The Role of Leadership in Establishment of Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Humanitarian Organizations in Uganda: A Case of Action Africa Help-Uganda (AAH-U)

Norbert Aludi Anyidi and Rose. B. Namara
Uganda Management Institute

Abstract

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems are important for evidence based programing. Absence of M&E systems in humanitarian organizations affects their performance, leading to low donor support and diminishing public confidence. This study examined the extent to which existence of leadership championship affects establishment of a Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBM&E) system at AAH-U. This study conducted among 84 AAH-U staff found that leadership championship strongly affects establishment of RBME system in AAH-U. Attitudinal change among workers to demand for RBME depended on having a strong education programme and recruiting personnel with expertise in Monitoring and Evaluation. The study concludes that for RBME system establishment to be realised, AAH-U needs a transformational leader to motivate and support the team in M&E initiatives, put in place RBME promotional programmes and recruit technically competent M&E staff to support the leadership team.

Key Words: RBME system, Leadership Championship, AAH-U, Humanitarian Organizations

Introduction

Although there has been a steady improvement in the adoption of M&E in project management among organizations for better and successful project management, research has shown that M&E system establishment is still low among humanitarian organizations due to; insecurity, poor infrastructure, short implementation timing, difficulty in accessing populations and high staff turnover (Frerks & Hilhorst, 2002; ALNAP, 2003, IFRC M&E Guide, 2011). On the other hand (Kusek & Rist, 2004; Imas and Rist, 2009; Ernest (2013); Zhou and Hardlife (2013) identified low capacity, poor M&E culture, low demand for M&E information and compromised political will from highly placed leaders as challenges affecting RBME system establishment in stable circumstances.

Over the last decade, there has been a growing demand by the international community for development actors to adopt a results-based management approach to account for and demonstrate achievement of 'measurable' results (OECD, 2005). Although this has led to a steady improvement in project management, research has shown that M&E system establishment is still low among humanitarian organizations (Catherine Elkins, 2010; Vähämäki et al., 2011). Lack of adoption of M&E systems among organizations has had adverse effects on successful project implementation (Hummel Brunner, 2010; Jones, 2011; Mowles, 2010; Ramalingam and Jones, 2008) and is attributed to insecurity, poor infrastructure, short implementation timing, difficulty in accessing populations and high staff turnover (ALNAP, 2015, IFRC M&E Guide, 2011). Equally, it has been noted that low capacity, poor M&E culture, low demand

for M&E information and compromised political will from leaders are the main challenges affecting RBME system establishment in stable circumstances (Kusek and Rist 2004, Imas and Rist 200, Ernest 2013, Zhou and Hardlife 2013).

Generally, Results Based Management (RBM) took root in the developed systems such as United States of America (USA), Australia, Finland and the United Kingdom (UK) during the 1970s and was gradually introduced through the Logical Framework Approach (Cousins 2005). With the 2005 Paris declaration, humanitarian and development organizations and governments in Africa and world over embraced Results Based Management (Mackay, 2006). The humanitarian realm, the Rwandan genocide and other human disasters in the 1990s popularized M&E through establishment of effective M&E systems in the SPHERE project, the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership among others (ALNAP Annual Review, 2003). Though RBME was embraced fully, the humanitarian context characterised by insecurity and methodological challenges and limited use of scientific rigour in conducting studies in emergency situations affected its spread (Frerks & Hilhorst, 2002; UN assembly; 63 session, 2008; IFRC M&E guide, 2011). As stated above, most reports of lead humanitarian agencies like Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC), American Relief Committee and the United Nations agencies indicate that RBME system utilization was incomplete across organizations. But, as stated before, the absence of RBME in humanitarian organizations affects their performance and ultimately lowers donor support for them.

AAH-U has been critical in emergency and stable refugee caseload management in Kyangwali Refugee Settlement in Hoima but has not established an RBME system in eight years yet they have had a functional M&E department since 2011. AAH-U developed a guide to improve management systems for participatory implementation and results demonstrability so that AAH-U remains competitive in the ever-changing socio-economic and political environment in their program areas of emergency and refugee service delivery (AAH-I, 2011). Unfortunately, the RBM&E guide does not include M&E plan, nor does it include M&E policy. Although it has elements of the M&E plan, M&E policy and tools and frameworks, the guide has not been fully operationalized. In 2015, a Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Officer was recruited to spearhead M&E activities but the position existed for only a year because the budget was not supported by the donor hence leaving M&E function to program managers untrained in M&E skills and competences like data management, M&E tools development and evaluation skills among others.

Leadership championship in establishment of RBME system

While there could be many reasons why AAH-U may not have managed to establish a robust M&E system, another key factor is lack of leadership championship as Imas and Rist (2009) emphasize. The concept of leadership champion refers to a high-level figure with strong political will, good technical knowledge and an excellent networker who can influence and advocate for innovation agenda across partners. These champions provide the vision and the strategy to achieve the desired change.

Twende Mbele (2018) attributes success institutionalisation of Monitoring and Evaluation systems in countries including Uganda and South Korea to leadership support. In a report about collection of country experiences to inform improvement in M&E efforts, Twende Mbele (2018) concurred that to build demand and support for M&E systems, and ensure their successful implementation, countries require leaders with technical, political and social network championship skills. Leadership support and having leaders who understand M&E process is critical to the successful establishment of RBME system (Epstein & Olsen, 1996; Imas & Rist, 2009).

Görgens et al (2009) add that such leaders go even further to neutralize members of the team opposed to innovation. Busjeet (2012) in a readiness assessment report concluded that leadership support has a positive significant relationship with RBME system establishment. He states that lack of leadership support in Bangladesh failed their efforts for Monitoring and Evaluation. According to Burn (1978), the leadership champions should be transformational leaders who can champion change with their personality and articulate vision. Gould and Scott (2003) elucidate that transformational leadership is about change, innovation and entrepreneurship and it operates at micro and macro level of the social system.

Görgens and Kusek (2009) advise that substantial knowledge of RBME among the leaders can positively improve M&E efforts. Knowledgeable leaders become champions and advocates of monitoring and evaluation. Little knowledge of M&E tools, methods and processes significantly affects the success of advocacy for establishing an RBME system. Kusek and Rist (2004) assert that one of the challenges in moving towards RBM&E system establishment is the would-be champions in the government not understanding what entails the orientation into a performance management culture. Knowledge in M&E is an incentive for leadership champions to lead by example and speak from a knowledge point of view so that they command authority and respect during supervision and advocacy.

Demand for M&E information by leaders enables organisations to set in place systems to gather such information. Mackay (2007) notes that motivation and incentive for M&E points at demand for M&E information. He therefore advises leaders of organizations to create a sense of demand for M&E through their decision-making systems. The World Bank (2007) study on RBME implementation also concurred that lack of demand for M&E information is a constraint factor to M&E initiatives.

As above, literature does not specifically mention the establishment of M&E Plan and Policy and tools. But still, the components seem to be inherent since RBME authorities Kusek et al. (2004) strongly recommend the above components as key attributes of the RBME system design. Literature from the humanitarian coordination bodies like Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action studied general leadership qualities that affect operations and found out that lack of leadership support is still a challenge for effective results. (ALNAP, 2011; 2013). Similarly, in other realms, most writers either studied leadership and organizational performance or transformational leadership in technological innovations.

Furthermore, most leadership researchers make the explicit or implicit assumption that leadership is an important determinant of organizational effectiveness. However, Pfeffer (1977) argues that organizational effectiveness is majorly dependent on the economic conditions, market conditions, governmental policies, and level of technological change. To augment, Lennie & Tacchi (2015) studied financial capacity in general management terms and agree that enough finances ultimately account for better performance but should be augmented by human and logistical capacities. Thomas and Thomas (1998) and Caiden (1998) also re-echo that establishing RMBE system is costly. Hence not all organizations may have the capacity for it even when there are good leaders. Further still, Yukl (1989) argues that if leadership is the main determinant in organizational performance, changes in top leadership would always yield better performance. But Crawford, Gould & Scott (2003) insists that leadership championship is more pivotal to building a strong vision-based organization. They advise leadership trainers to prepare transformational leaders to assume positions and produce results without technical skills in a given field.

While scholars agree to a larger extent that factors such as dangerous humanitarian situations, short turn-around time, lack of baseline data and high staff turnover affect elaborate planning in humanitarian settings, literature above reveals that leadership championship takes a more centre stage in the success of RBME system establishment. Therefore, this paper establishes the extent to which existence of leadership championship affects establishment of RBM&E system at AAH-U.

Research Question

To what extent does existence of leadership championship affect establishment of RBME system in AAHU?

Research Scope

This article is limited to M&E system establishment with its dimensions conceived as M&E plan, M&E policy and M&E tools. Influential events in AAH-U from 2009-2016 were considered. In the article, attributes of leadership championship for M&E was seen from aspects of; leaders' level of technical knowledge in M&E, leaders' level of support for M&E cause and, leaders' level of commitment to motivate and incentivise M&E cause.

Theoretical Review

This study is anchored on the transformational leadership theory (Burns, 1978) which posits that leaders and their followers help each other to champion their objectives to a higher level of motivation to create significant change in organisations. It further views leaders as champions of change through their personality and ability to cause change through an articulate vision (Warrilow 2012).

This theory aided in understanding how leaders influence others through trust, loyalty, admiration and respect. The study accentuates the transformational leadership as it shows how leaders transform and motivate followers through their influence, vision, values, long

term goals and commitment to work through intellectual stimulation (leadership knowledge), inspirational motivation (leadership motivation) and individual consideration (leadership support).

The theory has been widely used and hailed by various scholars including Crawford (2001), Crawford, Gould & Scott (2003) and Sehal (2015) in explaining influence of leadership in adoption of innovation. Transformative leadership is also instrumental in influencing the culture of the entire organisation to focus on the desired objectives. Yukl (1989), Bass & Bass (2008) and Bass (1985) used the transformative theory to study leadership behaviour like charisma and intellectual stimulation that yielded intervening outcomes. Although intellectual stimulation, individual consideration and inspirational motivation have a direct strong influence on followers, it is not clear how they influence core managerial behaviours like planning, monitoring and evaluation to easily give rise to M&E planning, M&E policy design and development of M&E tools.

Methodology

This article is derived from the Masters' dissertation ascertaining the extent to which leadership championship affects establishment of RBME system in AAH-U. The study utilised a cross-sectional research design because of its short, one-off nature and prescribed timeframe (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). Purposive and simple random sampling techniques were used. Purposive sampling was used to target top management who make key decision in management. In accordance with Morgan & Krejcie (2007), a sample size was drawn from 118 accessible population. This method was chosen because of its effectiveness in determining the sample size for a research study.

The researchers used a self-administered, semi-structured questionnaire to obtain quantitative data from the 84 selected employees of AAH-U who included section heads, sub-section heads and other operations staff because of its convenience of privacy and freedom of anonymity to answer sensitive questions on leadership support, knowledge and financial support (Tongco, 2007; Amin, 2005). The researchers interviewed three senior management team members and one UNHCR program staff to provide in-depth information about the extent leadership championship affects establishment (Mugenda, 1999). Key organizational documents including work plans, reports and policy documents were reviewed to enable understanding of the context in line with RBME system establishment.

Quantitative and qualitative data analysis approaches were employed. Quantitative techniques facilitated analysis and interpretation of numerical data while qualitative techniques helped in collection and analysis of narrative data, largely exploratory and explanatory (Amin, 2005). Descriptive statistics were summarized, relationship between the independent and dependent variables were established using Pearson's correlation coefficient and regression analysis respectively. Quantitative techniques facilitated analysis and interpretation from numerical variable while content analysis in qualitative techniques helped in adding information from non-numerical values. (Amin, 2005); (Dattalo, 2010).

Study Findings

RBME System establishment

The study sought to ascertain whether AAH-U has an established M&E system especially appropriate policies, strategies, plans, tools and whether these tools are used to generate required information to aid decision making. Table 1 below describes respondent's opinions.

Table 1: RMBE System establishment

Variable	SD	DA	NS	A	SA	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Organization has an M&E policy	12.5%	13%	28.8%	33%	13.8%	80	3.225	1.211
The M&E policy is being used to guide M&E activities	10%	11%	35%	34%	10%	80	3.225	1.102
Organization has developed M&E plan for all its projects	3.75%	3.8%	25%	46%	21.5%	80	3.775	0.954
The M&E plan has clear set targets and time frame for its activities	2.5%	5%	23.8%	48%	21.3%	80	3.800	0.920
Organization has M&E tools for all programs	1.25%	14%	17.5%	44%	23.8%	80	3.750	1.013
The tools are appropriate for the measurement of the program activities	1.25%	7.5%	31.3%	45%	15%	80	3.650	0.873
M&E tools are used to collect data for reporting purposes	0%	7.5%	20%	51%	21.3%	80	3.863	0.838
M&E data are used to generate information to aid decision making	7.5%	5%	35%	36%	16.3%	80	3.488	1.067

Source: Primary data (2017)

Although 46.8% of the respondents agreed that AAH-U has an M&E policy, 25.5% disagreed and 28.8% were not sure. Review of the M&E strategy document of the organisation shows that AAH-U does not have an M&E policy in place much as there is an M&E strategy that was designed by the AAH-I Nairobi headquarters for Africa-wide rollout (AAH-I M&E strategy 2014-2018). AAH-U has no defined policy to guide the establishment of the RBME system possibly because the staff are not aware that a policy is required for such a set up. Respondents who thought there is an M&E policy possibly could not differentiate between an M&E policy and other policies like that of human resource.

The findings indicate that AAH-U developed M&E plan for all its projects as agreed by 67.5% respondents while 7.5% disagreed and 25% not sure. The records also show that AAH-U does not have an M&E plan in place to cover monthly, quarterly and annual activities. AAH-U has project monitoring plans for specific UNHCR implementation areas like Kyangwali in Hoima and Adjumani operations. This is an initiative of UNHCR to facilitate tracking of implementation in specific areas but not an AAH-U own initiated arrangement. The AAH-I 2014-2018 M&E strategy and the 2011 AAH-I PME guide could have somehow substituted the M&E plan as dubbed in this study. However, they were developed by AAH-I and are yet to be localised by AAH-U. The lack of M&E plan for AAH-U project demonstrates that there is no RBME system in the organisation and management is not aware of its importance.

AAH-U has M&E tools for all program evidenced by the 67.5% of the respondent's agreement while only 15% disagreed and 17.5% not sure. For instance, community services sector has over ten data collection tools for different refugee community protection needs. UNHCR also augments these with their generic tools for planning, monitoring and reporting progress. However, the tools or frameworks that connect the collected data to analysis and later meaningful sharing are limited. This makes data storage, analysis, interpretation and information sharing haphazard. When asked if tools are appropriate for the measurement of the program activities, 60% of the respondents agreed and only 8.8% of them disagreed while 31.3% were not sure. To a large extent, document review does not agree with this. The AAH-I PME guide outlines several tools that are to be used by staff, but the guidelines are not implemented since it was not even operationalized. Much as some of the tools recommended in it are the traditional ones that were and are still being used, they are mostly limited to activity monitoring and others are developed by donors. As one of the Key informants noted;

> *AAH activity outcome measurement is still infant but we do periodic staff evaluation. OPM is instituting an M&E system, so it may help improve some of these things...I saw evaluation done for the EU funded projects. For UNHCR projects, I see some assessment in WASH sector and Nutrition, but they are spearheaded by WFP and UNHCR.* [KI.01]

The above finding indicates that there is limited effort on ground for AAH-U to localize tools for tracking of results to inform decision making. This also points to the effect of donor motivation for the M&E approach.

Detailed proper results assessment tools are limited e.g. tools for KAP survey used in WASH and health sectors. Some of the sectors do not have evaluation tools. There are also tools developed by donor agencies like UNHCR and WFP that are appropriate.

On the question whether tools are used by staff and senior management, 61.3% of the respondents agreed, 15% of them disagreed and 23.8% were not sure. This level of agreement implies that AAH-U cherishes evidence based decision making and that staff are practically using some tools for data collection and reporting. This is supported by the next 72.5% respondents agreeing that M&E tools are used to collect data for reporting purposes and only 7.5% disagreed. When asked if M&E data is used to generate information to aid decision making, 52.5% of the respondents agreed, only 12.5% of them disagreed and 35% said they were not sure. However, from document review results, even if AAH-U was to have good

M&E reports, it was noticed that finance and human resource departments are not linked to M&E results through their policies although HR decisions on promotions are based on data from staff appraisal reports and recommendations from supervisors. Likewise, evidence from interview with a key informer indicates that finance decisions are not based on performance as one of them had this to say;

> Budgeting does not depend on sectoral or individual staff performance but mostly on needs of beneficiaries. [KI 02].

Aware that the policies of the two main departments do not have clear mention about M&E recommendations, it means decision making is mostly based on information from periodic reports and good memory of managers. In summary, the above inadequacy in tools and their inappropriateness for proper measurement of result indicates that RBME system is not in place. Besides, non-utilization of M&E data for decision making as reflected, affects demand for M&E which also affects RBME system establishment.

The mean of predictors ranging from 3.7-3.8 implies that staff are interested in the subject and are ready to support M&E initiatives although with moderate mean of 3.2-3.4 indicating limited awareness on the availability of M&E policy in the organisation.

Leadership support and RBME system establishment

The study sought to know if AAH-U leadership supports establishment of RBM&E system. Table 2 below describes respondent's opinions;

Table 2: Leadership support and RBME system establishment

	S D	D	NS	A	S A	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Top management support budget votes for M&E activities	2 (2.5%)	9 (11.3%)	28 (35%)	27 (33.8%)	14 (17.5%)	80	3.525	0.993
The M&E function has the support of senior management	3 (3.8%)	7 (8.8%)	24 (30%)	32 (40%)	14 (17.5%)	80	3.587	1.002
All M&E positions on the organizational chart are filled	12 (12%)	14 (17.5%)	28 (35%)	17 (21.3%)	9 (11.3%)	80	2.962	1.206
There is good working relationship between the M&E department and others	4 (5%)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	39 (48.8%)	13 (16.3%)	80	3.562	1.088
Each new staff gets orientation on M&E activities	20 (25%)	15 (18.8%)	7 (8.8%)	29 (36.3%)	9 (11.3%)	80	2.9	1.419

Source: Primary data

Findings from Table 2 show that 51.3% of the respondents agreed that top Management support budget votes for M&E activities while 13.8% disagreed and an equally high 35% were not sure. On the other hand, interview results with key informants revealed that there is

no budget allocated by top management to M&E activities and staffing. AAH-U staff feel that UNHCR is the root cause as expressed by the respondents below;

> *UNHCR has not yet embraced M&E. They are more willing to facilitate than fund it"* [KI 03]. Another one said, *"UNHCR does not appreciate M&E so, the position was removed from the budget. Donor seems not to see the importance of spending money on an M&E officer hence removed the position from the budget* [KI 02].

The above statements imply that UNHCR was not convinced of the relevance of the M&E officer position. This could explain why it is the mangers currently shouldering the role of M&E. Having no budget for M&E means that M&E activities must be done alongside other programme activities thus attracting secondary priority.

On the question whether the M&E function has the support of senior management, 57.5% of the respondents agreed while 12.6% disagreed and 30% were not sure. Unfortunately, members of senior management disagree, arguing that AAH-U's acceptance to remove M&E position shows no support for M&E initiatives as stated below;

> New ideas that were brought in by the then M&E officer was not supported. Even his presentations were rubbished, hence not motivated. [KI 04].

Another one echoed that,

> The then Country Director would have supported M&E initiatives, but he has been transferred to Nairobi office. He had more interest in it. [KI 02].

It implies that senior management is aware of the internal strength and weaknesses in M&E, and that there is limited support and willingness to build a robust M&E system. It is not surprising therefore that M&E position on organisational chart are not filled. Even if 32.6% of the respondents agreed that the positions are filled, this could be because staff have limited knowledge in M&E content as well as limited information regarding the organisational chart and budgets. However, this could also point at the inadequacies of the M&E officer by technically failing to showcase benefits of M&E to win senior management and UNHCR support.

Concerning good working relationship between the M&E department and others, findings indicated that 65.1% of the respondents agreed while 17% disagree and only 12% were not sure. This is supported by the cordial relationship seen during data collection although staff complained about difficulty in data collection. Lastly on whether each new staff gets orientation on M&E activities, results revealed that 37.6% of the respondents agreed while 43.8% disagreed and only 8.8% were not sure. In support of this disagreement, a respondent states that; *"staff orientation is done but not specifically on M&E activities. It is just a general orientation for the organizational environment and on specific tasks of each staff at sector level"*. [KI 01]. Likewise, the HR policy on staff capacity and development says; "*The purpose of staff orientation will be to provide new staff with suitable information on the history, objectives and activities of AAH-I"*. [pg. 24]

Additionally, most mean of the predictors lay within 3.5 indicating that the level of support for RBME system establishment is high within AAH-U top management.

Knowledge of M&E by Leaders and RBME system establishment

This section presents the level of agreement of respondents on leaders' M&E knowledge.

Table 3: M&E Knowledge and RBME system establishment

	S D	D	N S	A	S A	N	Mean	Std. Devn
The head of program has technical knowledge to support M&E work	2 (2.5%)	6 (7.5%)	33 (41.3%)	26 (32.5%)	13 (16.3%)	80	3.525	0.940
M&E tools are understood by senior management	2 (2.5%)	7 (8.8%)	33 (41.3%)	25 (31.3%)	13 (16.3%)	80	3.5	0.954
Staff know the benefit of having RBM&E System	1 (1.3%)	11 (13.8%)	24 (30%)	30 (37.5%)	14 (17.5%)	80	3.5625	0.978
Management and coordinators have acquired M&E knowledge	3 (3.8%)	12 (15%)	25 (31.3%)	27 (33.8%)	13 (16.3%)	80	3.4375	1.053
M&E tools and guide reflect organizational mission and vision	1 (1.3%)	4 (5%)	25 (31.3%)	39 (48.8%)	11 (13.8%)	80	3.6875	0.820

Source: Primary data 2017

Empirical findings revealed that 48.8% of the respondents agreed that the head of program has technical knowledge to support M&E work while 10% disagreed. Respondents from key informants support the above but confessed that they only have general knowledge in M&E.

> Leaders have ordinary M&E knowledge except the M&E system establishment has not been prioritized for reasons I cannot explain, but maybe because it is a new concept". [KI 05].

Another staff echoes that

> Leaders are knowledgeable about M&E but lack interest in M&E. They always hire external specialists for assessments. [KI 01].

Furthermore, another key informant adds that;

> I see leaders knowledgeable, but I have not seen it articulated and translated into a built system. [KI 03]

The above verbatims imply that management is not aware that establishing an RBME system requires more technical knowledge, but it also shows that other factors including political will to motivate, organizational culture and capacity are also required to have a complete drive. AAH-U leaders have adequate program management knowledge and ordinary M&E knowledge which couldn't translate into establishing an RBME system. It seems more emphasis was put on program coordination work but not technical M&E.

Similarly results indicate that 47.6% of the respondents agreed that M&E tools are understood by senior staff while 11.3% disagreed. Findings from document review support this result because the researcher was able to see each sector having data collection tools that have been used periodically. When asked if staff know the benefit of having RBM&E system 50.1% of the respondents agreed while15.1% disagreed that and a high 37.5% were not sure. This means that there is limited appreciation of the function of M&E in the organisation and possibly there is lack of knowledge about M&E among staff members. Concerning the question if Management and coordinators have acquired M&E knowledge, results reveal that 50.1% of the respondents agreed that while 18.8% disagreed and 31.3% were not sure. Staff members seem to have high confidence in their supervisor's competencies. However, this knowledge as stated before is a general knowledge which may not translate into creation of an RBME system.

Meanwhile 62.6% of the respondents agreed that M&E tools and guide reflect organizational mission and vision while only 6.3% disagreed and 31.3% were not sure. Majority of the staff are aware of their mission and vision statements and appreciate that the tools used are in line with the business of the organisation. Those who were not sure could be lower operational staff that have not even read such documents.

To support the above descriptive statistics further, mean of the predictors ranging from 3.5 – 3.9 were generated. This imply that there is a better understanding of M&E and establishment of RBME system among the senior management and the staff of AAH-U.

Motivation for M&E and RBME system establishment

This section presents the level of agreement of respondents on motivation for M&E system establishment

Table 4: Motivation for M&E and RBME system establishment

	S D	D	N S	A	S A	N	Mean	Std. Devn
Managers deliver positive messages	7 (8.8%)	13 (16.3%)	16 (20%)	29 (36.3%)	15 (18.8%)	80	3.4	1.218
Management Team demands for M&E Reports	4 (5%)	10 (12.5%)	12 (15%)	39 (48.8%)	15 (18.8%)	80	3.637	1.082
The Organization utilizes M&E reports for decision making	3(3.8%)	9 (11.3%)	28 (35%)	22 (27.5%)	18 (22.5%)	80	3.537	1.078
Salary and allowances for M&E staff encourages performance	17 (21.3%)	12 (15%)	22 (27.5%)	19 (23.8%)	10 (12.5%)	80	2.912	1.323
Financial system of the organization is linked to M&E reports	13 (16.3%)	5 (6.3%)	31 (38.8%)	19 (23.8%)	12 (15%)	80	3.15	1.243

Source: Primary data

Results indicate that 67.6% of the respondents agreed that Management Team demands for M&E Reports while 17.5% disagreed and 15% were not sure. 50% of respondents agreed that the reports facilitate decision making while 15% disagreed and 35% were not sure. Following the removal of the M&E position, staff submit reports individually to management, signifying that management demand reports. Document review of reports revealed that there were no indicator-based periodic statistical M&E reports from which key decisions can be made, but there were mostly general field activity reports. Some members of senior management confessed that accurate documentation is a challenge due to lack of database linking M&E reports to finance and HR departments. With this background and without a dedicated M&E staff to sieve information from the general reports and inform the various departments, the above view of respondents is not supported.

Meanwhile, about salary and allowances for M&E encouraging performance, only a slight 36.5% of respondents disagreed, 36.1 agreed and 27.5% were not sure implying that the staff were unsatisfied with the general remuneration. This disagreement is reflected in one of the interviews with members of management thus;

> Finance affects recruitment and focus on monitoring and evaluation because AAH does not have adequate funds to hire and motivate the right people. Lack of adequate budget for M&E affects establishment of RBM&E system. AAH does not have money to properly fund M&E activities [KI 03].

In support of the earlier finding that financial inputs are linked to performance outcomes, 38.8% of the respondents agreed that the organization's finance system is linked to M&E reports while 22.6% disagreed and but also a slightly high 38.8% were not sure. This implies that staff believe that financial decisions are motivated by performance.

To support this finding further, the above mean predictors ranging from 2.9-3.4 indicate that there is a weak support for M&E personnel leading to poor motivation among the staff, implying that AAH-U leadership style has contributed to setbacks in the establishment of RBME system.

Correlation analysis between leadership champion and RBME system establishment

Table 5 shows the findings of the Pearson (*r*) correlation analysis to establish the direction of relationship between leadership and RBME system establishment.

Table 5: Correlation findings

		Leadership support	M&E Knowledge	Motivation for M&E	RBME system establishment
Leadership support	Pearson Correlation	1	.477**	.419**	.325**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.003
	N	80	80	80	80
M&E Knowledge	Pearson Correlation	.477**	1	.536**	.523**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	80	80	80	80
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.419**	.536**	1	.359**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.001
	N	80	80	80	80
RBME system establishment	Pearson Correlation	.325**	.523**	.359**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000	.001	
	N	80	80	80	80
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

Source: Primary data

From the table above, Pearson correlation; 0.477**, 0.419** and 0.325** ($p< 0.01$) are less than 0.05, implying that any change in leadership championship leads to a change in RBME system establishment, thus if AAH-U changes their leadership support, motivation and leadership knowledge in M&E, the organization may register better results for impact and become more relevant and sustainable as is the focus of RBME system establishment.

Regression analysis to assess the impact of leadership championship on RBME system establishment

Table 6: Model summary of existence of leadership champions and RBME system establishment

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.736[a]	.542	.536	.46400
Predictors: (Constant), Existence of leadership champions				

The model summary in table 6 above shows adjusted R^2 value of 0.536 between existence of leadership champions and RBME system establishment which is suggesting that the mentioned factor predicted 53.6% of the variance in RBME system establishment. The adjusted $R^2 = 0.536$ and the standard error of the estimate 0. 46400 suggested that leadership support, leadership knowledge in M&E and leadership motivation were significant predictors of RBME system establishment in AAH-U.

Basing on the above adjusted R^2 value of 0.536 and the Pearson correlation coefficients; 0.325, 0.523 and 0.359 ($P< 0.03, 0.01$) being less than 0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative that there is a significant linear relationship between leadership championship and RBME system establishment.

Discussion of findings

There is no RBME system in place. Only programme activity monitoring plan, a PM&E guide and some basic data collection tools to record daily activities exist to perform a likeness of M&E activity.

Leadership championship and RBME system establishment

Findings revealed that senior management had the support of M&E function and that they had also supported budget for the same, but the support dwindled, evidenced by removal of the M&E position. This followed transfer of one of the champions to Nairobi regional office. The failure to see relevance of M&E position by the management staff, coupled with poor attitudes from the donor towards funding M&E position worsened the situation further as Bass (1985) opined in the transformational leadership theory that failure by leaders and followers to pursue their objectives jointly with moral and motivation affects focus on the desired change. During an interview with UNHCR staff, they said they did not see the difference made by the M&E staff hence reluctant to support budget for such a position. As of now management is reluctant in requesting and defending funds for M&E positions. Hence no M&E person to spearhead M&E work because results revealed that the available AAH-U staff have general basic M&E knowledge and each staff is focused on their respective primary departmental work. This is a huge disincentive for establishment of RBME system. Zhou et al., (2013) concurs that this kind of environment cripples efforts for RBME utilization. Busjeet, (2012) states that lack of leadership support in Bangladesh failed their efforts in monitoring and

evaluation. The above revelation indicates that establishment of the system could not have suffered to the current extent if the then director who was seen to have interest in M&E had not been shifted to Nairobi office. He could have employed intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation and individual consideration in AAH-U to encourage and motivate for RBME system establishment. The establishment of M&E system in humanitarian NGOs is embedded in their political economy i.e. their ability of the leaders to mobilise funding for the M&E function and the demand of M&E reports by the donors.

Knowledge of leaders in M&E

The senior management and sector coordinators acquired M&E knowledge and now have general knowledge, but it does not suffice to guide the team to establish RBME system. Although, generally, the staff claim to understand the benefit of having a functional M&E system in place, deficiency in technical M&E knowledge for champions does not provide a good environment for establishing a results-based system. According to Kusek et al., (2004) a champion has to have technical knowledge in RBME to be able to effectively lead and guide for RBME system establishment. He shares that lack of knowledge in M&E among the-would-be Romanian champions failed the establishment. Gorgens et al., (2009) also agrees that knowledgeable champions impact positively on M&E efforts but he cautions that it must be institutionalized to avoid sabotage by malicious middle officers. This fouls AAH-U because the study revealed that that HR and finance systems are not synchronized with M&E efforts. It's already clear that lack of leadership champions has significantly affected M&E efforts at AAH-U as seen in the previous paragraph. It can only be added that the level of M&E knowledge of the AAH-U leaders also seems to have contributed to the non-establishment of the RBME system. The push for the establishment of M&E system in the organisation does not only happen because of the existence of knowledgeable leaders in an organisation. Monitoring and evaluation is a technical field and therefore requires technical input into the design and operationalisation of the system.

M&E Motivation by leaders

Managers motivate the staff well in M&E related work. This includes delivering positive messages towards good performance and also through demand for reports although financial incentives do not offer positive motivation for M&E work. In a similar unfortunate way, findings revealed that AAH-U did not utilize the few M&E reports produced by the short-lived office for financial and HR decision making. This is contrary to guidance from RBME authorities like Kusek and Gorgens who emphasize the importance of financial motivation.

Generally, findings also revealed that a good percentage of staff are not aware in management processes and monitoring and evaluation issues, indicated by the high frequency of "Not sure" responses. This implies the level of empowerment and capacity building in those areas is weak.

Conclusions

In line with the study question, the findings indicate that existence of leadership champions positively and significantly affects establishment of RBME system. The short-lived M&E office did not impress the AAH-U and UNHCR and the AAH-U failed to operationalize tools and strategies developed by the Nairobi regional office and to develop its own M&E tools largely due to other intervening factors like financial and technical human capacity as well as organizational culture. Absence of functional M&E system is thus largely attributed to low appreciation of M&E skills and training across personnel at the organization's leadership and staff level.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of this study necessitate that AAH-U ensures that organizational leadership is technically skilled to guide and champion implementation of RBME at AAH-U.

Additionally, AAH-U should ensure that staff are technically knowledgeable and experienced in M&E to appreciate the instructions of organization leadership.

AAH-U should mobilize adequate financial resources required to effectively implement M&E systems and to attract and retain competent M&E personnel.

AAH-U should join other stakeholders in M&E to widely advocate for utilization of M&E systems across organizations so that M&E and its benefits are appreciated by all potential users.

References

Amin, A.E. (2005). *Social Science research, conception, methodology and analysis*. Kampala: Makerere University Printer.

Bass & Bass (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: theory, research, and managerial applications (4th edition).* New York: Free Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Busjeet, G. (2012). *The State Results-Based Management System of Minas Gerais*. Brazil. World Bank. Retrieved from https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/11050

Caiden, N. (2003). Public Service Professionalism for Performance Measurement and Evaluation. *Public Budgeting & Finance, 18*(2), 35-52. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0275-1100.1998.01133.x

Cousins, J.B. (2005). *Theory and practice: participatory evaluation enhancing evaluation use and IUCN.* The World conservation union, Global monitoring and evaluation initiatives.

Crawford, C.B., Gould, L.V., & Scott, R.F. (2003) Transformational leader as champion and techie: implications for leadership educators. *Journal of Leadership education, 2*(1), 58-59.

Epstein, J., & Olsen, R. T. (1996). Lessons learned by state and local governments. *The Public Manager,25*(3), 41-44.

Ernest, M. M. (2013). *Human capacity challenges in the implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system.* (Unpublished Thesis). University of the Witwatersrand.

Frerks, G., & Hilhorst, D. (2002). *Evaluation of humanitarian assistance in emergency situations.* New Issues in Refugee Research UNHCR/EPAU. Retrieved from https://www.alnap.org/help-library/evaluation-of-humanitarian-assistance-in-emergency-situations-working-paper-56

Gephart, M. (2016). Strategic organizational learning using system dynamics for sustained performance. *The Learning Organization, 24*(3), 198-200. https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-01-2017-0008

Goldratt, E.M. (1986).The goal: a process of on-going improvement. *International Journal of Production Research, 44*(2), 419-420.

Görgens, G., & Kusek, J. Z. (2009). *Making monitoring and evaluation systems work***:** a *capacity development toolkit.* Washington DC: World Bank. Retrieved from https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2702

Hardlife,Z &Zhou, G. (2008). Utilization of monitoring and evaluation systems by development agencies: the case of the UNDP in Zimbabwe. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 3*(3), 70-83.

Imas, M.G.R., & Rist, R.C. (2009). *Road to results*: *designing and conducting effective development evaluations.* Washington DC: The World Bank.

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. (2011). *Project monitoring and evaluation guide*. Geneva: IFRC.

Knox-Clarke, P. (2013). *Who's in charge here? A literature review of approaches to leadership in humanitarian operations.* London: Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance.

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). *Determining sample size for research activities. educational and psychological measurement.* Minnesota: Texas A&M University

Kusek, J., and Rist, R. (2004). *10 Steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system: a handbook for development practitioners*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Lennie, J., & Tacchi, J. (2015). A holistic, learning-centred approach to building evaluation capacity in development organizations. *Evaluation, 21*(3), 325-343.

Mackay, K. (2007). *How to build M&E systems to support better government.* Washington DC: World Bank.

Mebrahtu, E. (2002). Perceptions and practices of monitoring and evaluation: international NGO experiences in Ethiopia. *Development in Practice, 12*(3), 501-517. DOI: 10.1080/0961450220149645a

Menghetti, A. (2003). *Humanitarian Action: Improving Monitoring to enhance accountability and learning*. ALNAP. https://www.alnap.org/help-library/alnap-annual-review

Mugenda, O., & Mugenda, A. (1999). *Research Methods*: *Quantitative and Qualitative Approach.* Nairobi: African Center for Technology Studies.

Muraguri, M. R. (2004)**.** *The transfer of results-based management (RBM) to the trees and markets (T&M) at the World Tree Centre*. (PhD Dissertation, University of Illinois, USA)**.**

Ndikumana, L. (2012). *Applying evaluation to development and aid: can evaluation bridge the micro-macro gaps in aid effectiveness?* Massachusetts: Political Economy Research Institute.

OECD/DAC. (2002). *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. OEDC. https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/glossaryofkeytermsinevaluationandresultsbasedmanagement.htm

Pérez, S.L., José, M., Peón, M., Camilo, J., & Vazquez, O. (2005). Organizational learning as a determining factor in business performance. *The Learning Organization*, *12*(3), 227-245.

Pfeffer, J. (1998). Seven practices of successful organizations. *California Management Review, 40*(2), 96-124.

Scriven, K., & Buchanan, S. (2011). *Leadership in Action: Leading Effectively in Humanitarian Operations.* London: Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP).

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: a skill building approach.* Sussex UK: Wiley

Strauss, J., & Thomas, D. (1998). Health, Nutrition, and Economic Development. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *36*(2), 766-817.

Tarsilla, M. (2014). Evaluation capacity development in Africa: Current landscape of international partners' initiatives, lessons learned and the way forward. *African Evaluation Journal, 2*(1), 13-13. doi: https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v2i1.89.

Tongco, M.D.C. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *A Journal for Plant, People and Applied Research*, *5*(1), 147-158.

Twendembele (2018). Using M&E to improve Government performance and accountability. UKaid. http://www.twendembele.org/reports/at-a-glance-6-countries-nes

UNAIDS, (2009). *12 components monitoring and evaluation system strengthening tool*. Geneva: UNAIDS.

Yukl, G. (1989) Managerial leadership; a review of theory and research. *Journal of management, 15*(2), 273-275.