

DETERMINANTS OF EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONSTITUENCY DEVELOPMENT FUND PROJECTS IN BARINGO CENTRAL CONSTITUENCY, KENYA

PHILIP KIRUI CHESIYNA & DANIEL WANYOIKE

Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Nakuru CBD Campus, Nakuru

ABSTRACT

Parliamentary involvement in grassroots projects and in community development has been growing in developing countries such as Kenya. One policy tool for this involvement is Constituency Development Funds (CDF), which dedicate public money to benefit specific political subdivisions through allocations and/or spending decisions influenced by their representatives in the national parliament. Studies done on CDF funded initiatives in Kenya show a lot of money has been disbursed, but effective implementation of these initiatives has been very low. The current study therefore attempted to establish the determinants of effective implementation of CDF funded projects in Baringo Central Constituency, Kenya. The study employed a descriptive design using quantitative approaches. The target population was all 150 project beneficiaries, management committees and constituency planning and development officers in all CDF funded projects. The study used closed ended questionnaires to collect data. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences Version 21 was used to analyze the data and the results obtained was presented using tables. The study found that all four factors influenced effective implementation with community participation and training having the greatest influence. The study further found an R^2 value of 0.6379 implying that 63.8% of the variations in the effective implementation of CDF projects can be explained by the variations in independent variables. The study recommended that project stakeholders enhance community participation in the entire project implementation process. Further, the study recommends enhance planning and training in order to have effective implementation of CDF projects in the country.

KEYWORDS: Project Planning, Community Participation, Effective Implementation

INTRODUCTION

Parliamentary involvement in grassroots projects and in community development has been growing in developing countries such as Kenya. One policy tool for this involvement is Constituency Development Funds (CDFs), which dedicate public money to benefit specific political subdivisions through allocations and/or spending decisions influenced by their representatives in the national parliament. Policy making on CDFs, including goals and size of the funds; the structure of decision making on the use of the funds at all stages of implementation; oversight of CDF operations; and the relative influence of different individuals and groups in making policy; CDFs resemble the venerable U.S. congressional allocations in national and state-level policy making. Operations of CDFs have sometimes been controversial because they raise fundamental questions about the efficacy of government service delivery, the extent to which such service delivery can be made accountable, the role of legislators in selecting development priorities, and how public participation in policy making can be made more meaningful (Baskin, 2010). However, despite such challenges CDF have been credited with a lot of grass root projects that have direct impact of the taxpayer. Projects are temporary endeavors undertaken to produce

specific objectives within a given time and at a specified costs. This means that a project must have a clearly defined scope, have a definite starting and ending points and a budget for successful completion.

The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) is an annual budgetary allocation by the national government to each of the country's constituencies (Mwangi, 2005). While there are several rules that govern the utilization of CDF to ensure transparency and accountability, decisions over the utilization of the funds are supposed to be mainly by the constituents. The aim of CDF was to devolve national resources at the community level with the aim of spurring economic development at the grassroots level, which would then translate to overall national economic growth and poverty reduction. The spirit of CDF was in recognition of the fact that devolving funds to the community was crucial as it would strengthen the capacity of the people at the local level to exercise economic governance in an effort to spur development at the grassroots level. This would enable communities to allocate resources to priority projects that would address their economic needs towards poverty alleviation. It seeks to avail resources to the local people and fund development projects at the constituency level to achieve bottom up development and improve the economic status of all people. Ultimately, the CDF, as was envisaged, would lead to poverty reduction, improved well-being of Kenyans and political empowerment of Kenyan communities. However, there has been a lot of criticism, from various quarters, on the way the CDF is managed and implemented. The current study therefore seeks to address a number of pertinent questions which would lead to effective implementation of CDF projects.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There has been a lot of criticism, from various quarters, on the way the CDF is managed and implemented. According to Transparency International, doubts have been raised as to whether the constituency development fund has met its stated objectives. For instance there is reported lack of transparency in allocation of funds for development projects; it is not clear how decisions are arrived at on what development projects to be implemented and the formation of the Constituency development committees that are the centre of decision making are characterized by political patronage. CDF is intended to transform the economic well being of local communities leading to poverty reduction. In addition, it was hoped that the CDF and devolvement of funds in general, would enhance people's participation in decision making processes; promote good governance and promote transparency and accountability. However, most of the CDF developed projects have stalled and therefore are not helping the community in any way in improving their lives. Audit reports by the Auditor General Office and civil society indicated that there was an increased case of stalled projects funded by constituency development committees across the country. A report by the Kenya Tax Payers Association for 20013/14 indicated that 40% of the CDF could not be accounted for, 20% of the projects had not been successfully completed and only 5% had been completed successfully, and over 35% had been well utilized. The aforementioned status therefore begs the question: what are the determinants of effective implementation of government funded projects especially CDF funded projects? It is against this background that this study sought to establish the determinants of effective implementation of CDF development projects in Baringo-Central Constituency, Kenya.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The general objective of the study was to establish the determinants of effective implementation of CDF funded projects. Specifically, the study sought:

To evaluate the influence of project planning on effective implementation of CDF funded projects

- To establish the influence of community participation on effective implementation of CDF funded projects
- To examine the influence of monitoring and evaluation on effective implementation of CDF funded projects
- To determine the influence of training on effective implementation of CDF funded projects

LITERATURE REVIEW

Implementing strategies successfully is vital for any organization, either public or private. Without implementation, even the most superior strategy is useless. Implementing would thus be perceived as being about allocating resources and changing organizational structure (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000). For the purpose of this study we present four factors influencing effective implementation.

Influence of Project Planning on Effective Project Implementation

Baldwin and Bordoli (2014) state that regardless of the definition chosen for project planning, it has the objective of achieving a number of common factors including the production of realistic schedules and costs, the completion of a project to defined standards of quality, design criteria, project resources, health and safety, and meeting project stakeholders' expectations. The significance of project planning was recognized in early construction studies in which it was argued that project planning needed to be improved by considering more efficient management strategies in planning. According to Dvir et al., (2003), there is a strong correlation between successful project planning and the success of a project from the perspective of project stakeholders. These authors also indicated that clear definitions of functional and technical specifications in project planning can lead to more effective execution of projects. They also found a strong correlation between successful implementation of planning procedures and benefits to project stakeholders. Such findings are confirmed in a later study which indicated that project success can be measured in view of the quality of project planning; whereas poor planning means uncontrolled alterations in the planning variables of time, cost and quality (Dvir & Lechler, 2004). According to Baldwin and Bordoli (2004), important benefits include: the ability to forecast resource requirements and costs; the ability to develop more realistic schedules with clear time deadlines; the ability to communicate with clear and reliable information to project stakeholders; providing reliable information for risk and opportunity assessment; providing good information for monitoring and control; minimizing materials wastage; and providing a strong basis for team coordination and assisting in the negotiation of contractual claims. According to Kariungi (2014), these benefits cannot be achieved without strong commitment and knowledge on the part of project managers and other project stakeholders on how to manage planning and scheduling most effectively. Despite these theoretical discussions on the significance of project planning, little empirical research has attempted to understand the effectiveness of its application in CDF projects. Furthermore, there is little or no evidence in to indicate the project planning used by CDF teams in Kenya to enhance effective implementation of CDF funded projects.

Influence of Community Participation on Effective Project Implementation

Community participation is described as a social process in which groups with shared needs living in a "certain geographical area" actively identify needs, make decisions, and set up mechanisms to achieve solutions/goals (Adesina, 2010). However, heterogeneous groups and individuals can become a community and collectively take action to attain

shared and specific goals. Community participation is one of the important factors that influence project implementation and sustainability. The level of community support determines whether a project becomes established, how quickly and successfully it consolidates, and how it responds and adapts to meet changing needs. Thus, community participation is an important component of community development and reflects a grassroots or bottom-up approach to problem solving. It is widely recognized that participation in government schemes often means no more than using the service offered or providing inputs to support the project (Abbot, 2004). This is contrasted with stronger forms of participation, involving control over decisions, priorities, plans, and implementation; or the spontaneous, induced, or assisted formation of groups to achieve collective goals. The most important and complicated issue bearing on local level planning and development is community participation. Effective community participation may lead to social and personal empowerment, economic development, and sociopolitical transformation (Kaufman & Alfonso, 1997). Yet there are obstacles: the power of central bureaucracies, the lack of local skills and organizational experience, social divisions, and the impact of national and transnational structures. There is no clear-cut agreement in the literature of community development on the nature of community participation or on a prescription to ensure it. The need for community participation in development and management is nonetheless accepted and recognized in the professional literature. Community participation should therefore be aimed at empowering people by ensuring that skills developed lead to employment creation.

Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation on Effective Project Implementation

Monitoring and evaluating of projects can be of great importance to various players including project sponsors as it would ensure similar projects are replicated elsewhere as witnessed in various projects undertaken by the financial sector which revolve around a few areas (Marangu, 2012). Naidoo (2011) noted that if the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) function is located in a section or associated with significant power in terms of decision-making, it is more likely to be taken seriously. The study further explained that M&E units want to be seen as adding value, and must for their own perpetuation be able to justify their efforts hence M&E managers need success factors to bolster their credibility. This means that the monitoring team needs to be enhanced and strengthened in order for it to have more power which will increase its effectiveness. In addition to power of M&E teams other factors also play a role in strengthening monitoring teams which includes: frequency of scope monitoring to identify changes, number of persons monitoring project schedule and extent of monitoring to detect cost over runs, (Ling et al., 2009). An effective monitoring and evaluation is a major contributor to project success and hence the use of technology to compliment the efforts of the M&E team will strengthen it; which will in turn lead to value addition by the team. Managing Stakeholders, teamwork among members and monitoring the progress of the project work are some of the key processes used to manage the project work (Georgieva & Allan, 2008). A good monitoring team is the one that has good stakeholders' representation. Likewise an M&E team which embraces teamwork is a sign of strength and an ingredient for better project performance. Similarly, Gwadoya (2012) found that there was a shared need for proper understanding of M&E practices in donor funded projects. This is an indication that there was lack of shared understanding of M&E practices in donor funded projects among the various teams. Though the studies carried out mainly dealt with critical success factors, monitoring and evaluation being one of them, few of the studies have focused on monitoring and evaluation. Several other studies reviewed also focused on monitoring and evaluation for example (Naidoo, 2011; Mwala, 2012; Marangu, 2012) but none have addressed to the specific link between monitoring and evaluation in relation to effective project implementation.

Influence of Training on Effective Project Implementation

Schwalbe, (2006), emphasizes that some organizations spend a great deal of time and money on training efforts for general project management skills, but after the training, a project manager might still not know how to tailor their project management skills to the organization's particular needs. Because of this problem, some civil society organizations have developed their own internal project management methodologies. According to Shackelford (2004), project management has sometimes been called the "accidental profession" because many project managers take on their first project management duties without benefit of formal training. The benefits of project management training include; project teams and customers do not have to learn procedures and new jargon with each new project, it becomes easier to compare projects over time when they involve similar measurements and approaches, and consistent tracking and reporting helps uncover inefficiencies in the overall project management approach. Dinsmore and Cabanis-Brewin (2011) emphasizes that most training in project management still resides within corporate training, consulting, and professional organizations-entirely outside higher education. According to Lytras et al., (2010) in project management, a training session could aim at developing or improving one of the project manager competencies. A training session could refer to one or more, thus having an impact on duration of the training. Improving the capacities of local technical staff, training and workshops activities will allow the staff working in civil society organizations and public institutions involved, to improve their know-how and practical experience. This in turn leads to a more effective and efficient operating civil society sector local staff. It therefore follows that for effective implementation of projects, training is a key component. Furthermore, since the management of such government funded projects is made up of all types of stakeholders, there is need for effective training tailored to address specific project areas in order to enhance effective project implementation. the current study therefore seeks to interrogate the influence of training on CDF projects in Baringo Central Constituency, Kenya.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed a survey research design since it entails the collection of data on more than one case and at a single point in time in order to collect a body of quantitative or quantifiable data in connection with two or more variables, which are then examined to detect patterns of association (Bryman, 2012). The target population of the study comprised 150 project beneficiaries, project management team members and members of the constituency development planning office in each of the project types identified. From the population, statistical formula was used to tabulate the sample and found to be 110. Simple random sampling technique was used to select respondents from the various groups of respondents. This study used questionnaires in collecting data because it is straight forward and less time consuming for both the researcher and the respondents and it enables reaching a representative number of respondents with ease (Owens, 2002). The questionnaire consisted of close-ended items that aimed at obtaining data from the respondents. The collected data was analyzed quantitatively by first coding and then analyzing them using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Version 21. Out of 110 questionnaires that were issued to the sampled respondents, 96 of them were filled and returned. Of the returned questionnaires, 12 were incorrectly filled and thus were not used in the final analysis. Therefore, 84 were correctly filled and hence were used for analysis representing a response rate of 76.4%.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The researcher sought to find out the distribution of the respondents according to their gender, age bracket,

education level, working experience and their awareness of CDF projects in the constituency since previous studies have noted some relationship between these demographic factors on effective implementation of projects (Muchiri, 2010). According to the findings, majority of the respondents were male (75%) while the female respondents were 25% which is attributed to the existing gender gap in employment in Kenya and the cultural values of majority of the residents which limits the role of women in leadership majorly in rural communities in Kenya. Majority of the respondents in the region were of the age group 46 - 55 years (45.2%) while the least age group was between 26 – 35 years (7.2%). This can be attributed to the cultural practices prevalent in the region which accords leadership position to the mature and elderly in society and therefore representation of the youth in CDF projects in the region was limited. It was found that 23.8% of the respondents had a certificate and below qualification which was attributed to the generational gap amongst the respondents. Further, only 40% of the respondents had either a bachelors or masters degree further indicating low uptake of education in the region. In terms of working experience, most of the respondents (29.8%) had between 5 – 10 years working experience. Cumulatively, more than 42% had less than 5 years of experience while only 27.3% had more than 10 years working experience. The study attributed this trend to the fact that job opportunities were scarce initially and the devolving of government functions has contributed immensely creating employment opportunities. In terms of awareness of CDF projects, it was found that all the respondents were aware of CDF projects in the area with majority of the respondents (33.3%) being aware of construction of a school.

Influence of Project Planning on Effective Implementation

In this section the researcher presents various aspects touching on project planning and effective implementation of CDF are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1: Influence of Project Planning on Effective Implementation

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Projects are clearly planned for in terms of scope, time and completion schedule	84	2	5	4.16	.711
We normally develop realistic schedules for project implementation and completion	84	2	5	3.52	.884
The project stakeholders also develop realistic cost estimates with accompanying contingent plans	84	1	5	3.72	.984
In planning for projects we often assign and coordinate resources based on budgets and timelines set in the project plan	84	1	5	3.46	.817
The views of all project stakeholders are taken into account in every step of project planning	84	1	5	3.27	.977
There is always a deliberate attempt to include health and safety and environmental management aspect in planning for projects	84	2	5	3.69	.878
The planning team ensures there are quality standards and indicator for every stage of the project lifecycle	84	1	5	4.02	.779
Project planning normally involves provision of functional and technical specifications to be met for every section of the implementation stages	84	3	5	4.01	.649
Project planning is the greatest hindrance to implementation of CDF projects	84	3	5	3.16	.811

Majority of the respondents agreed that projects were clearly planned for in terms of scope, time and completion schedule (4.16), that they normally develop realistic schedules for project implementation and completion (3.52), that the project stakeholders also developed realistic cost estimates with accompanying contingent plans (3.72), that there was always a deliberate attempt to include health and safety and environmental management aspect in planning for projects (3.69), that the planning team ensured there are quality standards and indicator for every stage of the project lifecycle (4.02) and that project planning normally involved provision of functional and technical specifications to be met for every section of the implementation stages (4.01). The respondents were however unsure when asked whether the views of all project stakeholders were taken into account in every step of project planning (3.46) or whether the views of all project stakeholders were taken into account in every step of project planning (3.27) and whether project planning was the greatest hindrance to implementation of CDF projects (3.16).

Influence of Community Participation on Effective Implementation

In this section the researcher presents various aspects touching on community participation and effective implementation of CDF projects are findings are depicted in Table 2. From the results, it was established that majority of the respondents agreed that community mobilization and participation was a long process which impedes negatively to some extent the implementation process (3.87). The respondents however disagreed that the project stakeholders effectively involved the community in every aspect of project implementation as per regulations (2.18), that there was adequate community participation in decision making thereby enhancing implementation of CDF projects (2.42), that community members participated in contributing of resources whether land, electricity or water but they did not involve themselves in field activities of projects (2.45), that community members were illiterate and had no skills to facilitate effective implementation of projects (2.16), that there was a deliberate effort to community participation issues in the district to enhance project implementation (2.37) and that community participation was the greatest hindrance to the implementation of government funded projects (1.78).

Table 2: Influence of Community Participation on Effective Implementation

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
The project stakeholders effectively involve the community in every aspect of project implementation as per regulations	84	1	5	2.18	.895
Community mobilization and participation is a long process which impedes negatively to some extent the implementation process	84	1	5	3.87	.947
There is adequate community participation in decision making thereby enhancing implementation of CDF projects	84	1	5	2.42	.962
Community members participate in contributing of resources whether land, electricity or water but they do not involve themselves in field activities of projects	84	1	5	2.45	.971
Community members are illiterate and have no skills to facilitate effective implementation of projects	84	1	5	2.16	.633

There is a deliberate effort to community participation issues in the district to enhance project implementation	84	1	5	2.37	.963
Community participation is the greatest hindrance to implementation of CDF projects	84	1	5	1.78	0.844

Influence of Monitoring & Evaluation on Effective Implementation

In this section the researcher presents various aspects touching on monitoring and evaluation and effective implementation of CDF projects and the findings are depicted in Table 3.

Table 3: Influence of Monitoring & Evaluation on Effective Implementation

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
The project stakeholders always ensure that the goals and objectives of all projects match the needs being addressed by the projects	84	1	5	3.36	.988
Project stakeholders also ensure that all projects are delivered in a timely and cost effective manner	84	1	5	3.85	.890
Issues identified in the implementation process are always identified and addressed on time	84	1	5	4.05	.784
Project stakeholders often consider all factors that enhance implementation and all obstacles in order to control their effect	84	1	5	4.10	.786
The stakeholders usually analyze the results of each project where the positive and negative effects are identified.	84	1	5	3.07	.992
Project stakeholders often focus on the sustainability and long term effect of all implemented projects	84	1	5	3.44	.937
There is a dedicated team that addresses the monitoring and evaluation aspect and the findings are often made public to all stakeholders	84	1	5	2.19	.779
Monitoring and evaluation is the greatest hindrance to implementation of government funded projects	84	1	5	3.99	.875

From the results, it was established that majority of the respondents agreed that project stakeholders ensured that all projects were delivered in a timely and cost effective manner (3.85), that issues identified in the implementation process were always identified and addressed on time (4.05), that project stakeholders considered all factors that enhance implementation and all obstacles in order to control their effect (4.10) and that monitoring and evaluation was the greatest hindrance to implementation of government funded projects (3.99). The respondents were however unsure when asked whether the project stakeholders always ensured that the goals and objectives of all projects match the needs being addressed by the projects (3.36), whether the stakeholders usually analyzed the results of each project where the positive and negative effects are identified (3.07) and whether project stakeholders often focused on the sustainability and long term effect of all implemented projects (3.44). The respondents however disagreed that there was a dedicated team that addresses the monitoring and evaluation aspect and the findings are often made public to all stakeholders (2.19). The study therefore deduced that monitoring and evaluation is a key component in ensuring successful project implementation. An

analysis of the standard deviations showed that all responses had a standard deviation of <1.00 which indicated smaller dispersion from the mean which was interpreted to mean convergence of responses on the particular propositions.

Influence of Training on Effective Implementation

In this section the researcher presents various aspects touching on training and effective implementation of CDF projects in line with the last objective and the findings are depicted in Table 4.

Table 4: Influence Training on Effective Implementation

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
We are continuously trained on relevant issues in project implementation and management	84	1	5	2.19	.727
We have acquired varied knowledge, skills and attitudes arising from stakeholder training	84	1	5	3.81	.987
Stakeholders see training as an expensive venture and thus minimize training opportunities for the members	84	1	5	2.32	.698
Our training encompasses all aspects of project implementation process	84	1	5	2.35	.921
Stakeholder training has enhanced our decision making capabilities	84	1	5	4.31	.842
There is a deliberate effort to encourage continuous training in order to enhance project implementation	84	1	5	2.13	.759
Training is therefore a greatest hindrance to implementation of CDF projects	84	1	5	4.12	.876

The results in Table 4 indicate that most of the respondents agreed that they have acquired varied knowledge, skills and attitudes arising from stakeholder training (3.81), that stakeholder training had enhanced their decision making capabilities (4.31) and that training was therefore a greatest hindrance to implementation of CDF projects (4.12). The respondents however disagreed that they were continuously trained on relevant issues in project implementation and management (2.19), that stakeholders saw training as an expensive venture and thus minimize training opportunities for the members (2.32), that their training encompassed all aspects of project implementation process (2.35) and that there was a deliberate effort to encourage continuous training in order to enhance project implementation (2.13). The study therefore deduced that training is critical component of successful project implementation.

Effective Implementation of CDF Projects

In this section the researcher presents various aspects touching on measurement of the dependent variable which was effective implementation of CDF projects and the findings are depicted in Table 5. From the findings it was established that majority of the respondents agreed that CDF projects were implemented according to the intended quality standards (3.76), that CDF projects were implemented according to the set technical requirements (3.96), that CDF projects were implemented to user satisfaction (3.99) and that CDF projects were implemented and evaluated according to set objectives (3.97). The respondents however disagreed that CDF projects were implemented according to the set timelines (2.41) and that CDF projects were implemented according to the cost/budget provisions (2.17).

Table 5: Effective Implementation of CDF Projects

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
CDF projects are implemented according to the set timelines	84	1	5	2.41	.993
CDF projects are implemented according to the cost/budget provisions	84	1	5	2.17	.969
CDF projects are implemented according to the intended quality standards	84	1	5	3.76	.902
CDF projects are implemented according to the set technical requirements	84	1	5	3.96	.766
CDF projects are implemented to user satisfaction	84	1	5	3.99	.693
CDF projects are implemented and evaluated according to set objectives	84	1	5	3.97	.796

The study then carried out a regression analysis to test the significance of the influence of project planning, community participation, monitoring and evaluation and training. The model summary is depicted in Table 6.

Table 6: Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std Error of the Estimate
1	0.7987	0.6379	0.6178	0.3449

The R² value of 0.6379 implies that 63.8% of the variations in the effective implementation of CDF projects can be explained by the variations in independent variables. This therefore means that other factors not studied in this study contribute 36.2% of effective implementation of CDF projects. The researcher further conducted a multiple regression analysis and the findings of the multiple regression model is depicted in Table 7. From the multiple regression model, holding project planning, community participation, monitoring and evaluation and training constant, effective implementation of CDF projects would increase by 4.911. It was established that a unit increase in project planning would cause an increase in effective implementation of CDF projects by a factor of 0.231, a unit increase in community participation would cause an increase in effective implementation of CDF projects by a factor of 0.397, a unit increase in monitoring and evaluation would cause an increase in effective implementation of CDF projects by a factor of 0.292 and a unit increase in training would cause an increase in effective implementation of CDF projects by a factor of 0.345.

Table 7: Multiple Regression Analysis

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	P
		B	SE	B		
1	Constant	4.911	1.398		3.443	0.072
	Project Planning	0.231	0.109	0.213	2.541	0.018
	Community Participation	0.397	0.178	0.339	1.906	0.032
	Monitoring & Evaluation	0.292	0.115	0.203	1.717	0.044
	Training	0.345	0.109	0.288	2.712	0.028

The un-standardized beta coefficients in Table 7 were then used to obtain the overall relationship of the independent variables and the dependent variable and model was formulated as:

$$Y = 4.911 + 0.231X_1 + 0.397X_2 + 0.292X_3 + 0.345X_4$$

Where Y = Effective Implementation of CDF Projects, X_1 = Project Planning, X_2 = Community Participation,

X_3 = Monitoring & Evaluation, X_4 = Training. From the model it was established that all the independent variables positively related to effective implementation of CDF projects and were statistically significant at the 5% significance level. The findings are in agreement with those of Oyalo and Bwisa (2015) who established a similar trend on factors influencing effective implementation of projects.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that for effective implementation of CDF projects the said projects should be clearly planned for in terms of scope, time and completion schedule, the project stakeholders should develop realistic schedules for project implementation and completion and that project stakeholders should also developed realistic cost estimates with accompanying contingent plans. It was concluded that since community mobilization and participation was a long process which impedes the implementation process, stakeholders must have effective strategies to enhance participation. The study concluded that project stakeholders should ensure all projects were delivered in a timely and cost effective manner that issues identified in the implementation process should always be identified and addressed on time and that project stakeholders should consider all factors that enhance implementation and all obstacles in order to control their effect. The study also concluded that there should be a dedicated team that addresses the monitoring and evaluation aspect and thus findings of the monitoring and evaluation team should be made public to all stakeholders. The study also concluded that project stakeholders were not continuously trained on relevant issues in project implementation and management, that stakeholders saw training as an expensive venture and thus minimize training opportunities for the members.

REFERENCES

1. Abbot, J. (2004). *Decentralization and Community Based Planning*. PLA Notes Number 49 April 2004
2. Adesina, C. (2010). Globalization and the Unending Frontier: An Overview, *Journal of Global Initiatives: Policy, Pedagogy, Perspective*: 3(2), 1-9
3. Baldwin, A., & Bordoli, D. (2014). *Handbook for Construction Planning and Scheduling*, 1st Ed., Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
4. Baskin, M. (2010). *Constituency Development Funds (CDFs) as a Tool of Decentralized Development*. New York.
5. Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*, (4th Ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Dinsmore, C., & Cabanis-Brewin, J. (2011). *The AMA Handbook of Project Management*. Ohio: Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.
7. Dvir, D., & Lechler, T. (2004). Plans are nothing, changing plans is everything: the impact of changes on project success. *Research Policy*, 33, 1-15.
8. Dvir, D., Raz, T., & Shenhar, A. (2003). An empirical analysis of the relationship between project planning and project success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21, 89-95.

9. Georgieva, S., & Allan, G. (2008). Best Practices in Project Management Through a Grounded Theory Lens. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 6(1), 43-52.
10. Gwadoya, R. (2012). *Factors influencing effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation practices in donor funded projects in Kenya: a case of Turkana District* (Masters dissertation). Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya
11. Kariungi, S. (2014). Determinants of Timely Completion of Projects in Kenya: A Case of Kenya Power and Lighting Company, Thika. *ABC Journal of Advanced Research*, 3(2), 9 – 20.
12. Kaufman, M. & Alfonso, H. (eds.) (1997) *Community Power and Grassroots Democracy. The transformation of social life*, London: Zed Books.
13. Ling, F., Low, S., Wang, S., & Lim, H. (2009). Key project management practices affecting Singaporean firms' project performance in China. *International Journal of Project Management*, 27(1), 59-71.
14. Lytras, M., De Pablos, O., & Avison, D. (2010). *Technology Enhanced Learning: Quality of Teaching and Educational Reform*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
15. Marangu, E. (2012). *Factors influencing implementation of community based projects undertaken by the banking industry in Kenya. a case of Barclays Bank of Kenya*, Masters Dissertation, Kenyatta University, Nairobi.
16. Mwangi, K. (2005). *Efficiency and efficacy of Kenya's Constituency Development Fund: Theory and evidence. Working Paper Number 2005 – 42*, Department of Economics, University of Connecticut, U.S.A.
17. Mwala, F. (2012). *Effect of project monitoring on implementation of economic stimulus projects in education sector within Nairobi County, Kenya*. Masters dissertation, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya
18. Naidoo, A. (2011). *The role of monitoring and evaluation in promoting good governance in South Africa: A case study of the Department of Social Development*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Witwatersrand.
19. Oyalo, N., & Bwisa, H. (2015). Factors that Influence the Completion of CDF Funded Projects in Kangundo Constituency, *The Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*. 2(49), 21-36.
20. Shackelford, B. (2004). *Project Management Training*. New York: Upper Case publication services ltd.
21. Schwalbe, K. (2006). *Introduction to project management*. New York: Cengage Learning.