

# Households' Involvement in the Preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

Bernard Katerengabo<sup>1</sup>, Christopher Gakuu<sup>2</sup> & Harriet Kidombo<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Health, National Health Insurance Fund, Head Office, Dodoma, Tanzania

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

Correspondence: Bernard Katerengabo, Ministry of Health, National Health Insurance Fund, Head Office, P.O. Box 1437, Dodoma, Tanzania. E-mail: bkaterengabo@gmail.com

Received: October 17, 2022

Accepted: February 5, 2023

Online Published: February 7, 2023

doi:10.5539/jsd.v16n2p40

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v16n2p40>

## Abstract

Poverty has been identified as one of the challenges affecting communities in developing countries. The Conditional Cash Transfer project was introduced in Tanzania aiming at poverty reduction among households. On that note, this study was conducted to assess the extent to which households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan influenced the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project. Descriptive cross-sectional and correlational research designs were used with the support of a pragmatic paradigm. By using Yamane's (1967) formula, a sample size of 400 respondents was obtained from a target population of 61,240 households. Data was collected through administered questionnaires, key in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. The findings established a significant influence between households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan ( $t = 2.769$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.006$ ) on the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project. It was concluded that households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan played a significant role in the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project. Therefore, project implementers should review the Monitoring and Evaluation policy in order to incorporate households in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan for influencing the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project.

**Keywords:** households, monitoring, evaluation, poverty, performance, conditional cash transfer

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer was one of the alternatives to poverty reduction projects that have been given attention globally. In the 1990s, 36% of the World's population lived in poverty whereby households were generating income of less than US\$1.90 per day (Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative [OPHI], 2018; World Bank, 2018). In 1990, more than 1.8 billion people, equivalent to 36% worldwide were living in extreme poverty and up to 2018, 1.3 billion lived in multidimensional poverty (UNDP, 2019). In East Asia and the Pacific, the report by World Bank (2018) revealed that the economic growth of China enabled the uplift of millions of people out of poverty from 62% that existed in 1990 to less than 3% by the year 2015. These countries opted the bottom-up approach to implement Monitoring and Evaluation. The percentage of Africans living in poverty according to the World Bank (2018) was 54% in 1990. Later in 2015, it dropped to 41%. However, extreme poverty escalated from 278 million in 1990 to 413 million in 2015 due to a rapid population increase at the rate of 2.7% annually (Beegle & Christiaensen, 2019). Furthermore, 82% of people living in extreme poverty were from rural areas and they depended on farming as their main economic activity (Campos, Villani, Davis, & Takagi, 2018). The World Bank report indicated that in 2018, 14 million people were living below the official poverty line. The daily spending of 26 million Tanzanians was below \$1.90 per person. As detailed by Mansouri and Rao (2003), donors including World Bank found that top-bottom techniques failed to enhance the impact because the local people were excluded in the process of establishment of the programs. In some African countries, there are many international non-governmental organizations financing poverty reduction projects, but Valentine, Shukla, and Eugene (2016) noted that these organizations have not given the beneficiaries an opportunity to engage in the

Monitoring and Evaluation of their projects. UNDP (2018) report ranked Tanzania as a high poverty rate country whereby the World Bank (2019) reported that a large number of people who lived in extreme poverty were in the rural areas of Tanzania. This means despite the implementation of the Conditional Cash Transfer project, the extent of households' involvement in Monitoring and Evaluation has not been documented. Therefore, the study assesses the influence of households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan on the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project.

### *1.2 Literature Review*

Many development projects are supported through financial resources or agricultural needs whereby Noori (2017) argued that these supports are provided without consulting the beneficiaries so that they align with community priorities for effective interventions. In addition, Rimberia (2012) pointed out that beneficiaries' engagement is one of the techniques projects could use to ensure people monitor the effective and efficient utilization of resources and eventually increase transparency and equity. The Conditional Cash Transfer project was implemented in 2001 in two phases but households' involvement in Monitoring and Evaluation was ineffective as a result of abandoning them in the preparation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan (Iddi & Nuhu, 2018). Therefore, the review of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan for ensuring households take part in the implementation was very critical for ensuring there is collective decision-making. Many projects that were implemented in exclusion of local communities ended up collapsing after the financial support ended because the communities were not capacitated and prepared to take off their projects. Monitoring and Evaluation plan that include local people in the prioritization of problems with close guidance from the project team and skilled facilitators, lead to the development of a well-defined action plan (Mutale et al., 2017). Additionally, society could engage only if they would learn and use the technology to improve the practicability of Monitoring and Evaluation (Muriungi, 2015). Project implementers should not just do things for the public but rather do things with the public through the appointment of local people in the Monitoring and Evaluation team (Guerra-López & Hicks, 2015). The engagement to prepare the Monitoring and Evaluation plan incorporates the views and recommendations of the least powerful and most affected people (Rossman, 2015). Projects' recipients should engage in the preparation and discussion of the Monitoring and Evaluation framework and unlikely conventional Monitoring and Evaluation, where primary stakeholders only provide information to the experts during the feasibility studies for establishing the performance indicators (Institute of Development Studies [IDS], 1998). Therefore, Rossman (2015) said that the advantage of beneficiaries' engagement in the Monitoring and Evaluation is increased communities' abilities and skills through training that enables them to monitor and evaluate the projects while balancing donors' interests for reaching the goals. While primary stakeholders are increasingly involved in implementing, there is minimal involvement during the preparation of the Monitoring and Evaluation framework (Hilhorst & Guijt, 2006). According to Ahenkan, Bawole, and Domfer (2013), project implementation involved the local population in the Monitoring and Evaluation but with no clear Monitoring and Evaluation framework and that meant the beneficiaries were aware of the existence of Monitoring and Evaluation, but they did not participate in preparing Monitoring and Evaluation document. This observation was supported by Mugo et al. (2016) who noted that the involvement of farmers in planning and decision making of Monitoring and Evaluation was scanty because reports were prepared but not adequately shared to farmers in their meetings. This finding affirms that some projects disengage the beneficiaries to design Monitoring and Evaluation frameworks, but include them in the implementation and in taking collective decisions. Development stakeholders, according to World Bank (2010b), communities are mandated to monitor and evaluate projects to identify the areas of underperformance and act. In developing countries, this mandate has not been executed in implementing projects and as a result, beneficiaries remain uninformed about the progress of their projects. According to Sulemana, Musah, and Simon (2018), Ghana collaborates with the beneficiaries in the formulation and review of Monitoring and Evaluation of public projects through the Regional Coordinating Council (RCC) in all regions for transparency and accountability. The findings from IDS, (1998) recommended that the design of Monitoring and Evaluation through collaboration with local people enables them to participate in project goals and measurement of impacts for the attainable improvement of the lives of the marginalized population. Additionally, Nyaguthii and Oyugi (2013) stated that residents' engagement to design and undertake Monitoring and Evaluation of projects increases the degree of project acceptability and satisfaction. In countries where the communities participate to prepare Monitoring and Evaluation frameworks, project performance is higher because citizens could measure the level of performance and act. A clear understanding of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan enables the community to make informed decisions with or without donors' financial support.

### *1.3 Importance of the Research*

Conditional Cash Transfer was introduced in 2012 with the aim of ensuring it covers 15% of people living in

extreme poverty by 2025 (Mushi, Mwaita & Makauki, 2019). However, the target had not been met, because the Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessment report (2017) evidenced that in 2015 only 1.1 million poor people were the beneficiaries of the Conditional Cash Transfer project. Among other factors for underperformance was the disengagement of households in the preparation and implementation of projects. The report by the World Bank (2019) revealed that in 2018, the poverty rate in Tanzania was 26.4%. The report released in 2022 by the World Bank showed that in 2020, the poverty rate increased to 27.1% and in 2021 it decreased to only 27% which was a slight decrease. Conditional Cash Transfer was established as the means of reducing the poverty rate among households in Tanzania (World Bank, 2022). Despite the existence of the Conditional Cash Transfer project in Tanzania, data shows that poverty is still high. According to World Bank (2019), in 2018, 14 million people lived in extreme poverty and about 26 million people (49%) lived below \$1.90 daily. Human Development Index and Multidimensional Index ranked Tanzania with the highest level of poverty (UNDP, 2018). Studies, including Noori (2017), Rimberia (2012), Mutale et. al (2017), Thwala (2010), Nyaguthii & Oyugi (2013), and Ahenkan, Bawole & Domfer (2013) indicated that local people's participation in Monitoring and Evaluation influenced the performance of projects, but they did not establish the influence of community involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan on performance, rather the scope covered the general Monitoring and Evaluation. Conversely, the other literature including Alfred (2015), Nyonje, Ndunge & Mulwa (2012), Barasa & Jelagat (2013), Aupe, Awiti & Aketch (2019), Tengan & Aigbavboa (2017) and Kananura et. al (2017) studied on the community involvement of performance of projects but their areas of scope were all the aspects of projects and not specifically on the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan. Therefore, this study was motivated by the need to address the knowledge gap in terms of concept, context, philosophy and methodology.

#### *1.4 Study Objective*

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

#### *1.5 Study Hypothesis*

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant influence between households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

## **2. Method**

This study employed a pragmatism paradigm whereby a mixed method was employed to collect, analyze and data visualization. The pragmatism paradigm combines both constructivist and positivist philosophies that enable the application of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data was collected through questionnaires while qualitative data was collected through interview guides and focus group discussions. The target population was 61,240 households, 441 village committees each comprising 10 members and 8 Monitoring Officers. By using the Yamane formula, a sample of 400 respondents was obtained. In each District, Village Committee members were selected to form focus group discussions (FGD) of 10 people. The total numbers of respondents from FGDs were 80. The last group comprised Monitoring Officers, whereby one officer per District was selected. Therefore, all the 8 Monitoring Officers were purposively selected. These eight Monitoring Officers were selected because they have the supervisory skills and experience in managing Conditional Cash Transfer Projects at the District levels. Statistical tests were performed to ensure the relevant assumptions are met. Descriptive statistics used the central tendency, standard deviation, and variance while Pearson correlation and regression analysis was used for inferential statistics. A simple linear regression model was used to establish the causal relationship between variables. Regarding qualitative data, content analysis was used to analyze qualitative data. The study, triangulated both quantitative and qualitative data.

## **3. Results**

This section presents data analysis, interpretation and discussion of study findings. In this study, 400 questionnaires equivalent to 100% return rate were achieved. Through the application of a mixed method approach, the researcher collected data from questionnaires, focus group discussions and key informant guide questions. Descriptive analysis was done by testing the mean and standard deviation followed by inferential analysis using Pearson's correlation, coefficient of adjusted R, simple linear and hierarchical regression models.

### *3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents*

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

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of respondents

<b>Respondents profile</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Age</b>		
18-26	4	1
27-35	13	3
36-44	62	16
45-53	80	20
Above 53	241	60
Total	400	100
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	77	19
Female	323	81
Total	400	100
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	134	33.5
Single	1	0.25
Widowed	187	46.75
Divorced	78	19.5
Total	400	100
<b>Level of education</b>		
No schooling	191	47.75
Primary	206	51.5
Secondary	3	0.75
Total	400	100
<b>Occupation</b>		
Farmer	361	90
Small businesses	39	10
Total	400	100

Majority of the age of respondents 383 (95.8%) were above 35 years while only 17(4.3%) were below 35 years. The number of youths below 35 was low because of migrating from rural to urban areas for economic activities compared to the respondents above 35 who had established families. Gender-wise, 77 (19.3%) of the respondents were male while 323 (80.8%) were female. The number of females was higher because of the high rate of divorces and abandonment by husbands who migrated to urban areas. Results on marital status revealed that the majority of the respondents 187 (46.8%) were widowed, 134 (33.4%) were married, 78(19.5%) were divorced, and only 1 (0.3%) were single. That implies that the vast majority of households were married and widowed. Many women were widowed because of higher death rates among men who migrated to urban areas. Additionally, the level of education among the participants was generally low with a majority of 206 of the respondents representing 51.5% with primary education, 191 representing 47.8% with no schooling, and only 3 representing 0.8 % of the respondents had secondary education. The low level of education was because of extreme poverty which influenced many respondents' dropouts. Regarding occupation, the majority of the respondents 361 (90.3%) were farmers, while 39 (9.8%) were engaged in running small businesses.

### *3.2 Analysis of Households' Involvement in the Preparation of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan*

The analysis used the following indicators: households' ability to set goals, households' data collection skills, households' data analysis skills and households' report writing skills. Results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Analysis of households' involvement in the preparation of the monitoring and evaluation plan

Item	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	SD
Households' ability to set goals	400	393 (98.3%)	7 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.02	0.131
Households' data collection skills	400	391 (97.8%)	8 (2%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.03	0.172
Households' data analysis skills	400	386 (95.5%)	9 (2.3%)	5 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.05	0.265
Households' report writing skills	400	391 (97.8%)	7 (1.7%)	2 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.03	0.192
<i>Means of Means</i>							1.03	0.0190

The mean and standard deviation indicated that responses were concentrated around the mean (M=1.03, SD=0.190), implying that all respondents disagreed with all the indicators on involvement in the preparation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan. The results indicate that households' responses were closer to the mean with a small standard deviation. Therefore, the majority of households disagreed with being involved in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan.

### 3.3 Analysis of the Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

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

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

Indicator	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	SD
Number of jobs created	400	148 (37%)	57 (14%)	6 (2%)	156 (39%)	33 (8%)	2.67	1.5
Amount of food harvested	400	74 (19%)	84 (21%)	0 (0%)	180 (45%)	62 (15%)	3.18	1.41
Income earned from the harvest	400	222 (55%)	49 (12%)	0 (0%)	106 (27%)	23 (6%)	2.15	1.46
Ability to finance health care	400	273 (68.2%)	41 (10.2%)	1 (0.25%)	76 (19)	9 (2.25)	1.77	1.26
Number of hospitals delivery	400	155 (39%)	55 (14%)	5 (1%)	171 (43%)	14 (3%)	2.29	1.45
Number of Children who complete schools	400	110 (28%)	35 (9%)	0 (0%)	169 (42%)	86 (21%)	3.23	1.56
<b>Complete mean</b>							<b>2.6</b>	<b>1.44</b>

The results from the mean and standard deviation indicated that responses were concentrated around the mean (M=2.6, SD=1.44), suggesting that respondents agreed with most of the indicators on the performance of the project. The findings indicate that responses from the households were closer to the mean with a small standard deviation. This implies that the majority of households agreed that the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project was composed of a combination of variables.

3.4 Test of Hypothesis

H<sub>0</sub>: “Households’ involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan does not influence the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project”.

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

Table 4. Correlation between households’ involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan and performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project

		Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project		Preparation of M&E plans	
Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project	Pearson Correlation	1	.137		
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.006		
	N	400	400		
Preparation of M&E plans	Pearson Correlation	.137	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006			
	N	400	400		

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

Households’ involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan was significantly and positively correlated with the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project (r = 0.137, p=0.006, n= 400). This implies that improvements in the level of households’ involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan lead to the improvement in the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project.

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

Table 5. Coefficient of Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> of households’ involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan and performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project

		Change Statistics							
Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Std. Error of the Estimate	R <sup>2</sup> Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.137	.019	.016	.16564	.019	7.669	1	398	.006

a. Predictors: (Constant), Preparation of M&E plans

b. Dependent Variable: Performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project

The results from Table 7 reveal that the level of households’ involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan had a coefficient of adjusted R Square =.016. This indicates that 1.6% of the variation in the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project can be accounted for by the level of households’ involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan.

### 3.5 Coefficients of Household' Involvement in the Preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan

The coefficients tested the statistical significance of the households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project. Results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Coefficients of households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized		95% Confidence		
		Coefficients		Coefficients		Interval for B		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	Constant	0.396	0.008		46.955	.000	0.38	0.413
	Preparation of M&E plans	0.541	0.195	0.137	2.769	.006	0.157	0.925

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

From the findings, a unit increase in households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan was responsible for improving the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project by 0.137. This relationship was statistically significant with ( $t=2.769$ ,  $p\text{-value}=0.006$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis accepted that households' involvement in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan significantly influenced the performance of the Conditional Cash Transfer project.

### 3.6 Qualitative Findings

Qualitative findings revealed that households did not participate in the preparation of M&E plans, rather they participated in data collection and verification of District Committees' performance reports. The Village Committee member reported that households were excluded in M&E and no any strategies of involving them were in place.

*"I have never seen any arrangements of involving households in the preparation of M&E plans at the village level. Conditional Cash Transfer project beneficiaries are called only when there is an activity of distributing money to them". VC member.*

The Village Committee members also reported that households were not involved during the preparation of M&E plan. The Households are only invited in meetings for capacity building on how to use the money they received.

*"Households are not involved in the preparation of the document that measures ways the program performs. Rather, they only receive directives on how they should use the money they are given. Only VC members participate team to distribute money at the village level and in those committees, households are not part of the". VC member.*

Monitoring Officer also added that the Village Committee members were all non-beneficiaries of Conditional Cash Transfer Project. The beneficiaries were only consulted during the verification of project performance.

*"Households are not part of the team in our village in the activity of program information preparation. The only way the beneficiaries participate is by responding to questions from District officials. Therefore, no beneficiary is a member of the District team". MO.*

The interviews evidenced that the involvement of households in their program was likely to bring about improvements to their lives by ensuring they monitor the project.

*"To be sincere, households do not participate in the preparation of their program, Project Committees from the Districts are the ones doing all. Households believe they would supervise the project and ensure all beneficiaries use the money for intended purposes". MO.*

The focus group discussion further revealed that households felt they would participate to monitor and evaluate the utilization of money disbursed to households for ensuring the intended goals are achieved.

*"At the village level, households believe they must participate to establish the ways financial assistance would change their lives because their involvement in the verification of project*

*impacts would increase the improvements. Households would influence fellow households to use the money for benefit. Non-participation makes them feel bad and ignored.” VC member.*

The findings from the interviews revealed that households preferred to participate in the preparation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan, in terms of setting goals, data collection and data analysis and report preparation. However, project officials excluded the households.

### 3.7 Discussion of the Findings

This study evidenced that the involvement of households in M&E influenced the performance of the Conditional Cash Transfer project, relevant to the previous study by Ngochi, Mbugua, & Thiong’o (2020) that the implementation of M&E functions directly influenced the performance of constituency development fund projects. Despite that influence, M&E was not established at the planning stage because the implementers were not supporting it, something that resulted in the underutilization of M&E results. Similarly, Kiumbe, Wambungu & Luketero (2018) support that stakeholders’ involvement in the utilization of M&E influenced the performance of the fish farming project in Kenya although the involvement was found to be moderate. The findings were supported by Otieno, Munyua and Olubandwa (2016) who observed that the improvements of stakeholders partake in M&E influenced the performance of development programs. Like previous studies, this study revealed that households were not involved in the preparation of M&E plans. The same findings were supported by Sulemana, Musa and Simon (2018) that the level of stakeholders’ involvement was low and was not involved in the initiation of M&E plans. Similarly, Nyaguthii & Oyugi (2013) back up the findings of this study that beneficiaries’ involvement in the implementation of M&E was low. The study by Noori (2017) highlighted that the low involvement of beneficiaries in M&E denied their right to identify their priorities for making the program meaningful, whereby Rimberia (2012) added that involvement of beneficiaries in their projects increases transparency. Further, the performance as a result of beneficiaries’ engagement was addressed by Ofosu and Ntiamoa (2016) in that it enhances learning and creates a sense of independence. In addition, the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project was supported by Estrella and Gaventa (1998) that the involvement of local people in M&E improves their understanding of the development process.

### 3.8 Conclusion and Recommendations

Households’ plays a significant role in the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project. That provides a greater chance for identification of the program priorities, something that instills the understanding and the means of measuring the goals. Therefore, participation through the selected representatives provides the opportunity to engage in the setting of goals and performance indicators, and eventually participating in data collection, analysis, and report dissemination. This engagement makes most beneficiaries aware of Conditional Cash Transfer project progress and what the program intends to attain. Therefore, households are expected to play key roles in the M&E committees and contribute towards enhancing the performance of the project. The findings of this study are in line with the theory of change because they address the engagement of beneficiaries from the initial stages of the projects for them to understand a clear way for the actualization of goals. The ladder of citizen participation also revealed that vesting the power to beneficiaries through collaborative program planning and understanding of performance indicators enabled them to monitor and evaluate project expected change. The findings of this study will be useful to the Government of Tanzania for improvement of the community projects through a participatory approach. Despite the role of beneficiaries’ involvement in projects, households were excluded. Tanzania’s response to the United Nations Sustainable Development goal of ending destitution in all its forms led to the establishment Conditional Cash Transfer project. Therefore, project implementers must review the M&E policy and ensure households participate in the preparation of the M&E plan. The study established that the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project was implemented through the top-down approach whereby engagement of households in M&E was low. This study recommends the review of the policies for incorporation of the component of involvement of households. This study recommends that further studies should examine the institution’s practice of M&E and the level of utilization of M&E data for improving the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project.

### References

- Ahenkan, A., Bawole, N., & Domfer, K. (2013). Improving citizens’ participation in local government planning and financial management in Ghana: A stakeholder analysis of the Sefwi Wiawso Municipal Assembly. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 3(2), 191-208. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v3i2.3782>
- Alfred, A. (2015). *Enhancing stakeholder’s involvement in program monitoring among metropolitan, municipal and district assemblies: A case study of Atwima Mponua District Assembly*. Retrieved from <https://www.modernghana.com/news/60/news/602582/enhancing-stakeholders-involvement-in-project.html>



- Aupe, N., Awiti, L., & Aketch, N. (2019). Community participation and sustainability of water projects in Kwanza Sub-County, Trans-Nzoia County, Kenya. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 3(3), 160-173.
- Barasa, F., & Jelagat, T. (2013). Community participation in program planning, management and implementation: Building the foundation for sustainable development. *International Journal of Current Research*, 5(2), 398-401.
- Beegle, K., & Christiaensen, L. (2019). *Accelerating poverty reduction in Africa*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1232-3>
- Campos, A. D. L. O., Villani, C., Davis, B., & Takagi, M. (2018). *Ending extreme poverty in rural areas - Sustaining livelihoods to leave no one behind*. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Croasmun, J. T., & Ostrom, L. (2011). Using Likert-Type Scales in the Social Sciences. *Journal of Adult Education*, 40(1), 19-22.
- Estrella, M., & Gaventa, J. (1998). Who counts reality? Participatory monitoring and evaluation: A literature review (IDS Working Paper No. 70). Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.
- Guerra-López, I., & Hicks, K. (2015). The participatory design of a performance-oriented monitoring and evaluation system in an international development environment. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 48, 21-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2014.09.003>
- Guest, G. (2012). Describing mixed methods research, an alternative to typologies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(2), 141-151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812461179>
- Hilhorst, T., & Guijt, I. (2006). *Participatory monitoring and evaluation: A process to support governance and empowerment at the local level*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: KIT Royal Tropical Institute.
- Iddi, B., & Nuhu, S. (2018). Challenges and opportunities for community participation in monitoring and evaluation of government projects in Tanzania: Case of TASAF II, Bagamoyo District. *Journal of Public Policy and Administration*, 2(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.jpaa.20180201.11>
- Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, K. (2015). Likert Scale: Explored and Explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, 7(4), 396-403. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975>
- Kananura, M., Ekirapa-Kiracho, E., Paina, L., Bumba, A., Mulekwa, G., Nakiganda-Busiku, D., & Peters, D. H. (2017). Participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches that influence decision-making: Lessons from a maternal and newborn study in Eastern Uganda. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 15(2), 55-68. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-017-0274-9>
- Kiumbe, P., Wambungu, L., & Luketero, S. (2018). Influence of stakeholder participation in utilization of monitoring and evaluation results on the performance of fish farming projects in Kenya. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 23(09), 65-70.
- Mansouri, G., & Rao, V. (2003). *Evaluating community-based and community driven development: A critical review of the evidence*. Washington, DC. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-3209>
- Mugo, N., Keiyyoro, P., Iribe M., & Rambo, C. (2016). Influence of M&E capacity building on sustainability of agricultural food crop programs in Kenya: The case of Nyeri County, Kenya. *Academic Research International*, 7(5), 45-56.
- Muriungi, T. M. (2015). The role of participatory monitoring and evaluation programs among government corporations: A case of Ewaso Ngi'ro North development authority. *International Academic Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 1(4), 53-76.
- Mushi, V. A., Mwaita, R. K., & Makauki, A. F. (2019). Contribution of Social Protection Systems to children's Education in Tanzania: A Case of TASAF III Cash Transfer Programme1. Unpublished thesis.
- Mutale, W., Masoso, C., Mwanza, B., Chirwa, C., Mwaba, L., Siwale, Z., Chilengi, R. (2017). Exploring community participation in project design: application of the community conversation approach to improve maternal and newborn health in Zambia. *BMC Public Health*, 17(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4187-x>
- Ngochi, E., Mbugua, L., & Thiong'o, K. (2020). An analysis of the influence of monitoring and evaluation functions on projects performance among selected constituency development fund projects in Kirinyaga County, Kenya. *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, 2(8), 61-80.

- Noori, H. (2017). Community participation in sustainability of development projects: A case study of national solidarity program Afghanistan. *Journal of Culture, Society and Development*, 30, 27-36.
- Nyaguthii, E., & Oyugi, L. A. (2013). Influence of community participation on successful implementation of constituency development fund projects in Kenya: Case study of Mwea Constituency. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(8), 1-16.
- Nyonje, R. O., Ndunge, K. D., & Mulwa, A. S. (2012). *Monitoring and evaluation of projects and programs: A handbook for students and practitioners*. Nairobi, Kenya: Aura Books.
- Ofori, S., & Ntiemoah, E. (2016). Assessing community involvement in monitoring and evaluation of development projects. The case of the Kwahu West Municipal Assembly, Ghana. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 14(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJESBS/2016/22168>
- Otieno, J., Munyua, C., & Olubandwa, A. (2016). Effects of participatory monitoring and evaluation on stakeholder relationships and project quality in the local authority service delivery action planning (LASDAP) process in Bondo Sub County in Siaya County, Kenya. *Developing Country Studies*, 6(4), 82-86.
- Rimberia, E. K. (2012). Determinants of water projects sustainability: A case of water projects in Kieni East division, Nyeri County, Kenya (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Rossman, B. (2015). *Participatory monitoring & evaluation*. Amherst, MA: Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach* (4th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sulemana, M., Musah, A. B., & Simon, K. K. (2018). An assessment of stakeholder participation in monitoring and evaluation of district assembly projects and programmes in the Savelugu-Nanton Municipality Assembly, Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies*, 15(1), 173-195. <https://doi.org/10.4314/gjds.v15i1.9>
- Tengan, C., & Aigbavboa, C. (2017). Level of stakeholder engagement and participation in monitoring and evaluation of construction projects in Ghana. *Procedia Engineering*, 196, 630-637. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2017.08.051>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2018). *Tanzania human development report 2017: Social policy in the context of economic transformation*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Economic and Social Research Foundation.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2019). *Global multidimensional poverty index 2019: Illuminating inequalities*. New York, NY: Author.
- Valentine, I., Shukla, J., & Eugene, N. (2016). Effect of beneficiaries' participation in program monitoring and evaluation on program success. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 4(2), 334-349.
- Weiss, C. (1995). Nothing as practical as good theory: Exploring theory-based evaluation for comprehensive community initiatives for children and families. In J. Connell, A. Kubisch, L. Schorr, & C. Weiss (Eds.), *New approaches to evaluating community initiatives: Concepts, methods, and contexts* (pp. 65-92). Washington, DC: Aspen Institute.
- World Bank. (2010b). *Participatory monitoring and evaluation, in topics: Community driven development*. Washington, DC: Author.
- World Bank. (2018). *Poverty and shared prosperity 2018: Piecing together the poverty puzzle*. Washington, DC: Author. <https://doi.org/10.1596/33031>
- World Bank. (2019). *Tanzania mainland poverty assessment: Executive summary*. Washington, DC: Author.
- World Bank. (2022). *Sub-Saharan Africa: Macro Poverty Outlook, Country-by-country Analysis and Projections for the Developing World*. United States of America, New York.
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper and Row.

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).