

## **Effect of Monitoring and Evaluation Strategies on Project Completion in Cross River University of Technology (Crutech), Cross River State, Nigeria**

**Catherine I. A. Awah, Obo Ekpenyong Bassey, Eteng, Joy Umuolo, & Eni, Naomi Isang**  
Department of Business Management,  
University of Calabar,  
Calabar, Nigeria

**Samuel Manyo Takon, Emeffele, Charles C, & Stephen Ekpo Nkamare**  
Department of Banking and Finance,  
University of Calabar,  
Calabar, Nigeria

**Mbaze-Ebock Vivian Arrey**  
Department of Marketing,  
University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria

---

### **Abstract**

*This study examined the effect of monitoring and evaluation strategies on project completion in Cross River University of Technology (CRUTECH). The specific objectives were; to examine the effect of project inspection on project completion, to ascertain the effect of engineering certificate on project completion, to investigate the effect of contractor's integrity and to determine the effect of stakeholders' interest on project completion in Cross River University of Technology (CRUTECH). Data were sourced from primary through questionnaire. The population of the study was two hundred and fifty(250) and using Taro Yamane, the sample size was one hundred and fifty three(153) Simple regression statistical tool was adopted to investigate the effect of monitoring and evaluation strategies on project completion. The findings revealed that project inspection had a significant effect on project completion, engineering certificate had a significant effect on project completion, contractor's integrity had a significant effect on project completion and the research also discovered that stakeholders' interest positively affected project completion. The study recommended that the management of Cross River University of Technology (CRUTECH) should carry out strategic policies that will encourage departments efficiently to meet goals and objectives. Also, management should be involved in capacity building for monitors and evaluators.*

---

**Keywords:** *Monitoring and evaluation, project completion, project inspection, engineering certificate, contractor's integrity, stakeholders' interest*

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Monitoring and evaluation (M and E) are integral and individually distinct parts of programme preparation and implementation. They are critical tools for forward-looking strategic positioning, organizational learning and for sound management. Both monitoring and evaluation are meant to influence decision-making, including decisions to improve, reorient or discontinue the evaluated intervention or policy, decisions about wider organizational strategies or management structures and decisions by national policy makers and funding agencies (Barry, 2007). Monitoring and evaluation are important management

tools to track progress and facilitate decision making, while some funders require some type of evaluative process, the greatest beneficiaries of an evaluation can be the community of people with whom organizations work. By closely examining your work, your organization can design programs and activities that are effective, efficient and yield powerful results for the community (Bryson & Farunmi, 2005). Monitoring and evaluation strategies provide the management and main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results. An ongoing intervention might be a project, program or other kinds of support to an outcome. Monitoring helps organizations track achievements by way of information to assist timely decision making, ensure accountability and provide the basis for evaluation and learning the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy and its design, implementation and results (Whitty, 2008).

In many organizations, monitoring and evaluation are seen as donor requirements rather than a management tool. Donors are certainly entitled to know whether their money is being properly spent and whether it is being well spent. But the primary (most important) use of monitoring and evaluation should be for the organization or project itself to see how it is doing, whether it is having an impact, whether it is working efficiently and to learn how to do it better. They are tools which help a project or organization to know whether plans are not working and when circumstances have changed. They give management the information it needs to make decisions about the project or organization, about changes that are necessary in strategy or plans. It is important to recognize that monitoring and evaluation are not magic wands that can be waved to make problems disappear, or to cure them, or to miraculously make changes without a lot of hard work being put in by the project or organization. This research study intends to assess the effect of monitoring and evaluation strategies on project completion in Cross River State

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The following theories are postulated on monitoring and evaluation strategies.

### **1. Development theories**

This theory was propounded by James Fowler in 1940. It is a conglomeration or a collective vision of theories about how desirable change in society is best achieved. Such theories draw on a variety of social science disciplines and approaches. Development is the series of age-related changes that happen over the course of a life span. Development theory anchors on development as a series of stages. A stage is a period in development in which people exhibit typical behaviour patterns and establishes particular capacities. The various stages are involved; people pass through stages in a specific order, with each stage building on capacities developed in the previous stage, stages are related to age and development is discontinuous, with qualitatively different capacities emerging in each stage.

### **2. Capacity building theory**

This theory was propounded by Jim Stavros in 1998. Capacity building theory refers to what it is planned to build capacity. It refers to building the capacity of those many individuals in agencies and communities that directly or indirectly take the lead in initiating and supporting the many social process strands that support a sustainably learning society. Social learning and empowerment are based on each other. Empowerment is the process of enhancing the capacity of individuals or groups to make choices and to transform those choices into desired actions and outcomes. The contemporary view of capacity building goes beyond the conventional perception of training. Capacity building theory is to recognize that the social whole is more than the sum of its individual components.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Project monitoring is the continuous assessment of project implementation in relation to design schedules and the use of inputs, infrastructure and services (Simon, 1986). Project monitoring and evaluation provide managers and stakeholders with continuous feedback on implementation, interim and terminal evaluations. These are conducted on projects as ways to identify necessary adjustments in project design and to assess the project's effects and their potential completion (Paul, 2005). According to Biggs and Smith(2003), there is need for effective monitoring and evaluation of projects as this is increasingly recognized is an indispensable tool of both project and portfolio management. This acknowledged need to improve the performance of development assistance calls for close attention to the provision of management information, both to support the implementation of projects and programs and to feed back into the design of new initiatives. Maye, Douthwaite and Sten (2013), posit that, monitoring and evaluation also provides a basis for accountability in the use of development resources. Given the greater transparency now expected of the development of community, governments and agencies assisting them need to calls for more "success on the ground". Here, there should be examples of development projects with evidence that they have systems in place that support learning from experience. At all stages of the project cycle, monitoring and evaluation tools can help to strengthen project design and implementation and stimulate partnership with project stakeholders. This is because it can influence sector assistance strategy (Whitty, 2008). The project has been able to conceptualize the overall framework for management, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The project employs active participation to ensure sustainable development over the long run. The local participation is the core approach and it is applied to the project at all stages of project cycle. The application of the approach is iterative process with active participation of project beneficiaries, other stakeholders including officers. The full scale of project review, monitoring and evaluation took place after the actual implementation of specific activity. The implementation strategy of the project was designed as a development process project monitoring, evaluation were carried out at all stages in the process in order to ensure effective implementation of project activities. The identified activity was, then, started with some selected numbers of stakeholders in strategic communities for demonstration of project activity. For economic development activity, the project has been able to implement and offer diverse options for alternative income and household (Lennie, 2006). According to Bryson and Farunmi (2005) strategic planning is an organization management activity that is used to set priorities, focus energy and resources strengthen operations. Strategic planning involves identification of most important options towards the realization of a practical vision (goal). A strategy is seen as the approach to be used step by step by an organization to most effectively accomplish its mission towards a practical vision. It is a set procedures and tools designed to help leader's managers and planners think and act strategically. Barry (2007) sees strategic planning as a process not done off activity but ongoing or continuous process. It helps stakeholders in an organization or a project determine what they intend to accomplish in a specified period of time. This ensures that, employees and other stakeholders are working towards common goals have established agreement around intended outcomes or results, assess and adjust the organizations direction in response to actions that shape and guide what an organization serves, what it does and why it does it, while a focusing on the future. The strategic planning thus ensures project completion and sustainability. According to Mulwa (2010), strategic planning concerns itself with vision, mission, goals and values of the organization, which the organization will serve, organization role in the community further concerned with resources needed – people, money, relationships and facilities.

### **Integrating monitoring and evaluation in the project cycle**

One can start with a rough outline of the monitoring and evaluation in the planning phase. In the “general workshop” indicators for monitoring and evaluation can be added to different models and tables. If necessary, the determination of indicators can happen in a separate workshop. For monitoring the dynamic model can be a basic to add indicators. Also for evaluation, the dynamic model can be used as far as measurement of external factors is considered. For evaluation especially, indicators will have to be added to the efficiency evaluation, where the impact on the target group (outcome) occupies a central place. Indicators for evaluation are never situated at the intervention level purely but at the level of the target group (Best & Khan, 2003). While setting the priorities concerning the information that is needed, it is also important to consider the information flows who will give which information to whom, what happens with the information at different levels, which information is gained. Where, how is the feedback organized, when will policy decisions be taken and by whom? All these information flows must be decided on in the workshop. If the initial analysis and planning of the interventions have not been done within the framework described in the manual, then still it is possible to use this model for the evaluation of projects. In a workshop, the same tools as for planning can then be used for evaluation. The disadvantage of starting the procedure at a later phase, when projects have already started however, the process of evaluation does not stop with setting these indicators in the planning phase. These indicators are first impression of the participants of the workshop and are mainly based on the logic of the analytical framework. It is advisable to also involve the target group a grass-root level (Bryson & Farunmi, 2005)

Monitoring and evaluation are critical for building a strong, global evidence base around violence against women and for assessing the wide, diverse range of interventions being implemented to address it at the global level, it is a tool for identifying and documenting successful programmes and approaches and tracking progress toward common indicators across related projects. Monitoring and evaluation forms the basis of strengthening understanding around the many multi-layered factors underlying violence against women, women’s experiences with such violence, and the effectiveness of the response at the service provider, community, national and international level (Chelimsky, 1997). This is critically important because while the global evidence base on the proportion of women having ever experienced various forms of abuse is strong evidence on what kinds of strategies are effective in preventing such violence and offering adequate support to victims and survivors is still weak. At the programme level, the purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to track implementation and outputs systematically and measure the effectiveness of programmes. It helps determine exactly when a programme is on track and when changes may be needed. Monitoring and evaluation forms the basis for modification of interventions and assessing the quality of activities being conducted (Conservation Measures, 2003). Monitoring can be used to demonstrate that programme efforts have had a measureable impact on expected outcomes and have been implemented effectively. It is essential in helping managers, planners, implementers, policy makers and donors acquire the information and understanding they need to make informed decisions about programme operations (Hockings, Stolton & Dudley, 2000). Monitoring and evaluation helps with identifying the most valuable and efficient use of resources. It is critical for developing objective conclusions regarding the extent to which programmes can be judged a “success” monitoring and evaluation together provide the necessary data to guide strategic planning, to design and implement programmes and projects and to allocate and re-allocate resources in better ways (Mark, 2000).

### **Stakeholder analysis and project completion**

According to Milka (2011), basic premise behind stakeholder analysis is that different groups have different concerns, capacities and interests and that these need to be explicitly understood and recognized. This is done during the process of problem identification, objective setting and strategy selection, implementation and completion. The stakeholder analysis matrix and strength, weakness, opportunity and threats (SWOT) analysis are among the widely used by donors. Stakeholder engagement has become increasingly necessary as large and more complex projects are planned and implemented (Cray, 2001). Stakeholders can participate at various levels of which the lowest is information sharing at a higher-level is consultancy for decision making. At higher level, the developer can collaborate with stakeholders in each aspect of decision making including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution. At highest level, it can empower stakeholders to make final decision.

Independent variables are presented by the M & E tools that are strategic plan, logical framework, budget and stakeholder analysis. The dependent variable is project completion. Intervening and moderating variables have an impact on project completion comprise political environment policy, economics and social settings among others. For example, interference by the political leaders who control CDF funding' interferes with the completion of the project as schedules as stipulated in the budget, especially when there is change of MP to another in the constituency. The government policy has also featured whereby there is no further finding after the completion of the project. Neither can the stakeholder who will do voluntary work can be supported financially. The social-economic factor also featured whereby poverty affects the support that is expected from the community. Education level affects the ability of some of the project management committee member during their normal duties. According to Biggs and Smith (2003), high literacy levels increase the ability to communicate effectively ultimately generating easy in participation.

### **The role of monitoring/evaluation on projects**

Monitoring is the regular observation and recording of activities taking place in a project or programme. It is a process of routine gathering information on all aspects of the project. To monitor is to check on how project activities are progressing. It is a continuing function that aims primarily to provide the management and main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results. An ongoing intervention might be a project, program or other kind of support to an outcome. Monitoring helps organization track achievements by a regular collection of information to assist timely decision making, ensure accountability, and provide the basis for evaluation and learning (Agumena, 2013). Monitoring is a process that helps improving performance and achieving results. Its goal is to improve current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. It is mainly used to assess the performance of projects, institutions and programmes set up by governments, international organizations and NGOs. It establishes links between the past, present and future actions (Barry, 2007).

Monitoring processes can be managed by the donors financing and this is assessed by an independent branch of the implementing organization, by the project managers or implementing team themselves and/or by a private company. The credibility and objectivity of monitoring and evaluation reports depend very much on the independence of the evaluator or evaluating team. Their expertise and independence is of major importance for the process to be successful (Best & Khan, 2003). Many international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Bank group and the organization of American States have been utilizing this process for many years. The process is also growing in popularity in the developing countries where the governments have created their own national monitoring and evaluation systems to assess the development projects, the resource management and the government

activities or administration. The developed countries are using this process to assess their own development and cooperation agencies (Bryson & Farunmi, 2005).

Monitoring is a continuous assessment that aims at providing all stakeholders with early detailed information on the progress or delay of the ongoing assessed activities. It is an oversight of the activity's implementation stage. Its purpose is to determine if the outputs, deliveries and schedules planned have been reached so that action can be taken to correct the deficiencies as quickly as possible (Gok, 2009). For monitoring, data and information collection for tracking progress according to the terms of reference is gathered periodically which is not the case in evaluations for which the data and information collection is happening during or in view of the evaluation. The monitoring is a short term assessment and does not take into consideration the outcome and impact unlike the evaluation process which also assesses the outcomes and sometimes after the end of a project, even though it is rare because of its cost and of the difficulty to determine whether the project is responsible or the observed results (Gok, 2009). It is a systematic and objective examination concerning the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impact of activities in the light of specified objectives. The idea in evaluation projects is to isolate errors not to repeat them and to underline and promote the successful mechanisms for current and future projects. An important goal of evaluation is to provide recommendations and lessons to the project managers and implementation teams that have worked on the projects and for the ones that will implement and work on similar projects (AAS, 2011). Evaluations are also indirectly a means to report to the donor about the activities implemented. It is a means to verify that the donated funds are being well managed and transparently spent. The evaluators are supposed to check and analyze the budget lines and to report the findings in their work (Barry, 2007).

Evaluations are often a retrospective; their purpose is essentially forward looking. Evaluation applies the lessons and recommendations to decisions about current and future programmes. Evaluations can also be used to promote new projects, get support from governments, raise funds from public or private institutions and inform the general public on the different activities. Evaluation is assessing as systematically and objectively as possible an ongoing or completed project programme or policy (Fonseca, 2002). The object is to be able to make students about their irrelevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Based on this information, it can be determined whether any change need to be made at a project, programme or policy level, and if so, what they are. Evaluation thus has both a learning function (Dugan, Apgar & Douthwaite, 2013). During an evaluation, as much as possible is made of information from previous monitoring. In contrast to monitoring, where emphasis is used to provide insight into the relationships between results, effects (for example, improved services/products) and impact (for example, improved living conditions for the ultimate target group) (Cray, 2001).

### **Empirical studies**

Several studies have been conducted on monitoring and evaluation of project completion. Lennie (2006) carried out a research on the effect of monitoring and evaluation in Ghana, in his study, he carried out a survey study in 10 companies, using questionnaire design. A total of 500 copies of questionnaire were distributed, the study discovered that, monitoring of projects positively affected project completion. He concluded that, if projects are properly monitored, this will lead to effective performance of the organization. Monitoring and evaluation is a structured and it is an integral part of day-to-day management. A lot has been reviewed in terms of monitoring of project completion. Some opinions deliberated on the factors responsible for project completion, while some discussed effect of monitoring and evaluation of project completion. According to Whitty (2008), his seminar work brought about fresh investigations regarding the effect of monitoring and evaluation on

project completion. Similarly, Kantor and Apgar (2013) suggested that, the directions of project completion is influenced or determined by capital resources that are disbursed into the project. However, Patton (2011) empirically investigated relationship between monitoring, evaluation and implementation using seven organizations. This study adopted Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique and found that among the variables (monitoring, evaluation) impacted the growth of the organization significantly and positively, while implementation was insignificant. The study also found out that monitoring of project is influenced by many factors such as project inspection, engineering certificate. Hence, he concluded that monitoring related positively to project completion. Fonseca (2002) assessed the relationship that existed between monitoring and project completion using Chi-square statistical test. The analysis revealed the existence of a directional relationship, a positive and significant impact on project completion. .

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The design employed in this study is survey research design. The justification for adopting this design include: As a systematic empirical inquiry. This design allows for one time only observation that involves as many variables as necessary for the research but does not give room for the researcher to manipulate the independent variables to produce effect on the dependent variable of the study. The geographical area of the survey is Cross River State which is well defined and the respondents are drawn within its confine. The size of the respondents is large (i.e. the population) and this justified the conduct of this study in a survey design which relies on sampling approach. The characteristics of the population are known and the respondents who possess the needed information are clearly determined. The population of the study included the employees of the organization. The population of the study comprised of two hundred (250) employees from Cross River University of Technology, Calabar, Obubra and Ogoja Campuses. The research developed a questionnaire to find out some basic facts through the use of simple random sampling techniques. Data for this study were gathered from both primary and secondary sources. Secondary data were obtained from textbooks, journals articles, libraries and internet. On the other hand, the primary data were collected from respondents in Cross River State through the use of structured questionnaire. The study employed simple regression analysis to measure the degree of relationship between variables tested in the study; independent t-test was used to validate values obtained from the multiple regression analysis. However, a logical and objective analysis of relevant question bothering on each research questions was used to generate answer to the research question.

Simple regression formula is stated thus:

$$y = f(x)$$

Where;

y = Dependent variable

x = Independent variable

The equation is linearized into ordinary least square model.

$$PC = f(ME)$$

$$PC = b_0 + b_1 ME + U_t$$

Where;

PC = Project completion

ME = Monitoring and evaluation

b<sub>0</sub> = Regression constant

b<sub>1</sub> = Regression parameters

U<sub>t</sub> = Stochastic error

## DATA ANALYSIS

### Hypothesis one

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant effect of project inspection on project completion.

Independent variable: Project inspection

Dependent variable: Project completion

Test statistic: Least square regression statistic

The analysis shows coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.929, which implies that 92.9 percent of the response variation in the dependent variable (project completion) was explained or caused by the explanatory variable (project inspection); while 8 percent was unexplained. Thus, remaining 8 percent unexplained response could be caused by other factors or variables outside the model. Also, the value of R-square was high enough to indicate a good relationship between the dependent (project completion) and independent variable (project inspection). The Durbin Watson value was 0.197 which implies that, the test fell within the range of autocorrelation 2.879 in conclusive region of D.W partition curve. In testing for statistical significance of the model, the F-statistic was adopted at 5 percent significant level. The computed value of the f-statistic was 4578.83 far greater than the tabulated value of f-statistic of 3.84 at  $df_1 = 1$  and  $df_2 = 141$ . Also, as confirmation, the calculated t-statistics of 67.667 was greater than the critical value of 1.64. With these, the null hypothesis which states that project inspection and competence do not have significant effect on project completion in CRUTECH was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. It was then calculated that project inspection and competence have significant effect on project completion in CRUTECH.

**TABLE 1**

Least square regression result of effect project inspection and competence on project completion

#### Dependent variable – project completion

Variable	B	Standard error	b	T	Sig
Constant	.420	.050		8.440	.009
Project inspection	.893	.013	.964	67.667	.000

  

R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Std. error	DW	Cal. F*	Cri. F*	df <sub>1</sub>	df <sub>2</sub>	Sig.
.964	.929	.929	.323	.197	4578.83	3.84	1	141	P<0,05

**Source:** SPSS output.

### Hypothesis two

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant effect of engineering certificate on project completion.

Independent variable: Engineering certificate

Dependent variable: Project completion

Test statistic: Least square regression statistic

The analysis shows coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.843, which implies that 84 percent of the response variation in the dependent variable (project completion) was explained or caused by the explanatory variable (certificate); while 16 percent was unexplained. Thus, remaining 16 percent unexplained response could be caused by other factors or variables outside the mode. The value of R-square was high enough to indicate a

good relationship between the dependent (project completion) and independent variable (certificate). The Durbin Watson value was 0.111 which implies that, the test fell within the range of autocorrelation 2.879 in conclusive region of D.W partition curve. In testing for statistical significance of the model, the F-statistic was adopted at 5 percent significant level. The computed value of the f-statistic was 1871 far greater than the tabulated value of f-statistic of 3.84 at  $df_1 = 1$  and  $df_2 = 141$ . Also, as confirmation, the calculated t-statistics of 43.262 was greater than the critical value of 1.64. With these, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate is upheld, which states that engineering certificate has significant effect on project completion in CRUTECH.

**TABLE 2**

Least square regression result of effect of engineering certificate on project completion

**Dependent variable – project completion**

Variable	B	Standard error	b	T	Sig
Constant	.914	.107		-8.538	.000
Engineering certificate	1.121	.026	.918	43.262	.000

  

R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Std. error	DW	Cal. F*	Cri. F*	df <sub>1</sub>	df <sub>2</sub>	Sig.
.918	.843	.842	.482	.111	1871.595	3.84	1	141	P<0,05

Source: SPSS output.

**Hypothesis three**

**H<sub>0</sub>:** There is no significant effect of contractor's integrity on project completion.

Independent variable: Contractor's integrity

Dependent variable: Project completion

Test statistic: Least square regression statistic

The analysis shows coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.848, which implies that 85 percent of the response variation in the dependent variable (project completion) was explained or caused by the explanatory variable (contractor's integrity); while 15 percent was unexplained. Thus, remaining 15 percent unexplained response could be caused by other factors or variables outside the model. The value of R-square was high enough to indicate a good relationship between the dependent (project completion) and independent variable (contractor's integrity). The Durbin Watson value was 0.196 which implies that, the test fell within the range of autocorrelation 2.879 in conclusive region of D.W partition curve. In testing for statistical significance of the model, the F-statistic was adopted at 5 percent significant level. The computed value of the f-statistic was 1941.5 far greater than the tabulated value of f-statistic of 3.84 at  $df_1 = 1$  and  $df_2 = 141$ . Also, as confirmation, the calculated t-statistics of 44.06 was greater than the critical value of 1.64. With these, the null hypothesis which states that contractor's integrity does not have any significant impact on project completion. It was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. It was then concluded that contractor's integrity does have significant effect on project completion in CRUTECH.

**TABLE 3**

Least square regression result of contractor's integrity and project completion

Dependent variable – project completion

Variable	B	Standard error	b	T	Sig
Constant	.558	.073		7.631	.000
Contractor's integrity	.937	.021	.921	44.063	.000

  

R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Std. error	DW	Cal. F*	Cri. F*	df <sub>1</sub>	df <sub>2</sub>	Sig.
.921	.848	.847	.474	..0196	1941.539	3.84	1	141	P<0,05

Source: SPSS output.

**Hypothesis four**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no significant effect of stakeholders' interest on project completion.

Independent variable: Stakeholders' interest

Dependent variable: Project completion

Test statistic: Least square regression statistic

The analysis shows coefficient of determination (R-square) of 0.858, which implies that 86 percent of the response variation in the dependent variable (project completion) was explained or caused by the explanatory variable (stakeholders' interest); while 14 percent was unexplained. Thus, remaining 14 percent unexplained response could be caused by other factors or variables outside the model. The value of R-square was high enough to indicate a good relationship between the dependent (project completion) and independent variable (stakeholders' interest). The Durbin Watson value was 0.112 which implies that, the test fell within the range of autocorrelation 2.879 in conclusive region of D.W partition curve.

In testing for statistical significance of the model, the F-statistic was adopted at 5 percent significant level. The computed value of the f-statistic was 2105.8 far greater than the tabulated value of f-statistic of 3.84 at df<sub>1</sub> = 1 and df<sub>2</sub> = 141. Also, as confirmation, the calculated t-statistics of 45.890 was greater than the critical value of 1.64. With these, the null hypothesis which states that stakeholders' interest do not have any significant impact on project completion in Cross River University of Technology was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. It was then concluded that stakeholders' interest has effect on project completion in CRUTECH.

**TABLE 4.**

Least square regression result of stakeholders' interest and project completion

Dependent variable – project completion

Variable	B	Standard error	b	T	Sig
Constant	-.405	.090		-4.489	.000
Stakeholders' interest	1.027	.022	.926	45.890	.000

  

R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	Std. error	DW	Cal. F*	Cri. F*	df <sub>1</sub>	df <sub>2</sub>	Sig.
.926	.858	.857	.458	.112	2105.872	3.84	1	141	P<0,05

Source: SPSS output.

**FINDINGS**

The study examines the effect of monitoring and evaluation strategies on project completion in Cross River University of Technology. Based on the analysis, the result revealed that project inspection has significant effect on project completion in Cross River University of Technology. The linear regression test carried out on the survey data t-calculated was significantly greater than the t-critical. It was concluded that, inspection as a component of monitoring and evaluation, positively affected project completion. The findings of this research are in line with the study of Simon (1986), who posits that inspection improves the development resources. Based on the simple regression test carried out on the survey data, t-calculated was significantly greater than the t-critical which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypothesis. The regression result shows that certificate on effective monitoring and evaluation has significant effect on project completion in Cross River University of Technology implying that, an increase in project completion allocation will cause an increase in project completion. Based on the simple regression test carried out on the survey data, the t-calculated was significantly greater than the t-critical, which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypothesis. It was concluded that, contractor's integrity has a significant positive effect on project completion. In other words, their integrity is significantly linked to increase in project completion. Several reasons may be responsible for this significant effect.. Based on the simple regression test carried out on the survey data, the t-calculated was significantly greater than the t-critical which led to the rejection of the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative hypothesis. This implies that stakeholders' sense of mission has a significant positive effect on project completion. The findings of this study are also in harmony with the works of Simon (1986), who opined that project monitoring is the continuous assessment of project implementation in relation to design schedules and the use of inputs, infrastructure, and services by project beneficiaries such as stakeholders.

Based on the analysis, the findings were as follows:

- (i) There was a significant effect on project inspection and project completion.
- (ii) There was a significant effect on engineering certificate and project completion.
- (iii) There was a significant effect on contractor's integrity and project completion.
- (iv) There was a significant effect of stakeholders' interest and project completion.

## **CONCLUSION /RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study examined the effect of monitoring and evaluation strategies on project completion in Cross River University of Technology (CRUTECH), Cross River State, Nigeria. This study empirically showed that project inspection, engineering certificate, contractor's integrity and stakeholders' interest had an effect on project completion. Monitoring and evaluation (M & E) are important management tools to track progress and facilitate decision making. It helps organizations track achievements by information to assist timely decision making. In many organizations, monitoring and evaluation are meant to influence decision-making tools which help a project or organization knows whether plans are working and seen as part of planning process. It is concluded that when there is effective monitoring and evaluation of projects, this will positively lead to progress in organization.

In line with the findings, the following recommendations are made:

- (i) The management of Cross River University of Technology should implement capacity building for monitors and evaluators.
- (ii) The management of Cross River University of Technology should carry out policies that will encourage departments to invest efficiently and effectively when contracts are awarded.
- (iii) Stakeholders should participate at various levels.
- (iv) The management of Cross River University of Technology (CRUTECH) should design

programmes and activities that are effective and efficient which will yield powerful results for the community.

## REFERENCES

- AAS. (2011). *Program proposal. CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems*. Lagos: Global Publications.
- Agumena, D. (2013). Projects and principles of management forum for environmental in Ethiopia .Retrieved from [www.ffe-ethiopia-org/ethiopia-environmentalreviewpdf](http://www.ffe-ethiopia-org/ethiopia-environmentalreviewpdf)
- Barry, B. W. (2007). *Strategic planning work book for non-profit organizations*. Revised edition. London: Wilder Foundations.
- Best, J. W. & Khan, J. V. (2003). *Research in education*. (7th ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Biggs, S. & Smith, S. (2003). A paradox of learning in project cycle management and the role of organizational culture. *World Development*, 31(10), 1743–1757.
- Bryson, J. & Farunmi, K. A. (2005). *Creating and implementing your strategic plan. A work book for public and non-profit making organizations*. Jossey: Bass Publishers.
- Chelimsky, E. (1997). *The coming transformation in evaluation*. Oaks: Sage Publication.
- Conservation Measures Partnership (2003). Conservation Partnership: Washington DC.
- Cray, A. (2001). From stakeholder management to stakeholder accountability. Retrieved from: [www.researchgate.net/profile/Andreas-Rasche/publication/...](http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Andreas-Rasche/publication/...)
- Dugan, P., Apgar, M. & Douthwaite, B. (2013). *Research in development: The approach of AAS.AAS Working Paper*. London: Ivan Publications
- Fonseca, J. (2002). *Complexity and innovation in organizations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gok, (2009) *Kenya National Bureau Statistics (KNBS)*.
- Hockings, M., Stolton, S. & Dudley, N. (2000). *Evaluating effectiveness: A framework for assessing management of protected areas*. UK: IUCN.
- Kantor, P. &Apgar, M. I. (2013). *Transformative change in AAS*. Penang: World Fish.
- Lennie, J. (2006). Increasing the rigour and trustworthiness of participatory evaluations. *Valuation Journal of Australasia*, 6(1), 27–35.
- Mark, M. M. (2000). *An integrated framework for understanding, guiding and improving policies and programmes*. Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mayne, J., Douthwaite, B. & Stern, E. (2013). Evaluating natural resource management programs. Penang, Malaysia: CGIAR Research Program on Aquatic Agricultural Systems. *Practice Brief: AAS*, 2013-23.
- Milka, W. (2011). Guide to the logical framework approach republic of Serbia. Retrieved from: [www.naturaltherapypage.com](http://www.naturaltherapypage.com).
- Moi, D. T. (2006). *Kenya African nationalism: Nyayo philosophy and principles*. London: Published by Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Mulwa, F. W. (2010). *Demystifying participatory community development beginning from the people ending at the people*
- Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Paul, M. (2005). Principles of project monitoring and evaluation. [www.plantscience.paulinepublications](http://www.plantscience.paulinepublications). African daughters of St. Paul 00100 Nairobi G.P.O. Kenya. [www.plantscience](http://www.plantscience). Accessed February, 2014.
- Simon, F. (1986). Monitoring and evaluation massachuse its institute of technology. Retrieved from: [Webmitedu./issues-tools/monitoring](http://Webmitedu./issues-tools/monitoring)
- Whitty, B. (2008). *Accountability principles for research organizations*. London: One World Trust.