

Assessing the Effects of Organizational Readiness on the Implementation of Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System in International NGOs: A Case of Compassion International-Uganda

Andrew Job Okullo Awany¹, David Ssekamatte² and Gerald Kagambirwe Karyeija³

¹Busara Centre for Behavioral Economics, Kampala

²Department of Management, Uganda Management Institute

³School of Management Sciences, Uganda Management Institute

DOI: 10.46609/IJSSER.2024.v09i08.006 URL: <https://doi.org/10.46609/IJSSER.2024.v09i08.006>

Received: 7 July 2024 / Accepted: 10 August 2024 / Published: 15 August 2024

ABSTRACT

*This study delves into the dynamics of commitment, change efficacy, and their correlation with the implementation of Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) at Compassion International, Uganda. Employing a cross-sectional survey design with a sample size of 69 participants, the research aimed to elucidate the relationships between commitment, change efficacy, and the successful execution of RBME initiatives. The major research instruments include questionnaires and interview guide. The findings reveal positive and statistically significant associations between commitment and RBME implementation ($r = .329^{**}$, $p = .000$) and between change efficacy and RBME implementation ($r = .268^{**}$, $p = .000$). The study underscores the pivotal role of commitment in effective RBME implementation, aligning with theoretical perspectives emphasizing commitment's significance in organizational change. Similarly, the research highlights the practical importance of change efficacy, urging organizations to prioritize strategies that bolster employees' confidence and competence in implementing monitoring and evaluation systems. To enhance RBME practices, recommendations include fostering transparent communication, active leadership engagement, employee involvement in decision-making, and providing training opportunities. Establishing clear expectations, securing leadership support, instituting feedback mechanisms, and creating a collaborative decision-making environment emerge as crucial strategies.*

Keywords: Organizational readiness, change commitment, change efficacy, Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation.

1. Introduction and background

For more than four decades, international non-government organizations (INGOs) have been pivotal in Uganda, addressing gaps in communities where government services are limited (Ocen, et al. 2022). They actively provide educational opportunities, basic health services, food, water, sanitation, and human rights to the "unserved". INGOs utilize Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) mechanisms for transparency and accountability (Achuka, 2019). However, changes on a global scale impact INGO operations, prompting the timely adoption of Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME). The swift implementation of RBME caught many INGOs off-guard, lacking committed human resources and dedicated financing. Previous research on RBME explored success factors, readiness, and implementation in NGOs, but did not measure readiness in terms of commitment or change efficacy (Ahmed, 2013; Nyamupachitu, 2018; Anyidi & Namara, 2019). This study, guided by Weiner's theory of organizational readiness (Weiner, 2009), investigates the impact of organizational readiness, specifically change commitment and change efficacy, on RBME implementation at Compassion International, Uganda.

The roots of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) trace back to ancient times when Egyptians used it for recording crop and livestock yields (Nalubega & Uwizeyimana, 2019). In the 20th century, high-income countries like the United States, European Union, and Japan engaged in traditional M&E to monitor manpower and economic systems (Thomas et al. 2021). However, limitations in traditional M&E, including a lack of timely feedback, led high-income countries to embrace Results-Based M&E for improved decision-making and governance (Adhikari, et al., 2023). In Africa, successful implementation of results-based M&E faces challenges due to a lack of strong evaluation principles, especially in the public sector, marked by high corruption levels and accountability issues (Chirau, et al., 2022). Uganda, like other sub-Saharan African countries, grapples with challenges in coordinating and managing monitoring and evaluation systems, as seen in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) (Rutagwabeyi, 2022). This necessitated the adoption of a results-based M&E system integrated with decision-making practices and incentives supporting national development systems.

In Uganda, RBME is not a new concept, but its gradual implementation across government ministries and NGOs faces challenges. The emphasis on outcome and results-focused ME, driven by the relevance of results-based systems in governance and project deliveries, places NGOs, including Compassion International Uganda, under scrutiny for accountability. Donors and project beneficiaries demand evidence-based results, compelling NGOs to develop comprehensive monitoring and evaluation systems. Against this backdrop, the researchers explored the relationship between commitment and change efficacy and the implementation of Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation at Compassion International, Uganda.

The objectives that guided the study included:

- 1) To determine the relationship between commitment and the implementation of Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation at Compassion International, Uganda;
- 2) To determine the relationship between change efficacy and the implementation of Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation at Compassion International, Uganda.

2. Literature Review

The OECD (2002a) defines monitoring and evaluation as an ongoing process. Monitoring involves systematically collecting data on specified indicators to offer continuous feedback to management and key stakeholders during a development intervention. It provides insights into the progress, achievement of objectives, and the utilization of allocated funds. Evaluation, on the other hand, is a methodical and impartial assessment of an ongoing or completed project, programme, or policy. It encompasses examination of design, implementation, and outcomes to determine relevance, objective fulfilment, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The goal is to provide credible and useful information, facilitating the incorporation of lessons learned into decision-making for both recipients and donors.

Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBM&E) is a public management instrument used for continuously monitoring progress and assessing the impact of a specific project, policy, or programme (Kusek & Rist, 2004). RBM&E can also be applied to evaluate the performance of an institution, programme, or project concerning the significance and anticipated impacts it is expected to generate (Khan, 2001). The Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBM&E) approach empowers non-governmental organizations to shift their focus from merely spending to actively monitor performance and evaluate long-term results instead of short-term outputs. Additionally, an RBM&E system enables efficient ongoing assessments for management to gauge progress towards achieving organizational goals and satisfying stakeholders (Rist, Kusek & White, 2005). RBM&E serves as a potent tool in public management, aiding policymakers and decision-makers in tracking progress and showcasing the impact of projects, programmes, or policies. It diverges from traditional implementation-focused Monitoring and Evaluation by emphasizing outcomes and impacts rather than inputs and outputs (Clements, 2005). RBM&E systems address the crucial "so what" question, providing feedback on the actual outcomes and goals of government actions (Kimathi, 2015).

Oreg, Bartunek, Lee, and Do (2018) assert that commitment to change involves a belief guiding individuals to engage in actions they affirm as essential for the positive execution of a change initiative. This form of reasoning reflects an individual's beliefs about the necessity of change. Despite the vital role of organizational readiness for change in maintaining competitiveness,

some scholars argue that numerous change initiatives fail (Burnes, 2011). The primary reason for these failures is often attributed to the lack of commitment among individuals toward change (Lee, Sharif, Scandura, & Kim, 2017). The deficiency in commitment to change frequently stems from an underestimation of its importance by change initiators. Lee et al. (2017) demonstrated that higher levels of employees' commitment to change contribute to more successful implementation of change initiatives.

According to Cinite and Duxbury (2018), change commitment is entirely dependent on change valence, serving as a gauge of whether employees hold a positive attitude toward an upcoming change. For example, employees ponder if they deem the change necessary at the moment. If employees perceive the change as worthwhile, they are more likely to actively participate in its implementation. Change valence has become a contentious subject among researchers, questioning its hypothetical consistency in influencing readiness for change (Nevers & Schyns, 2018). Jaros (2010) outlines reasons why employees might consider a planned organizational change, including perceiving urgency, solving organizational problems, anticipating personal benefits, aligning with core values, and having support from managers, opinion leaders, and peers. Choi and Ruona (2011) argue that the reasons employees provide for organizational change should not be automatically interpreted as indicative of organizational readiness to implement change. Foster (2010), on the other hand, clarifies that change valence resulting from varying motives can be just as influential a factor in change commitment as valence stemming from commonly shared motives. In the context of organizational readiness, the crucial question is whether employees collectively view the change as significant enough to actively participate in its implementation.

As observed by Gist and Michell (1992), efficacy represents a comprehensive evaluation of the perceived ability to perform a task. When forming judgements of change efficacy, members of an organization engage in acquiring, sharing, assimilating, and integrating information, addressing three fundamental questions: Do we understand what is required for the effective implementation of this change? Do we possess the necessary resources for successful implementation? and, can we effectively carry out this change given the current situation? The capability to implement is influenced by the understanding of required actions, resource needs, time considerations, and the sequencing of activities.

In addition to assessing knowledge of task demands, organizational members also mentally evaluate the alignment between task demands and available resources. This involves appraising whether the organization possesses the human, financial, material, and informational resources essential for successful change implementation. Furthermore, situational factors such as time constraints and internal political support are considered. When organizational members collectively hold a positive assessment of task demands, resource availability, and situational

factors, there is a shared confidence that they can successfully implement a complex organizational change, indicating high change efficacy.

According to Beck and Schmidt (2018), change efficacy involves employees' mental judgements concerning three contributing factors to implementation competence: job demands, resource availability, and situational factors. Similarly, Richard et al. (2017) assert that efficacy is a holistic assessment of the purported capacity to accomplish a task. In the context of change efficacy judgements, employees inquire about the knowledge, resources, and capability required for successful change implementation. Moreover, Aarons, Hurlburt, and Horwitz (2011) emphasize that employees may cognitively evaluate the relationship between job demands and the accessibility of resources, considering factors such as competent staff, material, financial resources, time availability, and the political environment. When there is a collective positive assessment of job demands, resource accessibility, and time factors, employees develop a sense of confidence that they can implement a multifaceted organizational change.

Musubira (2017) highlights change efficacy as a predictor of implementation, emphasizing the importance of employees' perspectives and emotional states toward change. Steyn (2011) supports this view, suggesting that change readiness is achieved through rational thinking and a positive attitude among employees. The model proposes that readiness for change increases when employees believe the change is desirable, justified, and proper, and when there is confidence that the change will be valuable for both individuals and the institution.

3. Methods and Materials

3.1 Research design

This research employed a concurrent triangulation mixed methods design, allowing the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data to inform the findings. The design was chosen for its efficiency in providing information promptly. The design involved the collection of both data sets at the same time, ensuring validation of findings from one data set to the other.

3.2 Population and sampling

The study focused on the entire staff population of Compassion International, Uganda, totaling 103 individuals, as outlined in the Human Resource Report (2017). The staff encompassed top managers, technical/specialist staff, and other support staff. Employing Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table, the sample size was determined, indicating 86 participants for a population size of 103. However, 69 questionnaires were retrieved, resulting in an 80% response rate.

3.3 Data generation methods

The data was generated using the survey method and semi-structured in-depth interviews. The survey was chosen for data collection due to its effectiveness in describing characteristics within a large population. Closed-ended questionnaires were utilized to gather information from respondents, a method justified by Kothari (2009) for its ability to reach a large sample, cover a wide geographical area quickly, and focus solely on variables of interest.

3.4 Data analysis

Data analysis involved descriptive and inferential statistics with the help of the SPSS software. Descriptive analysis provided insights into commitment, change efficacy, and RBME system implementation in terms of frequencies, percentages, mean, and standard deviations. Additionally, linear correlational analysis was employed to assess the strength of the association between commitment and RBME implementation, as well as change efficacy and RBME system implementation, with a significance level set at 0.05.

4. Key findings

Objective 1: The relationship between commitment and the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at compassion international, Uganda

Table 1.1: Descriptive Statistics for commitment

Commitment	F (%)	SD	D	NS	A	SA	Mean	Std.
We are determined to implement the M&E at this organization.	F (%)	1 1.4%	2 2.9%	4 4.8%	30 43.5%	32 46.4%	4.30	0.828
We want to implement this change at the organization.	F (%)	1 1.4%	9 13.0%	0 0.0%	27 39.1%	32 46.4%	4.29	0.806
We are committed to implementing the M&E at this organization.	F (%)	1 1.4%	2 2.9%	6 8.7%	28 40.6%	32 46.4%	4.28	0.856
We will do whatever it takes to implement the M&E at this	F (%)	1 1.4%	4 5.8%	14 20.3%	22 31.9%	28 40.6%	4.04	0.992

organization.								
We are motivated to implement the M&E at this organization.	F (%)	1 1.4%	7 10.1%	11 15.9%	27 39.1%	23 33.3%	3.93	1.019
Average mean							4.17	0.900

Source: primary data, 2019

The data presented in Table 1.1 indicates a high level of commitment among Compassion's staff towards the implementation of a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) system, with an average mean of 4.17 and a standard deviation of 0.900. This heightened commitment is linked to the fact that a majority (46.4%) of respondents expressed strong agreement regarding their motivation (mean = 4.30, Std. = 0.828), unwavering commitment to taking necessary actions (mean = 4.29, Std. = 0.806), and dedication to implementing the RBME (mean = 4.28, Std. = 0.856). Additionally, a significant portion (40.6%) strongly agreed that they desired to implement this organizational change (mean = 4.04, Std. = 0.992). On a related note, 39.1% of respondents agreed that they were determined to implement the RBME at the organization, reflected in a mean score of 3.93 and a standard deviation of 1.019.

The findings suggest a robust and positive organizational culture at Compassion International, characterized by high levels of motivation, commitment, dedication, and a desire for change among the staff regarding the RBME implementation. The identified determination, while slightly lower, still signifies a substantial commitment to the initiative. These positive attitudes bode well for the successful integration and sustained adoption of the RBME system within the organization. Continuous support, communication, and recognition of staff commitment are essential to maintain this positive momentum throughout the implementation process.

Furthermore, the researcher conducted interviews with key interview informants (Director and Manager) regarding the commitment of staff members towards the implementation of RBME. Specifically, the researcher asked this question: How would you describe the commitment of the employees towards the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation in this organization? Their responses were summarized as below:

I am pleased to say that the commitment of our employees towards the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation (RBME) is truly commendable. We have seen a high level of dedication and enthusiasm among our staff members. They understand the importance of RBME in enhancing our programs and ensuring accountability. Many have voluntarily engaged

in training sessions to strengthen their understanding, and we often witness proactive initiatives from various teams to contribute to the success of RBME. This commitment is not only a reflection of their professionalism but also their belief in the positive impact RBME can have on our organization's outcomes (KII-01;).

Furthermore, a key interview informant mentioned that:

I can confidently state that our employees' commitment to the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation is a cornerstone of our organizational culture. The level of dedication we observe is integral to achieving our mission effectively. Team members actively embrace RBME principles, recognizing the value it adds to our programs and, ultimately, the lives we aim to impact. We've implemented communication channels that allow for open discussions about RBME, encouraging feedback and innovative ideas from our employees. Their commitment is not just a responsibility; it's a shared passion to make a meaningful difference through our work (KII-02;).

Overall, the above responses suggest a highly committed, proactive, and mission-driven organizational culture at Compassion International, setting a strong foundation for the successful implementation and continued effectiveness of RBME initiatives. The workforce's shared passion and understanding of RBME's importance underscore the potential for sustained positive outcomes within the organization.

Furthermore, the researcher asked the key interview informants regarding their readiness to implement the RBME. Specifically, the researcher asked this question: In your own understanding, how ready do you think the employees are to implement the results-based monitoring and evaluation system in this organization? Their responses were summarized as below:

From my perspective, I believe the employees at Compassion International are quite ready to implement the results-based monitoring and evaluation system. There's a general awareness and excitement among my colleagues about the positive impact RBME can have on our programs. Many have attended training sessions voluntarily, showing a proactive approach to understanding the system. Overall, there's a sense of commitment and a belief that implementing RBME is crucial for enhancing the effectiveness of our projects (KII-01;).

Furthermore, a key interview informant mentioned that:

Overseeing various teams, I can confidently say that our employees are well-prepared for the implementation of the results-based monitoring and evaluation system. We've conducted

comprehensive training programs to equip them with the necessary skills and knowledge. The enthusiasm I see among the teams is remarkable. They understand the importance of RBME in achieving our organizational goals and ensuring accountability. I've observed teams actively engaging in discussions and sharing ideas on how to seamlessly integrate RBME into their daily workflows (KII-02;).

Additionally, a key interview informant stated that:

Having been part of several team discussions, I can say that the readiness among employees is quite high. There's a genuine interest in aligning our work with the RBME principles. Many of us see it as an opportunity to improve the quality of our projects and better serve the beneficiaries. The openness to learning and adapting to new approaches is evident, and I believe this readiness will positively impact the successful implementation of RBME within the organization (KII-03;).

Moreover, a key interview informant cited that:

I have observed a high level of readiness among our employees to embrace the results-based monitoring and evaluation system. This readiness is not just in terms of technical preparedness but also in the way teams are fostering a culture of collaboration and continuous improvement. The employees understand that RBME is integral to achieving our mission, and their commitment to making a meaningful impact is reflected in their eagerness to implement this system effectively (KII-04;).

The consensus across these interviews paints a vivid picture of a workforce at Compassion International that is not only technically prepared but is also deeply committed, enthusiastic, and aligned with the organizational goals. This collective readiness positions the organization well for the successful implementation of the RBME system, setting the stage for positive outcomes and impactful results.

Table 1.2: Descriptive of Implementation of the Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation

Implementation of RBME	F (%)	SD	D	NS	A	SA	Mean	Std.
Timeliness								
We believe that project team and mgt. will make	F (%)	0.0	1	19	36	13	3.88	0.718
		0.0%	1.4%	27.5%	52.2%	18.8%		

timely decisions.								
We believe that staff concerns will promptly be addressed	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	1 1.4%	30 43.5%	25 36.2%	13 18.8%	3.72	0.784
We believe that the project testing will be done in a timely manner.	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	1 1.4%	30 43.5%	27 39.1%	11 15.9%	3.70	0.754
We believe that the RBME system will be completed in time	F (%)	1 1.4%	6 8.7%	31 44.9%	22 31.9%	9 13.0%	3.46	0.884
We believe that the change has been allocated enough time.	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	9 13%	29 42.0%	24 34.8%	7 10.1%	3.42	0.847
Average mean							3.64	0.797
Completion of Project within Budget								
We believe that the project will be completed on budget.	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	4 5.8%	19 27.5%	32 46.4%	14 20.3%	3.81	0.827
We believe that the project will successfully manage changes to costs	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	7 10.1%	13 18.8%	38 55.1%	11 15.9%	3.77	0.843
We believe that the project budget estimate will not greatly differ from the actual expenditure.	F (%)	1 1.4%	6 8.7%	23 33.3%	30 43.5%	9 13.0%	3.58	0.881
Average mean							3.72	0.850
Quality of Project								

We believe that the project final completion will be of good quality.	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	1 1.4%	16 23.2%	37 53.6%	15 21.7%	3.96	0.716
We believe that project audit will be effective.	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	1 1.4%	13 18.8%	42 60.9%	13 18.8%	3.96	0.716
We believe that the quality assurance process will be effective.	F (%)	1 1.4%	2 2.9%	14 20.3%	36 52.2%	16 23.2%	3.93	0.828
We believe that the project will be efficient in its functionalities.	F (%)	1 1.4%	2 2.9%	13 18.8%	39 56.5%	14 20.3%	3.91	0.800
We believe that the people affected by the project will be satisfied.	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	1 1.4%	19 27.5%	39 56.5%	10 14.5%	3.84	0.678
Average mean							3.92	0.748

Source: primary data, 2019

Timeliness

The findings presented in Table 1.2 indicate that the perception of the timeliness of implementing the Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) at Compassion is assessed as high, with an average mean of 3.64 and a standard deviation of 0.797. This positive assessment is primarily due to the majority (52.2%) of respondents agreeing that they believe the project team and management would make timely decisions concerning RBME, reflected in a mean score of 3.88 and a standard deviation of 0.718. However, there are notable areas of concern among respondents. A significant portion (43.5%) expressed skepticism about the prompt addressing of staff concerns (mean = 3.72, Std = 0.784), and a similar percentage (43.5%) had doubts about the timely execution of project testing (mean = 3.70, Std = 0.754). Correspondingly, 44.9% of respondents expressed hesitation about the timely completion of the RBME system (mean = 3.46, Std = 0.884). Lastly, 42% of respondents indicated uncertainty about whether sufficient time had been allocated for the change (mean = 3.42, Std = 0.847).

While the positive overall perception is encouraging, the identified concerns emphasize the importance of addressing specific aspects related to staff concerns, project testing, timely

completion, and the adequacy of allocated time. Proactive management and clear communication in these areas can contribute to mitigating concerns and ensuring a more seamless and timelier implementation of the RBME at Compassion. Continuous monitoring and strategic adjustments may be necessary to uphold the positive aspects and address the highlighted concerns.

Completion of Project within Budget

The results presented in Table 1.2 portray a positive and optimistic outlook among the staff at Compassion regarding the 'completion of project within budget' for the RBME initiative. The overall assessment, rated as High with an average mean of 3.72 and a standard deviation of 0.850, is underpinned by the respondents' affirmative beliefs. A significant majority, 46.4%, expressed confidence in the project's ability to be completed on budget, yielding a mean score of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.827. Moreover, a substantial 55.1% agreed that they believed the project team would successfully manage changes to costs, with a mean score of 3.77 and a standard deviation of 0.843. Additionally, 43.5% of respondents shared the belief that the project budget estimate would not significantly differ from the actual expenditure, resulting in a mean score of 3.58 and a standard deviation of 0.881.

The positive and optimistic outlook among the staff at Compassion regarding the project's completion within budget has positive implications for the RBME initiative. It indicates a strong foundation of confidence and trust among the staff, which can contribute to smoother project implementation, effective financial management, and potentially successful outcomes for the RBME initiative. This positive sentiment may also foster a conducive working environment, enhancing collaboration and commitment among team members. However, continuous monitoring and proactive management of the project's financial aspects will be crucial to ensuring that this positive outlook translates into successful budget adherence throughout the implementation process.

Quality of Project

The findings presented in Table 1.2 indicate a high assessment of the 'quality of the project' by respondents, with an average mean of 3.92 and a standard deviation of 0.748. This positive evaluation is rooted in several key agreements among the majority of respondents: A significant 53.6% agreed that they believed the project's final completion would be of good quality, resulting in a mean score of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.716. Furthermore, a substantial 60.9% agreed that they believed the project audit would be effective, reflected in a mean score of 3.96 and a standard deviation of 0.716. Similarly, 52.2% agreed that they believed the quality assurance process would be effective, with a mean score of 3.93 and a standard deviation of 0.828. Additionally, 56.5% agreed that they believed the project would be efficient in its

functionalities, yielding a mean score of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.800. Lastly, 56.5% agreed that they believed the people affected by the project would be satisfied, resulting in a mean score of 3.84 and a standard deviation of 0.678.

The findings suggest an overall positive perception and confidence among respondents regarding the quality, effectiveness, and satisfaction outcomes associated with the RBME project. This positive outlook bodes well for the success and impact of the initiative, emphasizing the importance of maintaining and further enhancing the perceived quality standards throughout the project's lifecycle. Continuous monitoring, adherence to quality assurance processes, and stakeholder engagement will be vital to sustaining this positive perception.

Table 1.3: The Relationship Between Commitment and the Implementation of Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation at Compassion International, Uganda

Correlations			
		Commitment	Implementation of RBME
Commitment	Pearson Correlation	1	.329**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	69	69
Implementation of RBME	Pearson Correlation	.329**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	69	69

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 1.3 shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between commitment and the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at Compassion International, Uganda ($r = .329^{**}$, $p = .000$). The correlation coefficient ($r = .329$) suggests a moderate positive association, and the p-value ($p = .000$) is less than the conventional significance level of 0.05, indicating that the observed relationship is unlikely to have occurred by chance.

The null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between commitment and the implementation of RBME at Compassion International in Uganda. However, based on this finding, it was reasonable to reject the null hypothesis, as the statistical evidence supports the presence of a positive relationship between commitment and the implementation of RBME at

Compassion International in Uganda. This suggests that higher levels of commitment among individuals or within the organization are associated with a more successful implementation of RBME practices. The practical implication may be that fostering and enhancing commitment could be a beneficial strategy for improving the effectiveness of RBME initiatives within the organization in Uganda.

Objective 2: The relationship between change efficacy and the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at compassion international, Uganda

Table 1.4: Descriptive statistics of Change Efficacy

Change Efficacy	F (%)	SD	D	NS	A	SA	Mean	Std.
We can coordinate tasks so that implementation goes smoothly.	F (%)	1 1.4%	0.0 0.0%	6 8.7%	43 62.3%	19 27.5%	4.14	0.692
We can get people interested in implementing this change.	F (%)	1 1.4%	0.0 0.0%	15 21.7%	31 44.9%	22 31.9%	4.06	0.820
We can keep the momentum going into implementing this change.	F (%)	1 1.4%	1 1.4%	9 13.0%	41 59.0%	17 24.6%	4.04	0.756
We can support everyone involved as they adjust to this change.	F (%)	1 1.4%	1 1.4%	15 21.7%	32 46.4%	20 29.0%	4.00	0.840
We can keep track of progress in implementing this change.	F (%)	1 1.4%	1 1.4%	15 21.7%	36 52.2%	16 23.2%	3.94	0.802
We can manage the issues arising out of implementing this change.	F (%)	0.0 0.0%	4 5.8%	18 26.1%	26 37.7%	21 30.4%	3.93	0.896
Average mean							4.02	0.801

Source: primary data, 2019

The findings from Table 1.4 indicate that the respondents have a high level of change efficacy, emphasizing their confidence and capability in facilitating the successful implementation of organizational change. The overall assessment, rated as High with an average mean of 4.02 and a standard deviation of 0.801, is substantiated by several key agreements among the majority of participants: A substantial 62.3% of respondents agreed that they can coordinate tasks to ensure smooth implementation. Almost a half (44.9%) of the respondents agreed that they can get people interested in implementing the change. Additionally, a significant 59% of respondents agreed that they can keep the momentum going into implementing the change. Similarly, 46.4% of respondents agreed that they can support everyone involved as they adjust to the change. Likewise, respondents agreed that they can keep track of progress in implementing the change. Moreover, 37.7% of respondents agreed that they can manage the issues arising from implementing this change.

The high change efficacy reflected in these responses suggests a strong foundation for successful change implementation within the organization. The participants' confidence in their ability to coordinate tasks, generate interest, sustain momentum, provide support, track progress, and manage issues contributes positively to the overall change readiness. This implies that the organization possesses a capable and committed workforce ready to navigate and drive the successful implementation of the proposed change initiative. However, ongoing support, communication, and adaptive strategies will be essential to maintain this positive change efficacy and address any emerging challenges during the implementation process.

Table 1.5: The relationship between change efficacy and the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at compassion international, Uganda

Correlations			
		Change Efficacy	Implementation of RBME
Change Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	.268**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	69	69
Implementation of RBME	Pearson Correlation	.268**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	69	69

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results in Table 1.5 show that there is a positive and significant relationship between change efficacy and implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at Compassion International ($r = .268^{**}$, $p = .000$). The correlation coefficient ($r = .268$) suggests a moderate positive association, and the p-value ($p = .000$) is less than the conventional significance level of 0.05, indicating that the observed relationship is unlikely to have occurred by chance.

The null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between change efficacy and the implementation of RBME at Compassion International. However, based on this finding, it was reasonable to reject the null hypothesis, as the statistical evidence supports the presence of a positive relationship between change efficacy and the implementation of RBME at Compassion International. This suggests that higher levels of change efficacy among individuals or within the organization are associated with a more successful implementation of RBME practices. The practical implication may be that fostering and enhancing change efficacy could be a beneficial strategy for improving the effectiveness of RBME initiatives within the organization.

5. Discussion of Key findings

5.1. The relationship between commitment and the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at compassion international, Uganda

The current study, revealing a positive and significant relationship between commitment and the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at Compassion International, Uganda, aligns with and supports several key assertions made in the cited studies. For instance, the current study's finding of a positive relationship between commitment and successful implementation aligns with Oreg et al.'s (2018) assertion that commitment to change involves individuals engaging in actions they consider essential for positive change execution. Both studies emphasize the importance of individual beliefs about the necessity of change, highlighting commitment as a guiding factor in the implementation process.

Furthermore, the current study supports Lee et al.'s (2017) argument that the lack of commitment among individuals is a primary reason for the failure of change initiatives. The positive relationship found in Compassion International suggests that higher levels of commitment contribute to more successful implementation. Both studies point to the deficiency in commitment stemming from an underestimation of its importance by change initiators, emphasizing the critical role of commitment in change success. Similarly, the positive and significant relationship between commitment and implementation in the current study aligns with Cinite and Duxbury's (2018) concept of change valence. The finding supports the idea that if employees perceive a change as worthwhile, they are more likely to actively participate in its

implementation. Both studies suggest that change commitment is dependent on the perceived value or positivity associated with the upcoming change.

Furthermore, the current study's positive relationship between commitment and successful implementation is consistent with Jaros' (2010) outlined reasons why employees might consider a planned organizational change. Employees who align with the change's perceived urgency, problem-solving potential, personal benefits, core values, and have support from managers and peers are more likely to be committed. Both studies underscore the multifaceted reasons that contribute to commitment and the subsequent success of organizational change initiatives. In addition, the current study supports Choi and Ruona's (2011) caution against automatically interpreting reasons for organizational change as indicative of readiness. The focus on commitment in Compassion International suggests that assessing active commitment is crucial. Likewise, Foster's (2010) clarification that change valence resulting from varying motives can be influential in change commitment aligns with the idea that commitment, as indicated in the current study, is a multifaceted and influential factor in successful implementation.

5.2 The relationship between change efficacy and the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at compassion international, Uganda

The finding of a positive and significant relationship between change efficacy and the implementation of results-based monitoring and evaluation at Compassion International aligns with the perspectives presented in the cited studies. For instance, the current study's result supports Gist and Michell's (1992) observations that efficacy involves a comprehensive evaluation of perceived ability to perform a task. The positive relationship suggests that organizational members at Compassion International, when forming judgments of change efficacy, likely addressed fundamental questions regarding their understanding of change requirements, possession of necessary resources, and effective execution given the current situation.

Furthermore, the positive relationship between change efficacy and implementation at Compassion International aligns with Beck and Schmidt's (2018) assertion that change efficacy involves employees' mental judgments concerning job demands, resource availability, and situational factors. Similarly, Richard et al. (2017) emphasize efficacy as a holistic assessment of capacity to accomplish a task. The Compassion International case indicates that organizational members mentally evaluated the contributing factors to implementation competence, leading to a positive change efficacy judgement.

In addition, the finding supports Aarons et al.'s (2011) emphasis on the cognitive evaluation of the relationship between job demands and the accessibility of resources. At Compassion

International, the positive relationship suggests that employees considered factors such as competent staff, material, financial resources, time availability, and the political environment when evaluating their change efficacy. Moreover, the positive relationship between change efficacy and implementation at Compassion International is in line with Musubira's (2017) highlighting of change efficacy as a predictor of implementation. It also supports Steyn's (2011) view that change readiness is achieved through rational thinking and a positive attitude among employees. The findings at Compassion International suggest that employees' perspectives and emotional states toward change, as emphasized by Musubira, align with the positive change efficacy, indicating increased readiness for change.

6. Conclusions

This study suggests that fostering and nurturing commitment among employees and stakeholders within Compassion International is integral to achieving effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation practices. This study not only validates theoretical perspectives emphasizing the significance of commitment in organizational change but also provides actionable insights for Compassion International to enhance its monitoring and evaluation practices by prioritizing and cultivating commitment among its members.

Furthermore, the finding not only confirms the theoretical importance of change efficacy in the literature but also provides actionable insights for Compassion International and similar organizations to consider when planning and implementing monitoring and evaluation systems. By prioritizing strategies that boost change efficacy, organizations can potentially enhance their capacity for successful implementation and improve overall organizational effectiveness.

References

- Aarons, G. A., Hurlburt, M., & Horwitz, S. M. (2011). Advancing a conceptual model of evidence-based practice implementation in public service sectors. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 38(1), 4-23.
- Achuka, P. (2019). The role of non-governmental organizations in community development in Uganda: a case study of Moroto District.
- Adhikari, M., Winterford, K., & Davila, F. (2023). Monitoring & Evaluation, Localisation and Post-Development: Is Localised M&E an Alternative to Current M&E?. In *Connectedness, Resilience and Empowerment: Perspectives on Community Development* (pp. 227-241). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

- Ahmed, F. U. (2013). *Application of result based management in the public sector projects: A study on the readiness situation of Bangladesh* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rajshahi).
- Anyidi, N. A., & Namara, R. B. (2019). The Role of Leadership in Establishment of Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in Humanitarian Organizations in Uganda. *Ugandan Journal of Management and Public Policy Studies*, 17(1), 80-97.
- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681-703.
- Beck, J. W., & Schmidt, A. M. (2018). Negative relationships between self-efficacy and performance can be adaptive: The mediating role of resource allocation. *Journal of Management*, 44(2), 555-588.
- Burnes, B. (2011). Introduction: Why Does Change Fail, and What Can We Do About It?. *Journal of Change Management*, 11(4), 445-450.
- Chirau, T., Dlakavu, A., & Masilela, B. (2022). Strengthening Anglophone Africa M&E systems: A CLEAR-AA perspective on guiding principles, challenges and emerging lessons. *African Evaluation Journal*, 10(1), 601.
- Choi, M., & Ruona, W. E. (2011). Individual readiness for organizational change and its implications for human resource and organization development. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(1), 46-73.
- Cinite, I., & Duxbury, L. E. (2018). Measuring the Behavioral Properties of Commitment and Resistance to Organizational Change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 54(2), 113-139.
- Clements, P. (2005). Book Review: A Handbook for Development Practitioners: Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26, 278 - 280.
- Foster, R. D. (2010). Resistance, justice, and commitment to change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(1), 3-39.
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management review*, 17(2), 183-211.
- Jaros, S. (2010). Commitment to organizational change: A critical review. *Journal of Change Management*, 10(1), 79-108.

- Khan, M. A. (2001). *A Guidebook on Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation: Key Concepts, Issues and Applications*. Monitoring and Progress Review Division, Ministry of Plan Implementation, Government of Sri Lanka. Colombo, Sri Lanka.
- Kothari, B. L. (2009). *Research Methodology: Tools and techniques*. New Delhi: ABD Publishers.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Kusek, J., & Rist, R. (2004). *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system*. World Bank, Washington DC.
- Lee, K., Sharif, M., Scandura, T., & Kim, J. (2017). Procedural justice as a moderator of the relationship between organizational change intensity and commitment to organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 30(4), 501-524.
- Nalubega, T., & Uwizeyimana, D. E. (2019). Public sector monitoring and evaluation in the Fourth Industrial Revolution: Implications for Africa. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 7(1), 1-12.
- Nyamupachitu, J. (2018). *An assessment of the implementation of results based management approach in non-governmental organizations: a case study of the ecumenical pharmaceutical network* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).
- Ocen, P., Acanga, A., & Mwesigwa, D. (2022). The role of Non-Governmental organisations in enhancing household poverty reduction in Uganda: a review of literature.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) (2002). *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management*. Paris: OECD/DAC.
- Oreg, S., Bartunek, J. M., Lee, G., & Do, B. (2018). An affect-based model of recipients' responses to organizational change events. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(1), 65-86.
- Rist, R., Kusek, J., & White, E.M. (2005). How will we know millennium development results when we see them? Building a results-based monitoring and evaluation system to give us the answer. *Evaluation*, 11, 1.
- Rutagwabeyi, M. A. (2022). *Monitoring and evaluation systems for better service delivery among donor funded projects in Uganda: A case of malaria control program* (Doctoral dissertation, Makerere University).

- Shea, C. M., Jacobs, S. R., Esserman, D. A., Bruce, K., & Weiner, B. J. (2014). Organizational readiness for implementing change: a psychometric assessment of a new measure. *Implementation science*, 9(1), 1-15.
- Thomas, J. C., Doherty, K., Watson-Grant, S., & Kumar, M. (2021). Advances in monitoring and evaluation in low-and middle-income countries. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 89, 101994.
- Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science*, 4(1), 67.
- Weiner, B. J. (2020). A theory of organizational readiness for change. In *Handbook on implementation science*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Weiner, B. J., Amick, H., & Lee, S. Y. D. (2008). Conceptualization and measurement of organizational readiness for change: a review of the literature in health services research and other fields. *Medical care research and review*, 65(4), 379-436.