GREAT JOURNS

Journal of Business Administration

Vol.1 No.2, August 2025

The Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in Execution of County Integrated Development Plans by County Governments in Kenya

[1]James Kamau Waribu, [2]Karanja Kabare and [3]Maurice M. Sakwa

[1]Department of Business Administration, Kisii University, waribuj@kisiiuniversity.ac.ke, P. O. Box 408-40200, Kisii, Kenya

[2,3] Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, P. O. Box 62,000-Nairobi-Kenya.

Great Journs
ISSN: 2328-4870
Vol.1 No.2, August, 2025

Journal homepage: www.greatjourns.com

ABSTRACT

This study sought to identify the Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in Execution of County Integrated Development Plans by County Governments in Kenya. The target population of the study was government officers from five counties which was 10% of forty-seven counties who comprised of 5 County Secretaries, 5 Heads of Monitoring and Evaluation, 5 Chairs of Public Accounts Committees and 5 Clerks of the County Assemblies. Others are 48 Chief Officers and 55 Directors. The target population was 123 participants and sample size were 92. The study adopted a descriptive research design. The questionnaire was used as the data collection instrument. Data analysis and interpretation was based on descriptive statistics and inferential statistics namely, Pearson correlation and Analysis of Variance. In addition, a multiple regression model was used to explore the relationship between the variables. The study adopted the multiple regression to assess the effects of the moderating variable (Policy framework) whose findings indicates that a 6.2 % change in variation after introduction of the moderator variable was realized. The effect of the moderator on the relationship between the independent variables (Monitoring and evaluation, Strategic direction, Organization structure, Innovation, Organization culture, Communication) and dependent variable (Execution) is statistically significant ($F_{(7, 55)} = 9.544$, p-value = 0.000). Envisioning role was found to positively influence the execution of CIDPs. Institutionalization had a positive influence on execution of CIDPs. Innovation role in the execution of CIDPs was significant. Monitoring and evaluation role in the execution of CIDPs had a significant relationship with execution. The study concluded that monitoring and evaluation was found to be a key component for successful execution of county integrated development plans. The coefficient of determination indicated that a third of the variation in the response to execution of county integrated development plans was explained by monitoring and evaluation. Counties should take monitoring and evaluation as one of the key drivers in the execution of county integrated development plans. County will be able to monitor and evaluate the impact their projects are impacting on the ground and they will be able to account to different government agencies and the public at large. The researcher recommended that Monitoring and evaluation should be taken as a key activity for the counties by having qualified staff and resources allocated to the department. This would ensure that all projects being executed are monitored and evaluated and therefore money being misused will be a thing of the past since there will be staff assigned and they are held accountable should funds be deviated from the intended projects. Also monitoring and evaluation staff should be independent of the executive for them to work without fear of intimidation from the executive.

Key Words: ***Monitoring and Evaluation, Execution of County Integrated Development Plans by County Governments in Kenya.***

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) played a critical role in the execution of County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) by county governments in Kenya. Since the promulgation of the Constitution of Kenya 2010, counties were mandated to prepare CIDPs as the main planning and development framework to guide resource allocation and service delivery. These plans outlined the priorities and strategies that counties were to implement within a five-year cycle. However, the success of these plans depended largely on how effectively county governments monitored progress and evaluated outcomes. M&E was applied as a systematic process that tracked implementation, identified challenges, and measured results against set objectives. Through effective monitoring, county governments ensured that development projects were implemented according to timelines, budgets, and standards. Evaluation, on the other hand, provided feedback on the relevance, efficiency, and sustainability of projects and programs outlined in the CIDPs. This enabled counties to make evidence-based decisions, improve accountability, and enhance transparency in the management of public resources (Charan,2011).

Moreover, monitoring and evaluation offered an important platform for citizen participation and oversight. By sharing M&E reports and findings, county governments promoted inclusivity, fostered trust, and strengthened democratic governance at the devolved level. Without structured M&E mechanisms, many counties risked misallocation of resources, duplication of efforts, and failure to achieve desired development outcomes. Thus, the

role of monitoring and evaluation was recognized as an indispensable component in ensuring that CIDPs translated into tangible socio-economic benefits for communities across Kenya (Charan,2011).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) were designed to serve as the guiding frameworks for planning and implementing development initiatives by county governments in Kenya. These plans outlined the priorities and strategies that counties intended to pursue within a five-year period. However, despite the existence of CIDPs, many counties continued to face challenges in achieving their development objectives. Projects were often delayed, resources were mismanaged, and in some cases, programs failed to meet the intended needs of communities. This raised concerns about the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanisms in ensuring that CIDPs were executed successfully. Monitoring and evaluation was expected to provide counties with timely information on project progress, highlight implementation bottlenecks, and assess the impact of interventions. Yet, in practice, M&E systems were frequently underdeveloped, poorly funded, or inconsistently applied. County governments often lacked adequate technical expertise, reliable data management systems, and clear performance indicators to support effective tracking and evaluation of development initiatives. As a result, decisions were sometimes made without sufficient evidence, leading to duplication of efforts, wastage of resources, and limited accountability (Molina,2008).

Furthermore, weak citizen involvement in M&E processes undermined transparency and reduced the effectiveness of public participation in county development. In several counties, M&E reports were either not produced consistently or not disseminated to the public, limiting opportunities for communities to hold leaders accountable. This situation created a gap between planning and actual service delivery, weakening the credibility of CIDPs as instruments of sustainable development. Therefore, the problem that this study addressed was that despite the central role that monitoring and evaluation was expected to play in the execution of County Integrated Development Plans, its application by county governments in Kenya remained inadequate, thus hindering the realization of intended development outcomes (Barbara ,2012).

1.2 Objective of the Study

The objective of the was to investigate the Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in Execution of County Integrated Development Plans by County Governments in Kenya.

11: LITERATURE REVIEW

Governments are constantly pressured to show results, as a performance obligation for good governance, transparency and accountability. There has been a paradigm shift in public service management, forcing governments to be more accountable to the stakeholders and the public in particular. The accountability growing need is seen as the main purpose of evaluation (Lehtonen, 2005:169). Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is a powerful public management tool that can be used to enhance the way governments and organizations get outcomes. Just as governments need financial, human resource, and accountability systems, governments also need good performance feedback systems.

Monitoring as defined by The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2004:16) is ‘a continuous function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and other stakeholders of an on-going development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and the achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

Evaluation is a time-bound and periodic exercise that seeks to provide credible and useful information to answer specific questions to guide decision making by staff, managers and policy makers GWM&ES policy framework (2007:6). Evaluations assess relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The Constitution of Kenya (2010) is the basis for the process of devolution in Kenya. To ensure greater transparency and accountability,

the Constitution of Kenya requires that government uses the M&E mechanism as an integral part of developing and executing government policies, programmes and projects, and in resource allocation and management at the two levels of government. This requirement is reflected in several sections of the Constitution of Kenya that relate to good governance and planning.

Monitoring and evaluation are tools to measure the performance of the organization in the timely implementation of its strategic plans. Monitoring and evaluation equally contribute to the identification of good practices and lessons learnt with respect to execution, as well as policy, strategy and programmatic design that will inform the next phase of the strategic planning.

The evaluation outcomes are important inputs to the strategic planning process and are used to adjust strategic direction and priorities (Young, 2001).The County Governments Act No. 17 (2012) outlines the responsibilities of the devolved levels, and the processes and procedures governing the relationship between the national and county levels. This includes the responsibility to prepare a County Integrated Development Plan that must include a monitoring and evaluation section. Section 108 (1) states that there shall be a five year CIDP for each county which shall have: (a) clear goals and objectives; (b) an implementation plan with clear outcomes; (c) provisions for monitoring and evaluation; and (d) clear reporting mechanisms.

According to Crawford and Bryce (2003), monitoring provides the background for reducing schedule and cost overruns at the same time it ensures that required quality standards are achieved in project execution. Evaluation is an instrument that helps to assess to what extent the projects have achieved the set objectives (Field & Keller, 1997). Projects completion within the budget is a measure of project success. Project costs can be calculated in various forms for example of unit cost, percentage of net variation over final cost and so on (Chan, 2001).

Baker et. al., (2008) identified performance as one of the project success factors among others such as schedule performance and cost performance. Quality achievement by projects has a bearing on project success. The quality of projects and project information has a significant role in project success (Raymond & Bergeron, 2008).

County governments are expected to have monitoring and evaluation units in place in order to ensure that the county integrated development plans are carried out as planned. Counties receive billions of shillings every financial year for development and these funds must be accounted for by ensuring a systematic monitoring and evaluation activities are carried out by competent staffs. This is a key unit since counties must be accountable for the funds allocated by the national treasury and transparency must be observed.

III: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Philosophy

Research philosophy relates to the development of knowledge and nature of that knowledge and contains important assumptions about the way in which researchers view the world (Saunders, et. al., 2007). There are two main epistemological research philosophies that are applied in social sciences. These are positivism and Phenomenology. This study was anchored in the positivism because it sought to objectively establish facts by empirically establishing relationships between variables. Positivism assumes that the observer is independent of what is being observed and measurement should be through objective based rather than being inferred subjectively (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

3.2 Research Design

According to Creswell (2014) a research design is plans and procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis. This study employed a descriptive survey research design. Descriptive survey design was appropriate for this study since it facilitated proper description of the variables under review (Okumbe, 2001). The design was appropriate for the study since it allowed collection of information for independent and dependent variables using questionnaire. Orodho (2003) and Namusonge (2010) observed that this method was best suited for gathering descriptive information where the researcher wanted to know about people attitudes pertaining one or more variables through direct questions.

Great Journs
ISSN: 2328-4870
Vol.1 No.2, August, 2025

3.3 Target Population

Sekaran (2010) posits that a target population is classified as all members of a given group to which investigation is related, whereas the accessible population was looked at in terms of those elements in the target population within the reach of the study. Kothari (2012) defined a population as a group of events, people or items of interest with a common observable attributes. Ewing (2011), described a population as the set of sampling units or cases that the researcher is interested in.

The target population was five counties which was 10% of the total number of 47 Counties in Kenya. The key staffs that carried out the task of implementation of CIDPs had been identified as the County Chief Officers, County Boards Secretaries, Directors, Clerks of County Assemblies, Chairs of Public Accounts Committees in County Assembles and Heads of M&E in the counties. Target population was 123 respondents.

3.4 Sampling Frame

The County Governments of Kenya formed the sampling frame. The Constitution of Kenya 2010 provided for devolution of political and administrative authority to forty-seven counties which are semi-autonomous (CoK, 2010).The researcher targeted five counties namely: Kiambu County, Murang'a County, Nyeri County, Kirinyaga County and Nyandarua County. Selection was based on Infotrak County Index that ranked them in top five in addition of being densely populated which exhibited a unique balance between rural and urban populations (Infotrak,2015).

3.5 Sample and Sampling Techniques

Sampling has been described as a procedure a researcher uses to gather people, places or things to study. It's a process of selecting a number of individuals or objects from a population such that the selected group contains elements representative of the characteristics found in the entire group (Orodho & Kombo, 2002). The study applied two steps sampling approaches. These were Purposive Sampling and Simple random sampling. Purposive sampling is a non-probability technique that entails the conscious selection by the researcher of opinion leaders to include in the study. The participants were selected on the basis of having particular characteristics that were of interest to the researcher.

Simple random sampling technique on the other hand gives room for each potential respondent the probability of being selected, hence giving a high degree of representativeness and had been used to identify counties' officials who would participate in the study.

3.5.1 Sample Size

The formula developed by the researchers Krejcie and Morgan was used (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). From the sample size determination table, the target population of 123 respondents required a sample size of 92. The study purposefully used all the twenty officers namely: 5 County Secretaries, 5 Clerks of County Assemblies, 5 Chairs of County Public Accounts Committees and 5 Heads of Monitoring and Evaluations. The remaining one hundred and three were distributed proportionately to a sample size of seventy-two and the seventy-two were randomly selected from the hundred and three as follows:

$$S = \frac{X^2NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1)+X^2P(1-P)}$$

Where:

S = Required Sample size
X = Z value (e.g. 1.96 for 95% confidence level)
N = Population Size
P = Population proportion (expressed as decimal) (assumed to be 0.5 (50%)
d = Degree of accuracy (5%), expressed as a proportion (.05); It is margin of error

County Chief Officers $\frac{48x72}{} = 34$

Great Journs
ISSN: 2328-4870
Vol.1 No.2, August, 2025

103

Directors $\frac{55 \times 72}{103} = 38$

Table 1: Distribution of sample per each group

Staff Designation	Target Population	Sample Size
County Chief Officers	48	34
Directors	55	38
County Secretaries	5	5
Chairs of Public Account Committees	5	5
Heads of Monitoring &Evaluation	5	5
Clerks of County Assemblies	5	5
Total	**123**	**92**

Source: County Service Public Boards (CSPB, 2017)

3.6 Data Collection Instruments

Instruments for data collection choice are key to the success of a research. It is therefore important for the researcher to take into consideration the type of the topic, response rate, time and the targeted population. Kothari (2004) defines a questionnaire as a document that consists of a number of questions printed or typed in a definite order on a form or set of forms. Wilson (1994) states that the questionnaire is a widely used and useful instrument for collecting survey information, providing structured, often numerical data, being able to be administered without the presence of the researcher and often being comparatively straight forward to analyze. Cohen (1989) defines a questionnaire as a self-report instrument used for gathering information about variables of interest to an investigation.

The choice of a questionnaire was because it had merits of allowing respondents a greater depth of response, time to verify answers and anonymity. Another advantage is that it was economical since it saves time and also cost. The questionnaire was divided into different sections. The questionnaire had close - ended and open-ended questions. An open ended question gives respondents the freedom to express their views or opinions and also make suggestions (Aleck, 2004). A 5-point Likert scale ranging from 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree was adopted for rating purpose.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

3.7.1 Questionnaires

This was the main or primary data collection instrument for this research. A questionnaire is a data collecting tool that is designed by the researcher and its major reason being to communicate to the participants what is intended to elicit desired responses in terms of empirical data from the participants in order to achieve research objectives (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2008). A questionnaire containing both open-ended and closed questions, as well as 5-point likert scales was used for collecting primary data.

Questionnaires were distributed to the respondents with instructions on how to fill them. A respondent was selected purposely (purposive sampling) there after he/she directed the researcher to a colleague (snowball sampling) and so on till the researcher achieved his target per county per category. Yang (2008) states that the questions in a study are directly related to the research questions. The procedure for issuing the questionnaires to the respondents was through self introduction. The Questionnaires were administered using a drop and pick method. The questionnaires

were accompanied with an introduction letter and a data collection authority letter from the National Council for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Research assistants were trained and engaged to administer and follow up on the questionnaires.

3.7.2 Secondary Data

Secondary data was collected from Office of Controller of Budgets reports, Commission on Revenue Allocation, Peer. Reviewed journals, County integrated Development Plans reports and research articles.

3.8 Pilot Testing

The questionnaire was pilot tested to determine its validity and reliability. Pilot test was conducted in order to determine approximate length of the survey in terms of time, as well as to further refine the instrument. The pilot test checked if the length of questionnaire was acceptable and uncovered any difficulties arising from the procedure and feedback given was used to make necessary adjustments. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (1999), a successful pilot study uses a 1% to 10 % of the actual sample size. The research instrument was pretested using a sample of 10% of the actual sample size. A total number of 10 respondents were targeted. The respondents who took take part in the pilot test were not included in the final data collection process. Kericho County was selected county for pilot-testing. It was a County that had been ranked among the top counties by the office of the Controller of budgets on absorption of development funds and allocated its budget beyond the 30% threshold on development agenda as per the PFM Act 2012.

3.8.1 Validity of Research Instrument

Validity is the ability of the research instrument to measure what is supposed to measure (Copper & Schindler, 2006). There are various types of validity including construct, content, face and criteria related validity. The research study used both content and constructs validities. Content validity was observed by questionnaire being examined by experts in the strategic management discipline. Construct validity was observed by dividing the questionnaire into several parts which had information for a specific objective and ensured that it was in tandem with the conceptual framework. This enabled the researcher to assess validity of instrument including clarity, relevance, interpretation of questions and time spent and improve where necessary.

3.8.2 Reliability of the Research Instrument

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which instruments yields consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Reliability of pilot study was carried out using officers from county which were not included in the study. Cronbach alpha coefficient which is used to assess the internal consistency among research instruments items was used. Cronbach Alpha coefficient equals zero when the true score is not measured at all and there is only an error component. Alpha equals 1.0 when all items measure only the true score and there is no error component. If the values are too low, either too few items were used or the items had little in common (Kothari, 2004).

His suggestion is that of a value of not less than 0.7 to be acceptable while Sekaran (2003) posits that any values between 0.5 and 0.8 are adequate to accept internal consistency. A threshold of a Cronbach Alpha of 0.7 and above is acceptable. Cronbach Alpha was used to test the reliability of the proposed constructs.

3.9 Data Analysis and Presentation

According to Bryan and Cramer (2011), data analysis is aimed at meeting the research objectives and provides answers to research questions. Kothari (2008) defines data analysis as the use of logic to understand and interpret data collected. Filled questionnaires were edited for completeness and consistency. Qualitative data was analysed by coding, categorizing into themes and analysed using the required statistical tests for descriptive statistics and frequency distributions such as standard deviation, mean and percentage. Statistical software for data analysis known as statistical package for social sciences (SPSS version 22) was used. Pearson Correlation and regression analysis was used to establish the association among the study variables and to test the formulated hypotheses. The ANOVA tests were carried out to test if the regression analysis model used was fit or not. Namusonge (2016) argues that the significance of F ration is used to determine if the model used was fit or not. ANOVA tests by application of p-values. Testing hypothesis was done using p value, where if p value was less than or equal to 0.05

Great Journs
ISSN: 2328-4870
Vol.1 No.2, August, 2025

the null hypothesis was rejected.**The Multiple regression model (details** Error! Reference source not found.**) equation is**:

$$Y= \beta_o + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2+ \beta_3X_3+ \beta_4X_4+ \beta_iX_iZ+ e$$

Where: Y is the dependent variable

β_o is the constant term

β_i is the coefficient of the independent variable X_i where i= [1, 2…n]

X_i is independent variable where $_i$ = [1,2…n], e is the error term.

Y = Execution of CIDPs by County Governments in Kenya, X1 = Envisioning, X_2 =Institutionalization, X_3 = Innovation, X_4 = Monitoring &Evaluation, XiZ = is the interaction between the moderating variable (policy framework) and each independent variable.

Moderating Effect Analysis – A moderator is variable that affects the direction and the strength of the relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable. The moderating variable may reduce or enhance the direction of the relationship between independent variable (predictor) and dependent variable, or it may change the direction of the relationship between the two variables from positive to negative (Ng'ethe, 2013). A moderator is supported if the interaction of predictor and moderator on the outcome of the dependent variable is significant (Berry, 2010).

IV: RESULTS

4.1 Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Execution of County Integrated Development Plans by County Governments in Kenya

The study sought to establish the role of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in the execution of County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) by county governments in Kenya. The respondents were presented with several statements regarding the effectiveness, presence, and outcomes of M&E practices within the counties. They were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement using a five-point Likert scale ranging from *Strongly Agree (1)* to *Strongly Disagree (5)*.

The results are presented in Table 2**,** which provides the frequency distribution of responses, the number of participants (N), as well as the mean and standard deviation for each item. These measures were used to assess the extent to which M&E has influenced the execution of CIDPs.

Table 2: Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Execution of County Integrated Development Plans by County Governments in Kenya

Role of monitoring and Evaluation in the execution of CIDPS by County Governments	Extent of Role of M&E in the execution of CIDPS (%)					Descriptive Statistics		
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Many County development plans have been successfully completed	21	58.1	8.1	9.7	3.2	62	2.16	.978

M&E teams are in place and the resources allocated for the task	17.7	61.3	11.3	8.1	1.6	62	2.15	.865
Functional internal audit department in place	16.1	71	9.7	1.6	1.6	62	2.02	.689
Development plans by counties have complied with the budgets threshold of 30% as per PFM Act 2012	16.7	35	25	15	8.3	60	2.63	1.178
There is positive impact of CIDPS on the ground due to strict adherence to M&E activities	27.4	48.4	14.5	9.7	0	62	2.06	.903
There exists a significant customer satisfaction of delivery due to effective M&E initiatives	32.3	38.7	12.9	14.5	1.6	62	2.15	1.084
Targeted projects have been successfully implemented within the projected time frame	11.3	40.3	6.5	24.2	17.7	62	2.97	1.355

Key: Strongly Agree=1, Agree =2, Not Sure =3, Disagree =4, Strongly Disagree=5

The responses in table 2 indicates that three items had a standard deviation of more than 1.0 which shows there were extreme in the scoring. The highest standard deviation was 1.355 a mean score of 2.97. In the item 'Targeted projects have been successfully implemented within the projected time frame,' (51.6%) of the respondents agree, while (41.9%) disagree with the statement and (6.5%) are not sure. This shows that the respondents were spread to the positive and to the negative hence the high standard deviation witnessed. However the results depicts that four items had a standard deviation of less than 1.0 which shows that there were no extreme scoring hence the items were good measure. The item, 'Functional internal audit department in place,' had the lowest standard deviation of 0.689 and a mean score of 2.02. The responses indicates that (16.1%) and (71.0%) strongly agree and agree respectively with the statement. Only a paltry (3.2%) disagreed with the statement and (9.7%) of the respondents were not sure.

The next statement sought to find out if monitoring and evaluation teams are in place and resources allocated for the tasks had a mean score of 2.15 and a standard deviation of 0.865. Majority of the respondents (61.3%) agreed with the statement while (17.7%) strongly agreed. However (9.7%) of the respondents disagreed and (11.3%) were not sure. The results are echoed by Stem et al., (2005) who argued that budget allocations develops human resources and

enhances management capabilities in planning and implementation of the project. As to whether development plans by counties have complied with the budgets threshold of 30% as per PFM Act 2012 had a mean of 2.63 and a standard deviation of 1.178 which indicated a wide variety of responses, majority (51.7%) of the respondents answered in the affirmative, (23.3%) disagreed and (25.0%) were not sure. As to whether there is Positive impact of CIDPs on the ground due to strict adherence to M&E activities a mean score of 2.06 and a standard deviation of 0.903 were observed and an overwhelming majority (75.8%) agreed. and (9.7%) disagreed, those not sure were (14.5%).Effective monitoring and evaluation enhances the project management decision making process at the execution hence positive impact on implementation of project (Gyorkos, 2003, Crawford and Bryce, 2003). On the statement that there exists a significant customer satisfaction of delivery due to effective M&E initiatives a mean score of 2.15 and a standard deviation of 1.084 were observed with (71.0%) of the respondents agreed and (16.1%) disagreed and (12.9%) were not sure. This is in agreement with McCoy (2005) who said that evaluation provides an assessment of the effectiveness of the project in realization of the goal and the relevance & sustainability of the projects in progress.

In summary, the findings indicate that Many County development plans have been successfully completed, and that M&E teams are in place and the resources allocated for the task and that functional internal audit department in place. Further, slightly over half of the respondents indicated that development plans by counties had complied with the budgets threshold of 30% as per PFM Act 2012. There is positive impact of CIDPs on the ground due to strict adherence to M&E activities. There exists a significant customer satisfaction of delivery due to effective M&E initiatives had an overwhelming acknowledgement from the respondents and finally targeted projects have been successfully implemented within the projected time frame was agreed by slightly over half of the respondents.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis is a method of statistical evaluation used to study the strength of a relationship between two, numerically measured, continuous variables. The Pearson Correlation of Monitoring and Evaluation versus Execution of County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) is 0.577(p value = 0.000) in table 3.This shows a moderate significant and positive relationship between Monitoring and Evaluation and Execution of county integrated development plans. It can therefore be affirmed of the existence of a moderate and positive linear relationship between the two variables, namely Monitoring and Evaluation and execution.

Coefficient of Determination

Coefficient of determination square -measures explained variation. Table 4.35 shows that the coefficient of determination R square is 0.333 and R is 0.577 at 0.05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination indicates that (33.3%) of the variation in the response to execution of county integrated development plans is explained by monitoring and evaluation. The remaining (66.7%) can be explained by other factors and variables in the model other than monitoring and evaluation.

Table 3: Model Summary for Monitoring and evaluation Versus Execution of CIDPs

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.577[a]	.333	.320	.699

a. Predictors: (Constant), Monitoring and evaluation

Overall Significance of the Model

The results of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on monitoring and evaluation versus execution of county integrated development plans. The ANOVA results for regression coefficients indicates that the significance of F is 0.000 which is less than 0.05 hence implying that there is a positive significant relationship between monitoring and evaluation and execution of county integrated development plans.

Great Journs
ISSN: 2328-4870
Vol.1 No.2, August, 2025

Table 4: ANOVA Results for Monitoring and Evaluation

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13.408	1	13.408	27.407	.000[b]
	Residual	26.907	55	.489		
	Total	40.316	56			

a. Dependent Variable: Execution
b. Predictors: (Constant), Monitoring and evaluation

Regression Coefficients

Analysis was further done to determine beta coefficients of monitoring and evaluation versus execution of county integrated development plans. The finding on the individual coefficients shows that there is a significant relationship between monitoring and evaluation and execution of county integrated development plans. The coefficient of monitoring and evaluation is 0.631 which is statistically greater than zero. The t statistic is 5.235 which is greater than zero. Monitoring and evaluation significantly influenced the execution of County Integrated Development Plans (5.235, PV=0.000) at 5% level of significance. Hence the Null hypothesis that monitoring and evaluation has no significant role in execution of county integrated development plans by county governments in Kenya is rejected (P-value = 0.000). Thus, monitoring and evaluation is a major determinant in the execution of county integrated development plans

Execution = 1.169 + 0.631 Monitoring and evaluation

V: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

Monitoring and evaluation was found to be a key component for successful execution of county integrated development plans. The coefficient of determination indicated that a third of the variation in the response to execution of county integrated development plans was explained by monitoring and evaluation. Counties should take monitoring and evaluation as one of the key drivers in the execution of county integrated development plans. County will be able to monitor and evaluate the impact their projects are impacting on the ground and they will be able to account to different government agencies and the public at large.

5.2 Recommendation

Monitoring and evaluation should be taken as a key activity for the counties by having qualified staff and resources allocated to the department. This would ensure that all projects being executed are monitored and evaluated and therefore money being misused will be a thing of the past since there will be staff assigned and they are held accountable should funds be deviated from the intended projects. Also monitoring and evaluation staff should be independent of the executive for them to work without fear of intimidation from the executive.

REFERENCES

Abudho-Riwo,M.,Njanja,L. & Ochieng,T.(2012).The role of strategic leadership during change:KCA University Journal of Business Management,4,48-61.

Abuya,B.A.(2011).Implementation of Strategic Plans Challenges at the Action Aid Kenya,Unpublished MBA Thesis,University of Nairobi.

Arsovski, S., & Arsovski, Z. (2012). Management's challenge for quality improvement. *Challenges of quality management*, 11-30.

Berry, L.M. (2010). *Examining Turnover Intent: Examining the Effect of Employee Engagement, Compensation Fairness, Job Satisfaction and Age:* Unpublished PhD Thesis. Tennessee: Tennessee University.

Bogopane,L.(2014).A qualitative exploratory analysis of the impact of perceived erosion of the politics administration dichotomy on good governance and service delivery in a democratic developmental state:South African perspective.European Scientific Journal,211-222.

Bryman, A. & Cramer, D. (2011). Q*uantitative data analysis with IBM SPSS Statistics 17, 18 and 19: A guide for social scientists.* New York: Routledge.

Chandler, A, D, (2002).Strategy and Structure, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Damanpour, F., & Evan, W.M. (1984).Organizational innovation and performance: the problem of 'organizational lag'. Administrative science quarterly,392-409.

Distefano,J.J., & Maznevski,L.M. (2003).Developing global managers integrating theory,behaviour,data and performance.Advances in Global Leadership.Oxford UK:Elsevier Science,Ltd.

Ekpo, A.H., & Ekpo, A.H. (2008). Decentralization And Service Delivery : Department of Economics University of Uyo Uyo, Nigeria Prepared for the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), Nairobi , Kenya October , 2007 Revised April , 2008 The comments by an anonymous referee.

Gitau, G. (2017, June 29). Nyeri Ranked Last in Uptake of Budget on Development.Daily Nation.Kenya.Thursday.ggitau@ke.nationmedia.com

Gostick,A.R., & Elton,C., (2007).The Carrot principle:How best managers use recognition to engage their people,retain talent and accelerate performance.New York: Free Press.

Hamel,G. & Prahalad,C.(1989).Strategic intent,Harvard Business Review,67(3),63-76.

Hamm,J.,(2011).Unsually Excellent-The necessary nine skills required for the practice of great leadership,New York:Jossey-Bass,Wiley.

Hitts,M.A.,Ireland,R.D.,&Hoskisson,R.E.(2007).Strategic Management:Competitiveness and globalization,7th edition,Ohio:Thomson/South Western.

Hussey, D. (2008).Strategic management from theory to implementation,4th edition,Oxford:Butterworth Heinemann.

Ibok, E. E. (2014). Local governance and service delivery in Nigeria. *Caribbean Journal of Science and Technology*, *2*, 536-541.

ICJ Kenya, (2013). *Handbook on devolution. The Kenyan Section of the International Commission of Jurists*. Nairobi: ICJ.

Ireland, R.D. & Hitt, M.A. (2005).Achieving and Maintaining Strategic Competitiveness in the 21st Century: The Role of Strategic Leadership. *Academy of Management Executive, 19*(4), 63-77.