



Assessing Community Involvement in Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Projects. The Case of the Kwahu West Municipal Assembly, Ghana

Samuel Ofoosu¹ and Evans Brako Ntiamoah^{2*}

¹*Department of Agriculture, Local Government and Rural Development, Ghana.*

²*School of Business and Economics, Canadian International University College, Ghana.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Author SO designed the study, wrote the protocol and supervised the work. Authors SO and EBN carried out all the work and performed the statistical analysis. Author EBN managed the analyses of the study. Author SO wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author EBN managed the literature searches and edited the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/BJESBS/2016/22168

Editor(s):

(1) A. K. Singha, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Barapani (Umiam), Meghalaya, India.

Reviewers:

(1) Samuel Ochuodho, University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, Kenya.

(2) Md. Mizanur Rahman, Bangladesh Academy for Rural Development, Bangladesh.

(3) Anonymous, University of Florida, USA.

(4) Anonymous, Asian Institute of Technology, Thailand.

Complete Peer review History: <http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/12791>

Original Research Article

Received 21st September 2015

Accepted 30th November 2015

Published 25th December 2015

ABSTRACT

The study was on assessing community involvement in the monitoring and evaluation of Kwahu West Municipal Assembly projects in the eastern part of Ghana. The study aimed at unraveling the research question that whether decision-making and planning (DMP), community participation (CP), participatory local governance (PLG), monitoring and evaluation (M&E) have any effect on development projects (DP). To that end in view the researcher selected the Kwahu West Municipal Assembly projects and adopted quantitative method. The researchers collected data from a total of 52 respondents comprising of management and non-management staff and others stakeholders involved with Kwahu West Municipal Assembly project by administering a structured questionnaire. Data were then analyzed using SPSS software. Through analyzing correlation and regression, it

*Corresponding author: E-mail: kwamebrako@yahoo.com;

was found that community participation (CP) has the highest correlation coefficient of 0.800 at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed) with development project, which were followed by participatory local governance (PLG) and monitoring (M) having a correlation coefficient of 0.680 at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed) and 0.623 at $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed) respectively. Lastly, there was a positive correlation between evaluation (E) and the dependent variable at 0.612 at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed). The study come up with the suggestions that training in the form of workshops and briefing sessions should be organized for community members to build their capacity and enable them contribute meaningfully to the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of community development project.

Keywords: Development project; Decision Making and Planning (DMP); Community Participation (CP); Participation Local Governance (PLG); Monitoring (M); Evaluation (E); Kwaahu West Municipal Assembly.

1. INTRODUCTION

Evidence abounds in development literature concerning the need to involve local stakeholders in all the stages of the project cycle [1,2,3]. In practice, however, very little community participation actually occurs in monitoring and evaluation as pointed out by [2]. "Participation in monitoring and evaluation does not occur very commonly. But it seems important to provide for this if development efforts are to be progressively improved" [2].

According to [3], Participation offers a way in theory for people to have an equal say in decision making about the issues that affect them. The aim of any community level Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) system is to assist stakeholders to discuss and develop actions on issues related to their work performance and expected outputs. Over the past ten years, PM&E has gained prominence over more conventional approaches to monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation in the past has been judgmental whilst PM&E seeks to involve all key stakeholders in the process of developing framework for measuring results and reflecting on the projects' achievement. According to [4], the neglect of community members in the monitoring and evaluation of development projects in the past has been blamed for Ghana's development failures and the enormous problems facing project implementation and management in the country. Conventional Monitoring and Evaluation was left to only a few people especially the bureaucrats who sit in the office and monitor projects at the community level. The centralized approach to project management and implementation led to the marginalization and exclusion of communities and other local stakeholders who were the ultimate beneficiaries of development projects in the monitoring and evaluation process. The results of the above

were that development activities were uncoordinated. They were often not locally adapted to the needs and aspirations of local people as well as the local capacity to manage them, thus resulting in misallocation of scarce resources, delay in project implementation and delivery of shoddy works and above all unsustainability of development project at the community level. In addition, conventional approaches to monitoring and evaluation were not only undemocratic but failed to promote grass root initiatives and optimum utilization of local knowledge, energies and other indigenous resources. It was to correct these shortcomings that, the new development plan system in Ghana recognize participatory monitoring and evaluation (PME) as an essential and integral part of effective development planning, project development and management. PME therefore seeks not to judge and make decisions alone but rather create an enabling environment for communities to be responsible for learning and interpreting changes that comes around them, and to take greater responsibility over their own [4] development there by moving them from a state of dependency to self reliance. In pursuance of this objective the National Development Planning Commission of Ghana spelt out the main tenets of this community participation. Similarly, both the long-term development framework of Ghana – Vision 2020 and the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Program contain guidelines for embarking on projects that involves the community in decision making, management and sustainability. It is in the light of this that the study would be undertaking to assess whether communities are involved in the monitoring and evaluation of development projects using as basis the project cycle management and profiles of some selected projects.

The problem at stake therefore is not a matter of inadequate financial resources as proclaimed by

some politicians, but lack of a good PME system to see to the proper implementation of development projects. [4], opined that the initiation of new structures conditioned the types of participation as many members do not feel they belong to it. This explains why importance is being attached to promoting the important role to be played by the community in PME system to assist District Assemblies in the development, implementation and management of development projects and programs. [3], opined that in transformative participatory local governance, there is the need to have a strong central state capacity, a well-developed civil society and an organized political force with strong social movement. This study therefore seeks to assess the level of involvement of community members in Monitoring and Evaluation of development projects in the Kwahu West Municipal Assembly.

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. We first present the introduction in section 1. In section 2, the literature review was discussed. We describe the data in section 3. In section 4, we analyze the data using correlation and regression. We finally conclude the paper with conclusion and recommendations in section 5.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Meaning and Dimension of Participation

The term participation has different meanings for different people. [4] describes participation as “an ambiguous concept, which can mean whatever one wants it to mean”. In a similar way, [5] asserts that participation assumes different meanings when used in different contexts and therefore attempting to rigorously define it, is of doubtful utility.

Despite the fact that it is difficult to define the concept of participation, [6] defines participation as the involvement of a significant number of persons in situations and actions, which enhance their welfare and self-esteem. Participation can also be seen as involving and sensitizing people to increase their acceptability and ability to response to development programs that are supposedly in their own interest [7]. To others, participation was one of the platforms for reconsideration of the Structural Adjustment Program of IMF and the World Bank [8].

The rationale for unveiling the different definitions and categorizations of participation is to provide a glimpse of the many different views held on the concept and practice of participation. What is significant is that most of the definitions and classifications acknowledge that participation by people is in decision-making, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and sharing of benefits while at the same time, sharing risks [9]. [10] identifies three main dimensions of participation as breath, depth and timing.

The depth according to him refers to the extent to which participants (stakeholders) influence decisions and other actions that are meant to bring about change. Fowler looks at depth as being a continuum that spans from shallow participation (i.e. zero influence by community) at one extreme end to deep participation (substantial influence by community) at the other extreme end. In terms of content, Fowler identified information gathering or sharing as being at the lower end of the continuum while joint control is at the upper end. In between them, there are other kinds of participation, such as consultation and shared influence. They represent the different degrees to which decision-making is concentrated in the hands of the community or outsiders. In this model, community participation is seen as a progressive process by which the capacity of the primary stakeholders (the community) is built by going through the various stages of the continuum until they reach the ultimate stage-joint control-where the outside agent (such as an NGO) can begin to withdraw from the process. Beyond joint control, communities become empowered enough to take full control.

Fowler defines the breadth of participation as the range (number and diversity) of stakeholders who are involved [10]. That is, while depth looks at the extent to which a group of stakeholders influence change, breadth looks at whom and how many people are involved. Inadequate breadth means that decision-making and change rest on the shoulders of just a few individuals whose interest and opinions may not reflect those of the larger community. This has the tendency to render local institutions fragile and less effective since their actions may not always reflect the legitimate concerns and interest of other stakeholders. Therefore, for participation to be authentic, as many people and interests as practicable have to be involved or represented. As Fowler noted, when depth outstrips breadth,

the motivations of individuals who have helped define strategies or interventions are made vulnerable. On the other hand, when breadth outstrips depth, wide understanding may not be complemented by commitment to implement decision because they are not sufficiently influenced and owned by local people.

While underscoring the necessity for community participation to be broad-based, it is also noted that securing the direct involvement of all stakeholders at all stages and levels of the decision-making process in a district is practically impossible [11]. Timing in participation by Fowler's estimation relates to the stage of the process at which different stakeholders are engaged. To Fowler "timing has both practical and symbolic importance". He explains that in practical terms, the timing of who is involved influences the quality and soundness of participation. Involvement of stakeholders from the beginning is ideal since poor timing could lead to distrust in the decision-making process. When timing is incorrect, people feel railroaded, oppressed or disrespected. It is therefore necessary to design participatory processes that are time-sensitive and do not create any imbalance between depth and breadth in the process of project implementation. It is never too late to start participation but it is better to start earlier. The right timing of participation should therefore start from the level of consultation through all phases of a project cycle; that is, from needs assessment through appraisal, implementation to monitoring and evaluation. This will enhance ownership and commitment to the course of development since right timing enhances better understanding of decision making process [10].

2.2 Meaning of Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring is a continuous assessment of both the functioning of the project activities in the context of implementing schedules and the use of project inputs by targeted populations in the context of design expectation as opined by [12]. In another dimension, the term monitoring is also viewed as the provision of information and the use of that information to enable management to assess progress of implementation and take timely decisions to ensure that progress is maintained according to schedule. Evaluation, on the other hand is defined as a collective concept involving all the steps from pre-identification of a project through appraisal for selection to implementation management and finally

assessment, always comparing every step to the objectives intended [12].

It is an internal project activity, an essential part of good management practice, and therefore an integral part of day-to-day management [13]. Evaluation on the other hand, assesses the overall project or program effects, both intentional and unintentional and their impact [14].

2.3 Distinction between Monitoring and Evaluation

Although monitoring and evaluation according to [15] are usually interdependent and supportive processes and are often used interchangeably, the two activities have different objectives and therefore demand different types of information. Monitoring is essentially carried out during implementation as a process of checking through routine reporting, whether planned programs/projects are being implemented on schedule as outlined in a project plan. Information thus collated relate primarily to activities, inputs and output. Indeed, monitoring information hardly provides any information about the impact or effects of projects on beneficiaries.

According to [15], Evaluation on other hand may be carried out at three clearly identifiable levels; during implementation i.e. on-going evaluation, after completion i.e. terminal evaluation and years after completion i.e. ex-post evaluation. On-going evaluation which is of more interest to the subject matter of this study, aims at providing information for improving corrective design, implementation strategies and taking timely corrective measures. In terms of local stakeholders' participation in development, therefore, on-going evaluation provides the best opportunity for management to base planning decisions on the input of project partners. On-going evaluation should be seen more as an organizational process for improving activities still in progress and for aiding management in future planning, programming and decision making [16].

2.4 The Concept of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)

Today, most organizations are aware of the inherent weakness in the conventional monitoring and evaluation processes. This has therefore led to the formulation of new concepts as far as approaches to monitoring and

evaluation are concerned. One of these new methods is the concept of participatory approaches to project monitoring and evaluation.

2.5 PME Defined

[17] explains participatory monitoring and evaluation (PME) as a procedure of self-assessment, knowledge generation, and combined action in which stakeholders in a program or intervention collaboratively define the evaluation issues, collect and analyze data, and take action as a consequence of what they learn through this process [4]. It is basically about sharing ideas among beneficiaries of the program, program implementers, funders, and often-outside evaluation practitioners [4]. Philosophically, participatory monitoring and evaluation strive to honor the perspectives, voices, preferences and results of the least influential and most affected stakeholders; the local beneficiaries [4].

2.6 The Role of PME in Project Implementation and Management

[18], opined that Development practitioners recognize several benefits connected with PM&E, by involving those affected directly, a stronger image of what is really happening in a program can be drawn, both achievements and disappointments. Second, vital stakeholder individuals may have a feel of empowerment through participating in the process; they divide obligation for the evaluation processes and outcomes [4]. Again, the ability of developing a capacity and skills in evaluation generally available; these can then be useful to other activities. Furthermore, when information is produced as a repetitive part of program operations, the likelihood that data will be used directly to make mid-course rectifications and adjustments as the program is implemented is also available [4]. Moreover, team building and creating commitment through collaborative inquiry yields substantial benefit. Lastly, the learning associated with participating in such a process is experiential and can carry a deep sense of seriousness to the labor [4].

2.7 PME and M&E Compared

Despite growing recognition of PME as being different from orthodox M&E, it is not easy sometimes to differentiate among a monitoring and evaluation procedure that is participatory

and one that is not (International Development Research Centre [18]. it is essential to distinguish between PME and M&E approaches. This dichotomy is shown in Table 1.

There is no clear-cut dichotomy. They are but dangerous points of a continuum in which lie various blends of more and less participatory [18]. Approaches since they both assess the progress of a project and provide information feedback [10]

2.8 Elements of PME

Given the diversity in PME thinking and practice, a useful starting point for exploring conceptual issues in PME is to identify "cornerstones" that can serve as "non-negotiable" principles to anchor any PME practices. Formulating "cornerstones" would have to take into consideration the subsequent elements as opined by [19].

- Who are the partakers in PME?
- Why PME is being undertaken and for whom?
- What is the role of participation in PME?
- When does participation take place in PME?

These issues are examined below.

2.8.1 Who are participants in PME?

In PME, involvement becomes a central feature of the entire process, from defining objectives and information's needs to analyzing and using results. This process requires efforts that must, for instances, include local stakeholders and others in developing the PME system itself. It is about the breadth of participation discussed previously.

Participatory process requires a broad range of participants. Hence, recognizing who participates is an important introductory step towards understanding PME. However, recognizing and selecting partakers often becomes challenging [18]. Power affairs among key actors can decide who finally is able to partake and under what particular situations. This is relatively because the role of monitor and evaluator permits individuals or groups to wield power over others in shaping how to interpret change [18]. Agreeing or disagreeing certain parties to participate depends on who has perceived ownership over [18] the PME process [20].

Table 1. Comparison between M&E and PME

Measuring tools	Conventional M&E	Participatory M&E
Who initiates? Purpose	The donor Donor accountability	The donor and community. Capacity-building, increased ownership over results, multi-stakeholder accountability.
Who evaluates? TOR	External evaluator Designed by donor with limited input from project.	Project beneficiaries. Designed by project stakeholders.
Methods	Surveys, questionnaire, semi-structured interviewing, focus groups.	Range of methods such as participatory learning and Action, Appreciative inquiry, Testimonials.
How success is measured.	Externally -defined, mainly quantitative indicators	Internally-defined indicators, including more qualitative judgments.
Role of "primary stakeholders"	Provide information	Design and adapt the methodology, collect and analyze data, share findings and link them to action.
Approach Outcome	Predetermined Final report circulate in-house	Adaptive. Better understanding of local realities, stakeholders involved in decision-making around analysis and what to do with information to adjust project strategies and activities to better meet results.

Source: Author's Construct 2015

The participants in PME process should include the following:

- Local people/community, primarily the beneficiaries.
- Local government officials.
- A broader group of stakeholders e.g. donors, government officials who are directly and indirectly engaged in or affected by development interventions.

In broad, this is a trend towards the insertion of a wider group of stakeholders as participants in PME [18]. There is also a shared acknowledgment that some form of connection by local people is a critical feature of PME according to [20]. However, this increases the important questions about which "local" people are, and what their exact roles and functions during the course of the PME process. Another perceptive pursues to combine internal and external approaches to PME so called collaborative PME takes place when participants comprise both insiders and outsiders. Combined PME is intended to deliver a more balanced, multiple perspectives in assessing and interpreting change [18].

2.8.2 Why is PME being undertaken and for whom?

PME unlike conventional M&E seeks not to go beyond simply judging and making decisions alone as opined by [21]. It strive for creating enabling environment for stakeholders groups-including those involved directly and affected by a exact intervention – to acquire how to define and interpret changes for themselves, and later to take greater control over their own development. For examples, self-monitoring and evaluation by jungle user groups can be an instrument for gaining influence over guidelines that govern natural resources use [18].

The purpose of PME according to [22] is four fold:

- To build local capacity of project stakeholders to reflect, analyze, propose solution and take action.
- To learn and adjust by taking corrective action such as adding or deleting activities or changing one's strategies to ensure achievement of results.
- To provide accountability at all levels from the community, organizational level to those responsible for the implementation

and funding of the project level to those responsible for the implementation and funding of the project.

- To celebrate and build on what is working.

Unlike conventional M&E strategies that are often driven by the information need of unknowns (e.g. donors, central management and other external interest groups), PME wishes to cater for the information needs and anxieties of a much wider range of actors who have a direct or indirect stake in development changes and results.

2.8.3 What is the role of involvement in PME?

There are a number of motives that can defend why involvement in M&E is important. However, those who campaign stakeholder participation in M&E frequently do not make clear whether they regard involvement as a means or as an end- or both. For some, involvement in PME is a means to accomplish other development objectives (e.g. greater productivity, improved provision of services) [18]. For [23], involvement is regarded as an end effect (e.g. empowerment). Empowering local communities through participatory community monitoring and evaluation means transforming what are made-up to be the “end beneficiaries” into “proponents” and “planners” of development interventions.

2.8.4 When does involvement take place in PME?

This presents the concerns of timing. Most practitioners of PME identify that involvement does not take place regularly throughout the entire M&E process but, rather, varies across temporal and spatial contexts [18]. Hence, it is possible to decide between different stages (timing), levels (depth) and the breadth of involvement by stakeholders in a project cycle [10].

Involvement in M&E may amend over a project cycle or from one M&E event to the next. A participatory approach to M&E may [18] be embraced right from the beginning and sustained throughout, or it may be only assumed during selected events [24].

Second, PME may not involve (breadth) all participants at each point of the process. Often, the breadth of participation by various participant groups varies from one event to the next. For instance, PME may start with a certain group of stakeholders, which might later expand or

contract in size as some join or fall out in the process [18].

Third, the stage (depth) at which PME occurs in a project may also vary. For example, it may be during the needs assessment stage alone, beyond that or not. What is significant to point out, however, is that PME does not become partaking simply on the basis of the number of participant groups involved [18]. The outcome is to also ensure that stakeholders are involved from the beginning to the end (timing) and at every stage of the process.

2.9 The Project Management Cycle

2.9.1 The meaning and concept of project

[25], “the whole complex of activities involved in using resources to gain benefits constitutes our projects”. A project may therefore, be viewed as investment activities in which financial resources are expended to create capital assets that produce benefits over extended period of time.

The project concept sometimes described, as the “cutting edge of development” has become an important means of marshalling a country’s resources, human and material, for investing in development. It involves an approach to investments in the form of specific projects and has evolved as a disciplined way to manage the use of resources to achieve important objectives. The project concept implies that investments should be planned and executed in the form of specific projects.

2.9.2 Project management cycle defined

There are trends to be a natural sequence in the way projects are planned and carried out, and this sequence is often called the project cycle. Project management cycle is therefore a planning approach that aims to improve the progress of projects and helps to manage the entire project portfolio more efficiently. By explicitly describing the organization of the project cycle in terms of division of responsibilities during the various phases of the project, individuals/stakeholders can better understand their position and role in the project. The various stages are discussed below. The categorization is adapted from an editorial by [26].

2.9.2.1 Project identification stage

The first stage in the sequence is to find potential projects. There are many foundations from which

suggestions may come. The most common will be educated technical specialists, local leaders and the societies themselves [27]. (While executing their professional duties, technical specialists would have recognized many areas where they feel new venture might be cost-effective. Local leaders will mostly have a number of ideas about where investment might be carried out [28]. Communities express their needs through discussions with their leaders. Usually, there is no scarcity of bids for projects that have been recognized. But there may be a scarcity of projects prepared in appropriate detail to permit implementation [28].

2.9.2.2 Project preparation and analysis stage

Once projects have been acknowledged, there begins a process of increasingly more detailed preparation and investigation of project plans. This process comprises all the work necessary to carry the project to the point at which a cautious review or appraisal can be undertaken, and, if it is resolute to be a good project, implementation can begin [28].

The typical first step in project preparation and scrutiny is to undertake a viability study that will provide enough information for determining whether to begin more advance preparation. The detail of the viability study will depend on the difficulty of the project and how much is previously known about the proposal [28]. The viability study should describe the objectives of the project clearly, provide opportunity to shape the project to fit its physical and social environment and to ensure that it will be high yielding and sustainable.

2.9.2.3 Project appraisal stage

After a project has been arranged, it is generally suitable for a critical review or an assessment to be conducted. This affords an opportunity to re-examine every feature of the project plan to evaluate whether the proposal is fitting and sound before huge sums are committed [28]. The assessment process forms on the project plan, but it may contain new information if the assessment team senses that some of the data are questionable or some of the expectations are faulty [28]. If the assessment team concludes that the project plan is sound, the venture may proceed [28]. But if the assessment team finds serious faults, it may be necessary for the analyst to amend the project plan or to develop a new plan altogether [28].

2.9.2.4 Project implementation stage

The aim of any effort in project planning and investigation clearly is to have a project that can be executed to the benefit of the society. Thus, implementation is possibly the most important part of the project cycle. There are some features of implementation that are of particular significance to project planning and investigation. The first obviously allowing to [29] is that the better and more accurate a project plan is the more possible it is that the plan can be carried out and the likely benefit realized. This highlights once again the need for careful consideration to each aspect of project planning and investigation. Second, project implementation must be bendable. Situations will change and project managers must be able to reply to these changes [28].

Project analysts commonly divide the implementation stage into three different time periods. The first is the investment period, when the major project investments are started [28]. Then, as the production/builds up, the project is spoken of as being in the development period. Once full development is touched, it endures for the life of the project. The project life is inputted to the normal life of the major asset. Together, the financial and economic analysis of the project communicates to this time horizon [28].

2.9.2.5 Project assessment stage

The final stage in the project cycle is evaluation. The analyst looks analytically at the elements of success and failure in the project involvement to learn how well to plan for the future. Evaluation is not limited only to finished projects. It is the most essential managerial tool in an on-going project, and reasonably formalized evaluation may take place at numerous times in the life of a project [29]. Evaluation may be assumed when the project is in suffering, as the first stage in a replanting effort. Cautious assessment should head any effort to plan follow-up projects. And, finally, assessment should be undertaken when a project is terminated or is well into unchanging operation [28].

Form of evaluation, should be carefully considered, recommendation about how to increase the appropriateness of each feature of the project design so that plans for project implementations can be reviewed if the project is on-going and so that future projects can be better planned if the project assessed has been completed [24]. Although, projects in the study

Municipality follow similar stages discussed above, it needs to be noted that this may not always be recognizable and also activities in the various stages discussed above are not carried out in details in the area [28].

2.10 Framework for the Analysis of PME

One of the tenets of the Ghana's decentralization policy is to promote community ownership, management and sustainability of development projects. This is to be achieved through effective partnership between local stakeholders, government officials and other development partners.

District assemblies through the district monitoring and evaluation teams are therefore mandated to promote, facilitate and bring into being community participation in decision-making and implementation of development projects.

Progress of works and impacts of development projects are to be tracked through effective monitoring and evaluation process. Therefore, to improve upon the efficiency and quality of work of development projects, effective monitoring and evaluation must not be seen in isolation from the complete project management cycle. It must be seen as a continuous on-going activity throughout the entire project management cycle taking place at each stage of the project through a feedback mechanism. To promote community ownership and sustainability of development projects therefore local stakeholders representing the various interest groups in the community should be involved in the monitoring and evaluation processes at each stage of the project [29]. It is in terms of the above and discussion in the previous sections that the assessment of community involvement in the monitoring and evaluation of development projects in the Kwahu West Municipal is undertaken.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This segment provides an outline of the method used for our research and how data for this study were collected and studied in order to examine our problem statement and attain our findings. The main aim of this research is to assess public involvement in the monitoring and evaluation of development projects. In order to recognize and establish a trustworthy result we adopted the use of the quantitative methods. Quantitative method

was adopted because of the empirical research we conduct into this phenomenon. [30]. Information for this section is mainly attained through the administering of questionnaires to be responded by Kwahu West Municipal and its staffs [30]. SPSS software was used to test the data from the survey. Furthermore, interviews were used for some questions that examine how it happened [31]. In this paper, Kwahu West Municipal was selected as case study. The significant information was acquired via the field survey using questionnaires of staffs and semi-structured interviews of top managers [30].

3.2 Case Selection

The method of selecting a suitable case is a vital step to build theories from case studies. This became imperative because when unsuitable cases are selected, the result attained will be misleading and will not help us accomplish our research objectives. Suitable selection of case helps define the perimeter for generalizing the result of the study and control waste [32]. Bearing in mind the number of cases that can be studied at a particular time choosing a relevant case becomes an essential requirement [33]. Kwahu West Municipal was chosen as case study because it is one of the districts created not long ago but has rose to become a municipal assembly. The authors also decided to use Kwahu West Municipal because getting access to information was easy.

3.3 Data Collection

The populace of the study constituted the managing and non-managing staff of Kwahu West Municipal and its stakeholders in Ghana. The examiners used the purposive sampling technique and accidental technique. The study used a sample size of fifty (55) respondents. [30]. Due to ample time the examiners devoted for the data collection, the examiners were able to get fifty-two (52) questionnaires that were administered. This data collection exercise was done from April, 2012 to August, 2012. Self-administered questionnaires were issued to respondents following an initial visit to reach an agreement to participate in the research. Follow-up calls and reminders to fill or return the filled questionnaire were used after three weeks.

3.4 Measurement of Variables

For purpose of this study, questions on the community participation in the monitoring and evaluation of development projects were

examined and placed on a 5- point scale ranging from strongly agree (5), Agree (4), Undecided (3), Disagree (2), and strongly disagree (1) in form of statement. This scale is embraced from [34,35,36]. The respondents were questioned to indicate their level of agreement with each report in relation to the question tested.

4. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Statistical Population and Statistical Samples

The statistical package program SPSS 20.0 is used. According to the descriptive statistics, the sample comprises of 52 respondents from Kwahu West Municipal in Ghana. With the 52 respondents, 14 (26.9%) were women and 38 (73.1%) were men. 17 participants (32.7%) are between the ages of 20-30, 57.7% (30 participants) are between the ages of 31-50 and 9.6% (5 participants) are at the age of 51 or older than 51. 32 participants (61.5%) are married, 20 participants (38.5%) are single. 17 participants (32.7%) are high school graduates, 26 participants (50.0%) are university graduates, 8 participants (15.4%) have a Master's Degree, 1 participant (1.9%) have a Doctorate Degree.

4.2 Statistical Analysis

This segment of the research reports the statistical analysis of the data on community participation in the monitoring and evaluation of development projects [30]. Table 2 is a descriptive statistics and correlation between all variable used. The dependent variable used is Development Projects (DP). The independent

variable used includes; Decision Making and Planning (DMP), Community Participation (CP), Participation local governance (PLG), Monitoring (M), and Evaluation (E).

Interpretations from the correlation analysis prove that all the independent variables had an affirmative correlation with the dependent variable [30]. All the independent variables had a substantial impact to the Development Projects within the kwahu west municipality. Community participation (CP) has the uppermost correlation coefficient of 0.816 at p<0.01 (2-tailed). Other independent variables such as participatory local governance (PLG) and monitoring (M) also have a correlation coefficient of 0.664 at p <0.01(2-tailed) and 0.632 at p< 0.05 (2tailed) correspondingly. Besides, the evaluation (E) had a trivial correlation with the dependent variable at 0.621 at p < 0.01 (2-tailed).

The equation: $Y = \alpha + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \dots + \beta_nX_n$ from the regression model was established where: Y is the dependent variable, "α" is a regression constant; β1, β2,β3 and βn are the beta coefficients; and X1,X2, X3,and Xn are the independent variables. Consistent beta coefficients were put in the regression equation. [30]. This exposed that development projects can be established as: $Y = \alpha + .23 X_1 + .60 X_2 + .38 X_3 + \dots + \beta_n X_n$ where: Y is (DP) ; X1 is (DMP) ; X2 is (CP); X3 is (PLG), and Xn is the nth predictor. The meaning of the regression coefficient β1 in this equation is the impact of a one-unit increase in X1 on the dependent variable Y, holding constant X2 and X3. Similarly β2, gives the impact of a one-unit increase in X2 on Y, holding X1 and X3 constant.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and pearson correlation

Variable	N	Mean	SD	2	3	4	5
DMP	52	3.20	0.414	.816**	.664**	.632**	.621**
CP	52	3.22	1.292		.528*	.723*	.453
PLG	52	4.08	1.034			.526*	.634**
M	52	3.05	0.175				.234
E	52	5.87	0.223				

*P ≤ 0.05; **P ≤ 0.01. (2-tailed)

Table 3. Regression analysis

Models	R-square	Unstandardized coefficients.		Standardized	t-value	Sig.
		Beta	Standard error	Beta		
1. DMP	.484	-.450	.052	.233	.0712	0.001
2.DMP, CP	.576	-.576	.058	.600	0.881	0.000
3. DMP, CP, PLG	.761	-.539	.053	.383	5.238	0.000
4. DMP, CP, PLG, E	.810	-.462	.062	.522	8.334	0.000

5. CONCLUSION

The focus of the study was to assess community involvement in the monitoring and evaluation of development projects using Kwahu west municipality in the eastern region of Ghana as a case study. Specifically we sought to establish the effect of Decision Making and Planning (DMP), Community Participation (CP), Participatory local governance (PLG), Monitoring (M), and Evaluation (E) on Development Projects (DP) and we adopted the quantitative method. Kwahu west municipality was selected to gather data, which was acquired from answers obtained from our administered questionnaire. The analysis shows that community participation (CP) has the highest correlation coefficient of 0.816 at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed). Participatory local governance (PLG) and monitoring (M) also have a correlation coefficient of 0.664 at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed) and 0.632 at $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed) respectively. Also, the evaluation (E) had a substantial correlation with the dependent variable at 0.621 at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed). Based on the analysis and findings of the research, the following recommendations are made.

Training in the form of workshops and briefing sessions should be organized for community members to build their capacity and enable them contribute meaningfully to the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of community development project.

Effort must be made to eliminate frequent misunderstanding between the Kwahu West Municipal Assembly (KWMA) and community members regarding development projects and indeed all areas requiring dialogue between KWMA and the communities. Community stakeholders should be part of all decisions and all financial details regarding funding, expenditure and allowances should be disclosed by KWMA to promote transparency and win the trust and confidence of community members.

Lack of opportunities to give feedback on projects, inconvenient meeting times, disrespect for the views of community members and unilateral revenue generation decisions should be addressed with urgency to promote peaceful collaboration and accord communities a sense of control over community development projects. This will arouse their ownership spirit that will propel them to maintain and sustain projects after their successful completion.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Oakley P. Project with people: The practice of participation in rural development; 1991.
2. Cohen and Uphoff "Project Monitoring and Evaluation: "Does a Participation Approach Make a Difference?" in Self-Assessment. Participatory Dimensions of Project Monitoring and Evaluation, Los Banos, Philippines, UPWARD Development; 1997.
3. Burkey M. Social analysis in participatory rural development in PLA notes, 11ED London. Rome, International Labour Office (FAO); 1993.
4. Cousins JB, Earl LM. The case for participatory evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1992;14(4):397-418.
5. Adenyinka Orimalade. Participate management in Nigeria: Problems and prospects. The Journal of Management Studies. 1978;10(2).
6. Machooka N. Participatory monitoring and evaluation of development projects. In PRA: IDS; 1984.
7. Ncgari M. Self-evaluation: Ideas for Participatory Evaluation of Rural Community Projects World Neighbours; 1984.
8. Terry DB. Methods for active participation. Sage Publications India Publishers Limited; 1993.
9. Bern J. Planning as dialogue. SRS. 2, SPRING Center, Dortmund; 1998.
10. Fowler A. The virtuous spiral. A guide to sustainable for NGOSs in International; 2000.
11. Chares YO. the role of sub-districts structures in promoting community participation in district development planning and management: The case of Kwabre District in Ashanti Region. University of Science and Technology, Kumasi; 2002.
12. Kroes G. Financing and budgeting in district development planning and management, Spring Centre, Dortmund, SPRING Research Series. 2000;3.
13. Casley DJ, Kumar K. Project monitoring and evaluation in agriculture. A Joint Study of World Bank/International Fund for Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations; 1987.

14. Casley DJ, and Lurry Monitoring and Evaluation of Agricultural Rural Development. World Bank, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London; 1982.
15. Parkinson S. Power and perceptions in participatory monitoring and evaluation. Original; 2006.
16. United Nations ACC Task Force on Rural Development, Monitoring and Evaluation Guiding Principles, IFAD Publications, Italy; 1986.
17. Jackson Edward R, Yussuf Kassam (eds). Knowledge shared: Participatory evaluation in development cooperation. West Hartford: Kumarian Press; 1998.
18. International Development Research Centre (IDRC). Approaches to Strengthening Research Institutions. Ottawa: IDRC; 1987.
19. Bendavid-val A. Rural area development planning, principles, approaches and tools of economic analysis. Analysis Division, Economic and Social Policy Department, FAO. 1991;1&2.
20. Campilan D and Buenavista Interfacing PME with the Research and Development Process. In self-assessment: Participatory dimensions of projects monitoring and evaluation. Los Banos, Philippines. CIP-UPWARD; 1997.
21. Guijt I. Participatory monitoring and evaluation for natural resources management and research, Socio-economic Methodologies for Natural Resource Institute. Chatham, UK. National Resource Institute; 1999.
22. Evans K, Guariguata M. Participatory monitoring in tropical forest management; a review of tools, concepts and lessons learned. CIFOR; 2008.
23. Guijt I, Woodhill J. Managing for Impact in rural development, a guide for project M&E. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Rome; 2002.
24. CARE International, Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation in Rural Development: Case Studies from East Africa. Published by the Development Communications Unit. CARE, Kenya; 1994.
25. Gittinger J. Price, economic analysis of agricultural projects: Economic development institute. World Bank: John Hopkins University Press; 1993.
26. Baum Warren C. The project cycle. Finance and Development. 1978;15:4.
27. FAO. Decentralized rural development and the role of self-help organizations. Bangkok, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific; 2001.
28. Price Gittinger J. Economic analysis of agricultural projects. Étienne Gilbert. Revue Tiers Monde. 1973;14(54):445-445
29. Estrella Marisol, John Gaventa. Participatory monitoring and evaluation: A literature review. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies. Evaluation in Development Cooperation, West Hartford: Kumarian Press; 1998.
30. Niamoah EB. An assessment of credit management practices on loan performance. International Journal of Marketing, Strategy, Operations Research and Organizational Behaviour. 2014;30:2.
31. Yin RK. Case study research: Design and methods (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2009.
32. Eisenhardt KM. Building Theories from case study research. The Academy of Management Review. 1989;14(40):532-550
33. Pettigrew TF. Intergroup contact theory. Annual Review Psychology. 1998;49:65-85.
Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev Psych.49.1.65>
34. Deshpande R, Farley UJ, Webster EF. Corporate culture, customer orientation and innovation in Japanese firms: A quadrant analysis. J. Mark.; 1993.
35. Jaworski BJ, Kohli AK. Market orientation: Antecedents and consequences. Journal of Marketing. 1993;57(3):53-70.
36. Samiee S, Roth R. The influence of global marketing standardization on performance. J. Mark. 1992;56:1-17.

© 2016 Ofosu and Ntiamoah; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://sciedomain.org/review-history/12791>