



IMPLEMENTING PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN WITH BENEFICIARIES FOR IMPROVING PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM TANZANIA CONDITIONAL CASH TRANSFER

Bernard Katerengabo¹, Christopher Gakuu², and Harriet Kidombo³

¹Faculty of Business and Management Science, Department of Management Science and Project Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya.

Email: bkaterengabo@gmail.com

²Faculty of Business and Management Science, Department of Management Science and Project Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya.

Email: cmgakuu@uonbi.ac.ke

³Faculty of Business and Management Science, Department of Management Science and Project Planning, University of Nairobi, Kenya.

Email: hkidombo@uonbi.ac.ke

Cite this article:

Katerengabo, B., Gakuu, C., Kidombo, H. (2024), Implementing Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan with Beneficiaries for Improving Performance: Evidence from Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer. British Journal of Management and Marketing Studies 7(4), 211-225. DOI: 10.52589/BJMMS-IEBEGEC7

Manuscript History

Received: 12 Oct 2024

Accepted: 8 Dec 2024

Published: 17 Dec 2024

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits anyone to share, use, reproduce and redistribute in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

ABSTRACT: *The study assessed the influence of households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan on the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project (CCTP). The study used the mixed method whereby the sample size was 400 heads of households while purposive sampling enabled to obtain 8 Village Committees and 8 Monitoring Officers. Quantitative data was analysed using Pearson's correlation and regression model while qualitative data was analysed using content analysis. The study established a significant influence between households' involvement in the implementation of the M&E plan ($t = 8.472$, $p\text{-value} = .000$) on the performance of the Tanzania CCTP. It was recommended therefore that the Tanzania CCTP M&E policy should be reviewed to ensure it is vital for households' involvement in the M&E cycle. The research recommended further study on the organizational practice and level of use of M&E information for further improving performance.*

KEYWORDS: Household, Monitoring and Evaluation, Poverty, Performance, Conditional Cash Transfer.



INTRODUCTION

The Conditional Cash Transfer was introduced in Tanzania in 2012 as an endeavour to reduce poverty among poor households through financial help. Poverty has been a global problem that is mostly affecting developing countries whereby in the 1990s, 36% of the World's population lived in poverty. Poverty affected the ability of people to generate income and as a result, they were earning less than US\$1.90 per day Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (2018), World Bank (2018). Later in 2018, about 1.3 billion of the World's population lived in multidimensional poverty UNDP (2019).

Unlikely other developing countries, Asia and the Pacific had success reports, as the World Bank (2018) reported China as among the countries that uplifted millions of people out of poverty from 62% in 1990 to less than 3% by the year 2015. The percentage of the African population living in poverty according to the World Bank (2018) was 54% in 1990. The percentage dropped in 2015 to 41%. Due to the rapid population increase at the rate of 2.7% annually, extreme poverty shot from 278 million in 1990 to 413 million in 2015 (Beegle & Christiaensen, 2019). The increase in poverty rate affected the efforts to end or rather reduce it and it was estimated that 82% of poor households who live in rural areas depended on agriculture (Campos, Davis, & Takagi 2018). The daily spending of 26 million Tanzanians was below \$1.90 per person. The poverty reduction underperformances were due to the top-down project implementation strategies failure as highlighted by Mansouri and Rao (2003) and the main reason was the disengagement of local people at all stages.

Therefore, while the involvement of beneficiaries in some countries was the catalyst for project performance, in Tanzania beneficiaries were excluded from the implementation and only remained as recipients. Despite the existence of poverty reduction projects run by local and international agencies, Valentine, Shukla, and Eugene (2016) revealed that beneficiaries were neither consulted nor involved in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation. Poverty, therefore, increases as UNDP (2018) ranked Tanzania as among the countries with a high poverty rate. A large number of poor people in Tanzania according to the World Bank (2019) live in rural areas. Therefore, despite the implementation of the Conditional Cash Transfer project, researchers have not researched the extent of households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan. Therefore, the study assessed the influence of households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and evaluation plan on the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

Background of the study

The goal of implementing the Conditional Cash Transfer project was to ensure it covers an average of 15% of Tanzanians living in extreme poverty by 2025 (Mushi, Mwaita & Makauki, 2019). Despite the existence of various efforts to meet the goal, the performance indicators show the underperformance whereby Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessment report by ISPA (2017) highlighted that up to 2015, beneficiaries of the Conditional Cash Transfer project were only 1.1 million. Among other factors for underperformance was the disengagement of households in the preparation and implementation of projects.

The report from the World Bank (2019) revealed that in 2018, the poverty rate in Tanzania was 26.4%. The other report from the World Bank (2022) showed that in 2020, the poverty rate increased to 27.1%, and in 2021 it decreased to only 27% which was a slight decrease.



Despite the Government's good plan for reducing poverty among households in Tanzania as explained by the World Bank (2022), data shows that poverty is increasing. The total number of people who lived in extreme poverty in 2018 in Tanzania as reported by the World Bank (2019) was 14 million and 26 million people (49%) lived below \$1.90 daily. The 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) evidenced that the involvement of local people in the Monitoring and Evaluation influenced the performance of their projects. These authors, however, studied the general scope of Monitoring and Evaluation rather than specific areas under this study on households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan on the performance of the project.

Conversely, the other authors including Nyonje, Ndunge & Mulwa (2012), Barasa & Jelagat (2013), Aupe, Awiti & Aketch (2019) Tengan & Aigbavboa (2017) and Kananura (2017) studied on the community involvement in their projects and its influence on the performance. These authors investigated the involvement of local people in the performance of projects and not specifically in Monitoring and Evaluation. Therefore, this research is specifically investigating households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation of the performance of the Conditional Cash Transfer project.

Research Objective

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

Research Hypothesis

H₀: There is no significant influence between households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

LITERATURE REVIEW/THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

It is of paramount importance to ensure that the community takes part in the governance of their project through Monitoring and Evaluation for improving performance. The local people also should attain skills and knowledge of implementing the projects and ensuring it does not die after the external financial support ceases (Aycrigg, 1998). During the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation, beneficiaries are supposed to receive training in Monitoring and Evaluation first because this is the technical aspect of the management of projects. Ahenkan et al. (2013) added that the exclusion of the beneficiaries in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation paralyzes the effectiveness of the projects because the local authorities would not be able to measure the level of attainment of the set goals and targets.

A study by Alfred (2015) revealed a case where beneficiaries were excluded and the Monitoring and Evaluation framework was performed only by the project Monitoring and



Evaluation team. The community is regarded as ignorant and vulnerable hence, unable to participate in the technical aspects of implementing Monitoring and Evaluation. However, when they receive capacity building in terms of public education, they can do participatory Monitoring and Evaluation with project Monitoring and Evaluation teams. When Monitoring and Evaluation is implemented in a participatory way (Coupal, 2001) acknowledged that beneficiaries clearly understand the logical framework and participate to measure key performance indicators for identifying the impacts. Household involvement in Monitoring and Evaluation influences performance when the project Monitoring and Evaluation team is composed of technical Monitoring and Evaluation staff and a selected few local people (Ahenkan, Bawole, & Domfer, 2013 & Alfred, 2015).

The study by Kiumbe, Wambungu, and Luketero (2018) revealed that beneficiaries' engagement in the Monitoring and Evaluation was moderate because the Monitoring and Evaluation team not only excluded the local people but also ignored the culture of sharing Monitoring and Evaluation documents to the beneficiaries for incorporating their opinions in the final decision-making. Therefore, the community members were not well informed on the performance of the project. Conversely, District Planning and Coordinating Unit and Savelugu-Nanton District Assembly Sulemana, Musah & Simon (2018) reported that the Savelugu-Nanton Municipal Assembly Monitoring and Evaluation plan of 2010 included Assembly and local members in the Monitoring and Evaluation although it was recommended that beneficiaries were required to receive capacity building on Monitoring and Evaluation for them to be able to participate in Monitoring and Evaluation reports meetings and decision-making. Rajalahti, Woelcke, and Pehu (2005) reported that practising Monitoring and Evaluation among beneficiaries would impart technical and managerial skills and increase their commitment to measuring project performance.

Therefore, Dube (2009) added that funders must ensure they provide the budgets for capacity-building projects so that the local people receive technical training and workshops periodically for them to engage in Monitoring and Evaluation for the attainment of pre-determined goals. The philosophy of performance is educating the community on the management and achievement of the project. If appropriately educated, the community and the representatives in the project's Monitoring and Evaluation teams would clearly understand the goals and objectives and hence measure the level of impact.



METHODOLOGY

The research adopted a pragmatism paradigm which is a combination of both constructivism and positivism philosophies. The target population was 61,240 households, and 441 village committees each comprising 10 members and 8 Monitoring Officers. By using Yamane's (1967) formula, a sample of 400 respondents was obtained. The calculation is shown below;

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

Where n = Sample size

N = Population size

e = Level of precision

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

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

$$n = 400$$

The sample size was 400 heads of households.

In each district, village committee members were selected to form a focus group discussion (FGD) of 8 people. The total number of respondents from FGDs was 80. The last group comprised of Monitoring Officers, where one Officer was selected from each district. These eight Monitoring Officers were selected because they had the supervisory skills and experience in managing the Conditional Cash Transfer Project at the district level. The sample for this study included heads of households, village committee members and Monitoring Officers. To obtain the sampling unit, the study applied a multistage sampling technique. The first step applied purposive sampling to select the Kagera region out of 26 regions. The second stage was cluster sampling whereby the Kagera region was divided into eight. The third stage involved proportional stratified sampling to obtain the sample of 400 heads of households. The fourth stage involved simple random sampling. In order to obtain the sample of heads of households, the first method was a selection of the first household and then moved to the third household until the required sample was reached. In each district, village committee members were selected to form the focus group discussion (FGD) of 10 people. The last group was of Monitoring Officers whereby all 8 Monitoring Officers were purposively selected. Quantitative data was collected using questionnaires while qualitative data was collected through interviews and focus group discussions. Statistical tests were performed to ensure the relevant assumptions were met. Data were analysed using Descriptive and inferential statistics. A simple linear regression model was used to establish the causal relationship between variables.



RESULTS

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

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The study assessed the respondents in terms of age and gender. The findings are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Age and gender of Respondents

Respondents' Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
18-26	4	1
27-35	13	3
36-44	62	16
45-53	80	20
Above 53	241	60
Total	400	100
Gender		
Male	77	19
Female	323	81
Total	400	100

Findings regarding the age of respondents, the majority of the respondents 383 (95.8%) were above 35 years while only 17 (4.3%) were below 35 years. The number of youths below 35 was low because many of them migrated from rural to urban areas, looking for employment and economic activities compared to the respondents above 35 who had established families. On the side of the gender of respondents, 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.

The study also assessed the respondents' marital status, level of education and occupation. The findings are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Marital status, level of education and occupation of Respondents**

Respondents' Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Marital status		
Married	134	33.5
Single	1	0.25
Widowed	187	46.75
Divorced	78	19.5
Total	400	100
Level of education		
No schooling	191	47.75
Primary	206	51.5
Secondary	3	0.75
Total	400	100
Occupation		
Farmer	361	90
Small businesses	39	10
Total	400	100

The majority 187 (46.8%) were widowed, 134 (33.4%) were married, 78 (19.5%) were divorced, and only 1 (0.3%) were single. Thus, vast majority of households were married and widowed. Many women were widowed because of higher death rates among men who migrated to urban areas. The education level of the respondents was generally low whereby the majority 206 representing 51.5% had primary education, 191 representing 47.8% with no schooling, and only 3 representing 0.8 % had secondary education. The low level of education was because of extreme poverty that influenced many dropouts. Regarding occupation, the majority of the respondents 361 (90.3%) were farmers, while 39 (9.8%) were engaged in running small businesses.

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

Households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan was measured by using the following indicators; households' ability to prepare indicators, households' ability to measure goals, households' ability to track impacts and households' ability to measure project relevance. Results of the analysis are shown in Table 3.



Table 3: Analysis of households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan

SN	Item	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	SD
1	Households' ability to prepare indicators	400	348(87%)	18(4.5%)	34(8.5%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1.22	0.583
2	Households' ability to measure goals	400	392(98%)	8(2%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1.02	0.14
3	Households' ability to track impacts	400	355(89%)	18(4%)	27(7%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	1.18	0.532
4	Households' ability to measure project relevance	400	274(68%)	8(2%)	101(25%)	15(4%)	2(1%)	1.66	1.009
Means of means								1.27	0.566

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

Analysis of the Performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

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

Table 4: Results on Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

SN	Indicator	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	M	SD
1	Number of employment created	400	148 (37%)	57 (14%)	6 (2%)	156 (39%)	33 (8%)	2.67	1.497
2	Quantity of food harvested	400	74 (19%)	84 (21%)	0 (0%)	180 (45%)	62 (15%)	3.18	1.412
3	Income earned from the harvest	400	222 (55%)	49 (12%)	0 (0%)	106 (27%)	23 (6%)	2.15	1.455
4	Households'	400	273	41	1	76	9	1.77	1.264



		(68%)	(10%)	(0%)	(19%)	(2%)		
	ability to finance health care							
5	Number of	400	155	55	5	171	14	2.59 1.445
			(39%)	(14%)	(1%)	(43%)	(4%)	
	hospital delivery							
6	Number of	400	110	35	0	169	86	3.23 1.559
			(28%)	(9%)	(0%)	(42%)	(22%)	
	children who completed schools							
Composite mean							2.6	1.439

The findings indicated that the responses were concentrated around the mean ($M=2.60$, $SD=1.439$). That implies that respondents agreed with most of the indicators that influenced the performance of the project. That means the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project created jobs and increased cultivation and income. Also, households were capable of financing health care, hospital delivery increased and children who completed school increased. The response was closer to the mean with a small standard deviation. Therefore, the respondents confirmed that the establishment and implementation of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project improved their socio-economic situation.

Test of Hypothesis

H_0 : "Households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan has no influence on the performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project".

Pearson correlation analysis measured the direction and magnitude of the relationship between households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. Results on this variable are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Correlation Analysis between households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan and performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

		Implementation of M&E Plans	Performance of Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project
Implementation of plans	M&EPearson Correlation	1	.401**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	400	400
Performance of Conditional Cash Transfer Project	TanzaniaPearson Correlation	.401**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	400	400

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



Households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan was significantly and positively correlated with the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project ($r=0.401$, $p=0.000$, $n=400$). Therefore, improvements in the households' level of involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan led to the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project.

Linear Regression Analysis

Simple linear regression examined how well households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan predicted the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. The results of the linear regression analysis are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Linear Regression Analysis of Households' involvement in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation plan on the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Change	Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change
	.401 ^a	.161	.159	.15316	.161	76.424	1	398	.000	

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

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

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

The Coefficients Test

This tests the statistical significance of households' involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project. Results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Coefficients of Households' Involvement in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Beta	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.356	.009		38.573	.000	.338	.374
	Implementation of M&E plans	.637	.073	.401	8.742	.000	.494	.780

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



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

Qualitative Data Findings

The interviews evidenced that the inclusion of the households would enable them to share their experience on the performance of the project. Households would be able to identify their priority areas instead of being ignored, leaving implementation to project implementers.

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

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

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

The interviews evidenced that households attended the meetings for verification of budget allocation but were not involved in the preparation stage. Therefore, despite the VC's supervisory roles at the village level, households' involvement was excluded in the implementation of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan.

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

It was also highlighted that the implementation of the project excluded the households during meetings that discussed the progress reports at the wards and village levels. During the meetings, Village Committee members participated and beneficiaries were not members of those Committees. Therefore, beneficiaries were excluded and had no representatives.

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



DISCUSSION

The findings show that households were not involved in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation, similar to the study by Alfred (2015) who also found a low level of stakeholders' involvement in Monitoring and Evaluation. In addition, Ahenkan, Bawole & Domfer (2013) observed the lack of stakeholders' involvement and that constrained poverty reduction efforts in Ghana.

Although the findings of this study revealed total exclusion of households in the implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation, while Kiumbe & Luketero, (2018) evidenced moderate involvement of stakeholders in the utilization of Monitoring and Evaluation results, Ngochi, Mbugua and Thiong'o (2020) observed that the beneficiaries were part of the Monitoring and Evaluation but the results were not considered in making projects' decisions.

Therefore, despite the usefulness of Monitoring and Evaluation in the performance of programs, Monitoring and Evaluation teams implemented it with total or partial inclusion of beneficiaries. This was done in order to meet the donors' conditions but eventually, Monitoring and Evaluation results are discarded in making program decisions. Conversely, DPCU & SNDA (2018) reported that the local members were involved in the Monitoring and Evaluation plan. Although the local people participated in Monitoring and Evaluation, they were not skilled enough. DPCU & SNDA Sulemana, Musah & Simon (2018) recommended Monitoring and Evaluation capacity building whereby Barasa and Jelagat (2023) and Woelcke, and Pehu (2005) revealed that it increases beneficiaries' commitment.

In this study, households' involvement in the Monitoring and Evaluation significantly influenced the performance of the Conditional Cash Transfer project. The performance is a function of the Monitoring and Evaluation team with local people representatives (Ahenkan, Bawole & Domfer (2013) & Alfred (2015).

IMPLICATION TO RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The establishment of the Poverty Eradication Strategy was the response to SDGs that was followed by the foundation of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer project that immersed in income destitution and improvements of social services among households. Although the study revealed that M&E significantly influenced the performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project, households strongly disagreed with being engaged in M&E.

Therefore, it is very critical for the paradigm shift from the hierarchical to a flat approach in the planning and implementation of M&E. Development policies must be reviewed to ensure M&E plans are comprised of both experts and beneficiaries' representatives. The performance of the Tanzania Conditional Cash Transfer Project requires beneficiaries' involvement in the project through M&E implementation.



CONCLUSION

The study established the positive influence of engaging project beneficiaries in Monitoring and Evaluation on the improvement of performance. Monitoring and Evaluation capacity building should be disseminated to beneficiaries to influence the performance of projects. The recruitment of gender-based representatives in the Monitoring and Evaluation team must be prioritized to ensure both men and women participate in monitoring and evaluating their projects. Therefore, since Monitoring and Evaluation is a new scientific field, the selected beneficiaries' representatives ought to receive periodic capacity building to equip them with skills.

FUTURE RESEARCH

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

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Alfred, A. (2015). Enhancing stakeholder's involvement in program monitoring among metropolitan, municipal and district assemblies: A case study of Atwima Mponua District Assembly. <https://www.modernghana.com/news/60/news/602582/enhancing-stakeholders-involvement-in-project.html>.
- 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.
- Campos, O., Villani, C., Davis, B., & Takagi, M. (2018). *Ending extreme poverty in rural areas - Sustaining livelihoods to leave no one behind*. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture.
- Coupal, F. (2001). *Results-based participatory monitoring and evaluation, CIDA's performance review*. Ottawa, Canada: Mosaic Net International.
- Dube, N. (2009). *Evaluating community participation in development projects* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch, South Africa.



- ISPA (2017). Assessment of TASAF PSSN in Tanzania Using the ISPA-PWP Tool. Iter-Agency Social Protection Assessment.
- Kananura, M., et. al. (2017). Participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches that influence decision-making: Lessons from a maternal and newborn study in Eastern Uganda. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 15 (2), 55-68.
- 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.
- Mushi, A., Mwaita, K., & Makauki, A. F. (2019). Contribution of Social Protection Systems to Children's Education in Tanzania: A Case of TASAF III Cash Transfer Programme 1. Unpublished thesis.
- Mutale, W., Masoso, C., Mwanza B., Chirwa, C., Mwaba, L., Siwale, Z., Lamisa, B, Musatwe, D., Roma 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.
- 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.
- Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative. (2018). Global multidimensional poverty index 2018: The most detailed picture to date of the World's poorest people. Oxford, UK: University of Oxford.
- Rajalahti, R., Woelcke, J., & Pehu, E. (2005). Monitoring and evaluation for World Bank agricultural research and extension programs: A good practice note (Agriculture and Rural Development Discussion Paper No. 20). Washington, DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- 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.
- Rimberia, 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.
- 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.



-
- Thwala, W. D. (2010). Community participation is a necessity for project success: A case study of rural water supply project in Jeppes Reefs, South Africa. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 5 (10), 970-979.
- 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.
- 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.
- World Bank. (2018). Poverty and shared prosperity 2018: Piecing together the poverty puzzle. Washington, DC.
- World Bank. (2019). Tanzania mainland poverty assessment: Executive summary. Washington, DC.
- 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.