Factors Affecting the Success of Project Implementation: The Case of World Vision Ethiopia

By

KirubelHailu

ID: SGS/0046/2008B

A Thesis Submitted to St. Mary's University School of Graduate Studies InPartial Fulfillment for the Requirements of Master of Arts Degree In General Business Management

May 2018

Addis Ababa

Ethiopia

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Factors Affecting the Success of Project Implementation: The Case of World Vision Ethiopia

By

KirubelHailu

ID: SGS/0046/2008B

Approved by Board of Examiners

-----------------------------   -------------------------

Dean, Graduate Studies   Signature

----------------------------   --------------------------

Advisor   Signature

-----------------------------   -------------------------

External Examiner   Signature

-------------------------------   ---------------------------

Internal Examiner   Signature

Declaration

I hereby declare that the study which is being presented in this thesis entitled "**Factors Affecting the Success of Project Implementation: The Case of World Vision Ethiopia**" is original work of my own. It had not been presented for a partial fulfillment for any educational qualification at this university or any other university for the award of any degree by any means, and all the resources/ materials used for this thesis had been duely acknowledged.

Declared by: **Confirmed by:**

AbebeEsayasMaruShete (PHD)

M.A Candidate   Advisor

------------------   -----------------------

Date and Signature   Date and Signature

List of Tables

List of Figures

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CSA	Central Statistics Authority
CSF	Critical success Factors
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DAC	Development Association Committee
L/SHIP	Leadership
LFA	Log Frame Analysis
LF	Log Frame
M E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MGT	Management
PME	Planning Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
PIP	Project Implementation Profile
PM	Project Management
PMI	Project Management Institute
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Acknowledgements

X

Abstract

A project is a temporary group of activity with a defined beginning and end in time, scope and resources designed to produce a unique product, service or result. The performance of a project towards meeting its intended objectives is dictated by diverse factors. This research emphasized on the critical factors that affected the success of projects implementation in an NGO operating within Addis Ababa World Vision Ethiopia. The purpose of this research is to improve the successful implementation of projects in investigating those critical factors really affected the project success. It extends to disseminate findings of this study to create understanding of the factors affecting project implementation success to NGOs management, hence they are informed and take on necessary correction strategies to mitigate effects of affecting factors on the project successes. This research used survey questionnaires of different projects as a research instrument for data collection and regression analysis such as frequencies and percentages used to present quantitative data with various tools of data presentations. The research finding is that there are critical factors affecting successes of projects implemented by the NGO. The research findings showed that factors related to the category of project leadership and management, organizational structures, team and cost related factors to the project itself were found the most success affecting factors of projects implemented by the NGO. Specifically the research concluded that identified success affected factors limited the success of projects implemented by the NGO. Due to those factors projects were not able to deliver the end products as far as intended originally to perform. Finally the research completed responding soundly to the objective of the study which was to investigate factors affecting successful implementation of projects in nongovernmental organizations World Vision Ethiopia Addis Ababa.

Key words: Factors, Success, Project, Implementation, NGO'S.

1

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1.   Introduction

This part presents background information on subject of research and covers statement of the problem, research objectives, research questions, and significance of the study. This chapter also covers other sections including limitations of the study and the scope. In the background of the study the study reviews the key concepts and how they relate to one another.

1.2.   Background of the Study

It is universally agreed that non- government organizations are operating in different nations and parts of the world. Human needs, poverty and injustice are the essential reasons for the existence of aid agencies. Resources are depleting and on contrary human needs and wants are increasing to unlimited extent. For this reason, poverty and injustice have aggravated and widen its existence especially in the poorest countries of the world. As a result, non- governmental organizations perform various projects to help the communities of those countries in order to fulfill their needs, eradicate poverty and neutralize injustice.

For the similar mission and purpose various non - governmental organizations are also operating in Ethiopia. These various non – government organizations implement different kinds of projects in most parts of Ethiopia. World vision is one of these NGOs performing in Ethiopia since 1971. After an intensive relief and rehabilitation program, the organization developed a new integrated development approach the objective of which was to ensure empowerment and transformational change. This approach led to the establishment of Area Development Programs (ADPs) in the 1990s that is still being implemented and continuously strengthened today.

A project in its basic definition is a temporary endeavor undertaken by people who work cooperatively together to create a unique product or service (Project Management Institute, 2000) within an established time frame and within established budget to produce identifiable deliverables. Project success has been defined by the criteria of time, budget and deliverables

(Flaman and Gallagher, 2001). According to Antill (1974), a project is only successful if it comes on schedule, on budget, it achieves the deliverables originally set for it and it is accepted and used by the clients for whom the project was intended.

A project usually needs resources to deliver its results. Most of the time project execution is based on detailed plan, which considers also external factors and constraints. Planning, execution and controlling of project is the primary field of project management. For major projects it is necessary sometimes to set up a special temporary organization, consisting of a project team and one or more work teams (Flaman and Gallagher, 2001). Major projects can be divided into sub-projects, and program denotes collection of related projects. Implementation is the stage where all the planned activities are put into action. Before the implementation of a project, the implementers who are spearheaded by the project committee or executive should identify their strength and weaknesses including internal forces, opportunities and threats which include external forces.

The inability to complete projects on schedule or to cost projections has sometimes led to total project abandonment. The question then is, "why are more and more projects failing?" And, what can the project manager do about the menace? The reasons for failure are numerous. They could range from technical problems associated with poor project conceptualization and design, to economic problem associated with their implementation. Others include political, environmental, cultural factors, etc. As credible and unpredictable as these reasons are, the truth is that professional project management can go a long way in envisaging the barriers to project success and curtailing them. Above that, professional project management can ensure that all relevant factors needed for successful project implementation are identified, factored in, and harnessed, in order to ensure successful delivery.

The ability of projects to deliver value to customers or users on completion is another crucial measure of importance and in many cases, this condition is not met. There are several cases of white elephant projects embarked upon by the government that have little inherent value, even

after gulping billions of naira. This means that, in order to be seen as performing, a project must be conceptualized to address a specific desired and justifiable purpose, which ranks very well on the scale of importance and priorities. For instance, in most resource-poor settings with no infrastructural provisions, there is hardly any justification to embark on a project for an amusement park, when there is no provision for pipe borne water, electricity, or good roads. The conceptualization is therefore very important, because once it is poorly done, there is a wider room for abandonment, in that incoming administrations may fault it and starve it of funds. The design of a project is also very important, and is intimately linked to the conceptualization of its very idea. Poor design eliminates the possibility of deriving maximum value from the project, because functionality is lost. Poor design could lead to early dilapidation and short utility life. Sometimes, structural collapse may occur (Halpin & Senior, 2010; Santos et al., 2002).

1.3.   Statement of the Problem

Globally, a number of project performances continue to fall below their targets. A lot of invested funds in these projects have gone down the drain with no tangible outcomes or results. In a study of Geneca (2011), only 47% of the teams achieve 70- 89% of their goals. Nearly 20% of the teams said that they only achieve 50- 69% of their goals (Geneca, 2011). Similarly, Only 64% of projects meet their goals (Project Management Institute, 2015). 70% of companies report having at least one failed project in 2009 (KPMG, 2010) (Project Management Institute, 2014).

According to the information obtained from DBE's Annual Performance Report of 2012, only 29% of the projects financed by DBE are categorized as successful while the remaining 71% are in the failure category. Similarly, the annual performance report of the Bank (2013), the percentage of successfully operating project of the Bank as at June 30, 2013 is stood at 31% and it falls down to 28% at the Corporate Credit Process of the Bank which is the main credit processing unit of the Bank and through which more than 75% of the total annual lending amount of the Bank is granted to borrowers (Yilkal, 2013).

The project failure attributed to whatever source, it will increase the sunk cost of the country since fixed investments of the projects are specific to intended purpose and difficult to liquidate or require high switching cost. Moreover, it depletes the fund available for loan that the Bank could finance other projects that may have significant importance for economic growth of the

country. To be able to respond to both internal and external variables / factors in a project environment that have affect project implementation, it was necessary to investigate, identify and understand these variables / factors and establish to what extent they individually or collectively contributed to project implementation, i.e. success failure.

In the past a lot of research undertaken partially addressed the factors that contributed to project failure in general. Much of the research was mainly focused on what causes delays in project implementation and cost overruns. Alajoutsijarvi (1996), focused on the time and cost overruns of projects and attributed project failure to many factors ranging from delayed payments to contractors, client, delay in disbursement of funds by financiers to approval of the project by the technical people. Sumner (1999) studied project failure in the context of cost and attributed it to poor communication among the client and the project team members, inadequate financial resources, lack of motivation, tendering methods and poor project definition and project organization, environmental conditions, quality of project management, lack of proper project definition and infrastructure. Arrow Smith (1998) in analyzing project failure factors identified as poor communication, little experience of the project manager, late procurement of equipment, lack of training of project managers and slow project selection methods has being the major causes of project failure.

Towards this end, a survey was conducted to establish what factors collectively and significantly contributed to poor project implementation by non- governmental organizations that affect in success of project implementation in World Vision Ethiopia Addis Ababa.

1.4. Objective of the Study

1.4.1. General Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study is to investigate and identify factors affecting successful implementation of projects in non- governmental organizations World Vision Ethiopia Addis Ababa.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are emanated from the main objectives. They guide the accomplishment of the main objective effectively. The specific objectives of this study are:

- To identify project related factors affecting the implementation of project
- To assess organizational structure factors that hinder the effective implementation of projects
- To identify project management and team related factors affecting the projects performance
- To assess project environment related barriers that are related to the projects
- To assess stakeholders level of involvement in project cycle management as well as their attitude towards projects implemented by NGOs

1.5. Research Questions

The study will seek to answer the following research questions

1. How far factors related to project affect the implementation of projects by non-government organizations in World Vision Ethiopia Addis Ababa?
2. To what extent those factors organizational structure factors that hinder the effective implementation of projects?
3. What are project management and team related factors affecting the projects performance?
4. To what extent project environment related barriers that are related to the projects?
5. How far stakeholders level of involvement in project cycle management as well as their attitude towards the success of project implementation?

1.6. Research Hypotheses

To address the research objectives and questions presented above, the study will test the following hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Project related factors has a positive association with the implementation of projects success

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive relationship between organizational structure factors and the effective implementation of projects success

Hypothesis 3: Project management and team related factors has an effect on the projects performance success

Hypothesis 4: Project environment related factors affects the successful implementation of projects negatively

Hypothesis 5: Stakeholders level of involvement in project cycle management as well as their attitude towards projects has an association with project implementation success

1.7.   Significance of the Study

In line with objectives of the study it is believed that the research is important because many projects fail without delivering the expected outcomes and many projects are not meeting their goal in accomplishment as kindly planned in the project document earlier. It is important to know why projects implemented by NGOs have not yet impacted and transformed the beneficiary of that project particularly. To know these factors and give possible solutions, it is laudable to conduct this research.

This study is important for several stakeholders including the management of the NGOs, government, NGO coordination Bureau, whole NGO sector, future researchers and academicians. For the management of the NGOs, the findings of this study would be important in understanding of the factors affecting its project implementation hence inform them on necessary correction strategies to mitigate on their effects. It will inform their future planning and strategy development as far as the operations of the NGOs are concerned. To the NGO coordination Bureau, this study will be important in the development of policies governing the NGO sector in the country besides clarifying the challenges that NGOs face in the implementation of their projects. For future researchers and academicians, the study will be important in areas requiring further research to build on the topic of factors affecting project implementation among the NGO sector. In addition, the findings of this study would be important source of reference for future scholars and researchers.

1.8. Scope and Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study is delimited to factors affecting the success of projects implemented by World Vision Ethiopia Addis Ababa. The research scope is limited to NGOs projects implemented in World Vision Ethiopia Addis Ababa and does not include other projects implemented by other parties.

It can be difficult to reach appropriate conclusions on the basis of explanatory research findings due to the impact of a wide range of factors and variables in social environment. In other words, while the relationship can be inferred, it cannot be proved with a high level of certainty. The sample size selected compared to the target population is small, consequently the research findings cannot be generalized to the overall population of the study at hand.

1.9. Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter includes the introduction and general background of the study. The second chapter will discuss related literature review regarding the study. The third chapter of the study will present the research methodology that will be used. The fourth chapter involves presentation, analysis and discussion of gathered primary and secondary data. The final chapter will deal with summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2.1. Introduction to Literature Review

This chapter discusses the literature review of the research study. Literature review provides the study with an explanation of the theoretical rationale of the problem being studied as well as what research has already been done and how the findings relate to the problem at hand. In this chapter, literature was reviewed under the raised factors on study objectives, this relied on earlier work which was obtained from published reference material such as magazines, newspapers and journals, and these provided an overview of major past activities that had earlier been undertaken on the topic under study. The Chapter covered the critical analysis of theoretical literature review, empirical literature review, and the identified research gaps.

2.2. Theoretical Review of the Literature

2.2.1. Project Success

What is project success? How do we define project success and design performance measures that allow us to recognize the degree of success attained? There has been a great deal written over the years about project success, project management success and performance management to deliver success. A number of papers relating to critical success factors emerged during the late 1980's—for example (Pinto and Slevin, 1987) and de Wit (1988) who viewed success as being judged by the degree to which project objectives have been met. These views centered on success of project management delivery processes and also acknowledged that project success is also a matter of the project stakeholder's perception of the value (in their terms) of what was delivered.

According to Crawford (2002) project success is an important project management issue, it is one of the most frequently discussed topics and there is a lack of agreement concerning the criteria by which success is judged (Pinto and Slevin 1988; Freeman and Beale 1992; Shenhar, Levy, and Dvir 1997; Baccarini 1999). A review of the literature further reveals that there is, in fact, a high level of agreement with the definition provided by Baker et al., (1988), that project

success is a matter of perception and that a project will be most likely to be perceived to be an "overall success" if: …….the project meets the technical performance specifications and/or mission to be performed, and if there is a high level of satisfaction concerning the project outcome among key people on the project team, and key users or clientele of the project effort. There is also a general agreement that although schedule and budget performance alone are considered inadequate as measures of project success, they are still important components of the overall construct. Quality is intertwined with issues of technical performance, specifications, and achievement of functional objectives and it is achievement against these criteria that will be most subject to variation in perception by multiple project stakeholders.

The concept of 'Critical Success Factors (CSF) was originally developed by Ronald Daniel of Mc Kinsey and Company in the Sixties, but was popularized by Jack F. Rokart of Sloan School of Management (Robert, 2007). Jugdev and Muller (2005) mentioned that success factors are the factors to achieve established goals and objectives. Further, Jugdev and Muller's (2005) retrospective study of the concept of success factors indicated that during the 1960's and the 1980's, the literature on success factors is largely limited to time, cost, specification and some extent client satisfaction. During 1980-90's the stress was much on a project being a success or failure. Mid 90's saw some publications involving stakeholder satisfaction. During 1990's-2000's, there are contributions in the form of integrated frameworks. Now during 21st century, the concept took a rationale on the agreement on CSF's before start of the work and empowerment of the project manager to achieve goals (Jugdev and Muller, 2005).

According to Belassi and Tukel (1996) sensible works to group critical success factors according to; those related to the project, those related to the project manager and the team members, those related to the organization and those related to the external environment. They further cite that factors which relate to the project include the "urgency" of a project. They identify that "projects which start after natural disasters are typical examples and that in these situations, not enough time is allocated for planning and scheduling projects". They further identify that in relation to factors related to external environment, a number of environmental factors such as political, economic, and social, as well as factors related to the advances in technology or even factors related to nature affect project performance.

2.2.2. Project Implementation

Effective project implementation is looked at in many ways to include a large variety of criteria. However, in its simplest terms, effectiveness of project implementation can be thought of as incorporating four basic facts. A project is generally considered to be successfully implemented if it comes in on-schedule (time criterion), comes in on-budget (monetary criterion), achieves basically all the goals originally set for it (effectiveness criterion), and is accepted and used by the clients for whom the project was intended (client satisfaction criterion). By its basic definition, a project comprises a defined time frame to completion, a limited budget, and a specified set of performance characteristics. Further, the project is usually targeted for use by some client, either internal or external to the organization and its project team. It seems reasonable therefore; that any assessment of project implementation effectiveness should at least include these four measures among others.

As noted by Schultz and Slevin (2009), management support for projects, or indeed for any implementation, has long been considered of great importance in distinguishing between their ultimate success or failure. Beck (2006) sees project management as not only dependent on top management for authority, direction, and support, but as ultimately the conduit for implementing top management's plans, or goals, for the organization. For the purposes of classification, the factor Top Management Support refers to both the nature and amount of support the project manager can expect from management both for himself as leader and for the project. Management's support of the project may involve aspects such as allocation of sufficient resources (financial, manpower, time, etc.) as well as the project manager's confidence in their support in the event of crises.

The famous Project Implementation Profile (PIP) is a set of factors developed by Pinto et al (2010). They came up with 10 CSFs to assist in identifying and measuring successfully implemented projects. These are project mission (clarity of goals and general direction), top management support (ability and willingness to provide resources, authority and influence), project schedule (a detailed specification and schedules for project implementation), client consultation (adequate communication, consultation and active listening to and with the client), personnel (recruitment, selection and training), technical tasks (availability of required

technology and expertise), client acceptance (final project was sold to end-users), monitoring and feedback (provision of comprehensive information at each implementation stage), communication and trouble-shooting (ability to handle crisis and deviation from plan). In a later study Pinto et al (2010) showed that the relative importance of the several CSFs changes significantly based on the life cycle stages. Pinto et al (2010) highlighted those CSFs identification will help the project teams minimize firefighting, intuitive and ad-hoc approach in managing uncertainties and changes encountered during project implementation.

2.2.3. Stakeholders Involvement in Project Management

The notion of stakeholders was originally introduced to the mainstream general management discussion by Freeman (1984). Two years later, Cleland (1986) brought stakeholder thinking into the project management paradigm. Ever since, the role of stakeholder management as a central project management process has strengthened, and today even the concept of project management is defined through stakeholders as "the process of adapting the specifications, plans, and approaches to the different concerns and expectations of the various stakeholders" (PMI, 2008). Despite the acknowledged importance of stakeholder management, project research still lacks both theoretical knowledge and empirical evidence of various project stakeholder related phenomena (Achterkamp and Vos, 2008). Until today, existing scarce research has primarily focused on the conceptual development of stakeholder management tools and frameworks in order to better manage stakeholders (Winch and Bonke, 2002).

The importance of stakeholder concept is growing in management literature. Stakeholder management is the process of managing the expectation of anyone that has an interest in a project or was effected by its deliverables or outputs. The application of stakeholder in the public sector seems to be in accordance with the wave new public management (Osborne and Gaebler, 1993). Stakeholder theory and empirical research (Clarkson 1995) indicate that companies do explicitly manage their relationships with different stakeholder groups. Donaldson & Preston (1995) point out that although this is descriptively true, companies appear to manage stakeholders for both instrumental (i.e., performance based) reasons and, at the core, normative reasons. Building on the work of others, Clarkson (1995) defines primary stakeholders as those "without whose continuing participation, the corporation cannot survive as a going concern,"

suggesting that these relationships are characterized by mutual interdependence. He includes here shareholders or owners, employees, customers, and suppliers, as well as government and communities. The "web of life" view (Capra 1995) envisions corporations as fundamentally relational, that is, as a "system of primary stakeholder groups, a complex set of relationships between and among interest groups with different rights, objectives, expectations and responsibilities" (Clarkson, 1995).

Developing initiatives that are capable of achieving all stakeholder goals and objectives may be difficult, if not impossible (Wood & Jones, 1995). This may be the case in certain circumstances, because the interests of all parties are not given equal consideration, with broader social and environmental goals being traded off against economic concerns (Huang & Stewart, 1996). Ford (1980) suggests that companies pursue relationships with other companies to obtain the benefits associated with reducing their costs or increasing their revenues. By entering into relationships, organizations hope to gain stakeholder satisfaction and loyalty while stakeholders look for quality (Evans &Laskin, 1994). Kakabadse (2005) in the extensive review on the stakeholder approach expressed that corporate social responsibility (CSR) and stakeholders' interests are partly related to each other. In line with this, Hillman (2001) noted that a firm has relationships with constituent (stakeholders) groups and the processes and outcomes associated with these relationships depend on the interest. The interests of all legitimate stakeholders have value and the focus of stakeholder theory is on managerial decision making". Kakabadse *et. al.* (2005), therefore, concluded that managers should pay attention to stakeholders.

A study carried out by Mitchell, (1997) *i*n stake holder identification and salience, it was found that one interesting characteristic of the stakeholder concept is the dynamics of stakeholders. Over time, the mix of stakeholders may change. New stakeholders may join and wish to be included in any considerations, while others may drop out, through no longer being involved in the process. The concept of the dynamics of stakeholders was acknowledged by Freeman, and according to him, in reality stakeholders' change over time, and their stakes change depending on the strategic issue under consideration. Alkhafaji also contributed to the understanding of this concept. To explain the dynamics, he defined stakeholders as the "groups to whom the corporation is responsible". They proposed that classes of stakeholders can be identified by the

possession or attributed possession of one or more of three relationship attributes: power, legitimacy and urgency. The influence of the stakeholder in the project depends on the relationship attributes and may affect both timeliness and level of funding.

2.3. Review of Project Theories

2.3.1. Henri Fayol Principal of Management Theory

A principle refers to a fundamental truth (Lanz, 2007). It establishes cause and effect relationship between two or more variables under given situation. They serve as a guide to thought & actions. Therefore, management principles are the statements of fundamental truth based on logic which provides guidelines for managerial decision making and actions. This affects organization governance and decision in an organization. Fayol's six primary functions of management, which goes hand in hand with the principles, are as follows: Forecasting, Planning, Organizing, Commanding, Coordinating and Controlling. Early Management Theory principal has a direct correlation with success or failure of a project. This principal if implemented by project managers, a phenomenon of success will be witnessed.

2.3.2. Henry Gantt theory

According to Jupta (2003) Gantt theory is in a form of a chart. Gantt chart is a bar chart showing the progression of time through the phases of a project. The charts can be simple or complex, depending on the needs of the project manager and the team. The management theory of Henry Gantt dictates the use of both resources and time when evaluating projects (Kanz, 2005). Henry Gantt scientific management is a theory that incorporates benchmarks in a project as a way to complete the project efficiently. What are the milestones and their deadlines in your project? How much time is needed to meet each of the milestone deadlines? This theory therefore has a direct influence to the performance of a project in that if it is not used, the completion of a project is in jeopardy.

2.3.3. Four Stages Theory

Stage theories are based on the idea that elements in systems move through a pattern of distinct stages over time and that these stages can be described based on their distinguishing

characteristics. Specifically, stages in cognitive development have a constant order of succession, later stages integrate the achievements of earlier stages, and each is characterized by a particular type of structure of mental processes which is specific to it. The time of appearance may vary to a certain extent depending upon environmental conditions. The discipline of project management attempts to systematize getting things done. One of the prevalent models in project management, the four stage model, breaks the act of completing a project into four phases: definition or start-up, planning, implementation or execution, and closure. Although the traditional conception of this model treats each stage as separate and distinct, some project managers allow some overlap and even backtracking, as necessary (Loum, 2003).

The start-up phase, also known as the definition phase, is where the project team begins the process of deciding what it will be doing. This phase takes the project from a fuzzy, blue sky idea to a clearly defined set of specifications and requirements for the project. This stage gives the project team members enough information to plan exactly how they will get it done. Once the project's contours are set, the planning phase allows the team members to figure out what they will need to do to complete it. This can include generating detailed engineering or specifications, and also includes the process of determining vendors. Once this phase is complete, the project should be outlined on Gantt charts or other outlines to clarify who is responsible for doing what, and when.

The third phase is where the proverbial rubber meets the road. It is all about acting on the plan determined in phase two and actually doing the project. This phase does not, however, mean that the project is completely done. Although some think that the closure phase is about doing an examination on a project and closing it down, there is a little more to it. In fact, the closure phase allows the project team to tie up any loose ends and clear up punch list items. Once that part of the phase is completely done, the team generates any final reports, closes any accounts and completes the project (Loum, 2003).

2.4 Empirical Review of the Literature

There is wide divergence of opinions in this field; the only agreement seems to be the disagreement on what constitutes 'project success. (Murphy et al., 1974; Pinto & Slevin 1988;

Gemuenden & Lechler, 1997 and Shenhar et al., 1997). De Wit (1988) and other writers distinguish between project success (measured against the overall objectives of the project) and project management success (measured against the widespread and traditional measures of performance against cost, time and quality). The second distinction is also important it is the difference between success criteria (the measures by which success or failure of a project or business will be judged) and success factors (those inputs to the management system that lead directly or indirectly to the success of the project or business). Rockart (1979) developed a three step procedure for determining which factors contribute to meeting organizational goals. His study reveals that many executives tend to link in terms of "what does it take to be successful" in their business rather than in terms of purposes, objectives, and goals.

Pinto & Slevin (1988) after sampling over 650 project managers, the researchers concluded that "project success" is something much more complex than simply meeting cost, schedule, and performance specifications. In fact client satisfaction with the final result has a great deal to do with the perceived success or failure of projects.

Baker et al. (1988) concluded that "In the long run, what really matters is whether the parties associated with, and affected by, a project are satisfied. Good schedule and cost performance means very little in the face of a poor performing end product." In the words of Baker et al. (1983): "instead of using time, cost and performance as measures for project success, perceived performance should be the measure." Clarke (1999) also stated that by targeting the main problems and issues using the key success factors as a focus could make a significant difference to the effectiveness of project management. In order to ensure that a project is completed successfully, project plans need to be updated regularly. He continues to profess that success will be measured more easily when the objectives are clearly stated at the outset of the project. Ward (1995) opines that: "scope and objectives are the guiding principles that direct the efforts of the project team and they will determine a project's success or failure".

According to Radolph & Posner (1994), having a few key objectives focuses the team on the target and creates commitment and agreement about the project goals. Richardson (1995) & King (1996) think that none of the key success factors described in the literature is responsible, on their own, for ensuring a project's success- they are all inter-dependent and require a holistic

approach to be taken. Groups of success factors and their interactions are of prime importance in determining a project's success or failure.

Belassi and Tukel (1996) grouped the success factors listed in the literature and described the impact of these factors on project performance. They grouped the factors into four areas: Factors related to the project, Factors related to the project managers and the team members, Factors related to the organization, and Factors related to the external environment.

In their second part of the research with a total of 57 responses, many project managers' related factors have been found to be critical. In contrast with a previous finding using 91 responses, a noticeable shift in ranking from organizational factors towards factors related to project managers and team members was witnessed with project managers' related factors dominating over the organizational factors. They came out with some important relationships as well. For example, when time is used to measure project success, then a project manager's skills and communication between the team members become critical. "In previous studies it was assumed that if a project's completion time exceeds its due date, or expenses overrun the budget, or outcomes did not satisfy a company's predetermined performance criteria, the project was assumed to be a failure. Today we know that determining whether a project is a success or failure is far more complex." To come up with all possible critical factors that might affect outcome is impossible because of the diversity of projects. But to identify the groups to which the critical factors belong would be sufficient for better evaluation of projects.

A study by Dong et al. (2004) covers most of the concerns of Chinese information systems' project managers, for which they reviewed extensive literature. The most commonly cited set of CSFs are: Effective communication, Top management support, User involvement, Project manager and team members, Project definition, Project planning, Project control and change management, and Technology support. Therefore, a major concern of the field of project management and a recurring theme in the literature is that of project success. The factors that contribute to the success of projects are known as success factors and the success on projects is judged by success criteria. On one hand, the competence of the project manager is in itself a factor in successful delivery of projects and on the other hand, the project manager needs to have competence in those areas that have the most impact on successful outcomes.

Murphy et al. (1974) used a sample of 650 completed aerospace, constructions, and other projects with data provided primarily by project managers on the factors contributing to project success. Theirs have been the most cited, used; extensive and authoritative research in the area of project success factors. They found ten factors that were found to be strongly linearly related to perceived success and perceived failure of projects, while twenty-three project management characteristics were identified as being necessary but not sufficient conditions for perceived success Baker et al (1988).

Pinto and Slevin (1987, 1988) and Morris and Hough (1986, 1987) also did an important work on project success factors in the 1980s. While Morris and Hough (1986, 1987) drew primarily on literature and case study analysis of major projects, Pinto and Slevin (1987, 1988) based their findings on the opinions of a usable sample of 418 PMI members responding to questions asking them to rate the relevance to project implementation success of ten critical success factors and four additional external factors (Slevin & Pinto 1986). Therefore, one can conclude that there are large numbers of factors that may have a bearing on project success.

According to Pettigrew and Whittington (2003) - achieving high levels of flexibility while maintaining structure. Managing projects in a particularly chaotic environment appears to best characterize the experience of one of the authors in delivering aid projects in post-disaster situations. The gap that these thought leaders have identified in PM practice as it is currently evolving in the commercial PM world is mirrored by observations in the field of how aid projects function and a growing body of literature that is critical of PM techniques being applied in what may be viewed as inappropriate situations. This suggest that there are a range of project planning and performance measurement approaches better suited for ambiguous or poorly defined aid or social service delivery projects (Sigsgaard, 2002; Earle, 2003; Ramage and Armstrong, 2005).

2.4.1 Project Monitoring and Evaluation

Aid agencies are required to conform to stringent project reporting requirements in order to satisfy the wide range of stakeholders. Project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frequently a requirement for funding believed to inform the reporting process. (Shenhar and Levy, 1997; Crawford and Bryce, 2003). The logical framework approach (LFA) is another tool widely used throughout the aid industry for project design and appraisal (Baccarini, 1999), and although

much of the literature also promotes the use of the LFA for the purposes of M&E, it has proved inadequate (Earle, 2003).

The nature of the research question that interests us is firstly Project Monitoring and Evaluation (P.M. & E.) as a process which is used extensively in the aid world and also has the potential to be brought to bear effectively on a whole range of projects. What is outstanding about this form of project delivery is it gives a lot more power to learn and drive to those at the working community level yet it is still able to be planned and managed effectively. The further point of interest here is the point of Action Research and involving not just project management experts in Project Management Research. This can then be extended to action learning workshops and even Action Science (Greenwood and Levin, 1998).

2.4.2 Project Log Frame

It becomes clear that there are different types of projects with very different needs and demands upon them and very different characteristics and, yet, professional bodies continue to assume a 'one-size-fits-all' approach is appropriate (PMI, 2004), or in many of the aid projects the logical framework approach (Log frame) that stresses a hierarchical cascade of identified objectives linked to assumptions in terms of goal, purpose, outputs and inputs presented in a How-why chain (Baccarini, 1999) or variations on this theme that take into account means of verification and a time dimension (Crawford and Bryce, 2003).

2.4.3Results Based Management

Results Based Management, also referred to as Performance Management, is best defined as a broad management strategy aimed at achieving important changes in the way project agencies operate, with improving performance on projects (achieving better results) as the central orientation in a comprehensive report by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC)Working Party on Aid Evaluation. The development co-operation (or donor) agencies whose experiences are reviewed include USAID, UNDP and the World Bank. Results based management with performance measurement is the process an organization follows to objectively measure how well it's stated objectives are being met.

This concept also addresses how to enable the effective incorporation of Log frame and Risk Management into Results Based Management whilst, at the same time, keeping a critical eye to their limitations. It concludes by pointing out that the challenge is to balance project performance monitoring needs at all Log Frame hierarchy levels, without overburdening the monitoring system or having it displace evaluation or implementation activities. The related factor here is also that most NGO /Aid agencies are typically under resourced and under trained in project management or measurement of any critical form.

Very relevant to all this is the Evaluation Journal of Australasia titled "Measuring Success" (Ramage& Armstrong 2006) They look at the Balanced Scorecard methodology which analyzes an organization's overall performance from four perspectives: communities, learning and growth, internal processes and financial. This alignment and similar process leads to papers such as "An Adapted Version of a Community of Practice Approach to Evaluation Owned by Indigenous Stakeholders" in Australia (McIntyre, 2002). Coincide with concerted efforts of academicians and researchers to identify the various factors affecting successful implementation of projects in Non-Governmental organizations, the research is also limited by the fact that successful implementation of projects is affected by many other moderating factors such as project related, organization, leadership and staff, and the external project environment.

2.5. Conceptual Framework for the Study

The study used the following conceptual framework that shows the interactions of the key study variables. The independent variables were: Project Related Factors (Mission/Goal statement, Schedule/Plan, Communication), Organizational Structure Factors (Functional, Dedicated Team, Matrix), Project management and Team Related Factors (Project team, Managerial Skills, Staff cohesion), Project Environment Related Factors (Socio-economic and Financial, Political environment, Legal environment, Social and Cultural), Stakeholders level of involvement and attitude (Client consultation, Client acceptance). While dependent variable was the project success measured by schedule, cost and quality. It was hypothesized that these independent variables will have significant influence on project success. Structural representation of this model is illustrated in Figure 2.1.

Independent Variables

Project Related Factors
> Mission/Goal
> Schedule/Plan
> Communication

Organizational Structure Factors
Functional
Dedicated Team
Matrix

Project management and Team Related Factors
Project team
Managerial Skills
Staff cohesion

Dependent Variables

Project Success Indicators
• Schedule Performance Index
• Cost Performace Ondex
• No deliverable Defect(Quality)

Project Environment Related Factors
Socio-economic and Financial
Political environment
Legal environment
Social and Cultural

Stakeholders level of involvement and attitude
Client consultation
Client acceptance

Source: Author's own construction based on literature (2017)

Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework for the Study

21

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3. 1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the method employed in conducting the research to achieve the intended objectives both general and specific ones. Besides this it presents the kind of instrument that is used to collect the data. More over; it includes the instrument and data collection procedure. Finally, it shows the way data will be analyzed and interpreted.

3.2. Research Design and Approach

Research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure (Kothari, 2004). This study adopted both descriptive and explanatory research design as well as a quantitative research approach.

3.3. Data Source

This research used both the primary data which is directly collected from the respondents or population under study which are the projects at hand and secondary data as a source of some information required was used to the required standard to make the research more viable. The secondary data was gathered from documented data concerning the success/ failure of projects using a checklist. Accordingly, in the current year 2017/18 it has initiated 60 projects out of these 40 had been completed within the anticipated time plan. The outcome of these projects were the part of the study. Secondary data was collected from client files, project appraisal reports, follow-up reports, internal audit reports and other periodic reports of World Vision Ethiopia Addis Ababa. The primary data was gathered from the officials involved in the completed projects in the year.

3.4 Population and Sample Size

The projects that are selected were operational for the year (2017/18) and had been completed. Projects that have been operational for the year 2017/18 were considered because it is important

to assess some of the causes of project failure/success within the year. In this year 40 projects were completed and each project had a project head who is directly involved. Therefore, the population of the study was 40 project heads and the project documents. Because of the small size of the study population, all of them are part of the study. So, the study adopted a census approach and collected data from 40 implemented and completed projects.

3.5. Data Collection Tools/Instruments

The researcher used questionnaire and document analysis type of data collection which employed both open and close ended kind of questionnaire and also reviewed secondary data to be more reliable and accurate as much as possible.

This research used survey questionnaire as a research instrument for data collection. Questionnaire is series of questions with multi sections designed to elicit information, which is filled in by participants in the sample. It is a questionnaire that was filled in by employees who have direct relationship with the selected projects in the NGO. It was used to gather information related to factors affecting the implementation of projects.

3.6. Data Analysis methods

The collected data were coded into SPSS and were analyzed using regression analyses. Regression analysis was selected because it is the best alternative to examine the relationship between a dependent variable and a set of independent variables. It also forecasts the value of the dependent variable based on its relationship to the independent variables used in the analysis. In this research project, the independent variables are causes of project failure while the dependent variable is project success/failure. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard error of the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum were used to describe the data. Explanatory analysis using regression (Multiple linear) using OLS model is employed to analyze the significant level of the relationship between causes of success of project implementation in the sampled projects.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1.   Introduction

Data analysis, presentation and interpretation were done here. The chapter is presented to match the objective of investigating factors that influence performance of projects implemented by World Vision Ethiopia.

4.2.   Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables

Findings in Table 4.2.1 show that mission statements of the projects were sound. All of the respondents agreed on this with a mean of 4.62 and standard deviation of .47. The goals of the project were in line with the general goals of the organization.The basic goals of the project were made clear to the project team.The project goals are developed in a way that contribute to the missions of the parent organization. The beneficial consequences of the project to the organization's success are also clear.

Table 4.2.1: Descriptive analysis of factors related to mission

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Agree	13	33.3	4.62	.47
	Strongly agree	26	66.7		
	Total	39	100.0		

Findings on the project schedule/plan in Table 4.2.2 shows that majority of the respondents agreed to a high extent (mean 4.42, std. dev. 44). They reported that they know which activities contain slack time of slack resources which can be utilized in other area during emergencies. There was also a detailed plan (including time, schedules, milestones, work force requirements, etc.) for the completion of the project.

There was a detailed budget for the project and key personnel needs (who, when) were specified in the project plan. Risks were also sufficiently identified and mitigation strategies included as

part of the project plan. This implies that the projected incorporated in the study were well planned.

Table 4.2.2: Descriptive analysis of factors related to project schedule/plan

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Agree	18	46	4.42	.44
	Strongly agree	21	54		
	Total	39	100.0		

From the findings in Table 4.2.3 below, communication related factors of the sampled projects were agreed as high with a mean of 4.26 and a standard deviation of .56. The results (decisions made, information received and needed, etc.) of planning meetings were published and distributed to applicable personnel. Individuals/groups supplying input have received feedback on the acceptance or rejection of their input. All groups affected by the project know how to make problems known to the project team. Plans were clearly communicated to the project team members and to stakeholders. The project adopted a formal communication channel to direct work orders and to receive feedbacks. This implies that communication activities of the projects were effective.

Table 4.2.3: Descriptive analysis of communication factors

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Disagree	1	2.6	4.26	.56
	Agree	26	66.6		
	Strongly agree	12	30.7		
	Total	39	100.0		

Findings in Table 4.2.4 show that the management team of the projects were sound. Majority of the respondents agreed on the management team is goodwith a mean of 4.04 and standard deviation of .58.

Table 4.2.4: Descriptive of team related factors

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. deviation
Disagree	1	2.6		
Undecided	4	10.25	4.04	.58
Agree	24	61.5		
Strongly agree	10	25.6		
Total	39	100.0		

Nearly 70% of the respondents agreed that managerial skill of the sample projects were good. In addition, 30% of them strongly agreed on the managerial skills with mean of 4.41 and standard deviation of 1.08.

Table 4.2.5: Managerial skill and staff related factors

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
Managerial skill	Agree	27	69.2	4.41	1.08
	Strongly agree	12	30.7		
	Total	39	100.0		
Staff related	Neutral	2	5.12	4.18	1.00
	Agree	29	74.3		
	Strongly agree	8	20.5		
	Total	39	100.0		

According to the result shown in table 4.2.6, majority of the respondents (66.65%) agreed that there were socio finance problems while the programs were implemented. While the project was being implemented inflation occurred, there was a change in economic policy and/or regulation that affected the project performance, currency devaluation occurred, the opportunity to get access to capital and technology changed.

Regarding the political and legal situations, only 14% of the respondents reported that there were political and legal problems during the project implementations. From the questions provided for them, only 15% agreed as there was political instability while the project was being implemented, the project is situated in a politically sensitive environment, the project was

implemented in a governance structure which was too inhibiting, there was election while the project was implemented.

In respect to socio cultural factors, majority (74.5%) reported that there were a problems such asbeing projects were implemented in a cultural setting that don't accept new things, there was hidden obstruction that affected the project implementation, there was adequate access to social amenities (e.g. medical care) and the literacy level of the local community was enabling the implementation of the project. This may affect success of the projects.

Table 4.2.6: Descriptive analysis of socio finance, politico legal and socio cultural factors

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
Socio finance	Neutral	13	33.3	3.85	.63
	Agree	18	46.15		
	Strongly agree	8	20.5		
Political and legal	Disagree	6	15.38	3.43	.64
	Neutral	10	25.64		
	Agree	9	2.07		
	Strongly agree	4	12.25		
Socio cultural	Disagree	1	2.6	3.74	.48
	Neutral	8	20.5		
	Agree	29	74.3		
	Strongly agree	1	2.6		
	Total	39	100.0		

The client consultation and acceptance related factors are provided in table 4.2.7. The result shows that majority of the respondents (74.3%) reported that the clients were given the opportunity to provide input early in the project development stage, were kept informed of the project's progress, the value of the project has been discussed with the beneficiaries/clients, the purpose of the project has been discussed with the clients, the clients were told whether or not their input was assimilated into the project plan. Regarding the client acceptance of the projects, 61.4% were agreed on the statements related to client acceptance such as there was adequate documentation of the project to allow easy use by the clients (instructions, etc.), potential clients have been contacted about the usefulness of the project, clients knew who to contact when

problems or questions arise, adequate advanced preparation has been done to determine how best to "sell" the project to clients.

Table 4.2.7: Descriptive result of client consultation and client acceptance

		Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
client consultation	Disagree	6	15.3	3.75	.87
	Neutral	4	10.25		
	Agree	22	56.4		
	Strongly agree	7	17.9		
client acceptance	Disagree	9	23.07	3.64	1.04
	Neutral	6	15.38		
	Agree	12	30.7		
	Strongly agree	12	30.7		
	Total	39	100.0		

4.3. Performance (success) of the projects

To determine the success of projects in terms of plan, schedule performance index was used. As shown in table 4.3.1, majority of the projects (28, 71.8%) were completed on the planned time. Six projects were completed before the planned time and the rest five projects were behind the schedule. Generally, the success of the sampled projects in terms of plan (schedule) was effective with mean of 1.06 and standard deviation of .398. Baker et al. (1988) concluded that "In the long run, what really matters is whether the parties associated with, and affected by, a project are satisfied. Good schedule and cost performance means very little in the face of a poor performing end product."

Table 4.3.1: Success in terms of plan (Schedule performance index)

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
.50	4	10.3		
.67	1	2.6	1.06	.398
.75	1	2.6		
1.00	28	71.8		
2.00	5	12.8		
Total	39	100.0		

In respect to the cost performance index, majority of the projects 26 (66.7%) were spent more than the planned budget and earned less than the amount spent. Eight (20.5%) of the projects were completed in accordance with the planned cost. Only five (12.8%) have completed below the planned cost. That means majority of the projects were under achievement in terms of cost with the mean of .847 and standard deviation of .229.

Table 4.3.2: Success in terms of cost (Cost Performance Index)

	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. deviation
.50	1	2.6		
.67	11	28.2	.847	.229
.75	14	35.9		
1.00	8	20.5		
1.34	5	12.8		
Total	39	100.0		

Regarding quality aspects of project success, the result indicated that all of respondents said that the projects achieve target benefits. Similarly, all of the respondents agreed on the statements of "the projects produce high-quality deliverables" and "the projects achieve it's laid out outcome level". On the other hand, more than half (56.4%) of the respondents said that there were no deliverable defect, the rest 43.6% said that there were deliverable defects on the quality of the projects.

Table 4.3.3: Success in terms of quality

Quality indicators	Frequency	Percent	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achieves target benefits (by taking its plans as a benchmark)	39	100	1	0
Produces high-quality deliverables (by taking its plans as a criteria)	39	100	1	0
Achieves its laid out outcome level(targeted result)	39	100	1	0
No deliverable defect(quality)	22	56.4	.56	.50
Total	39	100.0		

## 4.4.	Factors Affecting the success of Project Implementation

In order to identify the effect of each aspects of the implementation on the project success, each of the independent variables were regressed with each of the aspects of project success individually.

### 4.4.1.	Factors Affecting Performance of Projects from the Dimension of Schedule Performance Index

From the correlation results, project management and team related factors had a statistically significant positive correlation with schedule performance of the projects (r = 0.36, p<0.05). There was no found other variables statistically significant with schedule performance of projects.

As shown in the model summary table below, the cumulative effect of the independent variables on the schedule aspect of the project success were found to be .551 indicated moderate level of prediction. The R square also found to be .303. That means 30.3% of the variation in the dependent variable were explained by the independent variables.

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.551[a]	.303	.019	.39421	1.838

a. Predictors: (Constant), client acceptance, mission general, communication total, manager skill, staff total, socio finance, socio cultural, schedule general, team, client consultation, political legal
b. Dependent Variable: Schedule performance index

As shown in the coefficient table below, only management and team related factors were found to be the significant factor for schedule aspect of project success (B= .337, p .019). This means that for each one increase in management and team related factor, there is an increase in .337 unit increase on schedule performance. Other factors were not found to be significant predictors of plan project success.

Coefficient table

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-.144	1.217		-.119	.906		
	mission_general	-.239	.178	-.283	-1.341	.191	.579	1.727
	schedule_general	.353	.179	.389	1.977	.058	.667	1.498
	communication_total	.008	.134	.011	.060	.952	.711	1.406
	Team	.337	.135	.497	2.494	.019	.650	1.538
	manager_skill	-.035	.071	-.096	-.490	.628	.678	1.476
	staff_total	-.090	.071	-.227	-1.264	.217	.800	1.250
	socio_finance	-.102	.134	-.162	-.764	.452	.572	1.749
	political_legal	.161	.166	.260	.969	.341	.358	2.791
	socio_cultural	-.016	.173	-.020	-.093	.926	.570	1.755
	client_consultation	.003	.118	.007	.028	.978	.383	2.610
	client_acceptance	-.063	.083	-.165	-.757	.455	.541	1.847

4.4.2. Factors Affecting Project Performance from the Dimension of Efficiency (Cost)

The correlation table below revealed that communication in the project team and among stakeholders were found to have positive relationship with the cost aspect of project success (r= .310, p= .027).

That means when communication increases, the effectiveness of the projects also increases in terms of cost management. Other variables did not found to correlate with the cost aspect of project success.

The overall results illustrate a moderate positive and significant (p<0.05) association between these variables (r = .542, p<0.05). Results also indicate that 29.3% (R2 = 0.293) of successful completedprojects was attributed to the independent variables.

The result is consistent with the finding of Sumner (1999) studied project failure in the context of cost and attributed it to poor communication among the client and the project team members. The finding also support the result of Arrow Smith (1998) in analyzing project failure factors identified as poor communication.

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.542[a]	.293	.005	.22875	1.820

a. Predictors: (Constant), client_acceptance, mission_general, communication_total, manager_skill, staff_total, socio_finance,socio_cultural, schedule_general, team, client_consultation, political_legal
b. Dependent Variable: Cost performance index

The coefficient table below indicated that, communication found to be the only factor that significantly affect the cost aspects of project success (B= .180, p<.05). This implies that the one unit change in communication processes brings a .180 unit change on the success of projects related to cost performance.

Coefficient

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	1.772	.706		2.510	.018		
	mission_general	-.171	.103	-.352	-1.657	.109	.579	1.727
	schedule_general	.090	.104	.172	.867	.394	.667	1.498
	communication_	.180	.078	.442	2.306	.029	.711	1.406
	Team	-.073	.079	-.187	-.932	.360	.650	1.538
	manager_skill	.022	.041	.102	.521	.607	.678	1.476
	staff_total	.029	.041	.125	.693	.495	.800	1.250
	socio_finance	.020	.078	.054	.254	.801	.572	1.749
	political_legal	.098	.096	.275	1.017	.318	.358	2.791
	socio_cultural	-.036	.101	-.078	-.362	.720	.570	1.755
	client_consultation	.013	.069	.051	.195	.847	.383	2.610
	client_acceptance	-.003	.048	-.012	-.056	.956	.541	1.847

4.4.3. Factors that affect Project Performance from the Dimension of Quality

On correlating project factors and project implementation, a Pearson correlation coefficient of did not show any significant relationship between the independent variables and quality of project success.

The model summary table below indicated that the cumulative effect of the independent variables (r=.550). The R square result also found to be .303. This implies that 30.3% of the variability on the project quality is explained by the independent variables.

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.550[a]	.303	.019	.12441	1.439

a. Predictors: (Constant), client_acceptance, mission_general, communication_total, manager_skill, staff_total, socio_finance, socio_cultural, schedule_general, team, client_consultation, political_legal

b. Dependent Variable: quality

In order to see the individual independent variable effect on project quality, the coefficient table is presented below. As shown in the table, schedule was found to be the significant factor (B= .117, p< .05) for the quality aspect of project success. This means a unit change in scheduling leads to a .117 unit change in the quality of the project.

Coefficient table

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.738	.384		1.920	.065		
	mission_general	.096	.056	.362	1.712	.098	.579	1.727
	schedule_general	.117	.056	.409	2.081	.047	.667	1.498
	communication_total	-.005	.042	-.022	-.117	.907	.711	1.406
	Team	-.027	.043	-.128	-.644	.525	.650	1.538
	manager_skill	.016	.023	.141	.723	.476	.678	1.476
	staff_total	-.009	.022	-.072	-.400	.692	.800	1.250
	socio_finance	.003	.042	.016	.074	.942	.572	1.749
	political_legal	-.017	.052	-.089	-.330	.744	.358	2.791
	socio_cultural	.104	.055	.406	1.907	.067	.570	1.755
	client_consultation	.025	.037	.173	.666	.511	.383	2.610
	client_acceptance	-.031	.026	-.255	-1.168	.253	.541	1.847

4.5.   Summary of findings

The study was conducted to identify factors that affect project success by taking the case of projects of World Vision Ethiopiaoperating in Addis Ababa. The result found that majority of the projects experienced difficult in completing projects in line with the planned cost. That means, using the set resources were difficult for the sampled projects. On the other hand, the projects were effective in terms of their quality and time management.

The study revealed that the management and team related factors are found to be the significant factor for the schedule (plan) aspect of the project success. That means when time is used to measure project success, then an effective project management and team cohesionbetween the

team members become critical."In previous studies it was assumed that if a project's completion time exceeds its due date, or expenses overrun the budget, or outcomes did not satisfy a company's predetermined performance criteria, the project was assumed to be a failure.

Regarding the cost aspect of project success, communication was found to be the significant predictors to the performance of projects in their cost management. A study by Dong et al. (2004) covers most of the concerns of Chinese information systems' project managers, for which they reviewed extensive literature. The study concluded that effective communication is one of the factors that affect the project success.

Project schedule (plan) also found to be that statistically significant contributor for the quality aspect of program success (performance). Designing and following a proper and well planned project schedule has a positive effect on the quality of the projects.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1.   Conclusion

It was possible to conclude the following based on the objectives and research questions of the study. The projects were found effective in time management performance and quality of the projects whereas they were weak in cost performance. The study concludes that projects have well defined procedures of determining the project scope before implementation by staff. In addition project objectives are discussed before implementation and scope clarity to staff affect project completion time and quality of projects.

The study also concludes that management and team involvement and cohesion affected project implementation in respect to its schedule. The study noted that team involvement improved the accuracy and speed of project implementation as per its intended plan. Their involvement meant that projects were implemented as planned without delays. The stakeholders were involved in different ways. The study also established that stakeholders were involved in strategy implementation. Hence, their involvement was key for the success of project implementation at the Foundation.

The study also concludes that communication influences effective implementation of project implementation in respect to cost. This means the low achievement of the projects in terms of its cost management is may be because of lack of effective communication between staff members and stakeholders.

The study also concludes that project plan (schedule) is a prominent factor for the quality implementation of projects. Well organized, more discussed and involved plan (schedule) facilitates the quality of project implementation.

A study conducted by Pinto & Slevin (1988) concluded that "project success" is something much more complex than simply meeting cost, schedule, and performance specifications. In fact client satisfaction with the final result has a great deal to do with the perceived success or failure of

projects. Therefore, it is important to address other dimensions of project success and their contributing factors.

5.2. Recommendation

Based on the findings come up with, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. The study recommends that the project management office or committee should assess the causes of problems in cost management of the projects. This can eliminate the mismatch of the planned and actual cost expenses. This will be done by collaborating the stakeholders and enhancing their communication.

2. The study also recommends that the management and team cohesion and involvement should be enhanced to improve the plan (schedule) effectiveness of projects.

3. To improve cost effectiveness of the projects, the study recommends that reviewing the previous projects, assess the current market, and improve staff members and stakeholder's communication.

4. Planning phase of formulating projects is a basic stage for its success. So, the study recommends thatthere should be clear and specific schedule (plan) in order to improve the projects quality performance.

References

Achterkamp, M. C., & Vos, J. F. J. (2008). Investigating the use of the stakeholder notion in project management literature.

Alan Fowler and Rick James, 1994. The role of Southern NGOs in Development Cooperation; Occasional paper series # 2: INTRAC.

Antill, J.M. (1974), Project management: an overall concept, I.E. Aust, Adelaide, Keynote Address to Project Management Symposium, South Australian Division.

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

Belassi and tukel (1996) *A new framework for determining critical success/failure factors in projects International Journal of Project Management* Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 141-151.

Bingi, P., Sharma, M.K. and Godla, J. (7999), *Critical issues affecting an I; IZP implementation, Information Systems Management, pp. 7-14.*

Bromilov, (1988) *Empirical relation between the average constructions time (T) and project cost C in the building construction industry.*

Brown, C. and Vessey, I. (1999), TRP Implementation approaches toward a contingency framework, *Proceedings* of *the International Conference on Information Systems,* pp. 411-16.

Buckhout, s., Frey, e. and Neme c, J. Jr (1999), Making PROJECTS succeed: turning fear into promise, *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, pp. 116-23.

Callaway, E (2000), *Entprojectsrise Resource Planning-Integrating Application and Projects Process Across the Entprojectsrise*, Computer Technology Research Corporation, Charleston, SC.

Clarkson (1995) *A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance.*

Connor, P. Haiman, T. Scolt, W. (1978): Managing the modern organization Bouston: Houghton Mifflin Co. Pg. 65-70.

Cooper, R.G. (1999), from experience: the invisible success factors in product innovation, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol. 16 pp.115-33

DavidOsborne and Ted Gaebler(1992) Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector.

David .W. Chapman and Ann E. Austin (2006), *what do we seek when we seek sustainability?* Paper presented at the 10th APEID International Conference Bangkok, Thailand.

De Wit, A. (1988) *Measurement of Project Success. International Journal of Project Management*, 6, 164-170.

D. I.Cleland (1986) "Project Stakeholder Management," Project Management Journal, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 36-44.

Donaldson & Preston (1995). *The stakeholder theory of the corporation*: Concepts, evidence, and implications.

Evans, J. R. and Lindsay, W. M. (1999), *the management and Control of Quality* 4th ed. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College Publishing 85.

Freeman and Beale (1992). Measuring Project Success, _Project Management Journal_ 23(1):8-17.

Gerald M. Steinberg,(2003). _Monitoring the Political Role of NGOs:_ Jerusalem letter, No. 499.

Gilles Nancy and Boriana Yontchera, (2006). _Does NGO aid go to the poor?_ Empirical evidence from Europe: IMF working paper.

Jack F. Rokart of Sloan School of Management (Robert, 2007).

Jugdev and muller (2005) The Relationship between Project Success and Project Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences Volume 119, Pages 75-84.

Joseph, H. (2007), _Stakeholder Theory_, Corporate Governance and Public Management.

Krietner, S. (1995), _The Good Manager's Guide_, 1st ed. London: Synene Publishers.

Kumar R., (2005) _Second edition_ Research methodology a step-by-step guide for beginners.

Meridith J.R., Mantel S.J. Jr, 2000 _Project management;_ A managerial approach

Pinto and Slevin (1987). International Journal of Managing Projects in Business Critical success factors in projects: the elucidation of project success.

PMI, (2008) _A guides to the project management body of knowledge_ (PMBOK Guide) fourth edition.

R. Edward Freeman (2002). A Stakeholder Approach to Strategic Management. Winch and Bonke, Managing Project Stakeholders. _The Wiley Guide to Managing Projects_, pp.321 – 339.

Rick Davies (n.d), Donor information Demands and NGO institutional development.

Schultz, D.P. Slevin, J.K.(1987) *Pinto Strategy and tactics in a process model of project implementation.*

Shenhar, A., Levy, O., & Dvir, D. (1997). Mapping the dimensions of project success. *Project Management Journal, 28*(2), 5–13.

Thomas Donaldson and Lee E. Preston (1995), The Academy of Management Review Vol. 20, No. 1 pp. 65-91.

Westland J., (2006) *the project management lifecycle*; A complete step-by-step methodology for initiating, planning, executing & closing project successfully

William Easterly and Tobias Pfutze, 2008. *Where does the money go?* Best and worst practices in Muhumuza, William (2005) 'Unfulfilled promises? NGOs' micro-credit programmes and poverty reduction in Uganda', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 23:3, 391 – 416.*

Wood, D. and Jones, F. (1995), *convergent stakeholder theory*. 52.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Dear respondent:-

First of all I would like to appreciate your willingness to support my effort by responding to this questionnaire. This questionnaire is designed to get genuine information on **Factors affecting the Success of Project Implementation in NGOs**. Your genuine response to the questions will be pretty important to assure the quality and reliability of the research

The main aim of this questionnaire is to collect data as input for the study titled as **"Factors affecting the Success of Project Implementation in NGOs: World Vision Ethiopia Addis "**, whose sole purpose is to qualify the requirement for obtaining the Master's Degree of Business Management, from Saint Mary's University. Therefore, thanking in advance for your co-operation, I assure you that all information obtained from you will be used only for the research purpose and remain confidential except for the purpose pointed out here above. You need not to write your name. Thank you very much.

Questionnaire

Project name_____

Project type_____

Project year_____

Part 1: Demographic characteristics of the project manager/leader

Age_____

Sex_____

Educational background_____

Experience on project related positions_____

Part 2: Project related factors

Please rate the following statements considering the selected project you participated in based on the following rating scales.

1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Not decided, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree

No	Variables	Ratings				
	Project related: Mission/Goal	5	4	3	2	1
1	The goals of the project were in line with the general goals of the organization.					
2	The basic goals of the project were made clear to the project team.					
3	The project goals are developed in a way that contribute to the missions of the parent organization.					
5	The beneficial consequences of the project to the organization's success are clear.					
	Project related: *Project Schedule / Plan*					
1	We know which activities contain slack time of slack resources which can be utilized in other area during emergencies.					
2	There was a detailed plan (including time, schedules, milestones, manpower requirements, etc.) for the completion of the project.					
3	There was a detailed budget for the project.					
4	Key personnel needs (who, when) were specified in the project plan.					
	Plans are developed by using the work breakdown structure					
	The logical framework approach was adopted in identifying activities, and measureable objectives in the preparation of project plans					

	Risks were sufficiently identified and mitigation strategies included as part of the project plan					
	The Gantt chart was used in developing activity plans					
	Project related: Communication					
1	The results (decisions made, information received and needed, etc.) of planning meetings were published and distributed to applicable personnel.					
2	Individuals/groups supplying input have received feedback on the acceptance or rejection of their input.					
3	All groups affected by the project know how to make problems known to the project team.					
	Plans were clearly communicated to the project team members and to stakeholders					
	The project adopted a formal communication channel to direct work orders and to receive feedbacks					

Part 3: Factors related to organizational structure

No	Variables	Options			
	Organizational structure factor used for the project.	Functional	Dedicated Team	Matrix	Project
1	What kind of organizational structure the project used?				

Part 4: Project management and team related factors

No	Variables	Ratings				
	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	The project management was responsive to the requests for additional expertise, when the need arises. Upper management shared responsibilities with project team for ensuring the project's success.					
2	The project management team agreed and accepted the project manager's authority and responsibility. Upper management supported me in a crisis.					
3	The project management team has granted us the necessary authority and has accepted the decisions concerning the project.					
4	The project management team was responsive to the requests for additional activities, when the need arises.					
	The upper management shared responsibilities with project team for ensuring the project's success.					
5	The project manager agreed with the project team on his/her level of authority and responsibility for the project.					
	Upper management supported the project manager during times/period of crisis.					
	Managerial Skills					
1	The project leader possessed adequate technical/conceptual skills.					
2	The project leader possessed adequate interpersonal (communication) skills.					
3	The project leader possessed adequate leadership skills.					
4	The project leader maintained a high profile (is visible and involved) on the project team.					
5	The project leader has the ability to motivate team members					

	and maintain a cohesive project team.					
6	The project manager has a negotiation skill					
7	The project manager has skills of conflict resolution					
8	The project manager has a team building skill					
9	The project manager is endowed with decision making skills					
	Staff/team					
1	Project team personnel understood their role on the project					
2	There was sufficient (both quality and quantity) human power to complete the project.					
3	The personnel on the project team understood how their performance will be evaluated.					
4	Job description for team members have been written and distributed and were understood.					
5	Adequate technical and /or managerial training (and time for training) was available for members of the project team.					
6	Project team members work as a cohesive group					
7	Project team members are motivated					

Part 5: Project environment related factors

Considering the time that the selected project were undertaking, please rate the existence of the following environmental related factors based on the ranks provided.

No	Variables	Ratings				
	Project environment related factors	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
	Socioeconomic and Financial environment					
1	While the project was being implemented inflation occurred					
2	While the project was being implemented there was a change in economic policy and/or regulation that affected the project performance					
3	While the project was being implemented currency devaluation occurred					

4	While the project was being implemented the opportunity to get access to capital and technology changed					
	Political environment					
1	There was political instability while the project was being implemented					
2	The project is situated in a politically sensitive environment					
3	The project was implemented in a governance structure which was too inhibiting					
4	There was election while the project was implemented					
	Legal environment					
1	Change control (change in contract terms)					
2	Project contract/drafting of the project contract					
	Social and cultural					
1	The project is implemented in a cultural setting that don't accept new things					
2	There was hidden obstruction that affected the project implementation					
3	There was adequate access to social amenities (e.g. med-care)					
4	The literacy level of the local community was enabling the implementation of the project					

No	Variables	Ratings				
	Stakeholders level of involvement and their attitude	5	4	3	2	1
	Client Consultation					
1	The clients were given the opportunity to provide input early in the project development stage.					
2	The clients (intended users/beneficiaries) were kept informed of the project's progress.					
3	The value of the project has been discussed with the beneficiaries/clients.					
4	The purpose of the project has been discussed with the clients and what the project is not designed to do was made clear.					
5	The clients were told whether or not their input was assimilated into the project plan.					
	Client Acceptance					

1	There was adequate documentation of the project to allow easy use by the clients (instructions, etc.).					
2	Potential clients have been contacted about the usefulness of the project.					
4	Clients knew who to contact when problems or questions arise.					
5	Adequate advanced preparation has been done to determine how best to "sell" the project to clients.					

Appendix 2: Checklist for the project success

The level of project success will be decided based on the secondary data that will be collected from profiles of the selected projects

1. *Schedule performance index*

Based on the following formula, the schedule performance index will be rated

Schedule Performance Index = (Earned Value) / (Planned Value)

SPI = EV / PV

- If the SPI is greater than one, this means more work has been completed than the planned work. In other words, you are ahead of schedule.
- If the SPI is less than one, this means less work has been completed than the planned work. In other words, you are behind schedule.
- If the SPI is equal to one, this means work is being completed at about the same rate as planned, you are on time.
- Earned Value (EV) = **Total** project budget multiplied by the % complete of the project

2. **Cost Performance Index (CPI)**

The cost performance index will be determined based on the following formula;

Cost Performance Index = (Earned Value) / (Actual Cost)

CPI = EV / AC

With the above formula, you can conclude that:

- If the CPI is less than one, you are earning less than the amount spent. In other words, you're over budget.
- If the CPI is greater than one, you are earning more than the amount spent. In other words, you are under budget.

- If the CPI is equal to one, this means earning and spending are equal. You can say that you are proceeding exactly as per the planned budget spending, although this rarely happens.

		Options	
		Yes	No
1	Achieves target benefits (by taking its plans as a benchmark)		
2	Produces high-quality deliverables (by taking its plans as a criteria)		
3	Achieves its laid out outcome level(targeted result)		
4	No deliverable defect(quality)		

Table of Contents