International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management
United Kingdom Vol. V, Issue 8, August 2017
http://ijecm.co.uk/ ISSN 2348 0386

INFLUENCE OF MONITORING PLANNING PRACTICES ON PROJECTS PERFORMANCE OF KENYAN STATE CORPORATIONS

Muchelule Yusuf Wanjala
Phd Student, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya
ymuchelule@gmail.com

Mike Amuhayav Iravo
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Romanusv Odhiambo
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Noor Ismail Shalle
Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Abstract

The main objective of this study is to investigate the influence of monitoring planning practices on project performance of Kenyan State Corporations. Complexity theory informed the study. Mixed research design was adopted and a target population of 187 state corporations was used. Simple random sampling were used to select 65 state corporations who forms the sample size. Data was collect using questionnaire. The collected data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics as well as qualitative methods. Findings from regression model showed that monitoring planning (β1 = -0.307) had negative significant effect project performance in Kenyan State Corporations. The implication is that monitoring planning results in declined project performance. There is thus need for further research on the same to establish the validity of this concept.

Keywords: State Corporations, project, performance, monitoring planning, monitoring, evaluation

INTRODUCTION

Over many decades monitoring practices has become a mainstay and a major process (organizational activity) in for-profit and not-for-profit organizations. These organizations have refined and used the practices to understand issues which they cannot control but have a significant impact on their survival and success within their limited resources and competencies to improve their competitive positions. It was hypothesized that a firm could exert some positive control over market forces, create competitive advantages, improve organizational effectiveness, and improve its performance through effective monitoring practices(Pheng,2006). As a result, new concepts and tools were developed and added in an aspect of the development programs management within the development sector over time to bring formality and uniformity to project management practices (Muller, 2007). A substantial amount of annual budget (two to fifteen percent) of a development program spent on monitoring activities. Such activities include writing proposals, designing programs, and developing frameworks, compiling action plans, collecting data, writing reports and maintaining information systems by carrying out monitoring studies. The importance of Monitoring in global efforts toward achieving environmental, economic and social development cannot be understated (Muller, 2007).

Several studies were done to examine factors impacting on project performance in developing countries. A study by Faridi and El-Sayegh (2006) reported that shortage of skilled manpower, poor supervision and poor site management, unsuitable leadership; shortage and breakdown of equipment due to ineffective monitoring practices contributed to project delays in the United Arab Emirates. As established by Mbachu and Nkando (2007), that quality and attitude of service are key factors constraining successful monitoring practices on project delivery in South Africa.

Monitoring, therefore, is a practice that is useful and relevant for the actors in the development world (Asare, 2010). However, in Kenya many mainstream Monitoring practices tend to be isolated and disconnected from management and decision-making. Many programs and projects are driven by pre-set targets and actions, such that is an additional burden on application teams, and their monitoring practice is limited to the fulfilment of reporting requirements of governments (SteffDeprez, 2008).Monitoring practices in government owned entities play critical roles in the national development effort. First, government-owned entities are important in promoting or accelerating economic growth and development. They are essential to building capability and technical capacity of states in facilitating and/or promoting national development. Third, they are necessary instruments in improving the delivery of public services, including meeting the basic needs of citizens. Fourth, they have been variously applied to the creation of real and widespread employment opportunities in various jurisdictions,

and lastly the state corporations are useful for targeted and judicious building of international partnerships. They, therefore, play a major role in enabling the social and economic transformation of the country economies in which they operate through various projects under them (RoK, 2011). However, many times monitoring practices are complicated with disputable mechanism relating to projects accountability, procedures unfairness, and lack of transparency. According to Chesos (2010) most organizations lack effective monitoring practices due to misuse of resources, poor planning, conflict of interest and poor communication in meeting obligatory requirements; hence failing to deliver results that don't meet stakeholders needs despite monitoring practices being in place. However, none of the studies have addressed specific link between monitoring practices on performance from a Kenya's perspective. To investigate the influence of monitoring planning on performance of project in Kenyan State Corporations.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

One of the leading proponents of complexity theory is Stuart Kauffman in the 1950's. A complex system is defined by Thompson (1967) as one in which many independent agents interact with other in multiple (sometimes infinite) ways. Simon (1969) describes a complex system as one of the vast number of parts which can interact in a non-simple way. Arthur, Durlauf and Lane (1997) state that basic premise of complexity theory is that there is a hidden order to the behavior (and evolution) of complex systems, whether that system is a national economy, an ecosystem, an organization, or a production line. Later researchers based their definitions on this one and furthered by adding concepts such as non-linearity (Richardson &Cilliers, 2001).

It is evident that the management of projects transpires in a complex environment. The application of complexity theory can enable the systematic consideration of the conditions that give rise to such complexity (Baccarin, 1996). According to Lucas (2000), complexity can be associated more with the inter connection structures that link various objects and not the objects themselves. He also argues that mega projects, in particular, can involve a significant number of parties and myriad interconnections generating complexity with defined characteristics (Lucas, 2000). Understanding the complexity theory from a socio-organizational standpoint and how these affect the performance can contribute to the design of more efficient project delivery systems. In particular, it should enable project managers to respond with the necessary actions and improve the setting up of projects, the management style adopted and the decision-making process. The characteristics directly relevant have been mapped onto project conditions (Antoniadis, Edum-Fotwe& Thorpe, 2006). From a management perspective, complexity theory provides a rather different view, and it is picking up steam in the field of management science

especially that of project management. Frame (2002) states that Project Management has operated in a management environment of chaos and complexity for decades. The conceptual framework of this study bases on monitoring planning variables and one dependent variable.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Monitoring planning is identified as one of the key tools that stakeholders use to ensure that projects are successful (Naoum, Fong & Walker, 2004; Ling & Chan, 2002; Thomas, Macken, Chung & Kim, 2002; Naoum 1991). In separate studies Faniran, Love and Smith (2000) described monitoring planning as the systematic arrangement of project resources in the best way so as to achieve project objectives. According to Faniran et al. (2000), project success is measured in terms of the achievement of project objectives. Naoum et al. (2004) state that monitoring planning is the process of determining appropriate strategies for the achievement of predefined project objectives and it classified into preconstruction and construction planning. Preconstruction planning is also referred to as pre-contract planning which is the planning done during the conception, design and tendering stages of a project. Construction planning on the other hand refers to contract planning which describes the planning done during the construction of a project (Faniran et al., 1998).

There are three levels of monitoring planning, namely: the end-user level of planning where planning focuses mainly on the functional characteristics of the project and the end-product, the second level is the technical level that focuses on the technical specifications of the project deliverables that are needed to support the functional requirements, and the final level is the project management level which focuses on planning the activities and processes that need to be carried out to ensure that the technical work proceed effectively (Dvir, Raz & Shenhar, 2003). These three levels of planning can also be referred to as project conception planning, project design planning and contract planning. From the review above, it can be understood that different forms of planning are carried out in each of the five stages namely: conception, design, tendering, construction and closeout (Dvir et al., 2003).

It is further pointed out by Dvir et al. (2003) that in monitoring planning, project objectives are the focal point of every effort and activity and they are important in planning because project plans are derived from them. Project objectives in monitoring planning are first defined; then the strategies to achieve them are formulated and presented as project plans and these are used in evaluating the achievement of the objectives (Dvir et al., 2003). Monitoring planning can therefore be regarded as the process of defining project objectives, determining the framework, methods, strategies, tactics, targets and deadlines to achieve the objectives and the techniques of communicating them to project stakeholders. The process of monitoring planning requires

that clients' expectations and available resources are defined first, matched to set project objectives, so that available options are identified and evaluated and the most appropriate frameworks, strategies and tactics to achieve the objectives are selected (Puthamont&Charoenngam, 2004). The final planning process is communicating the objectives and the frameworks, methods, strategies, targets/deadlines to achieve them to people, parties and organizations concerned with their implementation, monitoring and control. The end products of monitoring planning are numerous project plans that represent defined strategies to achieve defined project objectives (Puthamont&Charoenngam, 2004).

The state corporations mainly use two major frameworks in their monitoring planning: result framework and logical framework (Jaszczolt et al., 2010). A framework is an essential guide to monitoring as it explains how the project should work by laying the steps needed to achieve the desired results. A framework, therefore, increases the understanding of the project goals and objective by defining the relationships between factors key to implementation, as well as articulating the internal and external elements that could affect the project's success. A good monitoring framework can assist with ideas through the project strategies and objectives on whether they are ideal and most appropriate to implement. The monitoring framework should also include details on budgeting and allocation of technical expertise, as well as inform government and project management on its implementation (Guijt et al., 2002).

While the logical framework identified internationally, is a matrix that makes use of planning indicators at each stage of the project as well as identifies possible risks. The logical framework hence shows the conceptual foundation on which the project monitoring system is built (Chaplowe, 2008). It also works well with other monitoring planning (Jaszczolt et al., 2010). The log-frame (logical framework) has four columns and rows that link the project goals and objectives to the inputs, process and outputs required to implement the project. Monitoring results can, however, be criticized regarding whether the data collection, analysis, and results lead to reliable information that reflects the real situation (Nabris, 2002). On June 2013, Rasna Warah, wrote an article in the Daily Nation on UNDP's shortcoming a reflection of a wider failure of the UN system and Kenya state corporation's being part of it, where she not only stated that internal monitoring are likely to be flawed within UN systems in Kenyan State Corporations but also added that, after UNDP spent more than $8.5 billion on activities of anti-poverty between 2004 and 2011 within Kenya and entire Africa; it was a challenge for it to show major impact on the lives of the people it was trying to change (Warah, 2013). In response to Rasna's article, IranNaidoo, Director in the monitoring office, UNDP said that Rasna comments called for better monitoring of the impacts of UNDP programs within Kenya and entire Africa (Naidoo, 2013).

Monitoring use separate tools and approaches, some of which are either complementary or substitute to each other while others are either broad or narrow (World Bank, 2008). An evaluator, however, may choose to use a combination of methods and sources of information in order to cross-validate data (Nabris, 2002). Monitoring system tools include performance indicators, logical framework approach, and theory-based monitoring, set surveys, rapid appraisal methods, and participatory methods, public expenditure tracking surveys, impact monitoring, cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis. The selection of these tools, however, depend on the information needed, stakeholders and the cost involved (World Bank, 2012). There are also two foremost methods of data collection which are regular and less formal methods (Nabris, 2002). Regular methods although costly, they have a high degree of reliability and validity and include surveys, participatory observations, and direct measurements among others. Less regular methods which are as well rich in information are subjective and intuitive, hence less precise in conclusion. They include, among others, field visits, and unstructured interviews. To increase the effectiveness of an Monitoring system, the monitoring plan and design need to be prepared as a constituent part of the project (Nabris, 2002).

Monitoring planning vary with type, sector and country of application, (Koffi-Tessio 2002 and Fitzgerald et al., 2009). A successful monitoring system, therefore, should be modified to a specific setting with allowance for flexibility and imagination (Jha et al., 2010). The Kenyan government when establishing monitoring planning within its state corporation is it should also consider experiences from other organizations in the world (Briceno, 2010). A well prepared and executed monitoring will contribute to both project outcomes and international standards of doing things (Jha et al., 2010). According to experience drawn from USAID Turkey monitoring planning , best practices not only include linking monitoring to project strategic plans and work plans, but also focusing on efficiency and cost effectiveness of projects, employing a participatory approach to monitoring progress, utilizing both international and local expertise, disseminating results widely, using data from multiple sources, and facilitating the use of data for program improvement (Mathis et al. 2001). Monitoring planning that are set based on ‘acceptable best practices’ aid in making ‘data-based’ decisions as well as provide state corporations with ‘evidence-based’ project results.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Ika et’ al (2010) established that project success was insensitive to the level of project planning efforts but on the other hand ascertained that a significant correlation does exist between the use of monitoring tools and project “profile,” a success criterion which was an early pointer of project long-term impact. Similarly, one of the components of the project management

methodology whose main aim is to achieve project success was monitoring project progress (Chin, 2012). Ika et' al (2012) carried out a regression analysis. The study showed that there was a statistically significant and positive relationship between each of the five Critical Success Factors and performance. The five critical success factors include monitoring, coordination, design, training and the Institutional environment.

The Kenya social protection sector review (2012), that focused on main programs in the social protection sector in Kenya, conducted through literature review, landscape survey and in-depth interviews with project implementers, states that not many programs in Kenya have a functional monitoring systems, despite of being accredited for promoting transparency and accountability. From the programs reviewed 76% had developed some indicator framework for monitoring, 71% conducted monitoring activities 51% had a planned, or ongoing impact monitoring and 39% had no monitoring reports for public consumption. This is attributed to programs not allocating the required resources at the design stage of the monitoring. There was also an inconsistency in the choice of performance indicators among the Kenyan programs which led to incoherent and incomprehensive monitoring systems. Out of 88.1% of the Kenya safety net programmes, only 16.7% could provide a review team with a logical framework. The review also established that although monitoring rarely influenced the decision-making process, its information was being used to inform project and program designs as well as inform policies. The review also notes that the country relies much on monitoring international consultants and therefore recommends the capacity building of national and progressive wean program of civil servants (locals) because they will stay in the sector over the long term.

From reviewed literature above it is also evident that the literature lacks in-depth case studies, studies of processes, and studies in real time and studies that would be beneficial to performance and also for understanding fundamental issues of projects and project organizations. From the literature, the majority of the researchers have paid limited interest in the actual work and performance of the project manager and the project management unit. It is clear that project responsibility was usually transferred to operating personnel, reluctance to transparency, ease of evaluating monitoring practices (Muller & Turner, 2005, 2004).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was based on theoretical foundations from which hypotheses derived, and quantitative methods were used for logic and evidence testing. Positivism believes that reality is stable and can be observed from an objective viewpoint by arguing that a phenomena can be isolated and observation can be duplicated. The research study, therefore, used descriptive research designs. The target population of this study were 187 state corporations in Kenya,

which include the commercial state corporation, executive agencies, independent regulatory agencies, research institutions, public universities, tertiary education and training institutions (RoK, 2013). The sampling technique that were used in the study is simple random sampling. Using the Yamane formula (1967) a sample size of 65 state corporations were selected. Primary data was collected through questionnaires using a nominal scale. Most of the questions were structured on an agreement continuum using 5-point Likert type scale. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient, α, were used for the internal reliability test. Descriptive statistics such as the rate of response, the frequency distribution, the mean, measure of relationship and the standard deviation were used to analyze the data. Pearson correlation analysis were used to establish the relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable. Multiple regression models basically reveal linear relationships between predictors and the dependent variable.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Demographic characteristics

The study settled on four age groups, from which, respondents were asked to identify their group. The groups were: - between 20 to 30 years old, 31 to 40 years old, 41 to 50 years old and above 50 years. The data collected revealed that 27.6% of the respondents aged between 20 to 30 years, 29.4% aged between 31 to 40 years, 24.1% aged between 41 to 50 years and 18.9% were above 50 years of age. The distribution of the respondents was distributed between project managers, finance office, project team leader and key stakeholder with each level having 27%, 39%,22.7% and 11.3% respectively. The respondents were mainly in the finance office (39%). This distribution provided a diversified base of information given the contribution of the different job categories. Academic levels were reflected in percentage as Certificate 28.2%; Diploma 34%; Undergraduate 28.2% and post graduate were featured at only 9.6%. The education level of project managers, finance officers, project team leaders and end user key stakeholder is utmost important. From the study, most of the respondents had worked with Kenya state corporation for over three years (45.6%); 29.1% for one to two years; while 253% had worked for a year. On the whole, most of the respondents had worked for more than a year and this provided responses based on a wider knowledge base of the corporations' operations.

Monitoring Planning

Monitoring planning is described as the systematic arrangement of project resources in the best way so as to achieve project objectives (Faniran, Love and Smith 2000). As part of the study objectives, the study sought to investigate the influence of monitoring planning on performance

of project in Kenyan State Corporations. Table 1 illustrates the results. Based on the findings in the table, monitoring plans are well applicable in organization activities (mean = 4.36, SD = 0.75). Also, employees are well trained on effective monitoring planning practices in organization projects (mean = 3.45, SD = 1.35). The implication is that employees have the requisite skills to systematically arrange project resources in such a way that it leads to the achievement of project objectives. Furthermore, network diagrams and frameworks are used in scheduling organization projects (mean = 4.01, SD = 0.99). With the use of network diagrams and frameworks, project managers and the involved stakeholders are able to lay out the steps needed to achieve the desired results. There is thus an increased understanding of the project goals as well as the objectives. Besides, the organization conducts stakeholder's analysis surveys on its resources before it plans (mean = 3.73, SD = 0.8). By carrying out this analysis before the implementation of a policy, project managers can detect and act to prevent misunderstanding or opposition to the implementation of the policy. As well, the information generated is key in developing a clear framework for the utilization of the resources.

In addition, the organization uses project management software for monitoring plans (mean = 3.99, SD = 0.98). Consequently, it is easier for the state corporations to plan, organize and manage its resources. Resource estimates, cost control and budget management, communication and decision-making are made easier with the use of the project management software. However, it was not fully established if the staff roles match their experience and qualifications in the organization (mean = 3.11, SD = 0.81). It could be that the state corporations have not created objective measures of what is important for the staff roles; whether it is their skill set or their years of experience in a similar role. Similarly, there was doubt if rapid assessment is conducted in monitoring plans used in projects (mean = 3.18, 1.12).Since rapid assessments are lowly evidenced, it could be a challenge for the corporations to measure the effectiveness of the plans. The findings on monitoring planning summed up to a mean of 3.69, standard deviation 0.7 and kurtosis 3.63.

Table 1. Monitoring Planning

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis
Monitoring plans are well applicable in organization activities	4.36	0.75	2.76
Employees are well trained on effective monitoring planning practices in organization projects	3.45	1.35	-0.6
Network diagrams and frameworks are used in scheduling organization projects	4.01	0.99	2.31

Table 1...

The organization conducts stakeholder's analysis surveys on its resources before it plans.	3.73	0.8	5.93
The staff's roles match their experience and qualifications in the organization.	3.11	0.81	-0.6
The organization uses project management software for monitoring plans.	3.99	0.98	2.96
Rapid assessment is conducted in monitoring plans used in projects	3.18	1.12	-0.7
monitoring planning	3.69	0.7	3.63

Project performance

This section of the analysis highlights the results on project performance. Table 2 presents the results. From the results, there was doubt whether most of the projects initiated are of good quality (mean = 3.42, SD = 1.27).It is also uncertain if projects are implemented and completed within expected timeframe and budget (mean = 2.8, SD = 1.45).

Similarly, it is undefined if concluded projects normally meet the required scope and quality projects standard (mean = 2.61, SD = 1.41). Furthermore, there is uncertainty as to whether there is proper utilization of project resources on its performance (mean = 2.5, SD = 1.54).The poor acquisition of the suitable monitoring practices by state corporations' is as a result of emphasis on physical infrastructure such as computers than on conceptual training. The respondents also denied that the organization gives regular project progress reports on its performance (mean = 2.1, SD = 1.31). On the whole, findings on project performance summed up to a mean of 3.64, standard deviation 0.93 and kurtosis -0.6.

Table 2. Project performance

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis
The project meet its intended goals and objectives	2.47	1.72	-1.4
There is proper utilization of project resources on its performance.	2.5	1.54	-1.1
Projects are implemented and completed within expected timeframe and budget	2.8	1.45	-1.6
Monitoring facilitates transparency and accountability of the of project resources.	2.29	1.13	-0.3
The organization gives regular project progress reports on its performance	2.1	1.31	-0.6
Most of the project initiated are of good quality	3.42	1.27	-1.3
project performance	3.64	0.93	-0.6

Factor analysis and Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's alpha is used as a measure of the internal consistency of the instrument and is based on the average correlation among the items on a scale. Reliability tends to increase with longer scales and heterogeneous (mixed) groups. Cronbach's alpha is expressed as a correlation coefficient, ranging in value from 0 to +1. An estimate of 0.70 or higher is desired for judging a scale to be reliable. Table 3 shows that the Cronbach's alpha result of monitoring planning factors were higher than 0.70 hence they are reliable and they reflect the respondent's opinions on monitoring planning. The factor analysis results for monitoring planning are as presented in table 3. Usually, factors with factor loadings of above 0.5 are excellent and should be retained for further data analysis. As a result, monitoring planning items namely Monitoring plans are well applicable in organization activities, employees are well trained on effective monitoring planning practices in organization projects, network diagrams and frameworks are used in scheduling organization projects, rapid assessment is conducted in monitoring plans used in projects, the organization conducts stakeholder's analysis surveys on its resources before it plans, the staff's roles match their experience and qualifications in the organization and the organization uses project management software for monitoring planswere retained for further data analysis. Furthermore, the first factor accounted for 37.597% of the total variance and the second factor accounted 71.426% of the total variance. In addition,Kaiser- Meyer- Olkin Measure (KMO measure) was used by the study to test for sampling adequacy. The findings in table 3 revealed that the KMO was greater than 0.5 and Bartlett's Test was significant.

Table 3. Factor Analysis for Monitoring Planning

	loading 1	loading 2	Cronbach's Alpha
Monitoring plans are well applicable in organization activities	0.761		0.799
Employees are well trained on effective monitoring planning practices in organization projects	0.822		0.81
Network diagrams and frameworks are used in scheduling organization projects	0.831		0.809
The organization conducts stakeholder's analysis surveys on its resources before it plans.	0.624		0.799
The staff's roles match their experience and qualifications in the organization.		0.785	0.831
The organization uses project management software for monitoring plans.		0.87	0.779
Rapid assessment is conducted in monitoring plans used in projects		0.911	0.828
Cronbach's Alpha			0.831
Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items			0.844

Table 3...

Total Variance Explained: Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
Total	2.632	2.368
% of Variance	37.597	33.829
Cumulative %	37.597	71.426
KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	0.557	
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity , Approx. Chi-Square		2642.39
df		21
Sig.		0.000
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.		

Hypothesis testing

The correlation between monitoring planning and project performance was significant, r = 0.196, P < 0.01. monitoring explain only 64.5% of the effects of the on project performance as represented by the R^2which means that other factors not studied in this research contribute 35.5% of the effects of the independent variables on project performance. Therefore, further research should be conducted to investigate the other factors influencing project performance (35.5%).

Study findings in ANOVA table 4.27 indicated that the above discussed coefficient of determination was significant as evidence of F ratio of 156.465 with p value 0.000 <0.05 (level of significance). Thus, the model was fit to predict project performance using monitoring planning.

The hypothesis of the study stated that there is a significant relationship between monitoring planning and project performance in Kenyan State Corporations. Findings in table 4.28 showed that monitoring planning had coefficients of estimate which was significant basing on β_1 = -0.307 (p-value = 0.000 which is less than α = 0.05) thus we accept the hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between monitoring planning and project performance in Kenyan State Corporations. This suggests that there is up to 0.307 unit decrease in project performance for each unit increase in monitoring planning. Also, the effect of monitoring planning is more than the effect attributed to the error, this is indicated by the t-test value = 7.936..As opposed to the study findings, the extant literature (Naoum, Fong & Walker, 2004; Ling & Chan, 2002; Thomas, Macken, Chung & Kim, 2002; Naoum 1991) has indicated that monitoring planning is a key tool that stakeholders use to ensure the success of projects. The results are also contrary with Faniran, Love and Smith (2000) who describe monitoring planning as the systematic arrangement of project resources in such a way that it leads to achievement of project objectives. In a similar vein, Jha*et al.*, (2010) posit that a well prepared and executed monitoring will contribute to both project outcomes and international standards of

doing things. In corroboration with the views of prior authors, Puthamont & Charoenngam, (2004) elucidate that the end products of monitoring planning are numerous project plans that represent defined strategies to achieve defined project objectives.

Table 4. Coefficient of Estimate

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			correlation
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	zero order
(Constant)	1.095	0.186		5.902	0	
monitoring planning	-0.407	0.051	-0.307	-7.936	0	.196**
R Square	0.649					
Adjusted R Square	0.645					
Std. Error of the Estimate	0.55186					
R Square Change	0.649					
F Change	156.465					
Sig. F Change	0					
a Dependent Variable: project performance						

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, monitoring planning has a negative and significant relationship with project performance. Though monitoring planning is key in determining the appropriate strategies for the achievement of predefined project objectives (Naoum *et al*. 2004), the study suggests that the relationship between the two variables is negative. The implication is that monitoring planning results in declined project performance. There is thus need for further research on the same to establish the validity of this concept.

The study findings have established that monitoring planning has a significant influence on the project performance of Kenya State corporations. As a result, it is utmost important have a monitoring plan that is set based on acceptable best practices in order to provide 'evidence-based' project outcomes. Employees need to be well trained on effective monitoring planning practices and network diagrams and frameworks need to be made use of scheduling organization projects. As well, it is of essence for organizations to conduct stakeholder's analysis surveys on its resources before it plans. The well-executed monitoring plan will contribute to both project outcomes and international standards of doing things (Jha et al., 2010). This study was primarily limited to65 state corporations who forms the sample size. Therefore, it may not be appropriate to generalize to the whole population of state corporations in this country or any other country.

REFERENCES

Antoniadis, D.N., Edum-Fotwe, F.T. & Thorpe, A., (2006). Project reporting and Complexity In: Boyd D (ed) Proceedings of 22nd annual conference ARCOM, UCE Birmingham.

Arthur, W.B., Durlauf, S. & Lane D., (1997). Introduction: The Economy as a Complex Evolving System. In (Eds.) The Economy as a Complex Evolving System II. Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe and Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Chaplowe, Scott G. (2008).Monitoring and evaluation planning module.American Red Cross and catholic relief services.Washington, DC and Baltimore, MD.

Chesos R. (2010).Automated M&E systems for NGO's.The co-ordinator, Issue no.5.

Dvir, D., Raz, T. &Shenhar, J., (2003).An empirical analysis of the relationship between project planning and project success, International Journal of Project Management, 21(2), pp. 1-7.

Faniran, O. O., Love, P. E. D., & Smith, J., (2000). Effective Front –End Project Management – A key Element in Achieving Project Success in Developing Countries, 2nd International Conference on construction in Developing Countries: Challenges facing the construction industry in developing countries.

Faniran, O.O., Oluwoye, J.O. & Lenard, D., (1998).Interactions between construction planning and influence factors, Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 124(4), 245-256.

Ling, Fang., Low, S. P., Wang, S. Q., & Lim, H. H. (2002). Key project management practices affecting Singaporean firms' project performance in China. International Journal of Project Management, 27(1), 59-71.

Faridi, A. & El-Sayegh, S, (2006). Significant factors causing delay in the UAE construction industry, Construction Management and Economics 24(11): 1167–1176.

Jaszczolt, K. &Potkanski, T (2010).Internal project M&E systems and development of evaluation capacity. Experience of World Bank funded rural programs.

Johnston, R.B., (1995). Making manufacturing practices tacit: a case study of computer aided production management and lean production. J. Opl. Res. Soc. 46, pp 1174-1183.

Kenya Social Protection Sector Review (2012).Ministry of state for planning, National Development and vision 2030.Republic of Kenya.

Koffi-Tessio,B. (2002). Efficacy and efficiency of monitoring and evaluation for projects financed by bank group.African development bank group.

Lucas, C., (2000). Setting the Scene, Humanity and Interaction. Retrieved from:www.calersco.org.

Lucas, C., (2000). The Philosophy of Complexity. Retrieved from; www.calersco.org. Martin, C.C., (1976). Project Management. New York.

Muller, R. & Turner, R. (2007).Matching the project manager's leadership style to project type.International Journal of Project Management, 25(4), pp. 21-32.

Mbachu, J.&Nkando, R., (2007).Factors constraining successful building project Implementation in South Africa, Construction Management and Economics 25(1): 39–54.

Naoum, S., Fong, D. & Walker, G., (2004).Critical success factors in project management; in proceedings of International Symposium on Globalization and Construction, Thailand.

Naoum, S. G., (1991). Procurement and project performance - A comparison of management and traditional contracting, CIOB occasional paper no. 45.

Pheng, L. S. &Chuan, Q. T., (2006).Environmental factors and work performance of project managers in the construction industry. International journal of project management 24: 24–37.

Puthamont, S., &Charoenngam, C., (2004). Strategic project selection in public sector Construction projects of the Ministry of Defence in Thailandǁ. International Journal of Project Management, Vol. 25, Issue 2, pp.178–188.

Richardson, K., &Cilliers, P. (2001). What is complexity science? A view from different directions. Emergence, 3 (1), 5-23.

Simon, H., (1969). The Architecture of Complexity', Organizations: Systems, Control, and Adaptation (Vol. II). (J. Litterer, Ed.) NewYork: Wiley.

SteffDeprez. (2008).Towards monitoring that makes sense: Action research design of a planning, learning and accountability system for a sustainable agriculture programme in Eastern Indonesia. Rhodes University Grahams town, South Africa.

Thomas, S.R., Macken, C.L., Chung, T.H. & Kim, I. (2002).Measuring the Impact of the Delivery System on Project Performance: Design-Build and Design-Bid-Build NIST GCR 02-840. Austin, US: Construction Industry Institute.

Thompson, J.D., (1967). Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2000.

World Bank, (2008).Infrastructure Assessment, Finance, Private Sector and Infrastructure Group, Middle East & North Africa, December 2008.

World Bank, (2012).Monitoring and Evaluation: Some tools, methods and approaches. The world bank Washington , D.C.

Yamane, T., (1967). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis, 2nd edition, New York: Harper and Row.