

International Journal of Culture and Religious Studies

(IJCRS) What is the Relationship between Monitoring and Performance of
Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese?



CARI
Journals

What is the Relationship between Monitoring and Performance of Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese?

By

Duncan Katimbo

Post Graduate Student: Uganda Technology and Management University

Corresponding Author's Email: katimbod@gmail.com

Assoc. Prof. John Micheal Maxel Okoche

Lecturer and Dean, School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Uganda Technology and Management University (UTAMU)

Abstract

Purpose: It was prudent that the Church of Uganda strategic plan 2025 was incorporated with a monitoring strategy intended to progressively track program performance and analyze activity implementation and foresee any difficulties so as to take timely corrective action. This paper examined the relationship between monitoring and performance of Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese.

Methodology: A Cross sectional survey design was used on a study population of 117 respondents. 87 respondents filled the Survey questionnaires whose responses were analysed by using correlational and regression analysis by using **PSPP software Version 1.2.0-g0fb4db**. Key Informant interviews and an FGD were carried out and responses were analysed using content analysis and results presented as text.

Findings: Descriptive findings highlighted that monitoring to some extent improves project performance (**mean 3.12**), This was further supported by the qualitative findings. Furthermore, inferential statistics confirmed that Monitoring had a significant positive relationship with Project performance (**$\beta=0.25$, $p=0.014<0.05$**).

Unique contribution to theory, practice and policy: In conclusion, this paper established that monitoring influences project performance. The weaknesses included; Diversion of funds from the intended projects, No assigned personels to directly monitor projects, Lack of monitoring skills and knowledge, Lack of transparency in the reports, inadequate salaries of the monitoring

staff, conflict of interest in the businesses that are run on Church land. Therefore, to improve upon the performance of Church of Uganda projects, it is important to strengthen the monitoring mechanisms; financial monitoring, process monitoring and outcome monitoring. The non-existent monitoring framework will be developed with informed decisions from the study.

Keywords: *Monitoring, Performance, Church of Uganda, Diocese*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

OECD/DAC provide a standard definition of monitoring as; A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Mbithi & Kiruja, 2015 and Civicus, 2007 further support the above statement and agree that monitoring is aimed at improving the project performance. Raimondo, 2016, Buntaine & Parks, 2013 in their studies of world bank projects conclude how monitoring is important for projects by highlighting supervision by project managers as a very important M&E quality as an aspect of routine monitoring. Monitoring helps managers and policymakers to understand what the money invested is producing and whether plans are being followed (Goldman and Porter, 2013). Further present an argument that there is evidence of an increasing demand of M&E with Monitoring being dominant in the evaluation systems of some African countries including South Africa, Benin and Uganda. In support of that because the Government of Uganda (GOU) is committed to achieving results through the efficient and effective delivery of key public services through successive implementation of five year National Development Plan (NDP) targets; the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (NIMES) was introduced in 2005/06 to strengthen performance assessment (National Policy on Public Sector Monitoring and Evaluation (NPPSME), 2011). The NPPSME, 2011 further provides three functions of Monitoring; (i) Financial monitoring addresses whether or not budgets have been released and spent in line with allocations, (ii) Physical/Process implementation monitoring addresses whether activities have taken place in line with targets; (iii) Outcome or impact monitoring trace whether or not results are occurring among the target population. These are supported by Otieno, 2002 & with an addition of (iv) Assumptions monitoring (Olsson, 2014; Lahey, 2015) which traces the basis for decision making before the start of projects and (v) Technical Monitoring (Mapitsa et al 2018) which involves assessing the strategy that is being used in project implementation to establish whether it is achieving the required results. The strategic plan implementation of the COU will consider the GOU proposed criteria of the three processes; Financial Monitoring, Process

monitoring and Outcome monitoring and their respective conceptualisation.

In most organisations as the best practise, Budgets are developed according to funds available for a given budget year, with managers stating outputs they will achieve over that budget year. Thus, performance-based budgets budget to outputs, but also help officials manage to outcomes. The lessons provided by UNDP M&E FRAME WORK drawn from these various experiences include the following: If a strong link is to be forged between performance monitoring and resource allocation, a single unit must be responsible for both. If performance is intended to influence management, a single unit must be responsible for carrying out activities and monitoring performance. The units responsible for performance monitoring, management, and resource allocation must coincide for accountability to be possible, and to enable improvements in efficiency and effectiveness (or even to enable monitoring of efficiency or effectiveness). In addition to the financial and resource based management systems, there is also an activity-based management system which focuses project implementers on the identified activities and even develop indicators by which they are measured to ensure proper project implementation through linking activities with resources. For a properly programmed intervention, being busy can be equated to being effective otherwise there is need to link inputs, activities, outputs as the means and strategies to the outcomes. Recently, organisations are focused onto the outcomes and hence have developed Result-based M and E (RBME) systems and this has led to setting realistic goals to what the means and strategies can achieve (Kuseck and Rist, 2004). Annual work plans are the means and strategies that are used by the organization to reach the desired outcomes and impacts. The standard of the level at which monitoring is done has been changed to assessing the contributions of various factors to a given development outcome, with such factors including outputs, partnerships, policy advice and dialogue, advocacy and brokering/coordination (UNDP M&E FRAME WORK, 2002). All these concepts are well-captured in the current strategic plan 2016-2025 of the Church of Uganda. A monitoring strategy was also included as part of the implementation strategies showing how the progress of the different projects would be tracked and most importantly to have information at hand for evidence-based decision making. Cupitt et al, 2014 revealed that most Church projects collect some project data and outcomes data but that monitoring is still limited within the projects. Efficient and effective use and control of resources is improved with an existing Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework (Ongare, 2020). With guidance from the top management at the Diocese or perhaps the province, it is the sole responsibility of each of the priest as a project manager or Monitoring and Evaluation officer to ensure the effectiveness of the M&E frame. It is the sole aim of this study to reveal the monitoring of projects status at Namirembe Diocese.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

Theoretically, this study was underpinned by the goal setting theory and the contingency theory.

1.2.1 Goal setting theory

In the later years of the 19th century to the first half of the 20th century, the goal setting theory has been used occasionally in several single studies but without any basis to any theory, without any attempt to discover where and why goal setting affects performance, not until the formulation of the goal setting theory by Latham & Locke in 2002 (Latham & Locke, 2007). The theory states that “the simplest, most direct motivational explanation of why some people perform better than others is because they have different performance goals (Latham and Locke, 1991 as mentioned by Latham and Locke, 2017). The theory is critical to this study because it provides the measure for the performance of Namirembe Diocese in the province of Church of Uganda. In light with the strategic plan of the Province of the Church of Uganda, the set strategic plan goal is broken down into strategic focus areas under which are several projects that lead to the realisation of the subsequent focus area goals. The goal setting theory provides an opportunity to the Church to understand that some of its projects will perform better because of the difference in project goals and it provides the linkage between project implementers in the different Archdioceses and top management at Namirembe Diocesan Offices through the documented lessons learned which is feedback on the project assumptions and strategies hence aiding decision making. The theory therefore reduces uncoordinated activity in the organization (Ahamed et al., 2017, as cited in Seezi et al., 2021). Further still, this goal setting theory promises high performance in the different projects that are developed to improve the socio-economic status of the Church of Uganda as backed up by Lunenburg, 2011 “Goals are more effective when they are used to evaluate performance, When employees know that their performance will be evaluated in terms of how well they attained their goals, the impact of goals increases”.

Despite the goal setting importance it has been discovered to have its own limitations. It has been studied by Drach-Zahavy & Erez, 2002 as cited in Locke & Latham, 2007 the effect of framing goals and the stress it can cause. When the complex task was set as something someone will have a challenge to achieve as opposed to something one can learn to do, there was low performance. So performance also depends on the perception of an individual regardless of the complex nature of the goal hence making it a subjective issue. In a study conducted in Germany by Wiese & Freund, 2005, found that only those people who perceived that their goal had been difficult to attain reported a significant increase in positive and a decrease in negative affect, an increase in job satisfaction, and perceptions of occupational success over a 3-year timeframe. In addition to

that, another aspect was discovered by Latham and Brown (2006) confirmed that people who set learning goals performed better than those who set performance goals. Further still, whenever the person's goals are compatible with the organisational goal then performance is enhanced and the reverse is true (Seijts & Latham, 2000). The theory limitations affect this study in a way that the top management for the Church of Uganda already set performance goals as can be seen in the mentioned COU strategic plan. And also the individual perspective of the performance of the Church of Uganda is expected since each Parish Priest possesses an individual subjective well-being. Latham and Locke, 2002 as cited in Lunenburg opines that combining goals with monetary rewards motivates organisation members to establish easy rather than difficult goals and this might affect the working theory of the Church where she prefers to use volunteers to accomplish certain tasks. And yet this theory implies that promising volunteers with some monetary incentive at the end of the task would improve their performance.

1.2.2 Contingency Theory

In the Mid 1960 Fred Fiedler introduced the Contingency theory which draws the idea that there is no one best way to manage organizations and thus the need to develop appropriate managerial strategy based on the situation and condition they are experiencing (Omalaja et al., 2011). Omalaja et al., 2011 further lists the following theories from which contingency theory is drawn; profit-maximizing and competition-based theory, resource-based theory, survival-based theory, human resource based theory, agency theory and contingency theory. A study was carried out by Kureshi, 2013 on the use of project performance tools and none of them remain more than 30% useful for project managers after they are more than 25% into the project and therefore since projects are novel by definition, they require a different, contingent approach on each instance simply because most variables have changed to some extent. The study concluded that there is an inherent linkage between projects and contingency theory. The assumption is that project performance is not static and different project performance tools are utilised as the project progresses: from Resource-based to Human resource based, agency based, profit-maximization and competition based to survival-based thereby being contingent.

Specific relevance to this study is that since project managers have liberty to select the best fitting managerial strategy at a particular moment, this provides freedom to the different parishes, Archdeaconries in the Church of Uganda to utilise the best approach that best suits their scenario in order to achieve the projects' goal. In as much as it might be the same project being implemented across the Church of Uganda, because of the uniqueness of the skills of the project implementers, resource availability and challenges faced, they will automatically be at different stages of the project and at whatever project stage one is expected to select the fitting approach. Therefore, contingency theory is relevant to the current study because automatically as the

project progresses through its cycle there is need to monitor and evaluate and at every moment choosing the right performance tool.

Betts, 2003 mentions that one of the problems of the contingency theory is that “causation is assumed and not explained”. Whereby if a set of environmental conditions and organisational characteristics designs were correlated then they were the best fit. This causes some organisations to make strategies based on that particular scenario and things work out, however the challenge is some organisations just copy what worked for another organisation even if there may exist a simpler way of doing things. In this study there exists several parishes and the underperforming parish may copy the approaches of the best performing parish without understanding that they both have unique sub-environments and subunits that could have made things work in one but fail in the other. In addition to that, the second part of the theory that states that one needs to find the best managerial strategy based on the situation and condition, this implies that the project manager and rest of the implementers need to understand all the other strategies to be able to utilise this approach. When the theory is stated it gives an impression that this is the easiest way out however it is one of the most complex. Morris, 1994 as cited in Thomas, 2000 confirms the above issue that projects move through three stages; the first level is the basic level that follows traditional project management, the second level incorporates the first level with additional tasks and the third level the most complex of all Project Management includes the more strategic issues of project definition, policy, strategy, technology, legal, financial, environmental, community and others. Morris further states that most people’s understanding of project management goes no deeper than the second level.

2. METHODS

2.1. Study Design

A cross-sectional survey design was used after having observed how it was used by related studies from the literature review (Odhiambo, Wakibia & Sakawa, 2020 ,Bazira, 2017) using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The characteristics of Cross-sectional design are that it is used to investigate a population and be able to carry out sampling and studying a single group in one instance which is what was needed in this study. It was also advantageous to the study that it helped the researcher to use the data collected to infer to the rest of the population and also study multiple variables at a single moment. This implies that cross-sectional design enabled this study to examine the influence of the independent variable (monitoring) on project performance.

2.2. Study Population

The study population steamed from Namirembe Diocese which is one of the 37 dioceses in the province of the Church of Uganda. Namirembe Diocese as the case study area consisted of 7 Archdeaconries each led by an Archdeacon which were subdivided into a total of 61 Parishes each having a parish priest, estates officer and a Lay Leader (Head of Laity). Namirembe Diocese had a Diocesan office for overall administrative purposes with different departments but most importantly the Estates Department as the unit of analysis of this study.

2.3. Sample size

The primary purpose of sampling for a qualitative researcher is to collect specific cases, events, or actions that can clarify or deepen the researchers understanding about the phenomenon under study (Mohd Ishak & Abu Bakar, 2014). In order to determine the sample size, all the seven Archdeaconries were considered, which provided us with a total of 61 Parishes in Namirembe Diocese. Under each Parish we considered a Parish Priest, an Estate Officer and the Lay Leader (Head of Laity), as indicated in the table below, each gets a population of 61 with a sample of only 39 respondents as per the percentage of the population and the Morgan & Krejcie tables. In case the Estates Officer and the Head of Laity were not available we considered any other congregant or Parishioner with a reasonable number of years and experience at that Parish. A population of 10 key informants were considered with a sample of only 6 respondents as per the percentage of the population and the Morgan tables. The Key Informants were mainly the Archdeacons and other Key people with experience in the Church matters and reasonable number of years of Church service. An intended Focus Group Discussion was considered at the Diocesan Level with a population of 15 and a sample size of 10 as per the percentage of the population and the Morgan and Krejcie tables.

2.4. Sampling techniques and procedures

This study followed Convenient sampling, Purposive sampling and Stratified random sampling in order to have a comprehensive representation. Convenient Sampling was used to choose the most accessible diocese in terms of distance, budget and time constraints and well published statistics (Anol, 2012). This technique falls under the non-probabilistic methods of sampling. Therefore, Namirembe diocese was conveniently sampled. Following that, through Stratified Random sampling we selected the Estate officers, Lay Leaders and Parish Priests. The Key informants were selected purposively due to the characteristics described above and similarly the FGD participants from the Diocesan office.

2.5. Data collection Methods

The primary data collection methods included; Surveys, Key Informant Interviews and Focus group discussions which were scheduled to capture information based on the objectives of the study. During the Survey method, the questionnaires were issued to the 117 respondents using the online questionnaire, phone interviews and lastly by delivering hard copies. All these methods were interchanged depending on the respondents convenience and the current COVID - 19 Standard Operating Procedures. The second method was the Key Informant Interview, whereby the interviews were carried out with the interviewees that possessed the special characteristics as required by the study. Lastly, a focus group discussion was held at the diocesan office with a selected team in order to discuss the findings and also to acquire the possible insights from each discussant.

2.6. Data collection instruments

The data collection instruments that were employed in this research included; Under the Survey method: Structured questionnaire, Online google form. For quantitative data capture in the survey questionnaire, a Likert scale was used as suggested by Tukei et al, 2016; a 5 rate and coded Likert Scale (5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Not sure, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree) for measurement of variables and cites these advantages that it both categorises and ranks the elements into some order. Under the Key Informant Interviews (KII) we used the Key informant Interview guide, and for the Focus Group Discussions we used the Focus Group Discussion guide.

2.7. Procedure of Data Collection

The designed questionnaires were sent out for primary data collection to the identified respondents at the diocesan offices and to the various archdeaconries. Respondents were contacted to share their whatsapp phone numbers or the emails onto which a google form link was sent to enable them to fill in remotely. Some of the respondents preferred hard copies and therefore they were delivered to them and returned to the researcher. The respondents were called by phone in advance to ask them to complete the questionnaires when they arrive and then reminders were sent out on the second week. This was followed by carrying out interviews with the selected key informants. Most of the informants preferred face to face interviews and therefore they were engaged in deep discussions. The KII was one of the ways to ensure the purpose of the Utilisation Focused Evaluation Theory. Finally, a Focus Group Discussion was held at the Diocesan office comprising of the Estates department unit members and then the senior management as was guided by the office of the Diocesan Secretary. FGD further

strengthens the fact that this study was guided by the Utilisation Focused Evaluation theory (UFE) whereby the diocesan management participates and owns the findings which are utilised to inform policy and cause change where possible.

2.8. Data Analysis

Richard, 2012; Tukei, 2016 defines data analysis as a process in which raw data is ordered and organized, modeled and transformed into useful information. In this research there was both qualitative and quantitative data that required different approaches of analysis. For quantitative data, by using PSPP software closed-ended questionnaires were edited, coded and then summarized the data into frequencies, percentages and later into tables. This study borrowed what was used by Tukei et al, 2016 in his study of Risk analysis and staff performance; Pearson product Moment correlations were used to determine the relationship between Monitoring and Project performance. Then regression analysis was carried out to determine the significance of monitoring in the above relationship. For qualitative data, there was need to reduce (code, categorise into meaningful themes) what felt like an overwhelming amount of data collected from Interviews and FGD recorded notes. These findings were purposefully used to substantiate findings from quantitative data (Wamuntu, 2017). The independent variable (Monitoring) was measured by the average of the three dimensions which included; Process monitoring, financial monitoring and outcome monitoring. Then the dependent variable (project performance) was measured by the average of its six (6) dimensions which included; Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. As earlier mentioned in the design of the questionnaire, the rate and scale that was used was the one suggested by Tukei et al, 2016 a 5 rate and coded Likert Scale (5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Not sure, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree) for measurement of both the IV. Finally as earlier explained in the data analysis section the relationships between the variables were determined by Pearson correlation analysis, Regression analysis and Multiple regression analysis. The empirical results were presented in frequencies, percentages and summarized into tables.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Response Rate

When the researcher distributed the questionnaires, organised interviews and arranged the Focus group discussion a certain number of respondents was proposed and hence expected to show up or send their filled questionnaires. However, due to different reasons some of the respondents did not show up or send their replies, therefore by simple mathematics the response rate was got by dividing the total number of received respondents by the proposed number of respondents and

the result of that is multiplied by 100 in order to represent the response rate as a percentage. The existing literature presents to us with different minimum response rate values; 75% by Sekaran, 2003 in Apajo, 2016, 60% by Richardson, 2005; Luutu, 2015; Bazira, 2017, 55.6% by Baruch, 1999; Kabuye, 2016; Bazira, 2017.

Table 1: Response Rate

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Returned	87	74
Unreturned	30	26
Total	117	100

Source: Primary data

At the on set of the study the researcher planned a sample of 117 however, only 87 returned the questionnaires thereby having a response rate of 74% (26 parish priests, 14 Estates officers, 9 Lay leaders, 38 other long serving respondents that were used as proxies to the Estates officers and Lay leaders). There were planned Key Informant Interviews and a diocesan Focus Group Discussion, which were carried out as planned. The obtained response rate of 74% was valid which enabled the study to continue with the data analysis since it was within the range of the provided response rates from the discussed scholars above.

3.2. Background Characteristics of Respondents

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents in reference to period of service with Namirembe Diocese, age distribution of the respondents and the education level of the respondents. This ensures the representativeness of the research findings

Table 2: Background Characteristics Of Respondents

Variable	Dimensions	Frequency	Percentage
Period of Service	5-9years	19	22%
	>10years	36	41%
Age	29years and below	6	7%
	>30years	71	82%
Education Level	Ordinary Diploma	7	8%
	First Degree and above	68	78%

Source: Primary data

The study findings show that the majority (63%) of the respondents have served in the Church for more than 5 years, where 22% have served for 5-9years and 41% have served for more than 10 years. In this study this implies that a respondent who has served for 5 years and above is likely to understand the performance of Church projects.

More to that the study findings show that majority of the respondents (82%) of the respondents were more than 30years of age and only 7% were 29years and below. This suggests that majority of the workers in the Church have gathered enough experience to understand project performance and monitoring and evaluation.

In addition to the above the study findings further show that majority (78%) of the respondents have at least attained their first Bachelors Degree and above and only 8% had attained an ordinary Diploma. Therefore majority of the Church staff are fairly educated. As for this study, this implies that the sample is well representative of the education characteristics since some have attained from as low as Ordinary diploma and as High as Doctorate Degree level. Hence, the responses achieved were of high quality.

3.3. The relationship between monitoring and performance of Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics On Monitoring And Project Performance

MONITORING	SD	D	NS	A	SA	MEAN	ST.DEV
Finance Monitoring influences project performance	07% (06)	10% (09)	15% (13)	40% (35)	28% (24)	3.71	1.18
Process Monitoring influences project performance	03% (03)	15% (13)	13% (11)	47% (41)	22% (19)	3.69	1.08
Outcome Monitoring influences project performance	01% (01)	18% (16)	17% (15)	46% (40)	17% (15)	3.6	1.02
We conduct Finance Monitoring in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects	09% (08)	20% (17)	26% (23)	36% (31)	09% (08)	3.16	1.13
We undertake Process Monitoring in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects	07% (06)	19% (17)	29% (25)	40% (35)	5% (04)	3.16	1.02
We undertake Outcome Monitoring in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects	10% (09)	21% (18)	30% (26)	33% (29)	06% (05)	3.03	1.09
N=87 Mean of means =						3.12	

Source: Primary data 2021

The descriptive findings from Table 3 in relation to influence of finance monitoring on project performance established that 28% strongly agreed, 40% agreed, 15% were not sure, 10% disagreed and 7% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlighted that 68% agreed and 17% disagreed with a mean of 3.71 and standard deviation of 1.18 were achieved which implies that

majority of the respondents agreed to the statement that finance monitoring influences project performance.

In addition to that, the findings in relation to influence of process monitoring on project performance established that 22% strongly agreed, 47% agreed, 13% were not sure, 15% disagreed and 3% strongly disagreed. Generally, the study shows that 69% agreed and 18% disagreed with a mean of 3.69 and standard deviation of 1.08 were achieved which implies that most of the respondents agreed to the statement that process monitoring influences project performance.

Further to that, the findings in relation to the influence of outcome monitoring on project performance established that 17% strongly agreed, 46% agreed, 17% were not sure, 18% disagreed and 1% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlighted that 63% agreed and 19% disagreed with a mean of 3.6 and standard deviation of 1.02 were obtained which implies that most of the respondents agreed to the statement that outcome monitoring influences project performance.

More still, the study findings in relation to undertaking finance monitoring in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda projects established that 9% strongly agreed, 36% agreed, 26% were not sure, 20% disagreed and 9% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlighted that 45% strongly agreed and 29% disagreed with a mean of 3.16 which was close to not sure and a standard deviation of 1.13 were achieved which implies that few of the respondents agreed that finance monitoring is undertaken in Namirembe Diocese. The qualitative findings also supported the findings, one of the discussants in the FGD highlighted in his own assessment that *“there is laxity in financial monitoring and auditing”*.

It was confirmed from the findings in relation to conducting process monitoring in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects that 5% strongly agreed, 40% agreed, 29% were not sure, 19% disagreed and 7% strongly disagreed. Generally indicating that 45% agreed and 25% disagreed with a mean of 3.16 which was close to not sure and a standard deviation of 1.02 were achieved which implies that few of the respondents agreed that process monitoring is undertaken in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects. The qualitative findings also supported the findings, one of the key informant highlighted in his own assessment that *“With the few existing projects we do try our best, eg by requesting for periodical reports from Kyankwanzi farm and at times the Archdeacons also visit the farm to have a physical monitoring”*.

Finally, the descriptive findings in relation to undertaking outcome monitoring in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects established that 6% strongly agreed, 33% agreed, 30% were

not sure, 21% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed. The study generally highlighted that 39% agreed and 31% disagreed with a mean of 3.03 which was very close to not sure and a standard deviation of 1.09 were achieved which implies that few of the respondents agreed that outcome monitoring is undertaken in Namirembe Diocese Church of Uganda Projects. The qualitative findings also supported the findings, in the FGD it was highlighted that “...we do not even know what our inputs should be and our expected outcomes”.

The mean of means indicating the actual monitoring situation in Namirembe Diocese was 3.12 which was very close to 3 or “Not Sure” on the Likert Scale. This implied that the Monitoring dimensions; Financial monitoring, Process monitoring and Outcome monitoring of the Church of Uganda projects were not well defined at Namirembe Diocese. The qualitative findings also supported the findings, one of the key informant highlighted in his own assessment that “Monitoring church projects is not good and that is why projects do not progress”. Confirmed in the FGD “that there is no well-coordinated Monitoring frame work”.

3.4. Correlation results between Monitoring and project performance

In this Study we carried out the Pearson correlation analysis in order to establish the direction of the relationship between the independent variable, Monitoring and the dependent variable, project performance of the Church of Uganda projects Namirembe Diocese. The results of the correlation coefficient (r) and the significance level (p) are displayed in the table below;

Table 4: Correlation Results Between Monitoring And Project Performance

		Monitoring	Evaluation	Project Performance
Monitoring	Pearson Correlation	1.00	0.68	0.45
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.000
	N	87	87	87

The study shows that there is a significant and moderate positive linear relationship between monitoring and project performance of Namirembe Diocese ($r=0.45$, $P=0.000$, <0.05) which implies that for any change in monitoring of project activities there is a moderate change in project performance. It was noted that Monitoring had the highest correlation coefficient, therefore it is of more significance in this relationship than evaluation.

3.5. Regression relationship between Monitoring and project performance

Regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between monitoring and project performance and to predict the actual value of the dependent variable, project performance by using monitoring as the independent variable. The study was guided by the hypothesis below;

H_{01} = *There is no significant positive relationship between monitoring and performance of Church of Uganda projects.*

H_{A1} = *There is a significant positive relationship between monitoring and performance of Church of Uganda projects.*

The results of the regression are shown in the tables below;

Table 5: The Monitoring Regression Analysis Results

	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Monitoring	0.25	0.10	0.33	2.52	0.014

Source: Primary Data

The above regression findings revealed that Monitoring had a significant positive relationship with Project performance in Church of Uganda Namirembe Diocese (Sig =0.014 and an Unstandardised B Coefficient of 0.25). This implies that a unit increase in monitoring results in 0.25 increase in the performance of Church of Uganda Projects in Namirembe Diocese. Consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis which stated that there is a significant positive relationship between monitoring and performance of Church of Uganda projects, was accepted.

3.6. Discussion

The study established a moderate positive linear correlation that was statistically significant between Monitoring and project performance ($r=0.45$, $P=0.000$, <0.05). This implied that any small change in the monitoring of projects would result in a corresponding change in the performance of Church of Uganda projects in Namirembe Diocese. Results from the regression analysis revealed that Monitoring had a positive significant influence on Project performance in Church of Uganda Namirembe Diocese (Sig =0.014 and an Unstandardised B Coefficient of

0.25). The alternate hypothesis which stated that there is a significant positive relationship between monitoring and performance of Church of Uganda projects, was accepted and its value of (0.25) was higher than that of evaluation (0.17) which makes monitoring of more significant importance. It was strongly agreed by a Key informant that *Monitoring influences project performance “because finance is part of motivation, and means of reaching the project goal and Physical attendance or process monitoring is very important because you get first hand information”*.

The above findings are confirmed by Mbithi & Kiruja, 2015 and Civicus, 2007 who agree that monitoring is aimed at improving the project performance. The corresponding positive relationship of process monitoring with project performance shows that success of a project must be watched from the beginning by the project managers in order to achieve the desired results. This is opined by Raimondo, 2016, Buntaine & Parks, 2013 in their studies of world bank projects concluded how monitoring is important for projects by highlight supervision by project managers as a very important M&E quality as an aspect of routine (process) monitoring. In addition to that management of the project budget by the project managers in order to have smooth progress of the scheduled activities is one of the main tasks that must be improved in order for the performance of Church projects to improve, this was highlighted by Goldman and Porter, 2013 “Monitoring helps managers and policymakers to understand what the money invested is producing and whether plans are being followed”.

The mean of means indicating the actual monitoring situation in Namirembe Diocese was 3.12 which was very close to 3 on the Likert Scale. This implied that the Monitoring framework was not well defined at Namirembe Diocese. It was found out that because *there is no well-coordinated Monitoring framework, one would find that the different Churches perform differently but instead if a priest finds an existing system with set targets he/she would just follow suit and push for the achievement of those targets and not to start from scratch or bring completely new projects*. And this hence also protects them from the weakness of the new priest or committee that has no skills in planning and development or project execution. For example, *even during the transfers of the clergy the system would be used to check the performance targets or KPIs of each parish and they are handed to the New priest to guide them on what they should achieve. And this also would guide the top management to Match the capabilities of the priest being sent to a new place with the set KPI’s*. This kind of effective planning cannot be done without M&E system.

Specifically there is poor financial monitoring (mean = 3.16) because of what the Key informants revealed that *“even the available funds are not handled well (money is not used for what it is supposed to do) both at the project level and at managerial level (at times money is*

diverted to other projects)”. Further still, Process monitoring is also not well defined in Namirembe Diocese because *there are no assigned personnel to monitor projects from the beginning to the end and where they are assigned the employed staff do not do the monitoring activities sufficiently, which also leads to some workers stopped from working because they are not transparent or trust worthy (The reports that are submitted to top management do not depict what is on ground)*. It was also established that the reason why they do this is because *they are not well paid and therefore find their own way to survive and hence end up mishandling the projects*. Another reason for poor process monitoring was that the *Diocese office is understaffed!* However, specifically the Estates department have representatives in each parish just like in this study we found that *there is an estates officer per parish who can be the eyes and feet of the diocesan office. So reporting is expected from bottom to up through the structure and currently in the upcoming voting of church leaders each department should have a committee at the parish level that is answerable to another committee at the archdeaconry level. Additionally, whenever there is a change in the Parish Priest, some local congregations do not disclose information on some of the projects and more specifically where they themselves run personal businesses on Church property, or where they have been running businesses on behalf of the Church they now hijack them and personalise them*. This causes the Church to lose the project outcomes without benefiting from them since they have been hijacked thus making difficult the process of outcome monitoring.

3.7. Conclusion

Monitoring had a positive significant influence on Project performance in Church of Uganda Namirembe Diocese ($\beta=0.25$, $p= 0.014$, <0.05). Therefore, carrying out Financial monitoring, process monitoring and outcome monitoring is likely to significantly improve the performance of Church of Uganda projects in Namirembe Diocese as is the case in some of the well done projects as indicated by the percentages of the respondents. However, as discussed above there was a general weakness in the monitoring framework through the three areas of Financial, Process and Outcome monitoring; Diversion of funds from the intended projects, No assigned personels to directly monitor projects, Lack of monitoring skills and knowledge, Lack of transparency in the reports, inadequate salaries of the monitoring staff, conflict of interest in the businesses that are run on Church land. In light of that there should be improvement in those three dimensions in order to have a well defined Monitoring framework in Namirembe Diocese.

3.8. Recommendations

Firstly, the Church should set up the Monitoring framework and share it across the diocese for use and improve on coordination from top to bottom (Diocese level to Parish level).

Process monitoring should be improved upon by having specific project managers who carry out close project supervision critically focus on the processes involved in the individual projects to ensure activities have taken place in line with the targets.

To improve on the financial monitoring in order to ensure that budgets have been released and spent in line with allocations such that the allocated funds are utilised for the intended project objectives.

And to sensitize the entire diocese on the advantages of the financial contributions from the different parishes to Archdeaconries up to the Diocesan office. And in return the top to bottom support should be evident.

Outcome monitoring should be improved upon to ensure and track whether results are occurring among the target people.

There should be focused training to those key personnel who need skills and knowledge in financial monitoring, process monitoring and outcome monitoring.

References

- Anol, B. (2012). *Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices*. Textbooks Collection Book 3. http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/oa_textbooks/3
- Bazira, D. (2017). *Organizational Learning Culture and Utilization of Evaluation Results By International Development Agencies. a Case Study of Heifer International Uganda*. <https://utamu.ac.ug/docs/research/studentresearch/masters/dissertations/DanBazira.pdf>
- Buntaine, M. T., & Parks, B. C. (2013). When Do Environmentally Focused Assistance Projects Achieve their Objectives? Evidence from World Bank Post-Project Evaluations. *Global Environmental Politics*, 13(2), 65-88. doi:10.1162/glep_a_00167 <https://www.aiddata.org/publications/when-do-environmentally-focused-aid-projects-achieve-their-objectives-evidence-from-world-bank-post-project-evaluations>
- Drach-Zahavy, A., & Erez, M. (2002). Challenge versus threat effects on the goal-performance relationship. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 88, 667–682.
- Kureshi, N. (2013). Project Performance and Contingency Theory. *Journal of Strategy & Performance Management*, 1(2), 46–51. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312195549_Project_Performance_and_Conting

ency_Theory?enrichId=rgreq-a4cba16af15f03f8744c8bfe8537f18d-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzMxMjE5NTU0OTtBUzo0NDkxODUzNjQzNTMwMjRAMTQ4NDEwNTU0NDgwMQ%3D%3D&el=1_x_2&_esc=publicationCoverPdfBetts, 2003

- Kusek, Z. J. and Rist, R. C. (2004). Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System. A Handbook for Development Practitioners. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/14926> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.”
- Lahey, R. (2015). Common issues affecting monitoring and evaluation of large ILO projects. International Labour Office (2015). https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/--eval/documents/publication/wcms_424047.pdf
- Latham, G. P. (2017). Motivate Employee Performance through Goal-setting. The Blackwell Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behaviour, June 2020, 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405164047.ch8> (Ahamed et al., 2017, as cited in Seezi et al., 2021).
- Latham, G. P., & Locke, E. A. (2007). New developments in and directions for goal-setting research. *European Psychologist*, 12(4), 290–300. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.12.4.290>
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1991). Self Regulation through Goal Setting. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 16(2), 480. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258875>
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705–717. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705>
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Goal-Setting Theory of Motivation. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 15(1), 1–6. <http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic Journal Volumes/Lunenburg, Fred C. Goal-Setting Theoryof Motivation IJMBA V15 N1 2011.pdf>
- Mapitsa, C. B., & Khumalo, L. (2018). Diagnosing monitoring and evaluation capacity in Africa. *African Evaluation Journal*. Vol. 6. Issue(1) <https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v6i1.255> <https://aejonline.org/index.php/aej/article/view/255>
- Mbithi, V., & Kiruja, I. &dr E. (2015). Role of Monitoring and Evaluation on Performance of

- Public Organization Projects in Kenya: a Case of Kenya Meat Commission. *International Journal of Innovative Development & Policy Studies*, 3(3), 12–27. <http://seahipaj.org/journals-ci/sept-2015/IJIDPS/full/IJIDPS-S-2-2015.pdf>
- Mohd Ishak, N., & Abu Bakar, A. Y. (2014). Developing Sampling Frame for Case Study: Challenges and Conditions. *World Journal of Education*, 4(3), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v4n3p29>
- Morris, P.W.G. (1994) *The Management of Projects*. London: Thomas Telford.
- Odhiambo, J. O., Wakibia, J., & Sakwa, M. M. (2020). Effects of monitoring and evaluation planning on implementation of poverty alleviation mariculture projects in the coast of Kenya. *Marine Policy*, 119(December 2019), 104050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104050>
- Olsson, N.O.E. and Spjelkavik, I. (2014). Assumption surfacing and monitoring as a tool in project risk management', *Int. J. Project Organisation and Management*, Vol. 6, Nos. 1/2, pp.179–196. <https://www.inderscienceonline.com/doi/abs/10.1504/IJPOM.2014.059740> ;
- Omalaja, M. A., Eruola, O. A., & College, I. (2011). Strategic Management Theory : Concepts , Analysis and Critiques in Relation to Corporate Competitive Advantage from the Resource - based Philosophy. *Economic Analysis*, 44(1–2), 59–77. <https://www.library.ien.bg.ac.rs/index.php/ea/article/download/194/190>
- Ongare, M. (2020). Influence of Monitoring and Evaluation Practices on the performance of Church Projects. *August*, 1–61. http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/154296/Ongare_Influence_of_monitoring_and_evaluation_practices_on_performance_of_church_projects?sequence=1
- Porter, S., Goldman, I., (2013). A Growing Demand for Monitoring and Evaluation in Africa. *African Evaluation Journal* 2013;1(1), Art. #25, 9 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/aej.v1i1.25> <https://aejonline.org/index.php/aej/article/view/25>
- Raimondo, E. (2016). What Difference Does Good Monitoring & Evaluation Make to World Bank Project Performance? Policy Research Working Paper;No. 7726. World Bank, Washington, DC. © World Bank., June. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-7726>
- Richard, T. H. (2012). Organizational applications of business intelligence management:

- emerging trends. IGI Global. <https://www.igi-global.com/book/organizational-applications-business-intelligence-management/59739>
- Seijts, G. H., & Latham, G. P. (2000). The effects of goal setting and group size on performance in a social dilemma. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 32(2), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087105>
- Thomas, J. L. (2000). Making Sense of Project Management: Contingency and Sensemaking in Transitory Organizations. 1–300.
- Tukei et al. (2016). Risk Analysis and Staff Performance of Kampala Metropolitan Police-Uganda. *International Journal of Technology and Management*, 1(11). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330934827%0ARisk>
- UNDP. (2009). Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.68.034321>
- UNDP. (2014). GUIDANCE FOR CONDUCTING MID-TERM REVIEWS OF UNDP-SUPPORTED, GEF-FINANCED PROJECTS. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm_Review_EN_2014.pdf
- Wamuntu, M. (2017). An Evaluation Of Agricultural Financing Practices And Productivity Of Agricultural Cooperatives In Kamwenge District. May, 40. <https://utamu.ac.ug/docs/research/studentresearch/masters/proposals/MichaelWamuntu.pdf>
- Wiese, B. S., & Freund, A. M. (2005). Goal progress makes one happy, or does it? Longitudinal findings from the work domain. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(2), 287–304. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X26714>Latham and Brown (2006)