



Organizational Capacity and Utilization of Evaluation Results

Edwin Ochieng Okul

Ph.D. Candidate, Project Planning and Management
The University of Nairobi, Kenya

Prof. Raphael O. Nyonje

Senior Lecturer, School of Open, Distance and eLearning
The University of Nairobi, Kenya

Prof. Dorothy N. Kyalo

Associate Dean, School of Open, Distance and eLearning
The University of Nairobi, Kenya

ABSTRACT

A major concern in programme management, given the potential of programme or project evaluations to inform decision-making, has been how to ensure the results or findings of an evaluation are used for the intended purpose. How information from an evaluation process and/or the products are used in practice and decision making is equally a concern for evaluators. This article presents a research that sought to explore the extent to which organizational capacity impacts the utilization of evaluation findings for programme improvement. Guided by the pragmatic paradigm and informed by the Utilization Focused Evaluation Model and Knowledge Use Theory, the research adopted a descriptive and correlational design using mixed methods. The sample size for this study was 232 project staff from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Kisumu Central Sub-County, Kenya. To analyze qualitative data, the open ended responses from key informant interviews were recorded and coded appropriately for further analysis for themes through content analysis and comparative analysis. Frequencies and percentages were calculated to describe the basic characteristics of the quantitative data. To ensure validity and reliability of the research instruments, pilot testing was conducted. Cronbach's alpha at $\alpha = 0.908$ was attained as the reliability coefficient of the pre-test instruments. Tests of statistical assumptions were carried out before data analysis to avoid invalidation. A hypotheses H_{01} : Organizational capacity does not significantly influence utilization of evaluation results was tested at $\alpha = .05$ level of significance and was rejected since $P = 0.000 < 0.05$. The study findings demonstrate that there is a significant relationship between organizational capacity and the utilization of evaluation results. This research therefore reinforces literature and helps to understand the ways in which organizational capacity influences the utilization of evaluation results. It thus informs the evaluation field of study, fills gaps in the evaluation use literature and contributes to the appreciation of factors that predict and enhance the utilization of evaluation results.

Key words: Project evaluation, Evaluation utilization, Organizational capacity.

INTRODUCTION

One of the greatest challenges in the field of evaluation has been how to ensure the evaluation results are actually being utilized. If evaluation results are not being used then evaluations are not able to achieve their primary goal, which is social betterment (Henry, 2003; Mark, *et al.*, 2000). Resources are spent on the evaluation of development programmes, yet not much is known about the utilization of the results. Utilization Focused Evaluation is a result of a desire in the evaluation arena for evaluations that are in essence useful. While this may appear simple, its application may be hindered by some limitations, among them organizational challenges (Ramírez *et.al*, 2017).

The development of evaluation practice and interest in its use has varied globally. In the U.S. for instance, evaluation became particularly relevant in the 1960s when large sums of money were invested in social programmes, but the impacts of these investments were largely unknown (Stufflebeam *et al.*, 2000). In Europe evaluation practice has advanced to various levels across nations, with Sweden, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Germany, Denmark, Norway, France and Finland currently in the lead (BaTall, 2009). The use of evaluation in Europe is most visible and explicit at an operational level, i.e. within and between different stages of expenditure programmes (EPEC, 2005). Here, evaluation use is evident in the design and implementation of interventions. South Eastern Asian countries have for long had institutional arrangements for development planning and implementation (Magno, 2011). While systems for planning and implementation of development projects have been instituted by the governments, strong evaluation practice is still lacking (Lowden, 2005). Evaluation in Malaysia assumes an integrated approach and is entrenched within the M Integrated Results Based Management (IRBM) since 90s. It is accepted by government as a significant management tool for improving performance in government programmes as well as projects (Stolyarenko, 2014). As the experience demonstrates in Indonesia, it is only when the government became aware of the evaluation purposes and started feeling the public pressure to deliver better services thus developed a demand for evaluation, that the institutionalization of the evaluation function became effective (Boyle & Lemaire, 1999). Programme evaluation in South Africa first emerged as a practice wherein project activities and results needed to be evaluated in the non-government (NGO) quarter as a demand for further donor investment (Mouton, 2010). Essential funding via authorities in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) began in the 2000s (Goldman, *et al.*, 2015). The earliest M&E system in government began when the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) was set up. This was predominantly a compliance-based system, notably in terms of responsibility to National Treasury and the Auditor General (Phillips *et al.*, 2014). To make sure that evaluations were used, it was crucial to change this tradition. Similarly, the potential of those in authority to use evaluations was restricted (Mouton, 2010).

In Kenya, as in most developing countries, programme evaluation in the public sector at government level is yet to reach satisfactory levels of application (Republic of Kenya, 2014). However, there have been efforts to carry out some monitoring and evaluation. For example, in 1983, a Monitoring and Evaluation framework was proposed for the District Focus for Rural Development strategy and in the 1990s Monitoring and Evaluation use became evident in the Poverty Eradication Strategy (Kirori, 2015). The most recent government effort at evaluation was the development of a National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System to monitor progress of the Economic Recovery Strategy (Republic of Kenya, 2007). In most sectors within

the government, including at the county level, central monitoring and evaluation of programmes and projects is therefore only a recent development (Republic of Kenya, 2017). In 2004, the government added results based management (RBM) within the Public service as a planning policy in an effort to enhance overall performance, service delivery and governance. Performance contracts have been then added as a control device for measuring overall performance against negotiated performance targets (Ochanda, 2005).

Non-Governmental Organizations in Kisumu have undertaken evaluation activities, and although some of the evaluations are utilized largely to analyze the impact of projects, they are also an obligatory requirement for most donor funded projects. Donors use them to determine effective usage of funds by NGOs (USAID, 2014; African Water Facility; 2014, Concern Worldwide; 2014). The utilization of the evaluation results therefore remains an important outcome of any evaluation for most evaluators.

Project evaluation

Project evaluation is the determination of the worth or merit of a project or its product or method. This means it is a scientific technique used to decide the worth of a selected project in a particular context. Organizational decision-makers including the project sponsors, donors and stakeholders want to judge the worth or merit of their programmes to ensure that the programmes are accomplishing the intended purpose (Guskey, 2000).

Evaluation utilization

The term “utilization” is often treated interchangeably with the term “use” (Gary and Melvin, 2003). These two terms have been applied in nearly synonymous ways in the evaluation literature and this study did not attempt to distinguish between the two. Empirical studies on evaluation use have identified several types of evaluation utilization; Conceptual use, Instrumental use, Persuasive use and Process use. Conceptual use occurs when the evaluation findings help the programme staff or key stakeholders to think about and understand the programme in a new way (Fleisher and Christie, 2009). Persuasive use involves persuading, informing or educating others, such as decision makers or stakeholders (Johnson *et al.*, 2009). Process use refers to the cognitive, behavioural, programme, and organizational changes resulting, either directly or indirectly from engagement in the evaluation process and learning to think evaluatively (Patton 2008). Instrumental use of evaluation occurs when decision makers use the findings to change or modify the programme in some way (McCormick, 1997; Shulha and Cousins, 1997).

This study considered multiple definitions in exploring the influence of organizational capacity and three definitions that reverberated for the researcher are those of Alkin and Taut (2003) who reported that use is “the ways in which an evaluation and information from the evaluation impacts the programme that is being evaluated”; Patton (2008) who identified use as “how real people in the real world apply evaluation findings and experiences” and Johnson *et al.* (2009) who described use as “the application of evaluation process, products, or findings to produce an effect”.

Organizational capacity

The concept of organizational capacity has grown substantially in its meaning since it gained attention in the literature. Capacity is an organization’s ability to achieve its objectives. This

understanding is evident in the works of those researchers interested in understanding the impact of organizational performance variables (Ingraham and Joyce, 2003; Christensen and Gazley, 2008). Some of the definitions offered over time refer to the ability of certain actors to achieve specific objectives set, or the ability to do something (Yu-Lee, 2002). Others have defined it as the set of resources, practices, processes and management attributes which helps the organization to fulfil its mission (Letts et. al, 1999; Eisinger, 2002). The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) defines organization capacity as the means through which people, agencies and societies obtain, give a boost to and keep the abilities to set and achieve their personal development objectives over time (UNDP, 2008). The literature thus provides a wide range of meanings and definitions; some referring to the resources, while others are related to the performance of an organization. This study borrowed heavily from the works of Letts *et al.* (1999) and Eisinger (2002) that regarded organization capacity as the set of resources, practices, processes and management attributes that help an organization to fulfil its mission.

The study accordingly assessed the influence of human resources, financial resources, and information technology resources on utilization of evaluation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

One important evaluation research domain that has gained considerable attention in the last decade is called *organizational evaluation capacity*, or *EC* (Cousins, Goh, Elliott, & Bourgeois, 2014). Several theoretical and practical frameworks have been developed to describe the various components of organizational evaluation capacity. A framework, outlined by Bourgeois and Cousins (2013), identifies six dimensions of EC: three of these dimensions illustrate an organization's *capacity to do* evaluation (Human Resources, Organizational Resources, and Evaluation Planning and Activities), while the other three dimensions focus on an organization's *capacity to use* evaluation (Evaluation Literacy, Organizational Decision-Making, and Learning Benefits).

The concept of EC, however, did not in its entirety constitute an important element of this study's theoretical base. It is only the dimensions related to organizational *capacity to do* evaluation that are of particular conceptual interest for the present study. Guided by Bourgeois and Cousins' (2013) three dimensions of EC which illustrate an organization's *capacity to do* evaluation, organizational capacity is here conceptualised as the ability of an organization expressed in terms of its *human resources* (organizational processes aimed at recruiting competent and skilled staff, organizational processes aimed at hiring new staff, adequate staffing resources as characterized by the number of staff and level of skill and expertise, evaluation capacity (Torres & Preskill, 2001), organizational resources and processes that provide professional development and training opportunities (Yu-Lee, 2002). It is also conceptualized as *financial resources* (money and credit, a stable and diverse funding stream, adequate funding resources (Rowe & Jacobs, 1998) for M&E services) and as *infrastructural capacity* (information technology resources: organizational resources for data collection, processes for analyzing data, processes for using data, processes for inter-organizational information sharing).

Gorgens and Kusek, (2010) established that an evaluation system cannot function without skilled people, who effectively execute the evaluation tasks for which they are responsible, so

is the utilization of its results. The study concluded that proper the capacity of people involved in the evaluation is vital in the utilization of the results. Shula and Cousins' (1997) also found that organizational context was one of the main influencers of use. This suggest that the organizational setting in which the evaluation is situated has a major impact on the extent to which the evaluation findings are used.

Preskill *et al.* (2003) identified six organizational characteristics that may affect process use. These characteristics include the degree of organizational stability; support of previous evaluation work; location and ownership of the evaluation function; external demands, constraints, threats; extent to which the organization's culture supports ongoing learning; and extent to which the organization supports evaluation capacity.

To address the need for a common understanding of evaluation capacity, Suarez-Balcazar *et al.* (2010) concluded that although evaluation scholars and practitioners differ in their emphasis on the relative importance and inclusion of factors that contribute to evaluation practices, collectively they agree that the presence of both individual and organizational factors facilitates evaluation capacity, leading to evaluation mainstreaming and use among participating staff members (Suarez-Balcazar *et al.*, 2010). They came up with a model that includes individual and organizational factors that are believed to predict evaluation capacity outcomes as well as the outcomes themselves.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study was guided by Utilization Focused Evaluation Model; and supported by Knowledge Use Theory.

Utilization Focused Evaluation Model

The study was anchored on Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE) model. What are characteristically termed "theories" in evaluation are more accurately designated as models or frameworks (Alkin, 2004). Evaluation use theories focus on how information will be used and by whom the evaluation results will be used (Christie & Alkin, 2008; Alkin, 2004). Patton's Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE) is one of the most outstanding theoretical explanations of use. Consequently, it is the basis for much of the evaluation use research (Alkin, 2004; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The foundation of Utilization Focused Evaluation is the principle that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use. To that end, evaluators should facilitate the evaluation process and design any evaluation with careful consideration of how everything that is done, from start to finish, will impact use (Nyonje *et al.* 2002). The spotlight in utilization focused evaluation is therefore, on intended use by intended users (Patton, 2008).

Knowledge Use Theory

Evaluation results, like all organizational experiences, are also knowledge. Knowledge use, as identified by Shadish, Cook, & Leviton (1991), is one of the five fundamental issues that undergird practical evaluation theory. They proposed a model of evaluation theory that comprises five components. Among the components are knowledge construction and knowledge use. Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, (1991) argue that the knowledge generated from evaluation should be useful in addressing social problems. They contend that the resources spent on evaluation should be justified by the usefulness of the new knowledge that emanates

from evaluation. Evaluation, in their view, should inform how, when, where, and why useful results can be produced.

METHODOLOGY

This was a descriptive and correlational study using mixed methods and adopted the Pragmatic Paradigm. The use of the two designs were found appropriate since the study relied on both descriptive and inferential data analysis. The majority of previous studies on evaluation use have nonetheless been either case studies or literature reviews (Johnson *et al.*, 2009; Goh, *et al.*, 1997; Shulha and Cousins, 1997; Preskill, *et al.*, 2003; Greene, J. G., 1988).

The sampling unit comprised of project staff drawn from a target population of 585 staff of 117 NGOs in Kisumu Central Sub-County, Kenya. The sample size for the study was 232, determined using Krejcie and Morgan tables (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970) and the hypergeometric distribution formula for small samples to confirm the sample size. The requisite sample size was purposively selected from executive directors, programme managers, project coordinators, project assistants and field assistants from the NGOs. The study then adopted the simple random sampling approach to reach 2 members of staff from a list of 5 staff in each NGO. The questionnaire was the main instrument but given the importance of accountability to this study, additional information was sought from key informants from the NGOs using interview schedules as a subsidiary tool.

The questionnaire was pre-tested with 23 project staff from non-participating NGOs in a neighbouring Sub-county. This was 10% of the sample size (Mugenda and Mugenda 2003). The pre-test was followed by correction of sections or questions that needed to be corrected. Cronbach alpha was used to test the reliability of the instrument (Cronbach and Azuma, 1962). The instrument had a reliability coefficient of 0.908 thus considered reliable and internally consistent. According to Cronbach and Azuma, (1962) an alpha coefficient of 0.7 indicates that the gathered data are reliable and have relatively high internal consistency which can be generalized to reflect views of all respondents in the target population.

Pearson product-moment correlations coefficients was computed to determine the relationships that exist between organizational capacity and utilization of evaluation results in NGOs in Kisumu central sub-county. The Alternate Hypothesis, H_1 "There is significant relationship between organizational capacity and utilization of evaluation results in NGOs in Kisumu central sub-county" was first changed into Null Hypotheses and the significance of the objective of the study tested at $\alpha=0.05$ significance level. Sekaran's (2006) decision criterion, according to which the Null Hypothesis is to be rejected if P-value < 0.05; or otherwise it is accepted using the Pearson correlation p-values under 2-tailed test was relied on. The following hypothesis was tested for possible rejection or otherwise:

Hypothesis; H_1 : There is significant relationship between Organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results in NGOs in Kisumu central sub-county.

Utilization of evaluation results = f (Organizational capacity, random error)

$$Y_j = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \varepsilon_i$$

Where β_0 is the Population's regression constant, X_1 is Organizational capacity, β_1 is the regression coefficient of Organizational capacity and ε is the Model error variable.

The regression model was used to make predictions or inferences about the population of study from observations and analyses of a sample. Simple linear regression was adopted to investigate how organizational capacity influences Utilization of evaluation results.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The research sought and got the consent of respondents before carrying out interviews. This was done verbally before the start of each interview session. Respondents were asked to take part in the survey willingly and only those consenting participated in the research. The research respected human dignity, privacy, and autonomy. To the extent possible the research endeavoured to avoid bias in data analysis, data interpretation, peer review, personnel decisions, expert testimony, and other aspects of research where objectivity is expected or required. It avoided and minimized bias and self-deception. The researcher made every effort to keep promises and agreements, acting with sincerity and there was consistency of thought and action throughout the research. Objectivity and subjectivity in the research are other important ethical considerations that were made. The researcher endeavoured to ensure own personal biases and opinions do not get in the way of the research and gives both sides fair consideration. Since the research was done in a university setting and requires Postgraduate Board approval, the research had to be approved by a review committee to make sure it is not violating any of the above considerations.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Out of the 232 questionnaires administered to project staff, 226 questionnaires were appropriately filled, giving a response rate of 97.4% as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Questionnaire response rate

Number of Project staff	Questionnaires issued	Total questionnaire returned	Percentage of Response
232	232	226	97.4

The 97.4% questionnaire return rate was considered sufficient for data processing and analysis as a response rate above 50% is sufficient for data that could be generalized to represent the opinions of respondents about the study problem in the target population (Orodho, 2009).

Utilization of Evaluation Results

Ten statements were used to assess the project staff's views on utilization of evaluation results in their organizations, the dependent variable of the study. The respondents were requested to respond to the items in the Likert scale of 1-5 whereby: Strongly agree (SA) = 5; Agree (A) = 4; Neutral (N) = 3; Disagree (D) = 2 and Strongly disagree (SD) = 1.

The responses as per individual indicators as well as aggregate indicators of utilization of evaluation results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Utilization of Evaluation Results

ITEMS	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Std. Dev
<u>INSTRUMENTAL USE</u>							
My organization used evaluation results to increase funding	60(26.5%)	79(35.0%)	48(21.2%)	31(13.8%)	8(3.5%)	3.67	1.115
My organization used evaluation results to scale up our project	74(33.1%)	88(38.5%)	40(17.7%)	19(8.5%)	5(2.2%)	4.09	2.854
My organization used evaluation results to restructure our project	82(33.6%)	94(41.6%)	30(15.9%)	15(6.7%)	5(2.2%)	3.98	0.982
<u>CONCEPTUAL USE</u>							
From the findings of our last evaluation I understand the project differently	75(33.2%)	85(37.6%)	53(23.4%)	4(1.8%)	9(4.0%)	3.96	0.942
From the findings of our last evaluation I have learnt more about the project	83(36.7%)	84(37.2%)	33(14.6%)	22(9.7%)	4(1.8%)	3.97	1.032
From the findings of our last evaluation I understand other's perception of the programme better	75(33.2%)	96(42.5%)	26(11.5%)	12(5.3%)	17(7.5%)	3.88	1.153
<u>PERSUASIVE USE</u>							
Results from our last evaluation have persuaded others to be interested in our project	71(31.4%)	86(38.1%)	35(15.5%)	18(8.0%)	16(7.0%)	3.79	1.177
Results from our last evaluation have persuaded others to fund raise for our project	50(22.1%)	72(31.9%)	52(23%)	30(13.3%)	22(9.7%)	3.43	1.243
I applied a new skill(s) learned as a result of conducting the evaluation	76(33.6%)	86(38.1%)	28(12.4%)	26(11.5%)	10(4.4%)	3.85	1.141
I applied lesson learned as a result of conducting the evaluation	79(35%)	80(35.4%)	38(16.8%)	20(8.8%)	9(4.0%)	3.88	1.106
COMPOSITE UTILIZATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS	72(31.6%)	85(37.6%)	39(17.3%)	20(8.8%)	10(4.4%)	3.85	1.382

The results in table 2 indicate that 72(31.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed that evaluation results were utilized in their organization, 85(37.6%) of the respondents agreed, 39(17.3%) of the respondents were neutral, 20(8.8%) disagreed and 10(4.4%) of the

respondents strongly disagreed that evaluation results were utilized in their organization. The composite mean of utilization of evaluation results was found to be 3.85 with a standard deviation of 1.382. This composite mean score implies that the respondents agreed that there was utilization of evaluation results in their organization. The organizations tend to use results mostly to scale up projects (mean = 4.09), to restructure projects (mean = 3.98) and staff learn more about their projects (mean = 3.97) as a result of evaluations. The least common uses of evaluation results among organizations are to persuaded others to fund raise for projects (mean = 3.43), to increase funding (mean = 3.67) and to persuaded others to be interested in projects (mean = 3.79).

These findings are in agreement with similar findings by Burr, E. M. (2009) who studied an organization and found out that there is evidence of utilization of evaluation results in the organization. In Burr's study, 80% of the project directors used the results of their evaluation for making programme-related decisions, 70% used the results of their evaluation for educational purposes, and 50% used the results of their evaluation for persuasive purposes. These findings are also in agreement with similar findings by Bourgeois and Whynot (2018) who found that evaluations are methodically used in organizations for instrumental and conceptual purposes at the programme level to authenticate prevailing programme management concerns and to enhance changes in programme strategy and delivery. Some instances cited by respondents in their study included enhancements in processes, changes in grant and contribution amounts, clarification of program theory, and learning about target audiences. Likewise Burr (2009) had established that project directors are using their programmes' evaluations for instrumental, conceptual, symbolic, and process-related purposes. Ramírez, *et al.* (2015) also affirmed that evaluation findings inform organizational strategic and operational decisions during the life of the evaluation.

Organizational Capacity

The study assessed the influence of organizational capacity, conceptualised as human resources, financial resources, and information technology resources, on utilization of evaluation results.

Ten statements were used to measure project staff views on the extent to which organizational capacity influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County on a five point Likert scale of 1-5 whereby; Strongly agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4 Neutral (N) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2 and Strongly disagree (SD) = 1.

The responses as per individual organizational capacity indicators as well as aggregate indicators of utilization of evaluation results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Organizational capacity and Utilization of Evaluation Results

STATEMENTS	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Std. Dev
My organization has processes aimed at recruiting staff qualified and skilled in evaluation	84(37.2%)	81(35.8%)	39(17.2%)	13(5.8%)	9(4.0%)	3.96	1.066
My organization has a professional evaluator on staff	67(29.6%)	75(33.2%)	41(18.2%)	26(11.5%)	17(7.5%)	3.66	1.227
My organization provides training for staff in evaluation	62(27.4%)	81(35.8%)	37(16.4%)	33(14.6%)	13(5.8%)	3.65	1.192
My organization provides incentive for conducting evaluation	81(35.8%)	87(38.5%)	36(15.9%)	15(6.6%)	7(3.2%)	3.99	1.032
My organization has clear job descriptions to conduct evaluation	86(38.1%)	88(38.9%)	31(13.7%)	14(6.2%)	7(3.1%)	4.03	1.024
My organization has a budget allocation for M&E activities	83(36.7%)	90(39.8%)	23(10.3%)	15(6.6%)	15(6.6%)	3.93	1.155
My organization absorbs the budget allocation for M&E activities	74(32.7%)	81(35.8%)	33(14.6%)	22(9.7%)	16(7.2%)	3.77	1.23
My organization has a fully-fledged M&E department	79(35%)	86(38.1%)	22(9.6%)	21(9.3%)	18(8.0%)	3.83	1.23

with an office space and equipment							
My organization provides information technology resources to conduct evaluation	80(35.4%)	82(36.3%)	33(14.6%)	17(7.5%)	14(6.2%)	3.87	1.161
My organization provides resource for data collection, analyzing and using data	74(32.7%)	86(38.1%)	34(15%)	20(8.8%)	12(5.4%)	3.84	1.136
Overall composite Scores of Organizational Capacity	77(34.1%)	84(37.2%)	33(14.6%)	20(8.8%)	12(5.3%)	3.86	1.142

The overall composite score of all indicators of organizational capacity's influence on the utilization of evaluation results revealed that 77(34.1%) strongly agreed that organizational capacity influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County, 84(37.2%) of respondents agreed, 33(14.6%) were neutral, 20(8.8%) disagreed and 12(5.3%) of respondents strongly disagreed that organizational capacity influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. The composite mean of organizational capacity's influence on the utilization of evaluation results was found to be 3.86 with a standard deviation of 1.142. This composite means score implies that the respondents agreed that organizational capacity influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County.

There was need to establish the extent to which project staff agreed or disagreed with statements about the capacity of their organizations and as indicated in Table 3, the majority (73%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organization has processes aimed at recruiting staff qualified and skilled in evaluations. The mean score of 3.96 and standard deviation of 1.066 were above the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that availability of processes aimed at recruiting staff qualified and skilled in evaluation in the organization thus human resource capacity positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The study also required the respondents' view on availability of a professional evaluator on staff (human resource capacity), and the findings implied that the majority (62.8%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organizations have a professional evaluator on staff. The

mean score of 3.66 and standard deviation of 1.227 were below the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that availability of a professional evaluator on staff thus human resource capacity only moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The respondents' view on provision of training for staff (human resource capacity) in evaluation by the organization was also sought and the majority (63.1%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organization provides training for staff in evaluation. The mean score of 3.65 and standard deviation of 1.192 were below the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that provision of training for staff thus human resource capacity moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The study also needed the respondents' view on provision of incentives (human resource capacity) for conducting evaluations by the organization and the majority (74.3%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organizations provide incentives for conducting evaluation. The mean score of 3.97 and standard deviation of 1.032 were above the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that provision of incentives thus human resource capacity positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

On clear job descriptions (human resource capacity) to conduct evaluations in the organization, the majority (75.7%) of the project staff agreed that their organizations have clear job descriptions to conduct evaluations. The mean score of 4.03 and standard deviation of 1.024 were above the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that clear job descriptions thus human resource capacity positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The study also sought the respondents' view on budget allocation (financial resource capacity) for M&E activities in the organization and the majority (76.5%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organizations had a budget allocation for M&E activities. The mean score of 4.03 and standard deviation of 1.024 were above the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that budget allocation for M&E activities thus financial resource capacity positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The study required the respondents' view on absorption of the budget allocation (financial resource capacity) for M&E activities in the organization and the majority (68.5%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organizations absorb the budget allocation for M&E activities. The mean score of 3.77 and standard deviation of 1.206 was below the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that on absorption of the budget allocation thus financial resources capacity moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

On a fully-fledged M&E department with an office space and equipment (infrastructural capacity) in the organization, the majority (73.1%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organization has a fully-fledged M&E department with an office space and equipment. The mean score of 3.83 and standard deviation of 1.230 were below the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that having a fully-fledged M&E department with

an office space and equipment thus infrastructural capacity moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The respondents' view on provision of information technology resources (infrastructural capacity) by the organization to conduct evaluations implied that the majority (71.7%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organizations provide information technology resources to conduct evaluations. The mean score of 3.87 and standard deviation of 1.161 was above the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that provision of information technology resources thus infrastructural capacity positively influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

On provision of resources for data collection, analyzing and using data (software) by the organization (infrastructural capacity), the majority (70.8%) of the project staff at least agreed that their organization provides resources for data collection, analyzing and using data (software). The mean score of 3.84 and standard deviation of 1.136 was below the composite mean score of 3.86 and standard deviation of 1.142 implying that provision of resources for data collection, analyzing and using data thus infrastructural capacity moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the organization.

The organizations mostly have clear job descriptions to conduct evaluation (mean = 4.03), provide incentive for conducting evaluation (mean = 3.99), have processes aimed at recruiting staff qualified and skilled in evaluation (mean = 3.96) and budget allocation for M&E activities (mean = 3.93). Fewer of the organizations have a fully-fledged M&E department with an office space and equipment (mean = 3.83), absorb the budget allocation for M&E activities (mean = 3.77), have a professional evaluator on staff (mean = 3.66) or provide training for staff in evaluation (mean = 3.65).

These findings on the influence of organizational capacity on utilization of evaluation results are in agreement with similar findings by Ramírez, *et al*, (2015) who established that organizational capacity influences the utilization of evaluation results. The findings are also similar to conclusions by Cousins *et al*. (2008) who established that organizational capacity influences utilization of evaluation. Like this study, they found that organizations allocating resources for conducting evaluations (human resources, financial resources, time and tools) are more likely to enhance evaluation activities and the use of evaluation results.

Relationship between Organizational Capacity and Utilization of Evaluation Results

The research sought to establish the relationship between Organizational Capacity and Utilization of Evaluation Results and to test the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant relationship between Organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects.

Using the aggregate scores for items in the Organizational capacity and utilization of evaluation results scale, Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) was run in SPSS to examine if a significant relationship existed between the two variables on the sample data at 95% confidence level. The result is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Correlation between Organizational Capacity on Utilization of evaluation results

		Utilization of evaluation results
Organizational Capacity	Pearson correlation coefficient	0.978*
	Sig.(2-tailed)	0.000
	N	226

* $p < .05$

The correlation output table 4 indicated that $r = 0.978$ implying that there was a strong positive linear correlation between Organizational Capacity and Utilization of evaluation results. The research findings thus conclude that there is a significant relationship between Organizational Capacity and Utilization of Evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. The findings are consistent with those of Hudson-Mabbs (1993) who identified six organizational factors that affect utilization, Preskill *et al.* (2003) and Shula and Cousins (1997) who also found that organizational context was one of the main influencers of use. Suarez-Balcazar *et al.* (2010) concluded that organizational factors facilitates evaluation capacity, leading to evaluation mainstreaming and use among participating staff members (Suarez-Balcazar *et al.* 2010). These studies found a significant relationship between Organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results.

Hypothesis Testing

The study sought to test the hypothesis that there is no statistically significant relationship between Organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County as follows:

H01: There is no statistically significant relationship between Organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County.

The p value was found to be 0.000 at 0.05 level of significance. This was less than 0.05 implying that there is a significant relationship among the variables. This lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis and adoption of the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between Organizational capacity on Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County.

The research findings therefore conclude that there is a significant relationship between Organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. The findings are similar to those of Jiang (2014) who also established the presence of a relationship between a project manager's leadership style and its effect, or even regulation over, project success factors.

Regression Analysis on Organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results

The rationale of using the simple regression model was to establish how organizational capacity as a predictor significantly or insignificantly predicted Utilization of evaluation results. The model summary table suggest that there is a positive correlation ($R=0.978$) between organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results and those predicted by the regression model. In addition, the regression analysis revealed that the coefficient of determination is ($R^2= 0.956$); suggesting that the amount of variance in the Utilization of evaluation result is explained by organizational capacity is 84.1%. The results are consistent

with the findings of studies done by Shulha & Cousins (1997), Ramírez, *et al.* (2015) and Cousins *et al.* (2008) that suggest significant relationships between organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation result.

The ANOVA results indicated that F-statistics (1,224) =4887.554, is significant at P value 0.000 < 0.05 implying that the regression model results in significantly better prediction of Utilization of evaluation results.

The coefficients table presented p-values less than the level of significance (0.05) hence the simple regression model is given as;

$$Y = 0.184 + 0.946X_2$$

Where:

Y is Utilization of evaluation results and

X_2 is Organizational capacity

The model shows that organizational capacity had a statistical significance (P-value 0.000<.05; t-statistics 3.386 > 1.96), leading to a unit change of 0.946 in Utilization of evaluation results. The results are consistent with the findings of studies done by Cousins *et al.* (2008) that suggest significant relationships between organizational capacity and Utilization of evaluation results. The regression results are presented in table 5.

Table 5 Regression output of Utilization of evaluation results on organizational capacity

Model summary	R	R²	Adjusted R²	Std. error of the estimate		
ANOVA	0.978	0.956	0.956	0.232		
		Sum of squares	d.f	Mean square	F	Sig.
	Regression	262.894	1	262.894	4887.554	0.000
	Residual	12.049	224	0.054		
	Total	274.942	225			
Model co-efficient	Model	Un-standardized efficient	co-	Standardized efficient	co-	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta	t	
	Constant	0.184	0.054		3.386	0.001
	Organizational capacity	0.946	0.014	0.978	69.911	0.000

R = 0.978, R² = 0.956, R² adjusted = 0.956, Se = 0.232, F-stat: 4887.554 on 1 and 224 df, p-value = 0.000

CONCLUSIONS

The study found that majority of the project staff agreed that organizational capacity influence the utilization of evaluation results. Further, based on the hypothesis H1, (H01: There is insignificant relationship between organizational capacity on utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County), it was concluded that there was a statistically

significant relationship between organizational capacity on utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County ($p = 0.000$; $p < 0.05$). This approved the alternative hypothesis; "There is a significant relationship between organizational capacity on utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County"

The overall composite score of all indicators of organizational capacity influence on the utilization of evaluation results revealed that a majority of respondents agreed that organizational capacity influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County. Further, reviews of related literature suggested that organizational capacity influences utilization of evaluation results. In establishing the influence of organizational capacity on utilization of evaluation results, the correlation was statistically significant ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$) which indicated that enhancement of organizational capacity improved utilization of evaluation results.

Furthermore, the regression analysis revealed that the coefficient of determination is ($R^2 = 0.956$); suggesting that the amount of variance in the Utilization of evaluation result is explained by organizational capacity is 95.6%. The ANOVA results indicated that F-statistics ($1,224$) = 4887.554, is significant at P value $0.000 < 0.05$ implying that the regression model results in significantly better prediction of Utilization of evaluation results. The model demonstrates that organizational capacity, had statistical significance ($P\text{-value } 0.000 < 0.05$; t-statistics $3.386 > 1.96$), leading to a unit change of 0.946 in Utilization of evaluation results.

During the interview sessions with respondents, one of the issues considered was their knowledge and awareness on whether their organization's capacity to use evaluations depends on the availability of staff qualified and skilled in evaluations and whether the organizations have professional evaluators on staff. A respondent had this to say:

"Our organization's capacity to use evaluation results has greatly improved since we got a new M&E manager" [Respondent]

Human resources therefore emerged as an important capacity dimension in the ability of an organization to accomplish its mission.

Similar sentiments were echoed by another respondent whose comment on organizational capacity in influencing use of evaluation results was that:

"My organizational has processes aimed at recruiting staff qualified and skilled in evaluations" [Respondent]

Another staff member averred that;

"We have in the organization a budget allocation for M&E activities which is in most cases absorbed" [Respondent]

On organizational infrastructural capacity, a respondent reported that:

"We are provided with information technology resources for data collection and analysis for our evaluations" [Respondent]

The study therefore established that human resource capacity, financial resources capacity and infrastructural capacity all moderately influenced utilization of evaluation results in the NGOs.

It was thus concluded that organizational capacity influences the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County.

The correlation between organizational capacity and utilization of evaluation results was statistically significant at $p = 0.000 < 0.05$. This means that, as organizational capacity is being improved, the utilization of evaluation results in NGO projects in Kisumu Central Sub-County also increases.

CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

The study demonstrate that utilization focused evaluation theory can help project staff to intensify the use of evaluation results in their organizations by illuminating the relationship between organizational capacity and utilization of evaluation results.

The practical dimensions of the findings will interest both commissioners and practitioners of evaluation. The findings also increase both applied and theoretical scopes of evaluation use that may be of interest to evaluation researchers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

NGOs should use UFE to clearly articulate intended uses for both the organization and the staff involved in the evaluation.

NGO management and donors should separate program improvements from accountability to funders by rewarding evaluation work that clearly illustrates how results are used for program improvements. This should include having clear job descriptions to conduct evaluations, providing incentive for conducting evaluations, having processes aimed at recruiting staff qualified and skilled in evaluation and budget allocation for M&E activities.

Project staff should report project results, including strategies on how knowledge acquired will be used to inform programmatic improvement. The reports should also be able to persuade others to be interested in organizations' projects thus fund-raise for the organizations' projects to increase funding available for the projects.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There is need to carry out more empirical studies on process use since organizational capacity for evaluation can be improved through process use. The interviews with the NGO staff suggests the need for evaluation work beyond documenting positive results to donors. This calls for more research on how to increase use of evaluation findings beyond reporting project results.

Reference

- African Water Facility. (2014). Project Appraisal Report, Innovative Sanitation Value Chain for the Un-sewered Urban Poor in Kisumu, Kenya. <https://www.africanwaterfacility.org/fileadmin/uploads/awf/Projects/AWF-Project-Appraisal-Report-KENYA-KIWASCO.pdf>. Accessed on 15th March, 2017
- BaTall, O. 2009. The Role of National, Regional and International Evaluation Organizations in Strengthening Country-led Monitoring and Evaluation Systems. In Segone, M. 2009. (Ed.). Country-led monitoring and evaluation systems: Better evidence, better policies, better development results. New York: UNI CEF.
- Baughman, S. (2010). Non-formal Educator Use of Evaluation Findings: Factors of Influence. PhD Dissertation. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

- Bourgeois, I., & Whynot, J. (2018). Strategic Evaluation Utilization in the Canadian Federal Government. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 32.3, 327–346
- Boyle, R. & Lemaire, D. (Eds.), Building effective evaluation capacity. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishing.
- Bryan, T.K. (2011). "Exploring the Dimensions of Organizational Capacity for Local Social Service Delivery Organizations Using a Multi-method Approach". PhD Dissertation. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
- Burr, E. M. (2009). "Evaluation Use and Influence among Project Directors of State GEAR UP Grants". PhD diss., University of Tennessee. http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/15
- Christensen, R. K., & Gazley, B. (2008). Capacity for public administration. Analysis of meaning and measurement. *Public Administration and Development*, 28.
- Christie, C. A. & Alkin, M. C. (2008). Evaluation theory tree re-examined. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 34, 131-135.
- Concern Worldwide. (2014) SQUEAC REPORT, OTP PROGRAM Kisumu East District, Kisumu County, Kenya Samuel Kirichu, February 2013. http://www.coverage-monitoring.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Kisumu-East-OTP_Feb-2013_-Kenya_-SQUEAC.pdf
- Cousins, J. B. and Leithwood, K. (1986). Current Empirical Research on Evaluation Utilization. *Review of Educational Research* 56(3): 331–364.
- Cousins, J. B., Goh, S. C., Elliott, C. J., & Bourgeois, I. (2014). Framing the capacity to do and use evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2014(141), 7–23.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Azuma, H. (1962). Internal-consistency reliability formulas applied to randomly sampled single-factor tests: An empirical comparison. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, volume 22
- Eisinger, P. (2002). Organizational capacity and organizational effectiveness among street-level food assistance programmes. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(1).
- European Policy Evaluation Consortium (EPEC) (2005). Study on the Use of Evaluation Results in the Commission. Final Report, Dossier no.1: Synthesis Report and Annexes
- Fleischer, D. N. & Christie, C. A. (2009). Evaluation use: Results from a survey of U.S. American Evaluation Association members. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(2).
- Gary, T, H. & Melvin, M. (2003). Beyond Use: Understanding Evaluation's Influence on Attitudes and Actions. *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 24, No. 3
- Goldman, I., Mathe, J.E., Jacob, C., Hercules, A., Amisi, M., Buthelezi, T. *et al.*, 2015. Developing South Africa's national evaluation policy and system: First lessons learned. *African Evaluation Journal* 3(1)
- Gorgens, M., & Kusek, J.Z. (2010). *Making Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Work: A Capacity Development Toolkit*. Washington D.C, World Bank
- Greene, J. C. (1988). Stakeholder participation and utilization in program evaluation. *Evaluation Review*, volume 12.
- Henry, G. (2003). Influential evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(4)
- Hudson-Mabbs, S. (1993). Influences on the Use of Evaluation Information. Unpublished medical thesis. Murdoch University, Western Australia.
- Ingraham, P. W., & Joyce, P. G. (2003). *Governance performance: Why management matters*. Baltimore, M.D.: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Johnson, K., Greenesid, L. O., Toal, S. A., King, J.A., Lawrenz, F. & Volkov, B. (2009). Research on evaluation use: A review of the empirical literature from 1986 to 2005. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(30)
- Khan, M. Adil. 1992. Monitoring and evaluation of development projects in South East Asia: the experience of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand (English). WBI working paper. Washington, DC: World Bank.

- Kirori, G. N., (2015). Rural Development Policies in Kenya: A Descriptive Analysis Over 1970-2001 Period. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accountancy Vol. 3, No. 1, 2015*.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Letts, C., Ryan, W. P., & Grossman, A. (1999). *High performance nonprofit organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Lowden, C. (2005). Evaluating the impact of professional development. *Journal of Research in Professional Learning*
- Magno, C., & Gonzales, R. D.L.C. (2011). Measurement and evaluation in the Philippine higher education: Trends and development. In E. Valenzuela (Ed) *UNESCO Policy Studies: Trends and development in Philippine Education*. Manila: UNESCO.
- Mark, M. M., Henry, G. T. & Julnes, G. (2000). *Evaluation: An integrated framework for understanding, guiding and improving policies and programmes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCormick, E. R. (1997). Factors influencing the use of evaluation results. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, 58.
- Mouton, C. 2010, 'The history of programme evaluation in South Africa', MPhil thesis, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Sociology and Social Anthropology Department, University of Stellenbosch.
- Nyonje, R., Kyalo D. and Mulwa A. (2012) *Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects and Programmes: A Hand Book for Students and Practitioners*. Nairobi: Aura Books
- Ochanda, J. (2005). A study of strategic management practices in the Kenya public sector. Nairobi: Unpublished MBA project, School of Business, University of Nairobi.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization Focused Evaluation* (4thed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Phillips, S., Goldman, I., Gasa, N., Akhalwaya, I. & Leon, B., (2014). A focus on M&E of results: An example from the Presidency, South Africa. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* 6(4)
- Ramírez, R., Kora, G. and Brodhead, D. (2017). Translating Project Achievements into Strategic Plans: A Case Study in Utilization-Focused Evaluation. *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation* Volume 13, Issue 28, 2017
- Ramírez, R., Kora, G. and Shephard, D. (2015). Utilization Focused Developmental Evaluation: Learning Through Practice. *Journal of Multi-Disciplinary Evaluation*. Vol. 11, Issue 24
- Republic of Kenya, (2007). Master plan for Implementation of NIMES, Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Republic of Kenya. (2014). Second Annual Progress Report on the Implementation of the First Medium Term Plan (2008-2012), May 2011. Nairobi: Republic of Kenya.
- Republic of Kenya. (2017). Performance Management Framework for County Governments. Council of Governors. Republic of Kenya.
- Sekaran, U. (2006). *Research Methods for Business, Skills Building Approach*. 4th edition. Heel print- N-Park, Noida.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Leviton, L. C. (1991). *Foundations of program evaluation: Theories of practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shulha, L. M., & Cousins, J. B. (1997). Evaluation use: Theory, research, and culture since 1986. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18
- Stolyarenko, K., (2014). *National evaluation policy in Malaysia*, Parliamentary Forum for Development Evaluation. Retrieved from: <http://betterevaluation.org/node/add/resources> [18th Aug. 2020]
- Stufflebeam, D. L. & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, & applications*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Stufflebeam, D.L., Madaus, G.F., & Kellaghan, T. (2000). *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. (2nd eds.). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Taylor-Ritzler, T., Garcia-Iriarte, E., Keys, C. B., Kinney, L., & Ruch-Ross, H., Curtin, G. (2010). Evaluation capacity building: A culturally- and contextually-grounded interactive framework and exemplar. In F. Balcazar, Y. Suarez-Balcazar, T. Taylor-Ritzler, & C. B. Keys (Eds.), *Race, culture and disability: Rehabilitation science and practice*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Torres, R. T., & Preskill, H. (2001). Evaluation and organizational learning: Past, present, and future. *American Journal of Evaluation*, volume, 22(3).
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP). (2008). *Capacity development—Practice note: 4*.
- United States Agency for International Development- USAID (2014) CAPACITY KENYA END OF PROJECT EVALUATION FINAL REPORT. http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pa00jrd2.pdf. Accessed on 15th March, 2017
- Yu-Lee, R. T. (2002). *Essentials of capacity management*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.