowledged that beneficiaries clearly understand the logical framework and participate to measure key performance indicators for identifying the impacts. Household involvement in the Monitoring and Evaluation influences performance when the project Monitoring and Evaluation team is composed of technical Monitoring and Evaluation staff and selected few local people [1, 2]. The study by Kiumbe, Wambungu, and

Luketero [12] revealed that beneficiaries' engagement in the Monitoring and Evaluation was moderate because the Monitoring and Evaluation team did not only exclude the local people but also ignored the culture of sharing Monitoring and Evaluation documents to the beneficiaries for incorporating their opinions in the final decision-making. Therefore, the community members were not well informed on the performance of the project. Conversely, District Planning and Coordinating Unit and Savelugu-Nanton District Assembly [22] reported that Savelugu-Nanton Municipal Assembly Monitoring and Evaluation plan of 2010 included Assembly and local members in the Monitoring and Evaluation although it was recommended that beneficiaries were required to receive capacity building on Monitoring and Evaluation for them to be able to participate in Monitoring and Evaluation reports meetings and decision-making. Rajalahti, Woelcke, and Pehu [21] reported that practicing Monitoring and Evaluation among beneficiaries would impart technical and managerial skills and increase their commitment of measuring project performance. Therefore, Dube [9] added, funders must ensure they provide the budgets for capacity-building projects so that the local people receive technical training and workshops periodically for them to engage in Monitoring and Evaluation for the attainment of pre-determined goals. The philosophy of performance is educating the community on management and achievement of the project. If appropriately educated, the community and the representatives in the project's Monitoring and Evaluation teams would clearly understand the goals and objectives and hence measure the level of impact.

3. Methodology

The research adopted a pragmatism paradigm which is a combination of both constructivism and positivism philosophies. The target population was 61,240 households, and 441 village committees each comprising of 10 members and 8 Monitoring Officers. By using Yamane [32] formula, the sample of 400 respondents was obtained.

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

Where n = Sample size

N = Population size

e = Level of precision

The sample size considered a 95% level of confidence with a precision of 7.5 and variability of 50%. The computation is shown below;

$$n = \frac{61,240}{1+61,240(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = 400$$

In each district, village committee members were selected to form a focus group discussion (FGD) of 10 people. The total number of respondents from FGDs was 80. The last group comprised of Monitoring Officers, where one Officer was selected from each district. These eight Monitoring

Officers were selected because they had the supervisory skills and experience in managing the Conditional Cash Transfer Project at the district level. The sample for this study included heads of households, village committee members and Monitoring Officers. To obtain the sampling unit, the study applied multistage sampling technique. The first step applied purposive sampling to select Kagera region out of 26 regions. The second stage was cluster sampling whereby Kagera region was divided into eight. The third stage involved proportional stratified sampling to obtain the sample of 400 head of households. The fourth stage involved simple random sampling. In order to obtain the sample of heads of households, the first method was a selection of the first household and then moved to the third household until the required sample was reached. In each district, village committee members were selected to form the focus group discussion (FGD) of 10 people. The last group was of Monitoring Officers whereby all 8 Monitoring Officers were purposively selected. Quantitative data was collected using questionnaires while qualitative data was collected through interview and focus group discussions. Statistical tests were performed to ensure the relevant assumptions are met. Data were analyzed using Descriptive and inferential statistics. Simple linear regression model was used to establish the causal relationship between variables.

4. Findings

A total of 400 households responded to the questionnaires and therefore the return rate was 100%. The researcher collected data from questionnaires, focus group discussions and key in-depth interviews. Descriptive analysis was done by testing the mean and standard deviation followed by inferential analysis using Pearson's correlation, coefficient of adjusted R, simple linear, and hierarchical regression models.

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The study assessed the respondents in terms of age, gender, marital status, level of education and occupation. The findings are presented in the Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of respondents.

Respondents profile	Frequency	Percent
Age		
18-26	4	1
27-35	13	3
36-44	62	16
45-53	80	20
Above 53	241	60
Total	400	100
Gender		
Male	77	19
Female	323	81
Total	400	100
Marital status		
Married	134	33.5
Single	1	0.25
Widowed	187	46.75
Divorced	78	19.5

Respondents profile	Frequency	Percent
Total	400	100
Level of education		
No schooling	191	47.75
Primary	206	51.5
Secondary	3	0.75
Total	400	100
Occupation		
Farmer	361	90
Small businesses	39	10
Total	400	100

Findings regarding age of respondents, the majority of the respondents 383 (95.8%) were above 35 years while only 17 (4.3%) were below 35 years. The number of youth below 35 was low because many of them migrated from rural to urban areas, looking for employment and economic activities compared to the respondents above 35 who had established families. On the side of gender of respondents, 77 (19.3%) of the respondents were male while 323 (80.8%) were female. The number of female was higher because of high rate of divorces and abandonment by husbands who migrated to urban areas. Results on marital status revealed that majority of the respondents 187 (46.8%) were widowed, 134 (33.4%) were married, 78 (19.5%) were divorced, and only 1 (0.3%) were

single. That implies that vast majority of households were married and widowed. Many women were widowed because of higher death rates among men who migrated in urban areas. In addition to that, education level of the respondents was generally low whereby the majority 206 of the respondents representing 51.5% with primary education, 191 representing 47.8% with no schooling, and only 3 representing 0.8 % of the respondents had secondary education. Low level of education was because of extreme poverty that influenced many respondents' drop outs. Regarding occupation, majority of the respondents 361 (90.3%) were farmers, while 39 (9.8%) were engaged in running small businesses.

4.2. Analysis of Households' Involvement in Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan was measured by using the following indicators; households' ability to prepare indicators, households' ability to measure goals, households' ability to track impacts and households' ability to measure project relevance. Results on the analysis of households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Analysis of households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan.

SN	Item	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	SD
1	Households' ability to prepare indicators	400	348 (87.0%)	18 (4.5%)	34 (8.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.22	0.583
2	Households' ability to measure goals	400	392 (98.0%)	8 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.02	0.140
3	Households ability to track impacts	400	355 (88.8%)	18 (4.5%)	27 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.18	0.532
4	Households' to measure project relevance	400	274 (68.5%)	8 (2.0%)	101 (25.3%)	15 (03.8%)	2 (0.5%)	1.66	1.009
<i>Means of Means</i>								<i>1.27</i>	<i>0.566</i>

The responses were concentrated around the mean (M=1.27, SD=0.566). This provides an evidence that all respondents disagreed in all the indicators that they were involved in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan. The results indicate that the responses of the households were closer to the mean with small standard deviation. Therefore, the majority of respondents disagreed of being involved to implement of Monitoring and Evaluation plan.

4.3. Analysis of the Performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

The performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project was measured by using the following indicators; the number of jobs created, the amount of food harvested, income earned from the harvest, households' ability to finance health care, the number of hospital delivery and the number of children who completed schools. The results on this variable are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Analysis of the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

SN	Indicator	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	SD
1	Number of jobs created	400	148 (37%)	57 (14.25%)	6 (1.5%)	156 (39%)	33 (8.25%)	2.67	1.497
2	Amount of food harvested	400	74 (18.5%)	84 (21%)	0 (0.0%)	180 (45%)	62 (15.5%)	3.18	1.412
3	Income earned from the harvest	400	222 (55.5%)	49 (12.25%)	0 (0.0%)	106 (26.5%)	23 (5.75%)	2.15	1.455
4	Households' ability to finance healthcare	400	273 (68.25%)	41 (10.25%)	1 (0.25%)	76 (19%)	9 (2.25%)	1.77	1.264
5	Number of hospital delivery	400	155 (38.75%)	55 (13.75%)	5 (1.25%)	171 (42.75%)	14 (3.5%)	2.59	1.445
6	Number of children who completed schools	400	110 (27.5%)	35 (8.75%)	0 (0.0%)	169 (42.25%)	86 (21.5%)	3.23	1.559
<i>Composite Mean</i>								<i>2.60</i>	<i>1.439</i>

The findings indicated that the responses were concentrated around the mean (M=2.60, SD=1.439). That implies that respondents agreed to most of the indicators that they influenced the performance of the project. That means the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project created jobs, increased cultivations and income. Also households were

capable of financing health care, hospital delivery increased and children who completed schools increased. The response were closer to the mean with small standard deviation. Therefore, the respondents confirmed that the establishment and implementation of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project improved their socio-economic situations.

5. Test of Hypothesis

H₀: “Households’ involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan has no influence on the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project”.

5.1. Pearson Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation analysis measured the direction and magnitude of the relationship between households’ involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan and performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. Results on this variable are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Pearson correlation analysis.

		Implementation of M&E Plan	Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project
Implementation of M&E plan	Pearson Correlation	1	.401**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	400	400
Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project	Pearson Correlation	.401**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	400	400

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

The results show that households’ involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan was significantly and positively correlating with performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project ($r = 0.401$, $p=0.000$, $n= 400$). Therefore, improvements in the households’ level involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan lead to the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

5.2. Linear Regression Analysis

A linear regression analysis was conducted to examine how well households’ involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan predicted the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. results on linear regression analysis are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Linear regression analysis.

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R ² Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
	.401 ^a	.161	.159	.15316	.161	74.424	1	398	.000

a. Predictor: (Constant) Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan

b. Dependent Variable: Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

The results reveal that the level of households’ involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan had a coefficient of adjusted R Square of.159. This indicates that 15.9% of the variation in performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project can be accounted for by the level of households’ involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation.

5.3. The Coefficients Test

This tests the statistical significance of households’ involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. Results are in Table 6.

Table 6. The Coefficients test.

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		95% Confidence Interval for B			
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1 (Constant) Implementation of M&E plan	.356	.009		38.573	.000	.338	.374	
	.637	.073	.401	8.742	.000	.494	.780	

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

The results illustrate that a unit increase in households’ involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan was responsible for improving the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project by 0.401. This relationship was found to be statistically significant with ($t= 8.742$, p -value = 0.000). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted that households’ involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan had a significant influence on the

performance of the Conditional Cash Transfer project. The findings therefore, evidenced the need to engage beneficiaries in Monitoring and Evaluation for increasing performance.

6. Qualitative Data Findings

Findings from the interviews evidenced that the inclusion of the households would enable them to share their experience on the performance of project. Households would

be able to identify their priority areas instead of being ignored, leaving implementation to project implementers.

“Performance of this project will depend on the level of households’ involvement. This is because one of the biggest mistakes the project officials make is excluding households like thinking they cannot participate to technical issues like assessing program performance. Therefore, I recommend the households to be in the Village Committees (VCs) so that they represent a big group of beneficiaries who feel they are disregarded”. VC member.

The community involvement would improve the project. The village committees represented the households by being told by project officials on the areas to collect information on project progress. The VCs stood on behalf of households because the beneficiaries were not the members.

“We have been asked several times why households are excluded in the VCs. Although we are doing the best in to supervise the program, but we believe that at the village level, households would be selected to join the VCs and participate to project for enabling them to identify areas of poor performance for improvements”. MO.

The interviews evidenced that households attended the meetings for the identification and verification of budget allocation. They were not involved in the preparation of the project. Therefore, despite VCs supervisory roles at the village levels, households’ involvement were excluded in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan.

“I observed households as recipients of the financial assistance. These people are ignored in the implementation of the projects. They are only consulted when the project officials call meetings for budget allocation”. VC member.

“The project is for households but are excluded to assess the impact because VCs oversee the implementation on behalf of the beneficiaries. Therefore, households are not involved in the committees”. MO.

7. Discussion of Findings

The findings show that households were not involved in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation, similar to the study by Alfred [2] who also found the low level of stakeholders’ involvement in Monitoring and Evaluation. In addition, Ahenkan, Bawole & Domfer [1] observed the lack of stakeholders’ involvement and that constrained poverty reduction efforts in Ghana. Although the findings of this study revealed total exclusion of households in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation, while Kiumbe, Wambungu and Luketelo [12] evidenced moderate involvement of stakeholders in the utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation results, Ngochi, Mbugua and Thiong’o [16] observed that the beneficiaries were part of the Monitoring and Evaluation but the results were not considered in making projects’ decisions. Therefore, despite the usefulness of Monitoring and Evaluation in the performance of programs, Monitoring and Evaluation teams implemented it with total or partial inclusion of beneficiaries. This was done in order to meet the donors’ conditions but eventually, Monitoring and

Evaluation results are discarded in making program decisions. Conversely, DPCU & SNDA [22] reported that the local members were involved in the Monitoring and Evaluation plan. Although the local people participated in Monitoring and Evaluation, they were not skilled enough. DPCU & SNDA [22] recommended Monitoring and Evaluation capacity building whereby Barasa and Jelagat [5] and Woelcke, and Pehu [21] revealed that it increases beneficiaries commitment. In this study, households’ involvement in the Monitoring and Evaluation significantly influenced the performance of the Conditional Cash Transfer project. The performance is a function of the Monitoring and Evaluation team with local people representatives [1, 2].

8. Conclusion

The study established the positive influence of engaging projects beneficiaries in Monitoring and Evaluation on the improvement of performance. Monitoring and Evaluation capacity building should be disseminated to beneficiaries for influencing the performance of projects. The recruitment of gender based representatives in the Monitoring and Evaluation team must be prioritized for ensuring both men and women participate to monitor and evaluate their projects. Therefore, since Monitoring and Evaluation is a new scientific field, the selected beneficiaries representative ought to receive periodic capacity building for equipping them with skills.

9. Recommendations

The Monitoring and Evaluation plan was implemented by using the top-down approach that excluded households. It is critical therefore, to amend the Monitoring and Evaluation document by ensuring that the team in composed of representatives for making it participatory and enhancing performance. This study recommends that further studies should examine the impact of compliance and utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation reports on the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

References

- [1] Ahenkan, A., Bawole, N., & Domfer, K. (2013). Improving citizens’ participation in local government planning and financial management in Ghana: A stakeholder analysis of the Sefwi Wiawso Municipal Assembly. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 3 (2), 191-208.
- [2] Alfred, A. (2015). Enhancing stakeholder’s involvement in program monitoring among metropolitan, municipal and district assemblies: A case study of Atwima Mponua District Assembly. <https://www.modernghana.com/news/60/news/602582/enhancing-stakeholders-involvement-in-project.html>.
- [3] Aupe, N., Awiti, L., & Aketch, N. (2019). Community participation and sustainability of water projects in Kwanza Sub-County, Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 3 (3), 160-173.

- [4] Aycrigg, N. L. (1998). Participation and the World Bank: Successes, constraints, and responses (World Bank Social Development Paper No. 29). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [5] Barasa, F., & Jelagat, T. (2013). Community participation in program planning, management and implementation: Building the foundation for sustainable development. *International Journal of Current Research*, 5 (2), 398-401.
- [6] Beegle, K., & Christiaensen, L. (2019). Accelerating poverty reduction in Africa. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [7] Campos, O., Villani, C., Davis, B., & Takagi, M. (2018). Ending extreme poverty in rural areas - Sustaining livelihoods to leave no one behind. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture.
- [8] Coupal, F. (2001). Results-based participatory monitoring and evaluation, CIDA's performance review. Ottawa, Canada: Mosaic Net International.
- [9] Dube, N. (2009). Evaluating community participation in development projects (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- [10] ISPA (2017). Assessment of TASAF PSSN in Tanzania Using the ISPA-PWP Tool. Iter-Agency Social Protection Assessment.
- [11] Kananura, M., et. al. (2017). Participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches that influence decision-making: Lessons from a maternal and newborn study in Eastern Uganda. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 15 (2), 55-68.
- [12] Kiumbe, P., Wambungu, L., & Luketero, S. (2018). Influence of stakeholder participation in utilization of monitoring and evaluation results on the performance of fish farming projects in Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 23 (09), 65-70.
- [13] Mansouri, G., & Rao, V. (2003). Evaluating community-based and community driven development: A critical review of the evidence. Washington, DC.
- [14] Mushi, A., Mwaita, K., & Makauki, A. F. (2019). Contribution of Social Protection Systems to children's Education in Tanzania: A Case of TASAF III Cash Transfer Programme. Unpublished thesis.
- [15] Mutale, W et. al. (2017). Exploring community participation in project design: application of the community conversation approach to improve maternal and newborn health in Zambia. *BMC Public Health*, 17 (1), 1-14.
- [16] Ngochi, E., Mbugua, L., & Thiong'o, K. (2020). An analysis of the influence of monitoring and evaluation functions on projects performance among selected constituency development fund projects in Kirinyaga County, Kenya. *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, 2 (8), 61-80.
- [17] Noori, H. (2017). Community participation in sustainability of development projects: A case study of national solidarity program Afghanistan. *Journal of Culture, Society and Development*, 30, 27-36.
- [18] Nyaguthii, E., & Oyugi, L. A. (2013). Influence of community participation on successful implementation of constituency development fund projects in Kenya: Case study of Mwea Constituency. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1 (8), 1-16.
- [19] Nyonje, 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 Books.
- [20] Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative. (2018). Global multidimensional poverty index 2018: The most detailed picture to date of the World's poorest people. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford.
- [21] Rajalahti, R., Woelcke, J., & Pehu, E. (2005). Monitoring and evaluation for World Bank agricultural research and extension programs: A good practice note (Agriculture and Rural Development Discussion Paper No. 20). Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- [22] Sulemana, M., Musah, A. B., & Simon, K. K. (2018). An assessment of stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation of district assembly projects and programmes in the Savelugu-Nanton Municipality Assembly, Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies*, 15 (1), 173-195.
- [23] Rimerberia, K. (2012). Determinants of water projects sustainability: A case of water projects in Kieni East division, Nyeri County, Kenya. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
- [24] Tengan, C., & Aigbavboa, C. (2017). Level of stakeholder engagement and participation in monitoring and evaluation of construction projects in Ghana. *Procedia Engineering*, 196, 630-637.
- [25] Thwala, W. D. (2010). Community participation is a necessity for project success: A case study of rural water supply project in Jeppes Reefs, South Africa. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 5 (10), 970-979.
- [26] United Nations Development Programme. (2018). Tanzania human development report 2017: Social policy in the context of economic transformation. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Economic and Social Research Foundation.
- [27] United Nations Development Programme. (2019). Global multidimensional poverty index 2019: Illuminating inequalities. New York.
- [28] Valentine, I., Shukla, J., & Eugene, N. (2016). Effect of beneficiaries' participation in program monitoring and evaluation on program success. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 4 (2), 334-349.
- [29] World Bank. (2018). Poverty and shared prosperity 2018: Piecing together the poverty puzzle. Washington, DC.
- [30] World Bank. (2019). Tanzania mainland poverty assessment: Executive summary. Washington, DC.
- [31] World Bank (2022) Sub-Saharan Africa: Macro Poverty Outlook, Country-by-country Analysis and Projections for the Developing World. United States of America, New York.
- [32] Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics: An introductory analysis (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper and Row.