ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

MBA- PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

DETERMINANT FACTORS FOR THE SUCCESS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS: THE CASE OF LIDETA SUB-CITY OF ADDIS ABABA

BY

TSEGAYE TILAHUN

JANUARY, 2018

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

DETERMINANT FACTORS FOR THE SUCCESS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS: THE CASE OF LIDETA SUB-CITY OF ADDIS ABABA

BY

TSEGAYE TILAHUN

(ID .No: SGS/0687/2007A)

A THESIS SBMITTED TO ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITYSCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILEMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF BUSINESS ADMINSTERTAION IN PROJECT MANAMAGEMNT

Advisor: Chalachew Getahun (PhD)

JANUARY, 2018

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

DETERMINANT FACTORS FOR THE SUCCESS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS: THE CASE OF LIDETA SUB-CITY OF ADDIS ABABA

BY

TSEGAYE TILAHUN

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

_____   _____

Dean, Graduate Studies   Signature

_____   _____

Advisor   Signature

_____   _____

External Examiner   Signature

_____   _____

Internal Examiner   Signature

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Acknowledgements

List of Abbreviations/Acronyms

APM	Association for Project Management
CCC	Community Coalition Committee
CPD	Community Development Project
CSF	Critical Success Factors
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EU	European Union
IDP	International Development Projects
IPMA	International Project Management Association
KPI	Key Performance Indicators
LFM	Logical Framework Methodology
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PMI	Project Management Institute

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to identify factors influencing success of community development projects in Lideta sub-city of Addis Ababa. In quest of achieving this objective, the research applied a mixed research approach, using both primary and secondary sources of data, exploratory and explanatory research design and descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlation techniques of analysis. Questionnaires are used to collect primary data from community development project beneficiaries and project staff. Further, key informant interview is used to collect qualitative data. Results show that community development projects in Lideta sub-city are successful as evaluated by the beneficiaries. The major success factors identified include effective consultation with all stakeholders, proper needs assessment, clear understanding of the project context, competency of project team/manger, adequate resources and monitoring and evaluation. In addition, partnership with key stakeholders and beneficiaries, alignment with the government structure, relevance to country's priorities and sustainability factors are key elements in the overall project success. Based on the findings of the study, it is recommended that it is essential that the views of all key stakeholders are collected and analyzed at an early stage. This can help identify the real needs and possible constraints. The study also provides clear evidence that the involvement of all relevant parties during the early stages of a project and other phases is vital in identifying their differing requirements and needs, critical for project success.

Keywords: Success factors, community development project

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

International Development projects (IDPs) are defined as projects funded by international donors for contributing to development in the country where they are located (Diallo & Thuillier, 2004). Objectives of IDPs may cover a diverse range of development fields from poverty alleviation, education, health, food, agriculture, trade, private sector development and institutional capacity building in developing countries (Diallo & Thuillier, 2004). IDPs play a vital role in the socioeconomic development of developing countries and their recipients.

The management of international development projects is a challenging area that has been relatively less studied (Hermano et al., 2013). Until the 1960s, no specific project management approach was available to guide IDPs management despite their importance (Hermano et al., 2013). Recently, project management concepts have been studied in other fields like construction and software development; however, there are limited tools and body of knowledge for managing IDPs due to their unique nature (Hermano et al., 2013; Ika et al., 2012). Furthermore, most of the attention of project management was allocated to project evaluation criteria or project management tools, while less focus was on the critical success factors of IDPs despite the presence of literature discussing ODA project management tools (Hermano et al., 2013).

IDPs are different from other types of projects for many reasons and so the approaches to project management and implementation should also be different. Therefore, international aid (or international development projects) is one of the sectors where project management concepts should be studied believing great value is added that impacts project success (Hermano et al., 2013).

In order for IDPs to achieve their mission, it is essential for donors and implementing agencies to understand the critical factors that influence project success. This is not only vital for monitoring

purposes or assessment of the project status, but also in guiding project managers and policy makers in identifying potential problems and allocating the necessary resources to guarantee project completion and success (Hermano et al., 2013).

In an effort to contribute to the theoretical knowledge and policy-making in the field of IDPs project management, this thesis aims to identify the critical success factors of community development projects implemented in Lideta sub-city of Addis Ababa.

Benefitting from an empirical and a theoretical review of literature, the current study reviewed scholar's definitions of project success, diverse approaches to project success criteria as well as broad scanning of authors' views on IDPs critical success factors. From this review, evidence from the literature confirms that some factors can affect IDPs success when taken into consideration in the different phases for the project life cycle (Khang & Moe, 2008). Therefore, this study follows a mixed approach to examine the critical success factors of the implementation of community development projects and aims to explain the relationship between these factors and project success. This is followed by identifying the lessons learned from the community development project implementation and the recommendations for project managers of NGOs, policy makers and governmental organizations.

1.2.   Statement of the Problem

Different stakeholders, including donors and governments demand to see results verifying the success and impact of nonprofit projects and activities (Carman, 2007). Development organizations need to communicate the impact and benefits they provide in order to satisfy and keep current donors, and attract future ones (Arvidson & Lyon, 2014). However, managing IDPs in developing countries like Ethiopia where there are political, economic and social challenges with scare resources is not an easy task. Such challenges can cause project delays, cost overruns, stakeholders' dissatisfaction, and other results that can affect project completion or eventually lead to project failure. The problem lies in identifying what can cause such projects to actually succeed or fail.

Although there is still a lack of consensus on the concept of project failure and success among management of development projects, very few of development projects which have been

9

phased-out, have had major impacts on the community members' overall living standards. This is attributed to them not becoming self-reliant. Further, development projects have been criticized for lack of capacity-building, especially the building of organizational skills at community level, and a lack of ownership of the projects by the beneficiary groups.

In this regard the limited studies in Africa (Kakonge, 1995) cited cases across several African countries and concluded that most agricultural projects in Africa have failed to achieve what was expected of them because of poor planning, lack of experience, bureaucratic inefficiency, technical incompetence, poor performance of government and donor agencies and project complexities. Likewise, Heeks (2002) explained that where e-government projects are introduced in Africa, they mainly end in either partial or total failure as a result of the disparities between project design and African public sector realities. Others like Agunga (1992) even suggested that poor management, more than anything else, is the main reason for the high failure rate of development projects in the third world, most of which includes African countries.

Unlike industrial or commercial projects that have tangible objectives and deliverables, the management of IDPs has less tangible objectives and deliverables where development outcomes and impacts are about qualitative changes in human development and in people's quality of life. Hence, the management of IDPs and identification of the critical success factors of each project are crucial for both donors, project managers and beneficiaries. Moreover, despite the presence of literature on IDP project management tools, there is limited research and lack of documentation on what critical success factors project managers of IDPs should consider. In addition, success and failure needs to be investigated from the perspective of active project team stakeholders as well as from that of their client/benefit recipients. It is against this background that this study aimed to investigate development project success and failure from selected projects in Addis Ababa to identify success factors and militating issues and reflect on how such issues can be scaled-up for other projects and handled in future to reduce the rate of project failures.

1.3. Research Questions

Based on the problems stated above, two main questions are formed as below:

a) What are the success status of development projects implemented by non-governmental organizations in Lideta sub-city?

b) What are the success factors that determine success and failure of development projects implemented by non-governmental organizations in Lideta sub-city?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The study aims to add to the literature an empirical investigation of the determinant factors contributing to the success of community development projects. To the knowledge of the researcher, there are no studies in Ethiopia specifically addressing success factors of development projects and the current study aims at exploring the determinant factors contributing to the success of development projects in Lideta sub-city.

The specific objectives of the study are:

a) To describe the success status of development projects implemented by non-governmental organizations in Lideta sub-city from the side of beneficiaries.

b) To analyze success factors of development projects implemented by non-governmental organizations in Lideta sub-city.

1.5. Definitions of Terms

Development Project: - for the purpose of this study, a development project is defined as: a unique and temporary endeavor whereby resources are utilized and integrated within a specific time and inherent uncertainty aiming for particular objectives so as to deliver outcome with beneficial change.

Success/failure factors: are key variables that explain the success/failure of the development project. In other words, they are contributing or militating factors to the management system that lead directly or indirectly to the success/failure of a project.

1.6. Significance of the Study

This research will be significant for both researchers and practitioners because it has the potential to shed light on factors affecting the success and failure of development projects. The study will also help the community members to find out their importance in influencing successful project

implementation. Finally, the study will also help give feedback to the non-governmental organization and how it can improve project management practices in the future as well as contributing to the literature in project management.

1.7. Delimitation of the Study

The current study was conducted only in Lideta sub-city of Addis Ababa City Administration. Only development projects established in this sub-city was included or considered during sampling. Participants included in the study are current development project beneficiaries, implementers of development projects and government officials responsible for the development of the area. Further the study only focuses on investigating success and failure factors of development projects and only included information from respondents in this area and from literature search.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Overview

The concept of project success is multi-dimensional; different people assess the success of projects in different ways (Shenhar et al. 1997), and certain factors may have different impacts on the various aspects of success (Freeman & Beale 1992). This chapter reviews the literature to find out the explanation of the project success before identifying various factors that could significantly contribute to the success of a project. The discussion also elaborates various concepts of project success, makes a clear distinction between those concepts and identifies criteria used to express the success. As different factors may affect the project at different time, this chapter also includes the project life cycle and indicates the point in the project life span where certain factors possibly take place.

2.1.1. What is a Project?

Defining the project in order to understand its nature is essential before beginning a critical review about factors that influencing its success. The term project might mean different things to different group of people depending on particular activity they referred. Encarta Dictionary (EDT 2005) defines a project as a task or scheme that regards a large amount of time, effort and planning to complete, while Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (CALD 2003) defines it as 'a piece of planned work or an activity which is completed over a period of time and intended to achieve a particular aim'. In Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary project is defined as a planned piece of work that is designed to find information about something, to produce something new, or to improve something (OALD 2005).

Project

In project management discipline, the term project is widely used in various contexts by different groups of people to describe their perception, depending on particular kind of work related to them. Buchanan and Boddy (1992) for instance, describe the project as:

"A unique venture with a beginning and end, conducted by people to meet established goals within parameters of cost, schedule and quality."

These authors emphasize element of uniqueness and temporariness in their description of project. Uniqueness is mentioned as 'a beginning and end'. Their concept of temporariness and uniqueness has been supported by PMI (2004) through a popular book, A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge:

"A temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product or service."

According to this author, unique means the product or service is different in some distinguishing way from all similar products or services. Uniqueness is the only characteristic that distinguishes a 'project' from the day-to-day indefinitely and predictable repetitive works known as 'operation' (Keller 1998). However, it is useful to consider the fact that there are some projects with a combination of some repetitive aspects from the previous identical project, beside new unique aspects of the project to be implemented. In other word, often projects are not truly unique, just unique for the particular client.

The other important feature of project is temporariness. PMI (2004) describes temporary as a definite beginning and a definite end for every project. The end of the project is reached when the project's objectives have been achieved, or it become clear that the objectives will not or cannot be met. This includes the situation where the need for the project no longer exits and the project is terminated by the project owner.

On top of those two features discussed above, Buchanan and Boddy (1992) also acknowledge goal as an important feature of every project. Goals sometimes tend to be confusing with objectives. A goal is described by some literature (Wideman 2002) as a general, broader and intangible target, while objective is mentioned as a more descriptive, focused, and tangible aim. Both terms can be simplified as targets or aims expected by an organization to achieve as a result of spending time and resources to complete a project.

Despite acknowledging the importance of 'beginning and end', Buchanan and Boddy (1992) do not include the other elements that are vital to the project, i.e. the project's resources and project's deliverables. Turner (1993) comes out with a broader scope by introducing more features in his definition of project:

"An endeavor in which human, material and financial resources are organized in a novel way, to undertake a unique scope of work, of given specification, within constraint of cost and time, so as to achieve beneficial change defined by quantitative and qualitative objectives."

The important element introduced by the author in this definition, is resources. Well utilization of project resources would lead the projects to complete successfully. Project resources can be divided into three major types: human, material and financial. The author also points out beneficial change as the other feature of the project. Beneficial change means the project's deliverables, either product or service, should establish some improvement. Sometimes project deliverable is mention as output and outcome. In a simple explanation, output is the direct and measurable products or services delivered by the project, while outcome refers to the impact of particular output (Taylor-Powell & Henert 2008).

Turner and Müller (2003) who review Turner's (1993) earlier definition find out that it is incomplete definition although it is not wrong; therefore, introduced a new definition with some enhancement:

"... project is a temporary organization to which resources are assigned to undertake a unique, novel and transient endeavor managing the inherent uncertainty and need for integration in order to deliver beneficial objectives of change".

They have included uncertainty and integration as features of the project. Uncertainty, sources from various project characteristics (Wohlin & Mayrhauser 2000) could affect the project, either negatively or positively (Wideman 2002). Negative uncertainty is known as project risk, while positive uncertainty can be described as opportunity. Project also needs for integration of the resources so that it can be utilized efficiently.

From the above discussion, it is apparent that different authors have different definition of the project, depending on type of work they are working with. After considering those views, the key

features of a project can be simplified as indicated below, and for the purpose of this study, a project is defined as:

"a unique and temporary endeavor whereby resources are utilized and integrated within a specific time and inherent uncertainty aiming for particular objectives so as to deliver outcome with beneficial change".

Quality in project is acknowledged by some literature (Buchanan & Boddy 1992) as a much more elusive substance. There is much debate about the definition of quality in the context of project management (Flett 2001). Measuring quality in project is not an easy task as its interpretation is often depend on evaluation by various parties, whether it fulfilled their expectation.

Key features of the project
- ✓ unique, that is, a one-off or non-repetitive undertaking, where each one is different from the others;
- ✓ temporary, which means, there should be a beginning and an end;
- ✓ utilization of resources;
- ✓ constraint of time;
- ✓ specific pre-defined objective to be achieved;
- ✓ subject to uncertainty;
- ✓ need for integration;
- ✓ beneficial change, i.e. improving outcome.

2.1.2. Characteristics of Development Projects

Before examining the literature about development project management success criteria and critical success factors, the term "development projects" or "foreign aid" is defined. According to OECD (2003), official development assistance (ODA) definition that was offered by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), foreign aid is the measure of aid from national governments with the aim of achieving economic development and welfare in low-income or developing countries. The concept of ODA was developed to act as an indicator for measuring the flow of international aid by donor governments, bilateral donors and multilateral institutions (OEDC, 2003).

In agreement with OECD, Lancaster (2008) claims that foreign aid can be defined as the "voluntary transfer of public resources from a government to another independent government, to a non-governmental organization or to an international organization such as the World Bank or the United Nations Development Program". Generally, the term "development projects" refers to medium or large projects and/or programs funded by developed countries and multilateral agencies (donors), multilateral development banks, the United Nations associated agencies, bilateral agencies and non-governmental organization through international aid to less developed countries (Hermano et al., 2013).

Development projects form a special type of projects that provide socioeconomic assistance to the developing countries, or to some specially designated group of target beneficiaries. These projects differ from industrial or commercial projects in several important ways, the understanding of which has strong impacts on how the projects can be managed and evaluated. In a recent study, Montes-Guerra et al. (2015) introduce a comprehensive view of development projects; the authors view development projects as those projects that contain a proposal of activities to serve a specific objective in a geographically defined area, for a group of beneficiaries, in a certain period or interval of time, with the purpose of solving a problem or improving a situation.

The objectives of development projects, by definition, concern poverty alleviation and living standards improvement, environment protection, basic human rights protection, assistance for victims of natural or people-caused disasters, capacity building and development of basic physical and social infrastructures. These humanitarian and social objectives are usually much less tangible, with deliverables less visible and measurable, compared with infrastructure and industrial projects commonly found in the private sector. Even for projects involving development of physical infrastructure and facilities, the ultimate "soft" goals of serving sustainable social and economic development always have a priority in the project evaluation by key stakeholders. The intangibility of project objectives and deliverables raises a special challenge in managing and evaluating development projects that require adaptation of the existing project management body of knowledge and adopting new tools and concepts to define, monitor and measure the extent that the development projects achieve these objectives. Neglecting this important aspect of development projects usually leads to the tendency of

measuring only resource mobilization and efforts, rather than results. The consequence is the inefficient use of development funds and long-term lack of accountability. As project interventions cannot be continued forever, most projects also have an ultimate goal to produce positive and significant changes that will be sustained after the external assistance comes to an end. This sustainability requirement adds a new level to the intangibility of the development outcomes.

Another characteristic of most development projects is the complex web of the many stakeholders involved (Youker, 1999). Industrial and commercial projects usually have two key stakeholders-the client, who pays for the project, and as a result, gets the benefits from its deliverables, and the contractor, or implementing unit, who gets paid for managing the project to achieve the desired results. Development projects, in contrast, commonly involve three separate key stakeholders, namely the funding agency who pays for but does not use directly the project outputs, the implementing unit, and the target beneficiaries who actually benefit from the project outputs but most commonly do not pay for the projects. The role separation of these three key stakeholders has several important implications. First, financial accountability by the project management team is often considered as important as its responsibility to complete the projects within the time, cost and quality. Second, because of the common developmental, cultural and knowledge gap between donors and the target recipients, the likely mismatch between the real needs and capacity of the target groups and the understanding and development policies of the funding agencies may result in poor project design, a precursor of failure in the implementation. Third, complicating the requirements for financial accountability are the efforts by the funding agencies and the governments of the recipient countries to establish rules and procedures to regulate the disbursement and utilization of the development funds. Set with similar intention, but by different institutions with different organizational cultures and traditions, these various rules and procedures often contradict each other, raising special and unnecessary difficulties during project implementation.

Development projects can be implemented by the government of the recipient country under a bilateral agreement with the funding country, or through an implementing partner (a non-governmental organization or a contractor) (Crawford & Bryce, 2003). Development projects

can also be managed by national management units, teams in ministries, national departments or institution and can be delegated to executing agencies (private companies, NGOs, international cooperation departments) (Diallo & Thuillier, 2005).

Scholars agree that development projects consist of a complex network where different stakeholders interact: project coordinator, project team, task manager, national supervisor, beneficiaries and other various firms (Crawford & Bryce, 2003; Khang & Moe, 2008), and emergence of new scenarios and multiple players is possible (Ogunlana, 2010).

2.2. Project Management and Project Success

In a systematic review of literature, this section starts by identifying what is project management and what is project success. This is followed by a theoretical review of project success criteria and success factors.

According to the Project Management Institute (PMI), project management is the application of knowledge, skills, tools and techniques to meet project requirements (PMI, 2013). Different scholars agree that a large number of project management tools and techniques were created to enhance project management (Morris, 2010; Besner & Hobbs, 2006). While others believe that different tools have been developed to assist the standardization and implementation of project management practices by associations like PMI, International Project Management Association (IPMA) and the Association for Project Management (APM), and others (Montes-Guerra et al., 2015). In addition, different bodies of knowledge are emerging with standards, guidelines and best practices to improve project management (Morris et al., 2006).

Although project management was traditionally applied on engineering and software projects, literature points that recipient countries for international aid have been interested to apply project management practices in development projects (Ika et al., 2010). Different scholars studied the most commonly used project management techniques; for example, the earned value analysis (Plaza & Turetken, 2009), critical path method (Conde, 2009), the logical framework (Baccarini, 1999; Couillard et al., 2009; Crawford & Bryce, 2003), and balanced scorecard (Barclay, 2008; Milis & Mercken, 2004). According to Montes-Guerra et al. (2015), using project management

19

tools and techniques combine essential elements that can influence the projects results if used properly.

According to several scholars, project success remains a complex and a subjective issue depending on different points of views of the parties involved, a project can be a success for some and a failure for others (Montes-Guerra et al., 2015). Authors including Baccarini (1999) and De Wit (1998), differentiate between project success in achievement of objectives and the success of project management. While Lim and Mohamed (1999) introduce two possible viewpoints for project success: macro-level success and micro-level success; the micro success is concerned with the traditional triangle of whether the project is on time, in budget and meets quality specifications, while the macro success is concerned with the eventual operation, functions and long term gains of the project (Ogunlana, 2010).

In his study, Cooke-Davies (2002) differentiates between project success criteria as the measurements by which the project's success or failure is judged, while defining project success factors as the inputs to the management system that support the project and which contributes to project success. In agreement with Cooke-Davies (2002), Ogunlana (2010) points that the measurements constituting the success criteria are commonly referred to as the key performance indicators or KPIs.

The British Association for Project Management states that project success includes satisfaction of needs of the project's stakeholders and that it should be measured according to a predetermined set of criteria that was agreed upon prior to project implementation (Yamin & Sim, 2016). In a more comprehensive definition, Ika (2009) states that project success is achieved through effectiveness and efficiency and summarized the definition of project success to be hexagonal - that it is about cost, time, quality, realization of strategic objectives, and satisfaction of end beneficiaries and other stakeholders. In the same line, a more recent definition by the Project Management Institute (2013) views project success as the completion of a project within a specific scope, time, quality, cost, constraints and resources.

2.3. Project Success Criteria

In an integrative literature review about project success criteria, scholars included the so-called "iron triangle" and that is measurement of cost, quality and time in their criteria of measurement of development projects (Atkinson, 1999; Wi & Jung, 2010). Though project conformity to cost, quality and time constraints have been indicative for project success for a long time, however, scholars like Shenhar et al., (2001) argue that measurement of project success should go beyond the iron triangle to include project efficiency, impact on customer, business and direct success, and contribution for the future.

Many scholars referred to defining criteria to measure project success as a difficult and controversial task; this is due to the varying perceptions that lead to disagreement about the project success (Baccarini, 1999; Liu & Walker, 1998) while other scholars attempted to identify certain dimensions that constitutes project success.

Pinto and Mantel (1990) propose three dimensions to define project success. The first is the *efficiency of the implementation process* in terms of the project team performance, staying on project schedule and budget, meeting project goals and maintaining smooth team relationships. The second dimension examines *the quality of the project deliverables and the value added* as perceived by the project team, while the third and last dimension examines *the client's satisfaction*. Though these dimensions are essential for project success and can act as performance indicators, however, they are missing the relevance of the project to the targeted audience and the project's alignment with the country's agenda.

Baccarini (1999) proposed that project success consists of two components: product success and project management success. The product success component is concerned with achieving the strategic objectives and goals of the project, as well as the satisfaction of key stakeholders, while project management success focusses on how the management process was conducted and whether it takes into consideration the traditional time, cost and quality aspects at the completion of the project. This separation between product success and project management success is critical; it sheds light on the independency of the success of project management processes from the success of the final product. For example, project managers can interpret project failure as

one that did not meet budget or schedule, while the same project can be considered a success for the beneficiaries for delivering a useful product in spite of exceeding time or budget. In other words, the success of project management does not necessarily mean product success and vice versa.

Some authors including Baccarini (1999) and Cooke-Davies (2002) have adopted the Logical Framework Methodology (LFM), also known as the Logic Framework Approach (LFA), to understand and analyze the concepts of project management success and product success. The LFM was developed by the American Aid Agency in 1960s to improve management of development projects (Couillard, 1995); LFA was applied by many international aid donors as the methodology to manage ID projects (Baccarini, 1999). The LFM uses a top-down approach where project objectives are placed in different levels; at any given levels, achieving its objectives satisfies reaching the higher-level objectives until achieving the ultimate objectives of the project (Baccarini, 1999).

In this line of research, Andersen and Jessen (2000), cited in Khang and Moe (2008), emphasized on the importance of separating the task-oriented aspects from the people-oriented ones while examining project success. Authors investigate 10 project elements to give a more comprehensive picture of the outcomes of the project. These include time, budget, quality, as well as the usefulness of product, stakeholders' satisfaction, learning experience, motivation for future work, knowledge acquisition, final project report and project closure.

In their survey for African national project coordinators, Diallo and Thuillier (2004) suggest ten project success criteria that can be grouped in three broad categories: project management success (meeting objectives, staying on time, staying on budget), project success or impact (beneficiaries satisfaction from deliverables, impact on beneficiaries, institutional capacity for the country), and project profile (conformity of the goods and services delivered, national visibility of the project, project reputation among donors, and probability of additional funding). This model has built on Baccarini's (1999) theory in differentiating between project management success and product success, but also adds an essential component for development projects that examines the project profile in relevance to the country and the donor.

Furthering the work of Diallo and Thuillier (2004), Khang and Moe (2008) added some success criteria for international development projects carried out by NGOs in Vietnam and Myanmar in the project life-cycle phases including: clear understanding of project environment, project team competencies, effective consultation with stakeholders, commitment to goals and objectives, clear donor's policies and adequate local capacities.

By combining the work of Diallo and Thuillier (2004) and Khang and Moe (2008), the model of Ika et al. (2012) for project success criteria of international development projects includes: 1) relevance in meeting needs and priorities of the country, 2) efficiency of cost while meeting project objectives, 3) effectiveness which is the extent to which the project meets the desired objectives, 4) impact which is the indirect positive or negative changes generated by the project, and 5) sustainability where the benefits of the projects are institutionalized and will continue after project completion. This model acknowledges the different factors that affect the success of development projects and the unique nature of such projects in light of country priorities, donors' policies and sustainability objectives.

2.4. Critical Success Factors

Beginning with the definition of critical success factors (CSFs), Andersen et al. (2006) defined CSFs as those features that are identified as necessary to be achieved for the project to make excellent results; the absence or inconsideration of such factors can cause project failure or barriers to achieving project success. Different scholars agreed that while project success criteria establish measurements of project success, the occurrence of CSFs of inputs, events, conditions and circumstances in project management influence the project success (Lim and Mohamed, 1999; Cooke-Davies, 2002; Ika, 2009).

In a systematic and integrative literature review about CSFs that influence project success, Slevin and Pinto (1986) addressed project success as a multi-dimensional concept and proposed that the critical success factors for a project are ten internal factors: project mission (goals and ultimate benefits of the project), top management support (such as allocation of resources and top management's confidence in project manager during the event of crisis), project schedule/plan

(formulation, conceptualization, detailing and evaluation), client consultation, personnel (recruitment, selection, training), technical tasks (for example, technology and technical expertise), client acceptance, monitoring and feedback, communication, and troubleshooting.

Morris and Hough (1987) provide a comprehensive framework depicting the pre-conditions related to project success. They identified six elements that impact project success; these are having a positive attitude to success that is shared by all parties, having a workable and properly defined project, careful monitoring and management of external factors that influence the project, clear understanding of the project work on the schedule and finance, organization and contract strategy, clear communication and controls, and human qualities and tolerance towards errors.

In agreement with the work of Pinto and Slevin (1989) about the ambiguity of defining project success, Belassi and Tukel (1996) agree that one main reason behind this ambiguity is that different parties involved in the project perceive project success or failure differently. The second reason Belassi and Tukel recognize is the variability of lists of success and failure factors from one study to the other. In their study, Belassi and Tukel argue that grouping factors according to some criteria help analyze the interaction between them rather than identifying individual factors that might vary in different projects. The authors suggest a new framework that group critical success factors and identify their possible effects on project performance. This framework suggests grouping project success factors into four areas: 1) factors related to the project (the size and the value of a project, the uniqueness of project activities, the density of a project network, project life cycle and the urgency of a project outcome); 2) factors related to the project manager and the team members (the skills and background of the project manager and the team members); 3) factors related to the organization (for example, the management support and the organizational structure); and 4) factors related to the external environment (for example, the political environment).

By comparing the work of Belassi and Tukel (1996) with Pinto and Slevin (1989) discussed here earlier, unlike the later, Belassi and Tukel identify some factors as the effects of others or what they called "system responses". For example, resource availability is a systems response to

organizational, environmental and project management-related factors such as top management support, project managers' negotiation skills and the general economic situation.

In a more recent review of literature on the critical success factors (CSFs) for international development projects in Africa, Kwak (2002) acknowledges that the environment of international development projects is far more complex than domestic projects. The author attempts to identify visible and invisible factors that influence the project environment and challenge completion of development projects and classifies them into ten categories. These categories cover issues of political factors (like political instability, laws and regulations, policies, war or revolution), legal factors (like changes in government policies, convertibility of currency, taxation rules), cultural factors (like socio cultural backgrounds, traditions, values and beliefs), technical factors (use of technology), managerial factors (like quality and effectiveness of project management), economical factors (like changes in economic conditions), environmental factors (like pollution), social factors (like religious fragmentation, social uprisings or riots), corruption factor (like lack of regulatory institutions, lack of transparency and bribery), and physical aspects (like natural disasters, military coups, wars and acts of terrorism). In addition, the author recommends that project managers of IDPs should maintain flexibility and should be competent to analyze problems and their effects on the project, as well as respond promptly in solving them (Kwak, 2002).

In agreement with Kwak (2002) about the importance of the project manager's competencies, Diallo and Thuillier (2005), in their empirical study on the World Bank projects in Africa, found that two factors: trust and communication, between the project team and the local project coordinator influence project success.

From another approach, Khang and Moe (2008) proposed a project life-cycle-based framework model for international development projects addressing critical success factors corresponding to the various stages of the project life cycle phases, namely, conceptualizing, planning, implementing, and closing. In their study, Khang and Moe (2008) suggested 18 critical success factors that are expected to influence project success. According to Khang and Moe (2008), the CSFs of the conceptualizing/initiation phase are: clear understanding of project environment,

competencies of project designers, and effective consultation with primary stakeholders. In the planning phase, the CSFs are: compatibility of development priorities, adequate resources, competencies of project planners and effective consultation with key stakeholders. While the CSFs of the implementation phase are: compatible rules and procedures, continuing supports, high motivation and interest, adequate knowledge and skills, and effective consultation during implementation. In the closing phase, the CSFs are: adequate provision for project closing, competencies of project manager, and effective consultation with key stakeholders. And lastly, in the overall project success: clear policy of donors and governments, adequate local capacities and strong local ownership and institutional commitments.

Viewing the work of Slevin and Pinto from a different perspective and with the same approach of grouping CSFs like Kwak (2002) and Belassi and Tukel (1996), Steinfort and Walker (2011) regrouped project critical success factors into four different groups. There suggested groups are: 1) leadership related factors (project mission, top management support, communication), 2) stakeholder engagement factors (client consultation, communication, client acceptance), 3) technical expertise factors (personnel, technical task, trouble-shooting), and 4) operational planning and control factors (project schedule/plans, monitoring and feedback, trouble-shooting).

In their study in IDPM, Ika et al. (2010) highlight a specific set of CSFs for the World Bank development projects: monitoring, coordination, design, training, and project supervision. The study suggests that project supervision has differing significant influences on the two project success dimensions and that project management success does not significantly affect deliverable success. The authors propose that project supervisors and managers should aim to strengthen project design and monitoring and thus improve project implementation as well as the chances for project success.

Later in 2012, same authors, Ika et al. (2012), resume their studies on World Bank projects and attempt to find the correlation between project critical success factors and project success. The findings of their empirical study affirm a positive correlation between five critical success factors and project success; these are monitoring, coordination, design, training and institutional environment.

In an evaluation of a government public administration reform project in Bangladesh through a technical assistance project jointly sponsored by the government and the Department for International Development, Government of the UK, Khan et al. (2000) identify nine reasons for project success.

- ✓ **In project planning:** their research acknowledged the importance of creating a culture of change in organizational culture, habits and traditions. In addition, participation and involvement of stakeholders at the lower level (not only the top management) in the design and implementation phases was also found essential. And lastly, project purpose and outputs should be more focused and appropriately organized.

- ✓ **In project management:** efficient and effective team building, participation of stakeholders and training.

- ✓ **Implementation approach:** effective change management; creating an awareness and sense of urgency for change; publicizing success stories; creation of a powerful group of 'champions' of change; networking and team building; and anchoring changes in the organization's culture.

- ✓ **Project management structure:** forming a steering committee to supervise, monitor implementation and take key decisions, a task force for each project component, an operational management team, and selecting a 'right' project team.

In their study to explore project success factors and criteria for development projects funded by the European Union (EU) in Ethiopia, Bayiley and Teklu (2016) followed an interpretive approach using a questionnaire and unstructured interviews for data collection. The study also aimed to explain the relationship between the critical success factors (CSFs) and project success as perceived by the project managers and team members of the participating organizations or EU funded projects from the period 2010 to 2014 that are completed and still ongoing. The statistical findings of the study indicate that there is a positive relationship between five identified CSFs and project success. The first CSF is the intellectual capital including human capital, stakeholder capital and social capital as a critical factor in the success of EU funded projects. In addition, clear working policies along with compatible rules and procedures forming a sound project case,

competency and abilities of key manpower (project designers, planners and managers), and effective stakeholder engagement were found as vital critical success factors to the complex nature of EU funded projects (Bayiley & Teklu, 2016).

Moreover, according to the respondents of the questionnaire, "relevance" to the targeted beneficiaries, "impact" on the beneficiaries or the broader sector, "effectiveness" of projects results, "sustainability" of positive outcomes and "efficiency" of using resources are ranked respectively according to their level of importance as success criteria to evaluate the success of the EU development projects (Bayiley & Teklu, 2016).

Mishra (2016) conducted a recent study on managing development projects in India through a comparative case study approach to four development projects that were implemented in different points of time and in different contexts. The study aims to understand how project design, implementation process, and stakeholder analysis interact with one another and how does this interaction affect the project outcome (Mishra, 2016). At first, the study compared the four projects in terms of the fundamental principles of project management: time, cost and quality. Moving ahead with the implementation process being the focus of the study, the context associated with it also included project design, management of human resources, policy guidelines, interaction among stakeholders, monitoring, decisions and outcomes. Matching the findings of Ika et al. (2012), Mishra's (2016) conceptual framework suggests that apart from cost, time and quality, adding a flexible organizational design and implementation dynamics are the important critical factors that determine the outcomes of international development projects. Furthermore, the study implies the importance of taking into consideration the dynamics of the implementing organizations and the inter-organizational coordination while designing international development projects (Mishra, 2016).

Through an exploratory approach, Ofori (2013) conducted a study in Ghana to identify and assess the quality of project management practices as well as the critical success factors for projects. The study emphasized on the importance of knowledge of best practices to improve the quality of project management and consequently project success. Ofori's study used a survey

method for data collection from Ghanaian organizations. The conceptual model of the study embraces not only time, cost, scope but also social, cultural, economic, political, communication, competencies, stakeholder involvement and leadership among others. The model combines project management practices and success factors, and their expected outcomes that are influenced by the environment under which the project is being carried. In analyzing the findings of the study, the author grouped the critical success factors into two groups: factors that *hinder* project success and factors that *facilitate* project success. The factors that hinder project success were found to be: lack of support/finance; lack of communication; lack of coordination and commitment; lack of experienced and competent personnel; high bureaucracy in government institutions; and lack of consultation with stakeholders. While factors that facilitate project success were found to be effective communication, coordination and commitment; top management support; effective planning; having experienced and competent project personnel; teamwork; and good leadership. Respondents to this study were also asked to rank some of the critical success factors that were already identified in the literature review. The findings showed that: clear goals and mission, adequate resources, and top management support as the three most important critical success factors for successful projects and project management, while realistic cost and time estimates, appropriate technology, and standards and regulations were ranked as the three least important critical success factors.

2.5. Conceptual Framework

The concepts used in this study are all drawn from the literature review above; the study refers to critical success factors as the inputs, events, conditions and circumstances in project management that influence the project success (Lim and Mohamed, 1999; Cooke-Davies, 2002; Ika, 2009). The researcher adopts the critical success factors framework proposed by Khang and Moe (2008) to explore the critical success factors for development projects in different phases of the project life cycle:

- ✓ **Conceptualizing CSFs:** clear understanding of project environment; effective consultation with key stakeholders; competencies of project designers (Slevin & Pinto, 1986; Morris & Hough, 1987; Steinfort & Walker, 2011)
- ✓ **Planning CSFs**: compatibility with development priorities; adequate resources (Khan et al., 2000; Belassi & Tukel, 1996)

- ✓ **Implementation CSFs:** rules and procedure; team-related factors (Morris & Hough,1987; Khan et al., 2000; Kwak, 2002)
- ✓ **Closing CSFs:** local ownership and institutional commitments (Ika et al., 2012; Steinfort & Walker, 2011)

Critical Success Factors

Conceptualizing
- Clear understanding of project environment
- Competencies of project designers
- Effective consultation with primary stakeholders

Planning
- Compatibility of development priorities
  Adequate resources
  Competencies of project planners
- Effective consultation with key stakeholders

Implementing
- Compatible rules and procedures
- Continuing supports
- High motivation and interest
- Adequate knowledge and skills
- Effective consultation during implementation

Closing
  Adequate provision for project closing
  Competencies of project manager
- Effective consultation with key stakeholders

Leads to Project Success

Overall project success
- Clear policy of donors and governments
- Adequate local capacities
- Strong local ownership and institutional commitments.

Case Study

Lessons Learned

Source: Adopted from Khang and Moe (2008)

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This section describes the various methodologies that were used in collecting information, the sampling strategies, techniques that were used in analyzing and the presentation of data collected. The chapter focuses on the study design, population, sample design and data collection and analyses that were applied during the study.

3.1. Research Design

This study used a mixed-methods design to investigate success factors and success of community development projects. Mixed-methods designs involve collecting, analyzing, and interpreting quantitative as well as qualitative data in a single study within one or more of the stages of the research process (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Using a mixed-methods approach ensures more credible findings because a better understanding of a human phenomenon is gained (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Mixed-methods approaches provide the researchers with additional opportunities to answer a more complete range of research questions, because the researcher is not confined to a single method or approach. Mixed-methods research also enables the researchers to capitalize on the strengths, and to minimize the weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative methods. As outlined by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004), the researcher can use the strengths of one method (e.g., the quantitative method) to overcome the weaknesses of the other method (e.g., the qualitative method), or vice versa, when using both methods in a single study. Hence, in quest of achieving this objective, the research applied a mixed research approach, using both primary and secondary sources of data, exploratory and explanatory research design.

3.2. Population and Sampling Techniques

Population

Determining the appropriate sample starts with identifying the population. A population is a group of individuals who have the same characteristics and is further defined in quantitative research as a group of individuals with some common defining characteristics that the research

can identify and study (Creswell, 2012). The population of this study are community development project beneficiaries, project staff and concerned government officers from Lideta sub-city of Addis Ababa City Administration.

A study on urban poverty conducted in three sub-cities with the highest incidence of poverty-Lideta, Arada and Addis Ketema-revealed that Lideta had the highest proportion of households under the relative poverty line for the area, i.e., 53% as compared to 29% in Arada and 47% in Addis Ketema (Netsanet, 2008). While Lideta and Addis Ketema both experienced increased rates of poverty in 2008, Lideta was the only sub-city that exhibited generally rising levels of poverty since the mid-nineties.

Hence the sampling covered Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa where the project is implemented. This research adopted probability sampling method. Random sampling was made to get a representative sample from the sub-city. A representative sample size with 95% confidence level and an error limit of 5% was calculated based on the sample frame provided by the project and based on the work of Yamane (1967). The formula used by Yamane (1967) is illustrated below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where:

n = sample (required responses)

e^2 = error limit

N = population size

Accordingly, a sample of 196 was computed based on the above formula out of the 400 population size of beneficiaries enrolled in community development projects in Lideta sub-city. A random number generator was used to select these representative sample size from the population.

3.3. Types of Data and Tools for Data Collection

The study used questionnaire and interview as instruments to collect data in this study. A questionnaire is a form used in the survey design that participants in the study complete and return to the researcher. The basic objective of a questionnaire is to obtain facts and opinions

about a phenomenon from people who are informed on the particular issue. The aim of using a questionnaire is often to survey a representative sample of the population so that one can make generalization from responses of the respondents. Questionnaires were structured to ensure that each respondent is asked the same simple, clear, concise and precise questions and to ensure that the responses made to those questions/issues are also simple, clear, concise and precise. Accordingly, the researcher designed and distributed questionnaires to respondents who participated in the study based on the above sampling procedure.

The questionnaires were completed by project staffs and beneficiaries in Lideta sub-city. Questionnaires provide a high degree of data standardization and adoption of generalized information amongst any population (Chandran 2003). Chandran explains that they are useful in a descriptive survey study where there is need to quickly and easily get information from people in a non-threatening way. This study used structured questionnaires to collect data in order to investigate success factors influencing project performance of community development projects and their success in Addis Ababa. The questionnaires had items aimed at answering the study questions and meeting the research objectives.

Interviews were undertaken with project staff and government officers to get their views and opinions on the topic under investigation. Interview is a personal interrogation in which the interviewer attempts to get the respondents to talk freely about the subject of interest. A semi-structured interview was used in this study to allow the researcher to exchange ideas with the respondents more freely. The questions aimed at obtaining their evaluation, comments, and recognition of the project based on their own experiences in managing the project. In order to avoid bias or leading the interviewees in giving their answers, the interviewer kept the questions open-ended.

3.4. Procedures for Data Collection

A structured questionnaire and interview were the instruments used for data collection in this study. Questionnaires were distributed to all sampled project beneficiaries and project staff and completed in the presence of the researcher face to face. Further, an interview was conducted to get information and opinions from project staff and government officials responsible for implementation and follow-up of development projects in the area under study.

Five project staff and twenty beneficiaries not included in the final study were selected for piloting the questionnaires. The purpose of the pilot study was to check the clarity of the questionnaire items and instructions; eliminate poor wording; check the readability and understanding levels of the research respondents and gain feedback on the time required to complete the questionnaire. Based on the pilot study, the following changes were made to the questionnaire items, namely vague or unclear items were deleted, items having similar concepts or ideas were rephrased and replaced, and irrelevant items were deleted.

Reliability, as defined by Cohen, et al. (2007), is the consistency, dependability and replicability of the measuring instrument over time, and with the same respondents. It is the extent to which the measuring instrument yields consistent and accurate results when the characteristic being measured remains constant (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). One means of increasing the reliability of the instrument is the inclusion of more items in the questionnaire. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), a good rule of thumb is that the reliability needs to be 0.7 or higher. In order to determine the reliability of the questionnaire in the study, Cronbach alpha was computed with reliability value of 0.78.

3.5. Method of Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-Version 20.0) was used to aid in analyzing the data producing descriptive statistics and identifying the importance of different factors affecting project success. The data was analyzed quantitatively and the factors' relative importance was ranked using likert scale analysis. In addition to descriptive statistics, Pearson's correlation techniques of analysis were used.

3.6. Ethical Issues

Informed consent, according to Marczyk, DeMatteo, & Festinger (2005), is the system for communicating the research study to potential participants and providing them with the opportunity to make autonomous and informed decisions regarding whether to participate in the study or not. It gives the participants the freedom and self-determination to participate or not. In addition, informed consent gives the participants the opportunity to understand the procedures to be employed, the risks, and the demands that may be made upon them. Thus, the researcher explained all the required information to participants, including the right to confidentiality, the

non-disclosure of information, the right to withdraw from the research process at any time, and the benefits of the research. The researcher also provided the participants with the opportunity to ask questions.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 The response rate

The study achieved a 95.24 % response rate for project staff and government staff since out of the 42 questionnaires administered to respondents, 40 were returned dully filled. For beneficiaries, the study achieved 89.80% response rate since out of the 196 questionnaires administered to respondents 176 were filled and returned as indicated in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Response rate for the questionnaire

Respondents	Administered Questionnaires	Valid Response	Response Rate (%)
NGO and Government Staff	42	40	95.24
Beneficiaries	196	176	89.80

4.2 Background characteristics of the respondents

4.2.1 Demographic background

Table 4.2 below shows the majority (75%) of the respondents were NGO staff and the remaining (25%) were from government offices. In terms of gender, the majority (60%) of the respondents were male while the rest, 40% were female. The study further sought to find out the highest academic and professional qualifications of the respondents. Accordingly, the majority (75%) of the respondents are BA/BSc holders, 12.5% MA/MSc and 12.5% are diploma holders. 45% of the respondents worked for five years with community development project, 25% for four years, 25% for three years and a minority (5%) for two years.

Table 4.2: Demographic characteristics of respondents-project staff

Descriptive Statistics		
	Frequency	Percent
Organization Type		
NGO	30	75
GO	10	25
Total	40	100
Gender		
Male	24	60
Female	16	40
Total	40	100
Education		
Diploma	5	12.5
BA/BSc	30	75.0
MA/MSc	5	12.5
Total	40	100
Work experience with community development projects (Years)		
2	5	5
3	10	25
4	10	25
5	18	45
Total	40	100

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Demographic information of beneficiaries

The majority (85.2%) of the beneficiary respondents were female and the rest (14.8%) were male. As indicated in Table 4.3, the majority (77.8%) of respondents were in the age category of 26-45 (38.9% in the age category of 26-35 and 38.9% in 36-45 respectively), 12.5% were in the age category of 46-55 and a minority (8.5%) above 56 years of age.

Table 4.3: Demographic information of respondents-beneficiaries

Descriptive Statistics		
Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	26	14.8
Female	150	85.2
Total	176	100
Age		
18-25	1	.6
26-35	68	38.9
36-45	68	38.9
46-55	22	12.5
56-65	15	8.5
66-75	2	1.2
Total	176	100
Position in the Household		
Household Head	45	25.6
Wife	128	72.7
Household member	3	1.7
Total	176	100
Number of Household Members		
1-5	109	62
6-10	66	37.5
>10	1	.6
Total	176	100
Marital Status		
Married	143	81.3
Single	12	6.8
Divorced	8	4.5
Widow	13	7.4
Total	176	100
Employment Status		
Self-employed	68	38.6
Employed	45	25.6
House Wife	41	23.3
Not Employed	22	12.5
Total	176	100

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

With regard to enrolment to the program, the majority (84.1%) of the respondents enrolled five years ago, 11.4% for four years and the rest three to one years back. A significant number (68) of the participants are self-employed, 25.6% employed for a salary, 23.3% are housewife and 12.5% not employed.

4.2.2. Project staff response on critical success factors of community development projects

Table 4.4: Perceived importance of potential success factors of community development projects

Suggested success factors	Importance									
	Not important		Low importance		Medium importance		High importance		Extremely importance	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Conceptualizing phase										
Understanding of project environment					2	5	19	47.5	19	47.5
Competency of project designers			1	2.5	13	32.5	14	35	12	30
Effective consultations with stakeholders							7	17.5	33	82.5
Planning phase										
Compatible development priorities					2	5	17	42.5	21	52.5
Adequate resources					8	20	24	60	8	20
Competency of project planners					17	42.5	18	45	5	12.5
Effective consultations during planning							11	27.5	29	72.5
Implementing phase										
Compatible rules and procedures					8	20	12	30	20	50
Continuing supports of stakeholders			11	27.5	19	47.5	4	10	6	15
Commitment to project goals and objectives					1	2.5	18	45	21	52.5
Competencies of project management team					13	32.5	19	47.5	8	20
Effective consultations with all stakeholders					1	2.5	10	25	29	72.5
Closing phase										
Adequate provision in project plan			2	5	26	65	10	25	2	5
Competency of project manager					6	15	23	57.5	11	27.5
Effective consultations with key stakeholders					1	2.5	12	30	27	67.5
Overall project success										
Clear policy of donors and implementing partners					15	37.5	13	32.5	12	30
Adequate local capacities					2	5	21	52.5	17	42.5
Strong local ownership of project							15	37.5	25	62.5

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Project staff and government staff involving in the implementation of community development project were asked the perceived importance of critical success factors at the different stage of the project as indicated in Table 4.4 above.

Conceptualizing phase

Effective consultations with stakeholders and clear understanding of project environment are the two most reported CSF in the conceptualizing phase by the majority of the respondents. Accordingly, effective consultation with stakeholders was rated as extremely important by 82.5% of the respondents, 47.5% rated understanding of project environment as extremely important and as high importance by 47.5%. Further competency of project designers was rated as extremely important by 30% of the respondents and highly important by 35% of the respondent at this phase.

In emphasis of stakeholder's consultation and understanding of project environment, one project officer interviewed states: "*we worked with the concerned government structures such as CCCs and the community before the start of the project to identify available resources and felt needs of vulnerable children and their households*".

Planning phase

In addition to effective consultation with all stakeholders in the conceptualizing phase, effective coordination and consultation with key stakeholders in the designing/planning phase is also rated as the most CSF by the majority of the respondents. 72.5% of the respondents rated effective consultation during the planning phase as extremely important and compatible development priorities rated as extremely important by 52.5% of the respondents. Adequate resources were rated as extremely important by 20% of the respondents and as highly important by 60%. Moreover, competency of project planners was rated as extremely important by 12.5% of the respondents and highly important by 45% of the respondent at the planning phase.

In support of this, one interview respondent underlined that involving community members in the planning phase creates a common ground, increases community buy in and spreads awareness about project for proper targeting. Interviewee 3 said:

"We involved community members and other stakeholders in assessing the needs of vulnerable children and their caregivers using CSI [child support index] and selecting committees for their savings group to create community ownership. Committees from government offices including women and children affairs, health office, education office and administration involved in the planning and need assessment phase".

Implementing phase

Similar to the conceptualizing and planning phase, effective consultations with all concerned stakeholders was identified as the most CSF as 72.5% of the respondents rated as extremely important. Commitment to project goals and objectives by project staff and presence of compatible rules and procedures are also identified as CSFs at the implementing phase and rated as extremely important by 52.5% and 50% of the respondents respectively. While competencies of project management team were rated as extremely important by 20% of the respondents and highly important by 47.5%. In the implementation phase, interviewees recognize the importance of consulting the relevant stakeholder as one interviewee states (4):

"During the implementation of community development project, we discuss with beneficiaries and members of savings groups to see if there is a problem, how the project is implemented and if they have any comment, we also discuss with CCCs to address problems at the beginning and mid-way, not at the end."

One additional CSF not captured by questionnaire but by interview was monitoring and evaluation at different phases. Accordingly, interviewees reported monitoring and evaluation as important factor affecting the success of the implementation phase. Interviewee 6 stated:

"We need to have mechanisms for measuring success and this is a major factor for effective project implementation, because when you implement every intervention you tend to evaluate it and get lessons learned and you move accordingly but how efficient the data collection processing and reporting tools is very important".

Closing phase and overall project success

Effective consultations with key stakeholders at the closing phase was identified as CSF by 67.5% of the respondents and competency of project manager as extremely important by 27.5% of the respondents and as highly important by 57%. Adequate local capacities and strong local

ownership of project were identified as the most CSF for the overall project success by 42.5% and 62.5% of the respondents. Many interviewees also agreed that ensuring successful project closure requires assuring the capacity of the local community and lower administrative structures such as the CCCs. Interviewee 2 states:

"We do not only focus on building the capacity of our staff, but we also consider building the capacity of the administrative units like the CCCs and volunteers and the beneficiaries so they can carry on the project work after the donor leaves in a sustainable way."

Table 4.5: Rank of perceived importance of critical success factors (CSFs) of community development projects

Descriptive statistics			
Importance of CSFs	N	Mean	Rank (with in a phase)
Conceptualizing phase			
Understanding of project environment	40	4.43	2
Competency of project designers	40	3.93	3
Effective consultations with stakeholders	40	4.83	1
Planning phase			
Compatible development priorities	40	4.48	2
Adequate resources	40	4.00	3
Competency of project planners	40	3.70	4
Effective consultations during planning	40	4.73	1
Implementing phase			
Compatible rules and procedures	40	4.30	3
Continuing supports of stakeholders	40	3.13	5
Commitment to project goals and objectives	40	4.50	2
Competencies of project management team	40	3.88	4
Effective consultations with all stakeholders	40	4.70	1
Closing phase			
Adequate provision in project plan	40	3.30	3
Competency of project manager	40	4.13	2
Effective consultations with key stakeholders	40	4.65	1
Overall project success			
Clear policy of donors and implementing partners	40	3.93	3
Adequate local capacities	40	4.38	2
Strong local ownership of project	40	4.63	1

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Mean was computed for critical success factors under each phase. Accordingly, effective consultations with stakeholders and understanding of project environment ranked first and second respectively under the conceptualizing phase. Similarly, effective consultations during

planning was ranked first while compatible development priorities and adequate resources second and third under planning phase by project staff. As shown in table 4.5 above effective consultations with all stakeholders was ranked first, commitment to project goals and objectives second, compatible rules and procedures third and competencies of project management team as fourth under the implementation phase. Effective consultations with key stakeholders was ranked and competency of project manager second under the closing phase.

Table 4.6: Results of bivariate Pearson's correlation analysis of critical success factors of community development projects

Correlations					
		Effective con. with SHs (conceptualizing phase)	Effective con. with SHs (planning phase)	Effective con. with SHs (implementing phase)	Effective con. with SHs (closing phase)
Effective con. with SHs (conceptualizing phase)	Pearson Correlation	1	.158	.116	.318[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.329	.475	.045
	N	40	40	40	40
Effective con. with SHs (planning phase)	Pearson Correlation	.158	1	.077	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.329		.637	.922
	N	40	40	40	40
Effective con. with SHs (implementing phase)	Pearson Correlation	.116	.077	1	.074
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.475	.637		.648
	N	40	40	40	40
Effective con. with SHs (closing phase)	Pearson Correlation	.318[*]	.016	.074	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.045	.922	.648	
	N	40	40	40	40
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).					

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Correlation analysis

Bivariate Pearson's correlation was used to know the order of strength of correlation between success factors of community development projects. The correlation results indicate that effective consultations with all concerned stakeholders at the conceptualizing and closing phase has moderate relationship. Pearson's bivariate correlation coefficient shows a moderate positive

linear relationship between both test scores (r = .318) that is significantly different from zero (p < 0.001). Further, Pearson's correlational analysis shows competency of project designers, planners and project managers at the conceptualizing, planning, implementation and closing phase are related.

Table 4.7: Results of Pearson's correlation analysis of critical success factors of community development projects

Correlations					
		Comp. of project managers (CP)	Comp. of project managers (PP)	Comp. of project management (IP)	Comp. of project manager (CP)
Comp. of project managers (CP)	Pearson Correlation	1	.656**	.356*	.109
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.024	.502
	N	40	40	40	40
Comp. of project managers (PP)	Pearson Correlation	.656**	1	.387*	.317*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.014	.046
	N	40	40	40	40
Comp. of project management (IP)	Pearson Correlation	.356*	.387*	1	.582**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	.014		.000
	N	40	40	40	40
Comp. of project manager (CP)	Pearson Correlation	.109	.317*	.582**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.502	.046	.000	
	N	40	40	40	40
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).					

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Table 4.8: Perceived importance of success criteria of community development projects

Descriptive Statistics			
Success Criteria	N	Mean	Rank
Relevance	40	4.83	1
Efficiency	40	4.03	3
Effectiveness	40	4.60	2
Impact	40	3.98	4
Sustainability	40	3.63	5
Total	40		

As indicated in Table 4.8 above, relevance was ranked as the best criteria to evaluate the success of development projects by the study participants. Effectiveness and efficiency were identified as the second and third criteria to evaluate the success of community development projects. The criterion ranked fourth in evaluating community development projects was impact and sustainability as the fifth important criterion.

4.2.3. Beneficiaries response on success of community development projects

Table 4.9: Management of community development projects

No	Statement	Response									
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Not sure		Agree		Strongly agree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Management of community development projects											
1	The project has the project manager responsible for managing the project					17	9.7	67	38.1	92	52.3
2	A project committee was established to control the project					15	8.6	71	40.3	90	51.1
3	The committee has the necessary skills to control the project					14	8.0	81	46	81	46
4	Management was working towards the realization of the goals of the project			2	1.2	18	10.2	63	35.8	93	52.8
5	The project manager or committee involved project members in decision making and project matters			8	4.6	15	8.5	86	48.9	67	38.1

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Table 4.9 above indicates how project beneficiaries view the management of community-based projects. Table 4.9 above indicates that the majority of respondents (52.3%) strongly agreed and 38.1% agreed that the project has project managers responsible for managing the projects. Table 4.9 also shows that the majority (51.1%) of respondents strongly agreed and 40.3% agreed that project committee was established to control the project. Further, a significant number of the

respondents strongly agreed and agreed (92%) that the committee has the necessary skills to control the project.

Moreover, most respondents (52.8%) strongly agreed and 35.8% agreed that the management was working towards the realization of project goals. Table 4.9 also indicates that 38.1% of the respondents strongly agreed and 48.9% agreed that project manager or committee involved project members in decision making and project matters.

Table 4.10: Community involvement in project matters

No	Statement	Response									
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Not sure		Agree		Strongly agree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Community involvement in project matters											
6	The community was involved during initiation of the project							36	20.5	140	79.6
7	The needs of the community were assessed during project initiation					2	1.2	41	23.3	130	75.6
8	The community has an opportunity to make inputs and suggestions during the project			2	1.2	1	.6	76	43.2	94	53.4
9	The community get reports on the progress of the project					19	10.8	93	52.8	64	36.4
10	Community members are involved in project committee			11	6.3	12	6.8	88	50	65	36.9

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Table 4.10 above indicates that the majority (79.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed and 20.5% agreed that the community was involved during project initiation. 75.6% of the respondents strongly agreed and 23.3% agreed that the needs of the community were assessed during initiation of the project. Further, Table 4.10 shows the majority (53.4%) of respondents strongly agreed and 43.2% agreed that the community has an opportunity to make inputs and suggestions during the project and only 1.2% of the respondents disagreed. 36.4% and 52.8% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that community get reports on the

progress of the project. Table 4.10 above also indicates that the half (50%) of the respondents agreed and 36.9 strongly agreed that community members are involved in project committee, whilst 6.3% disagreed.

In addition to community involvement in the project, project beneficiaries were asked the involvement of the government in community development projects as described in Table 4.11 below.

Table 4.11: Government involvement in community- based projects

No	Statement	Response									
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Not sure		Agree		Strongly agree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Government involvement in community- based projects											
11	The government was involved during initiation of the project			7	4	23	13.1	79	44.9	67	38.1
12	The government was involved during the planning of the project			8	4.6	15	8.5	81	46	72	40.9
13	The government provide assistance during the project			6	3.4	10	5.7	91	51.7	69	39.2
14	When there are challenges, the government is involved in addressing challenges			6	3.4	8	4.5	101	57.4	61	34.7
15	Government officials usually visit the project			8	4.6	9	5.1	89	50.6	70	39.8

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Table 4.11 above indicates that a significant number of respondents agreed and strongly agreed (83%) that the government was involved during the initiation of the project, 13.1% not sure and 23% disagreed. The majority (86.9%) of the respondents agreed that the government was involved during project planning and a minority (4.6%) disagreed. According to 90.9% of the respondents, the government provides assistance during the implementation of the project and the government is involved in addressing project challenges (92.1%). Table 4.11 above also indicates that the majority (90.4%) agreed that government officials usually visit the project whereas 4.6% disagreed.

Table 4.12: Communication

No	Statement	Response									
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Not sure		Agree		Strongly agree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Communication											
16	Decisions taken are communicated to all involved in the project			7	4	32	18.2	76	43.2	61	34.7
17	The flow of information in the project is satisfactory			10	5.7	28	15.9	75	42.6	63	35.8
18	Project members are given opportunity to give their views on the progress of the project			11	6.3	24	13.6	83	47.2	58	33
19	Project meetings are held including all members	3	1.7	10	5.7	22	12.5	84	47.7	57	32.4
20	The progress of the project is communicated to the community			9	5.1	21	11.9	84	47.7	62	35.2

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Table 4.12 above indicates that the majority (77.9%) of the respondents agreed that decisions taken are communicated to all involved in the project, while 18.2% not sure and 4% disagreed. Table 4.12 above also indicates that the majority (78.4%) of the respondents agree that the flow of information in the project is satisfactory, 15.9% not sure and only 5.7% disagreed. Moreover, Table 4.12 above indicates that the majority (80.2%) of the respondents agreed that project members are given opportunity to give their views on the progress of the project. 80.1% of the respondents agreed that project meetings are held including all members and that the progress of the project is communicated to the community (82.9%).

Table 4.13: Monitoring and evaluation

No	Statement	Response									
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Not sure		Agree		Strongly agree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Monitoring and evaluation											
25	The project committee usually visit the project to monitor and evaluate its progress			9	5.1	25	14.2	85	48.3	57	32.4
26	Concerned government officials including committee members visit the project to check its progress			4	2.3	22	12.5	92	52.3	58	33
27	Community leaders and civic members usually visit the project to monitor and evaluate its progress and challenges			3	1.7	22	12.5	99	56.3	52	29.5

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Table 4.13 above indicates that the majority (80.7%) of the respondents agreed that the project committee usually visit the project to monitor and evaluate its progress, 14.2% not sure and 5.1% disagreed. As shown in Table 4.13 above, the majority (85.3%%) of the respondents agreed that concerned government officials including committee members visit the project to check its progress and that community leaders and civic members usually visit the project to monitor and evaluate progress and challenges (85.8%).

Table 4.14: Interpersonal Skills

No	Statement	Response									
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Not sure		Agree		Strongly agree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interpersonal skills											
28	There was strong relationship between project members					15	8.6	72	40.9	89	50.6
29	The project committee and leaders were motivating project members to work hard to achieve objectives and high performance			3	1.7	13	7.4	86	48.9	74	42
30	Relationship between project members and the community was good			3	1.7	12	6.8	71	40.3	90	51.1
31	Beneficiaries were treated with respect and dignity			5	2.9	12	6.8	68	38.6	91	51.7

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Table 4.14 above indicates that most (91.5%%) of the respondents agreed there was strong relationship between project members, the relationship between project members and community was good (91.4%) and that customers were treated with respect and dignity (90.3%). The above table also shows that most (90.9%) of the respondents agreed that the project committee and leaders were motivating project members to work hard to achieve project objectives and high performance.

Table 4.15: Capacity building and skills development

No	Statement	Response									
		Strongly disagree		Disagree		Not sure		Agree		Strongly agree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Capacity building and skills development											
32	Project members received training on the production of goods and services			4	2.3	23	13.1	74	42	75	42.6
33	Workshops were done to project members to improve performance and production capacity			24	13.7	38	21.6	69	39.2	45	25.6
34	Project members were trained on managing and handling project finances			9	5.1	26	14.8	66	37.5	75	42.6

Source: CDP Survey, 2017

Table 4.15 above indicates that the majority (84.6%) of the respondents agreed project members received training on the production of goods and services. A significant number of the respondents (114) agreed workshops/experience sharing were done to project beneficiaries to improve performance and production capacity, 21.6% not sure and 13.7% disagreed. Finally, Table 4.15 above indicates that the majority (80.1%) of the respondents agreed that project members were trained on managing and handling project finances.

4.3. Discussions

Throughout all the project phases, the study examined effective consultation with key stakeholders or relevant stakeholders to every activity assures smooth processes throughout the project life cycle. For example, consulting end beneficiaries in the design phase ensures the project design fits the needs of the target group, while in the planning or the implementation phase, consulting the counterpart government ensures the plan fits the overall strategic plan and policies of the government. This is also similar to the findings of other development projects in

Ethiopia (Bayiley & Teklu, 2016), Bangladesh (Khan et al., 2000) and Ghana (Ofori, 2013) in terms of stakeholders' engagement and effective consultation with key stakeholders.

In the conceptualizing phase, the project management team has to carry out a proper needs assessment to the project context, environment and end beneficiaries to guarantee that the project meets an actual need that is relevant to the targeted beneficiaries. In the planning phase, ensuring the feasibility and practicality of the plan is crucial for its success. Lastly, in this study the interview captured that in the implementation phase, the ongoing monitoring and evaluation for the project activities ensures the project is being implemented as planned and that the project is on budget, on time and meets the desired quality. It also guides project managers to take necessary actions if things went off track. In agreement with the study of Yamin & Sim (2016) where "Monitoring CSF" was found to be the highest factor that influence project success.

Based on the findings of the study and the above discussion, it is possible to conclude stakeholder engagement is vital to community development planning, implementation, and evaluation, ensuring that development projects are appropriate, effective, and sustainable. According to (Cooke and Kothari, 2001) stakeholder engagement refers to substantive, two-way dialogue between an organization and its stakeholders. A stakeholder is anyone who may be affected by, or may affect a project. In the case of community development projects, stakeholders may include project donors, partner NGOs, government agencies, community participants and others. Engaging stakeholders can help to identify and prioritize community development needs and opportunities, to identify potential positive or negative impacts from extractives operations that development projects may further leverage or help to mitigate, gather innovative ideas, identify community resources and encourage community member involvement in project design, implementation, and monitoring.

Kapoor (2002) depicts two stakeholder engagement steps during community development process. During the planning phase, the organization should focus on identifying key stakeholders, the potential positive and negative impacts of the operation, community needs and existing community resources and assets. During the implementation phase, ongoing dialogue and participation is required to inform key decision making. In the monitoring and evaluation

phase, the impact of projects should be assessed together with stakeholders and communicated along with lessons learned. Effective community engagement in implementation projects may provide a springboard for building and maintaining positive community relations. According to (Bull, 1991) establishing and maintaining good relationships with communities and other key stakeholders is critical to an organizations effort to earn its "social license to operate" and may help to surface stakeholder issues, concerns before they become potential risks. Community relations and community development efforts are often closely aligned. Positive community participation is the foundation of successful community implementation projects and may help to shape project design and foster constructive partnerships with stakeholders.

In the same vein, throughout all the project phases, competencies and skills of the implementing units are crucial for the success of the phase; namely, project designers, planners, implementation team and essentially the project manager. Accordingly, competency of project designers was rated as extremely important by 30% and highly important by 35% of the respondents at the conceptualizing phase. It was also rated as extremely important by 27.5% and highly important by 57% of the respondents at the closing phase. Similar to the studies in Bangladesh (Khan et al., 2000), Ethiopia (Bayiley & Teklu, 2016) and Ghana (Ofori, 2013), the project management structure, the knowledge, skills and competencies of the project manager, project designers and planners were found to be critical for the success of development projects. Accomplishment of a project successfully cannot be realized without a competent project team working coherently on conducting the project management functions. This factor was suggested by the literature as critical to success of a projects, (Pinto and Slevin, 1987) and the findings of the current study support the above argument, as it was stated to be highly desirable by project managers.

Lack of commitment to project together with its goals and objectives is listed as one of the major obstacles to development project success in World Bank exposit facto evaluation reports (Youker, 1999). With regard to our study, commitment to project goals and objectives was rated as extremely important by 52.5% and high importance by 45% of the respondents and ranked second at the implementing phase.

From the side of beneficiaries, the findings in respect of the management of community-based projects indicate that community projects are managed by the project committee established for that particular project. There was also project managers responsible for managing project. The study also revealed that community involvement is critical to the sustainability of community projects and programs implemented in communities. Community involvement is the key that ensure the understanding of needs of the people and make decisions that will meet those needs in the best possible way. In support of project staff, beneficiary respondents confirmed that the needs of communities were assessed during project initiation and planning of projects.

In addition to the community, the findings of this study also shows that government was involved during planning development projects during planning and implementation of community projects. Further, the study identified government officials usually visit community projects to monitor and evaluated progress. The study also shows that communication in community projects is satisfactory because participants who are project beneficiaries agreed there was a good flow of information in projects.

The study shows that the project committee usually visit projects for monitoring and evaluation of the progress of projects. The study also revealed project beneficiaries received trainings and workshops/experience sharing are conducted for project members to improve skills and their capacity.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Major Findings of the Study

Effective consultations with stakeholders and clear understanding of project environment are the two most reported CSF in the conceptualizing phase by the majority of the respondents (82.5%). In addition to effective consultation with all stakeholders in the conceptualizing phase, effective coordination and consultation with key stakeholders in the designing/planning phase is also rated as the most CSF by the majority of the respondents (72.5%) as extremely important.

Similar to the conceptualizing and planning phase, effective consultations with all concerned stakeholders was identified as the most CSF as 72.5% of the respondents rated as extremely important. Commitment to project goals and objectives by project staff and presence of compatible rules and procedures are also identified as CSFs at the implementing phase and rated as extremely important by 52.5% and 50% of the respondents respectively.

Effective consultations with key stakeholders at the closing phase was identified as CSF by 67.5% of the respondents and competency of project manager as extremely important by 27.5% of the respondents and as highly important by 57%. Adequate local capacities and strong local ownership of project were identified as the most CSF for the overall project success by 42.5% and 62.5% of the respondents.52.5% and 50% of the respondents respectively.

In support of these, the majority of project beneficiaries (52.3%) strongly agreed and 38.1% agreed that the project has project managers responsible for managing the projects. Further, the majority of community development beneficiaries (51.1%) strongly agreed and 40.3% agreed that project committee was established to control the project. In terms of stakeholder consultation, the majority (79.6%) of the respondents and project beneficiaries strongly agreed and 20.5% agreed that the community was involved during project initiation. 75.6% of the respondents strongly agreed and 23.3% agreed that the needs of the community were assessed during initiation of the project. Further, the majority (53.4%) of respondents strongly agreed and 43.2% agreed that the community has an opportunity to make inputs and suggestions during the

project and only 1.2% of the respondents disagreed. 36.4% and 52.8% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that community get reports on the progress of the project. Finally, the majority (77.9%) of the respondents agreed that decisions taken are communicated to all involved in the project, while 18.2% not sure and 4% disagreed.

5.2. Conclusion

The main objective of this study was to identify the critical success factors and success of community development projects in Lideta sub-city, which are quite different from the conventional body of knowledge on project management in business projects. Reviewing the current literature, only a handful of studies was found in the field of community development project management in general and in Ethiopia in specific. Although the findings of this research cannot be generalized to all types of projects in the community development sector, nor to other sectors, lessons learned and best practices have provided a number of factors that highly influence project management practices, projects sustainability and overall project success.

The study examined the project life cycle with the purpose of identifying the CSFs of each project phase: conceptualizing, planning, implementation, closure and overall project success. In addition, the success of community development project was also analyzed from the beneficiaries' perspective. The above findings reveal that these factors can not only affect the project success, but also the project sustainability. The findings are also aligned with previous literature emphasizing that these factors affect project success. Community-based projects are used by communities, government structures and non-governmental organizations as a strategy for community development. In the area under study community development projects seem successful in achieving these objectives.

Hence, project managers, implementing agencies and project partners can consider the identified CSFs to facilitate project success. In addition, partnership with key stakeholders and beneficiaries, alignment with the government structure, relevance to country's priorities and sustainability factors are key elements in the overall project success. By and large, this study makes a theoretical contribution to the existing body of knowledge of project management of community development projects implemented in Ethiopia; it has also provided useful insights in

the identification of CSFs to development projects that researchers, practitioners and policy makers shall consider.

5.3. Limitations of the Study

As there are limited studies on determinant factors for success of community development projects in Ethiopia to see whether the findings of the current study are supported or not with empirical evidences, the findings of this study cannot be directly generalized to all development projects in Lideta sub-city in particular and Ethiopia in general. The study is also limited to the data and documents available or provided by the targeted organization and were allowed to be accessed by the researcher. The results of the study cannot be generalized to other organizations in the sub-city.

5.4. Recommendations

In addition to general contribution to the field of project management, the study identified specific recommendations for improving the management of future similar projects and programs.

Based on the findings of the study, it is essential that the views of all key stakeholders are collected and analyzed at an early stage. This can help identify the real needs and possible constraints. The study provides clear evidence that the involvement of all relevant parties during the early stages of a project and other phases is vital in identifying their differing requirements and needs, critical for project success.

In project design, it is recommended to use different tools in situational analysis that will lead to better needs assessment in a participatory way. Among these are gap analysis and community asset assessment. These tools will guide the project to find the real gap and will also promote community participation through capitalizing on the existing resources the community has.

It is recommended that project managers create resource mobilization plan to secure new and additional resources for community development projects. The plan should also involve utilizing the use of existing resources and maximizing their better use. This plan supports the project's sustainability, allows for scaling up the project and improvement of the services provided.

Based on beneficiaries' response and qualitative part of the study, it is recommended that monitoring and evaluation should be established throughout the project life cycle involving key stakeholders. The aim of this activity is not only to evaluate that activities are being carried as planed or to document project results, but also to make sure that the expectation of key stakeholders is met and to measure their satisfaction. This also ensures that all partners are on the same page and creates a channel of transparent communication to avoid future conflicts.

References

Agunga, R. (1992). Development by Rules: An ethical reflection on the high failure rate of development projects and implications for communication. *Africa Media Review*, *6*(10), 1-13.

Andersen, E. S., Birchall, D., Arne Jessen, S., & Money, A. H. (2006). Exploring project success. *Baltic Journal of Management*, *1*(2), 127-147.

Arvidson, M., & Lyon, F. (2014). Social impact measurement and non-profit organizations: Compliance, resistance, and promotion. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *25*(4), 869-886.

Atkinson, R. (1999). Project management: cost, time and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon, its time to accept other success criteria. *International Journal of Project Management*, *17*(6), 337-342.

Baccarini, D. (1999). The logical framework method for defining project success. *Project Management Journal*, *30*(4), 25-32.

Baccarini, D. (1999). The logical framework method for defining project success. *Project Management Journal*, *30*(4), 25-32.

Barclay, C. (2008). Towards an integrated measurement of IS project performance: The project performance scorecard. *Information Systems Frontiers*, *10*(3), 331.

Bayiley, Y. T., & Teklu, G. K. (2016). Success factors and criteria in the management of international development projects: Evidence from projects funded by the European Union in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, *9*(3), 562-582.

Belassi, W., & Tukel, O. I. (1996). A new framework for determining critical success/failure factors in projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, *14*(3), 141-151.

Besner, C., & Hobbs, B. (2006). The perceived value and potential contribution of project management practices to project success. *Project Management Journal*, *37*(3), 37.

Carman, J. G. (2007). Evaluation practice among community-based organizations research into the reality. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *28*(1), 60-75.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education.* (6th ed.). London: Taylor & Francis Group.

Conde, E. (2009). A minmax regret approach to the critical path method with task interval times. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *197*(1), 235-242.

Cooke-Davies, T. (2002). The "real" success factors on projects. *International Journal of Project management*, *20*(3), 185-190.

Couillard, J. (1995). The role of project risk in determining project management approach. *Project Management Journal*, *26*, 3-15.

Couillard, J., Garon, S., & Riznic, J. (2009). The logical framework approach-millennium. *Project Management Journal*, *40*(4), 31-44.

Crawford, P., & Bryce, P. (2003). Project monitoring and evaluation: a method for enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation. *International Journal of Project Management*, *21*(5), 363-373.

Creswel, J.W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Qualitative and Quantitative Research*, 4th edition. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

de Wit, A. (1988). "Measurement of project success." *International Journal of Project Management*. 6 (3): 164-170.

Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2004). The success dimensions of international development projects: the perceptions of African project coordinators. *International Journal of Project management*, *22*(1), 19-31.

Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2005). The success of international development projects, trust and communication: An African perspective. *International Journal of Project management*, *23*(3), 237-252.

OECD. (2003). Official development assistance. Retrieved from

http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/officialdevelopmentassistancedefinitionandcoverage.htm#Definition

Heeks, R. (2002). *E-Government in Africa: Promise and practice.*

Hermano, V., López-Paredes, A., Martín-Cruz, N., & Pajares, J. (2013). How to manage international development (ID) projects successfully. Is the PMD Pro1 Guide going to the right direction? *International Journal of Project Management*, *31*(1), 22-30.

Ika, L. A. (2009). Project success as a topic in project management journals. *Project Management Journal*, *40*(4), 6-19.

Ika, L. A., Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2010). Project management in the international development industry: the project coordinator's perspective. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, *3*(1), 61-93.

Ika, L. A., Diallo, A., & Thuillier, D. (2012). Critical success factors for World Bank projects: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Project management*, *30*(1), 105-116.

Johnson, RB. & Onwuegbuzie, AJ. (2004). Mixed methods research: a research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher,* 33(7):14-26.

Kakonge, J. O. (1995). Dilemmas in the design and implementation of agricultural projects in various African countries: The role of environmental impact assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *15*(3), 275-285.

Khan, Z. A., Thornton, N., & Frazer, M. (2000). Experience of a financial reforms project in Bangladesh. *Public Administration & Development*, *20*(1), 33.

Khang, D. B., & Moe, T. L. (2008). Success criteria and factors for international development projects: A life-cycle-based framework. *Project Management Journal*, *39*(1), 72-84.

Kwak, Y. H. (2002). International Development Project Management. In *10th Symposium Construction Innovation and Global Competitiveness*. CRC Press.

Lancaster, C. (2008). *Foreign aid: Diplomacy, development, domestic politics*. University of Chicago Press.

Leech, NL. & Onwuegbuzie, AJ. 2009. A typology of mixed methods research designs. *Qual Quant*, 43:265-275.

Leedy, PD. & Ormrod, JE. 2001. *Practical research: planning and design.* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lim, C. S., & Mohamed, M. Z. (1999). Criteria of project success: an exploratory re-examination. *International Journal of Project Management*, *17*(4), 243-248.

Liu, A. M., & Walker, A. (1998). Evaluation of project outcomes. *Construction Management & Economics*, *16*(2), 209-219.

Marczyk, G., DeMatteo, D. & Festinger, D. 2005. *Essentials of research design and methodology*. New Jersey: John Willey & Sons, Inc.

McMillan, JH. & Schumacher, S. 2010. *Research in education. Evidence-based research*. (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Milis, K., & Mercken, R. (2004). The use of the balanced scorecard for the evaluation of information and communication technology projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, *22*(2), 87-97.

Montes-Guerra, M. I., De-Miguel, A. R., Pérez-Ezcurdia, M. A., Gimena Ramos, F. N., & Díez-Silva, H. M. (2015). Project Management in Development Cooperation. Non-Governmental Organizations. *Innovar*, *25*(56), 53-68.

Morris, P. W. (2010). Research and the future of project management. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, *3*(1), 139-146.

Morris, P. W., & Hough, G. H. (1987). The anatomy of major projects: A study of the reality of project management. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester.

Morris, P. W., Crawford, L., Hodgson, D., Shepherd, M. M., & Thomas, J. (2006). Exploring the role of formal bodies of knowledge in defining a profession–The case of project management. *International Journal of Project Management*, *24*(8), 710-721.

Ofori, D. F. (2013). Project management practices and critical success factors-A developing country perspective. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *8*(21), 14.

Ogunlana, S. O. (2010). Beyond the 'iron triangle': Stakeholder perception of key performance indicators (KPIs) for large-scale public sector development projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, *28*(3), 228-236.

Pinto, J. K., & Mantel, S. J. (1990). The causes of project failure. *IEEE transactions on engineering management*, *37*(4), 269-276.

Pinto, J. K., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Critical success factors in R&D projects. *Research-Technology Management*, *32*(1), 31-35.

Plaza, M., & Turetken, O. (2009). A model-based DSS for integrating the impact of learning in project control. *Decision Support Systems*, *47*(4), 488-499.

Project Management Institute (2013), A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide), 5th ed., Project Management Institute, Inc., Newtown Square, PA.

Shenhar, A. J., Dvir, D., Levy, O., & Maltz, A. C. (2001). Project success: a multidimensional strategic concept. *Long range planning*, *34*(6), 699-725.

Slevin, D. P., & Pinto, J. K. (1986). The project implementation profile: new tool for project managers. *Project Management Journal*, 17(4), 57-70.

Steinfort, P. and Walker, D.H.T. (2011). What Enables Project Success: Lessons from Aid Relief Projects?, Project management Institute, Inc., Newtown Square, PA.

Wi, H., & Jung, M. (2010). Modeling and analysis of project performance factors in an extended project-oriented virtual organization (EProVO). *Expert Systems with Applications*, *37*(2), 1143-1151.

Yamin, M., & Sim, A. K. (2016). Critical success factors for international development projects in Maldives: Project teams' perspective. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, *9*(3), 481-504.

Annex A: Results of Pearson correlation analysis of critical success factors of community development projects

Correlations		Understanding of project env't by funding and IPs (CP)	Compatibility of dev't priorities of the key SHs (PP)	Adequate resources and competencies available to support the project plan (PP)	Compatible rules and procedures for PM (IP)	Continuing supports of SHs (IP)	Commitment to project goals and objectives (IP)	Adequate provisions for project closing (Closing P)	Donors and IPs have clear policies (Closing P)
Understanding of project env't by funding and IPs (CP)	Pearson Correlation	1	-.150	.202	-.115	.125	-.272	.393*	.483**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.357	.211	.482	.442	.089	.012	.002
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Compatibility of dev't priorities of the key SHs (PP)	Pearson Correlation	-.150	1	-.401*	.395*	.027	.425**	.020	-.340*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.357		.010	.012	.869	.006	.903	.032
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Adequate resources and competencies available to support the project plan (PP)	Pearson Correlation	.202	-.401*	1	-.051	.323*	-.072	.309	.483**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.211	.010		.756	.042	.658	.053	.002
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Compatible rules and procedures for PM (IP)	Pearson Correlation	-.115	.395*	-.051	1	.474**	.526**	-.130	-.317*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.482	.012	.756		.002	.000	.424	.046
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Continuing supports of SHs (IP)	Pearson Correlation	.125	.027	.323*	.474**	1	.210	.419**	.292
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.442	.869	.042	.002		.194	.007	.067

	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Commitment to project goals and objectives (IP)	Pearson Correlation	-.272	.425**	-.072	.526**	.210	1	.071	-.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.089	.006	.658	.000	.194		.662	.864
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Adequate provisions for project closing (Closing P)	Pearson Correlation	.393*	.020	.309	-.130	.419**	.071	1	.568**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.903	.053	.424	.007	.662		.000
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
Donors and IPs have clear policies to sustain project's activities and results (Closing P)	Pearson Correlation	.483**	-.340*	.483**	-.317*	.292	-.028	.568**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.032	.002	.046	.067	.864	.000	
	N	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).									
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).									

ANNEX B: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BENEFICIARIES

I, _____ am a Masters student at St. Mary's University in the School of Graduate Studies. I am engaged in a research study entitled: **Factors Affecting the Success/Failure of Development Projects: The Case of Yekokeb Berhan Project.**
The objective of the study is to investigate factors affecting success and failure of development projects and provide recommendations for future similar projects.

NB. Information supplied by respondents in this questionnaire will be treated with high confidentiality and anonymity. The questionnaire will be completed in the presence of the researcher thus face to face. Respondents will be treated with high level of respect and dignity. Respondents have the right to participate and withdraw in the study.
Date ....

A. Demographic Information
1. Gender_____
2. Age_____
3. Position in the household
4. Number of household members_____
5. Marital status_____
6. Employment status_____

B. Management of Development Projects
   Please mark the most appropriate with an "X"

	Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
	Management of community development projects					
1	The project has the project manager responsible for managing the project					
2	A project committee was established to control the project					
3	The committee has the necessary skills to control the project					
4	Management was working towards the realization of the goals of the project					
5	The project manager or committee involved project members in decision making and project matters					
	Community involvement in project matters					
6	The community was involved during initiation of the project					
7	The needs of the community were					

	assessed during project initiation					
8	The community has an opportunity to make inputs and suggestions during the project					
9	The community get reports on the progress of the project					
10	Community members are involved in project committee					
Government involvement in community- based projects						
11	The government was involved during initiation of the project					
12	The government was involved during the planning of the project					
13	The government provide assistance during the project					
14	When there are challenges, the government is involved in addressing challenges					
15	Government officials usually visit the project					
Communication						
16	Decisions taken are communicated to all involved in the project					
17	The flow of information in the project is satisfactory					
28	Project members are given opportunity to give their views on the progress of the project					
19	Project meetings are held including all members					
20	The progress of the project is communicated to the community					
Management of funds						
21	Funds received are recorded in project					
22	The project has a committee responsible for the control of funds					
23	Financial reports are prepared for the project					
24	Financial reports are given to the notice of all stakeholders involved					
Monitoring and evaluation						
25	The project committee usually visit the project to monitor and evaluate its progress					
26	Concerned government officials					

	including committee members visit the project to check its progress					
27	Community leaders and civic members usually visit the project to monitor and evaluate its progress and challenges					
	Interpersonal skills					
28	There was strong relationship between project members					
29	The project committee and leaders were motivating project members to work hard to achieve objectives and high performance					
30	Relationship between project members and the community was good					
31	Beneficiaries were treated with respect and dignity					
	Capacity building and skills development					
32	Project members received training on the production of goods and services					
33	Workshops were done to project members to improve performance and production capacity					
34	Project members were trained on managing and handling project finances					

Outline further suggestions and opinion important for community development projects

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thanks for your time and contribution. Good luck for the future.

ANNEX C: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT STAFF

I, _____ am MA student at St. Mary's University in the School of Graduate Studies. I am engaged in a research study entitled: **Factors Affecting the Success/Failure of Development Projects: The Case of Yekokeb Berhan Project.**
The objective of the study is to investigate factors affecting success and failure of development projects and provide recommendations for future similar projects.

NB. Information supplied by respondents in this questionnaire will be treated with high confidentiality and anonymity. Respondents will be treated with high level of respect and dignity. Respondents have the right to participate and withdraw in the study.

Date ....
  I. **Demographic Information**
    1. Gender: Male   Female
    2. Please choose your level of Education: Diploma BA/BSc   MA/MSc
    3. How long do you work with Yekokeb Berhan development project?_____

II. Questions about Success Criteria
For the following section please provide your perception about the extent of importance of the suggested success criteria of the projects by marking "X" in the appropriate answer box as follows:

No	Suggested Success Criteria	Not Important	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance	Extremely Important
1	**Relevance** (Identification of real problems and needs of the correct beneficiaries; how well the project's initial design addresses the identified problems and needs)					
2	**Efficiency** (The quality of day-to-day project management; costs and values for money; quality of monitoring)					
3	**Effectiveness** (Whether the planned benefits have been delivered and received by the key beneficiaries)					

No		Not important	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance	Extremely Importance
4	**Impact** (to what extent the planned overall objectives have been achieved and how far that achievement was directly related to the project)					
5	**Sustainability** (relates to the continuance of positive outcomes of the project at purpose level after the end of external funding)					

If you ranked any of these criteria as not important or less important, would you please briefly explain why?

_____

_____

_____

Questions Related to Success Factors

For the following section please provide your perception about the extent of importance of the suggested success factors of the projects you are managing by marking "X" in the appropriate answer box as follows:

No.	Suggested Success Factors	Not important	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance	Extremely Importance
	Conceptualizing					
1	Clear understanding of project environment by funding and implementing partners					
2	Competencies of project designers/managers					
3	Effective consultations with primary stakeholders/beneficiaries					
	Planning					
4	Compatibility of development priorities of the key stakeholders					
5	Adequate resources and competencies available					

No.	Suggested Success Factors	Not important	Low Importance	Medium Importance	High Importance	Extremely Importance
	to support the project plan					
6	Competencies of project planners/mangers					
7	Effective consultation with key stakeholders					

	Implementing					
8	Compatible rules and procedures for Project management					
9	Continuing supports of stakeholders					
10	Commitment to project goals and objectives					
11	Competencies of project management team					
12	Effective consultations with all stakeholders					
	Closing/Completing					
13	Adequate provisions for project closing in the project plan					
14	Competencies pf project manager					
15	Effective consultation with key stakeholders					
	Overall project success					
16	Donors and implementing partners have clear policies to sustain project's activities and results					
17	Adequate local capacities are available					
18	There is strong local ownership of the project					

Thank you for your time and concern again

ANNEX D: Key Informant Interview for Project and Government Staff

I, _____ am MA student at St. Mary's University in the School of Graduate Studies. I am engaged in a research study entitled: **Factors Affecting the Success/Failure of Development Projects: The Case of Yekokeb Berhan Project.**
The objective of the study is to investigate factors affecting success and failure of development projects and provide recommendations for future similar projects.

NB. Information supplied by respondents in this questionnaire will be treated with high confidentiality and anonymity. Respondents will be treated with high level of respect and dignity. Respondents have the right to participate and withdraw in the study.

Date ....
Demographic Information
1. Gender: Male Female
2. Your level of Education: Diploma   BA/BSc   MA/MSc
3. How long do you work with Yekokeb Berhan development project? _____

Q1. To what extent your involvement in the YB development project initiation, planning, implementation and remaining activities?

Q2. Can you list down all relevant stakeholders, which were invited and involved/involving in the project initiation, planning, implementation and remaining activities?

Q3. How do you see the overall management of the project? What factors are contributing to what you mentioned?

Q4. How was the project being managed/monitored/supervised?

ዐባሪ 1፡ ለፕሮጀክቱ ተጠቃሚዎች ቃለመጠይቅ

እኔ----------------- አባላለሁ በቅድስተ ማርያም ዩኒቨርሲቲ የድህረ ምረቃ ክፍል የሁለተኛ ዲግሪ ተማሪ ነኝ፡፡ "የልማት ፕሮጀክቶች ዉጤታማ እንዲሆኑ ወይም እንዳይሆኑ የሚያደርጉ ምክኒያቶች፡ የኮከብ ብርሀን ፕሮጀክት" በሚል ርዕስ ላይ ጥናት አያደረኩ ነዉ፡፡

የዚህ ጥናት አላማ የልማት ፕሮጀክቶች ዉጤታማ እንዲሆኑ ወይም እንዳይሆኑ የሚያደርጉ ምክኒያቶች መፈተሽ እና ወደፊት ለሚመጡ ተመሳሳይ ፕሮጀክቶች የማሻሻያ ሀሳቦችን መስጠት ነዉ፡

ማስታወሻ፡ በተጠያቂዉ የሚሰጡ መረጃዎች ሚስጢራዊነታቸዉ የተጠበቀ ነዉ፡፡ የተጠያቂዎችም ማንነት እንዲታወቅ አይደረግም፡፡ መጠይቁ በቃለመጠይቅ አድራጊዉ/ተመራማሪዉ ይሞላል፡፡ ተጠያቂዉ ከፍተኛ አክብሮት ይሰጠዋል፡፡ ተጠያቂዉ በቃለመጠይቁ የመሳተፍ ወይም የማቋረጥ መብት አለዉ፡፡

ቀን፡--------------------

C. **መሰረታዊ መረጃዎች**
   7. ጾታ፡ _____
   8. ዕድሜ፡_____
   9. በቤተሰብ ዉስጥ ያለዎት ድርሻ_____
   10. የቤተሰብ ብዛት_____
   11. የጋብቻ ሁኔታ_____
   12. የስራ ሁኔታ_____
   13. በየኮከብ ብርሀን ፕሮጀክት የታቀፉበት ዓ.ም_____

D. **የልማት ፕሮጀክት አስተዳደር**

እባክዎትን ትክክለኛዉን መልስዎን "X" ምልክት ያርጉበት

ተ.ቁ	ዓረፍተ ነገር	በጣም አልስማማም	አልስማማም	እርግጠኛ አይደለሁም	እስማማለሁ	በጣም እስማማለሁ
	የማህበረሰብ ልማት ፕሮጀክት አስተዳደር					
1	ፕሮጀክቱ ፕሮጀክቱን የሚያስተዳድር የፕሮጀክት አስተዳዳሪ አለዉ					
2	ፕሮጀክቱን የሚቆጣጠር የፕሮጀክት ኮሚቴ ተቋቁሞዋል					
3	የፕሮጀክት ኮሚቴዉ አባላት ፕሮጀክቱን ለመቆጣጠር የሚያስችል አስፈላጊዉ ከህሎት አላቸዉ					
4	የፕሮጀክት አስተዳዳሩ የፕሮጀክቱን አላማ ከግብ ለማድረስ ይሰራል					
5	የፕሮጀክቱ አስተዳዳሪ ወይም ኮሚቴ የፕሮጀክቱን አባላት በዉሳኔ አሰጣጥ እና ከፕሮጀክቱ ጋር ተያያዥ በሆኑ ጉዳዮች ላይ ያሳተፋል					
	ከፕሮጀክቱ ጋር ተያያዥ በሆኑ ጉዳዮች የማህበረሰብ ተሳትፎ					
7	ማህበረሰቡ የፕሮጀክቱ ህሳብ በቀረበበት ወቅት ተሳትፎ ነበር					
8	የማህበረሰቡ ፍላጎት/ችግሮች ዳሰሳ የፕሮጀክቱ ህሳብ በቀረበበት ወቅት ተካሂዶ ነበር					

ተ.ቁ	ዓረፍተ ነገር	በጣም አልስማማም	አልስማማም	እርግጠኛ አይደለሁም	እስማማለሁ	በጣም እስማማለሁ
9	ማህበረሰቡ በፕሮጀክት ትግበራ ወቅት አስተዋፅኦ ለማድለግ ወይም ሀሳብ ለመስጠት ዕድሉን ያገኛል					
10	ማህበረሰቡ የፕሮጀክት ትግበራ ሪፖርት/ዘገባ ያገኛል					
11	የማህበረሰቡ አባላት በፕሮጀክት ኮሚቴ ዉስጥ ይሳተፋሉ					
የመንግስት ተሳትፎ በማህበረሰብ ተኮር ፕሮጀክቶች						
12	የፕሮጀክቱ ፅንስ ሀሳብ ወቅት መንግስት ተሳታፊ ነበር					
13	የፕሮጀክቱ ዕቅድ በሚወጣበት ወቅት መንግስት ተሳታፊ ነበር					
14	የፕሮጀክቱ ትግበራ ወቅት መንግስት ድጋፍ አድርጎዋል					
15	ችግሮች ባጋጠሙ ወቅት መንግስት ችግሮቹን በመፍታት ሂደት ተሳትፏዋል					
16	የመንግስት ባለድርሻ አካላት በተደጋጋሚ ፕሮጀክቱን ይጎበኛሉ					
	ኮሚኒኬሽን/ተግባቦት					
18	የሚወሰኑ ዉሳኔዎች ለሁሉም ባለድርሻ አካላት እንዲታወቁ ይደረጋል					
19	የፕሮጀክቱ የመረጃ ፍሰት አጥጋቢ ነዉ.					
20	የፕሮጀክቱ አባላት በፕሮጀክቱ አተገባበር ላይ ሃሳባቸዉን እንዲሰጡ ዕድል ይሰጣቸዋል					
21	በፕሮጀክት ስብሰባ ወቅት ሁሉም አባላት ይሳተፋሉ					
22	የፕሮጀክት አተገባበር ሁኔታ ለማህበረሰቡ እንዲታወቅ ይደረጋል					
	የፈንድ/የገንዘብ ድጋፍ አስተዳደር					
23	በፕሮጀክቱ የተገኙ የገንዘብ ድጋፎች/ፈንዶች ይመዘገባሉ					
24	ፕሮጀክቱ ፈንዱን/የገንዘብ ድጋፉን የሚቆጣጠር ኮሚቴ አለዉ					
25	የፕሮጀክቱ የፋይናንስ/ገንዘብ አጠቃቀም ሪፖርት ይዘጋጃል					
26	የፕሮጀክቱ የፋይናንስ/ገንዘብ አጠቃቀም ሪፖርት ለሁሉም ባለድርሻ አካላት እንዲያዉቁ ይደረጋል					
	ክትትልና ግምገማ					
27	የፕሮጀክት ኮሚቴዉ አዘዉትረዉ ፕሮጀክቱን ለመከታተልና ለመገምገም ጉብኘት ያደርጋል					
28	የመንግስት ባለድርሻ አካላት እና የኮሚቴ አባላት ጋር የፕሮጀክቱን አተገባበር ሁኔታ ለማየት ጉብኘት ያደርጋሉ					

ተ. ቁ	ዓረፍተ ነገር	በጣም አልስማማም	አልስማማም	እርግጠኛ አይደለሁም	እስማማለሁ	በጣም እስማማለሁ
29	የማህበረሰብ መሪዎች እና የሲቪክ ማህበረሰብ አባላት አዘወትረዉ የፕሮጀክቱን አተገባበር ሁኔታ ለመከታተልና ለመገምገም እንዲሁም ያጋጠሙ ችግሮችን ለማየት ጉብኝት ያደርጋሉ					
	የተግባቦት ክህሎት					
30	በፕሮጀክቱ አባላት መካከል ጠንካራ ግንኙነት አለ					
31	የፕሮጀክት ኮሚቴ እና መሪዎች የፕሮጀክት አባላት የፕሮጀክቱን ዓላማ ከግብ እንዲያደርሱ እና ፐርፎርማንሳቸዉ እንዲጨምር ያበረታቱ ነበር					
32	በፕሮጀክቱ አባላት እና በማህበረሰቡ መካከል ያለዉ ግንኙነት ጥሩ ነበር					
33	የፕሮጀክቱ ተጠቃሚዎች ክብር ይሰጣቸዉ ነበር					
	የእቅም ግንባታ እና ክህሎት ማሳደግ					
34	የፕሮጀክት አባላት በምርት/አገልግሎት ማምረት ላይ ስልጠና ወስደዋል					
35	የፕሮጀክት አባላትን ፐርፎርማንስ እና የማምረት አቅም ለማሻሻል ወርከሾፖች ተዘጋጅተዉ ነበር					
36	የፕሮጀክት አባላት የፕሮጀክት ፊይናንስ አያያዝ ላይ ስልጠና ወስደዋል					

ለማህበረሰብ ልማት ፕሮጀክቱ ጠቃሚ አስተያየት እና ሀሳብ ካለዎት ይዘርዝሩ

_____
_____
_____
_____

ላደረጉት አስተዋጽኦ እና ለነበሮት ቆይታ አመሰግናለሁ። ለወደፊቱም መልካም ዕድል

ዐባሪ 2፡ ለፕሮጀክቱ ሰራተኞች

እኔ----------------- እባላለሁ በቅድስተ ማርያም ዩኒቨርሲቲ የድህረ ምረቃ ክፍል የሁለተኛ ዲግሪ ተማሪ ነኝ፡፡ **"የልማት ፕሮጀክቶች ዉጤታማ እንዲሆኑ ወይም እንዳይሆኑ የሚያደርጉ ምክኒያቶች፡ የኮከብ ብርሀን ፕሮጀክት"** በሚል ርዕስ ላይ ጥናት ዕያደረኩ ነዉ፡፡

የዚህ ጥናት አላማ የልማት ፕሮጀክቶች ዉጤታማ እንዲሆኑ ወይም እንዳይሆኑ የሚያደርጉ ምክኒያቶች መፈተሽ እና ወደፊት ለሚመጡ ተመሳሳይ ፕሮጀክቶች የማሻሻያ ሀሳቦችን መስጠት ነዉ፡

ማስታወሻ፡ በተጠያቂዉ የሚሰጡ መረጃዎች ሚስጢራዊነታቸዉ የተጠበቀ ነዉ፡፡ የተጠያቂዎችም ማንነት እንዲታወቅ አይደረግም፡፡ መጠይቁ በቃለመጠይቅ አድራጊዉ/ተመራማሪዉ ይሞላል፡፡ ተጠያቂዉ ከፍተኛ አክብሮት ይሰጠዋል፡፡ ተጠያቂዉ በቃለመጠይቁ የመሳተፍ ወየም የማቋረጥ መብት አለዉ፡፡

ቀን፡---------------------

I.   መሰረታዊ መረጃዎች
14. ጾታ፡ ወንድ   ሴት
15. የትምህርት ደለጃ፡ መጀመሪያ ደግሪ/ሁለተኛ ዲግሪ
16. ለምን ያክል ጊዜ ከየኮከብ ብርሃን ፕሮጀክት ጋር ሰርተዋል

II. የስኬት መስፈርት ጥያቄዎች

ለሚከተለዉ ክፍል ለተዘረዘሩት የዉጤታማነት መስፈርት ያሎትን የጠቀሜታ አመለካከት ይግለጹ፡፡ አባከዎትን ትክክለኛዉን መልስዎን "X" ምልክት ያርጉበት፡፡

ተ.ቁ	የስኬት መስፈርቶች	ጠቃሚ አይደለም	ዝቅተኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ	መካከለኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ	ከፍተኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ	አጅጋ ከፍተኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ
1	አስፈላጊነት (የፕሮጀክቱ ተጠቃሚዎችን እዉነተኛ ችግሮች/ፍላጎቶች መለየት፣ ምን ያክል የተቀረጸዉ ፕሮጀክት የተለዩትን ፍላጎቶች/ችግሮች ይፈታል)					
2	ዉጥት የመስጠት ችሎታ (የዕለት ከዕለት የፕሮጀክት አስተዳደር ጥራት፡ ወጪዎች እና የገንዘብ እሴት፡ የፕሮጀክት ክትትል ጥራት)					
3	ፈቱንነት (የታቀዱ ጥቅሞች ምንያክል ስራላይ ዉለዋል እንዲሁም ለተጠቃሚዉ ደርሰዋል)					
4	ዉጤት (ምን ያክል የታቀዱ አላማዎች ከግብ ደርሰዋል እና ምን ያክል ከፕሮጀክቱ ጋር ቀጥተኛ ግንኙነት ነበረዉ)					
5	ቀጣይነት (የፕሮጀክቱ መልካም ዉጤቶች ፕሮጀክቱ የገንዘብ ድጋፍ ከተቋረጠ በኋላ መቀጠል መቻል)					

መስፈርቶቹን ጠቃሚ አይደለም ወይም ዝቅተኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ ብለዉ ከሁነ አባከዎን ምክንያትዎን በአጭሩ ያብራሩ;

76

ከስኬታማነት ምክንያቶች ጋር የተያያዙ ጥያቄዎች

ለሚከተለዉ ክፍል ለተዘረዘሩት የዉጤታማነት መስፈርት ያሎትን የጠቀሜታ አመለካከት ይግለጹ፡፡ እባክዎትን ትክከለኛዉን መልስዎን "X" ምልክት ያኅጉበት፡፡

ተ.ቁ	የስኬት ምክንያቶች	ጠቃሚ አይደለም	ዝቅተኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ	መካከለኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ	ከፍተኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ	እጅግ ከፍተኛ ደረጃ ጠቃሚ
	አረዳድ/መረዳት					
1	የገንዘብ ድጋፍ አድራጊዉ እና ፕሮጀክት ተግባሪዉ የፕሮጀክቱን አካባቢ በደንብ መረዳት					
2	የፕሮጀክት አርቃቂዉ/አስተዳዳሪዉ ብቃት					
3	ከፕሮጀክቱ ተጠቃሚዎች ዉጤታማ የሆነ መማከር					
	ማቀድ					
4	የልማት ቅድሚያ የተሰጣቸዉ ነገሮች ከፕሮጀክቱ ተጠቃሚዎች ጋር መጣጣማቸዉ					
5	የፕሮጀክት ዕቅዱን ለመደገፍ ተመጣጣኝ የሆነ ሀብት እና ብቃት መኖር					
6	የፕሮጀክት አዘጋጁ/አስተዳዳሪዉ ብቃት					
7	ከፕሮጀክት ዋና ባለድርሻ አካላት ጋር ዉጤታማ የሆነ መመካከር					
	መተግበር/ትግበራ					
8	ለፕሮጀክት አስተዳደር ተመጣጣኝ የሆነ ህግ እና ሂደት					
9	ለፕሮጀክት ተጠቃሚዎች ቀጣይነት ያለዉ ድጋፍ					
10	ለፕሮጀክቱ ዓላማ እና ግብ ቁርጠኝነት					
11	የፕሮጀክት አስተዳደር ቡድን ብቃት					
12	ከሁሉም የፕሮጀክት ባለድርሻ አካላት ጋር ዉጤታማ የሆነ መመካከር					
	መዘጊያ/መጨረሻ					
13	በፕሮጀክት ዕቅዱ ስለ ፕሮጀክቱ መጨረሻ/ማብቂያ በቂ ማብራሪያ					
14	የፕሮጀክት አስተዳዳሪዉ ብቃት					
15	ከፕሮጀክት ዋና ባለድርሻ አካላት ጋር ዉጤታማ የሆነ መመካከር					
	አጠቃላይ የፕሮጀክት ስኬት					
16	የገንዘብ ድጋፍ አድራጊዉ እና ፕሮጀክት ተግባሪዎች በፕሮጀክቱ ቀጣይነት ዙሪያ ግልጽ ፖሊሲ/አቅጣ ጫ መኖር					
17	በአካባቢዉ በቂ የሆነ የሰዉ ሀይል መኖር					
18	በአካባቢዉ ጠንካራ የፕሮጀክት ባለቤትነት ስሜት አለ					

ላደረጉት አስተዋጽኦ እና ለነበሮት ቆይታ አመሰግናለሁ፡፡

DECLARATION

I the undersigned declare that this thesis is my original work, prepared under the guidance of Chalachew Getahun (PhD). All the sources of materials used for the thesis have been dully acknowledged. I further confirm that the thesis has been not been submitted either in or in full to any other higher learning institution for the purpose of earning any degree.

Tsegaye Tilahun   _____

St. Mary University, Addis Ababa, January, 2018