Global Scientific JOURNALS

GSJ: Volume 10, Issue 3, March 2022, Online: ISSN 2320-9186

www.globalscientificjournal.com

Influence of Project Planning Process on Performance of Food Sustainable Initiative Project in Rwanda

[1*] ***Mr. Kiiza Williams***

[2] ***Dr. Paul Munene Muiruri*** **(Ph.D)**

[1*] MBA student Mount Kenya University of Rwanda School of Business and Economic , Kigali Rwanda

wkiiza08@gmail.com

[2] Lecturer , Mount Kenya University of Rwanda School of Business and Economic ,Kigali Rwanda

Munenepaul1@gmail.com

Abstract:

The concern of this study was to explore the influence of project planning process on performance of food sustainable initiative project in Rwanda. The specific objectives of the study included determining how schedule influences performance of food sustainable initiative project in Rwanda, to examine the influence of project execution on performance of food sustainable initiative project in Rwanda and to assess the influence of budget on performance of food sustainable initiative project in Rwanda. This study is paramount to different stakeholders including the researcher, future researchers, and sustainable food initiative project, other projects and the government of Rwanda.

The study adopted descriptive research design using quantitative and qualitative approaches. The population involved in this study was 6 technical staff from the FSIP and 80 beneficiaries that were taken as target population. To sample respondents, stratified random and non-probability sampling techniques were used, with a sample size of 86 respondents. To acquire primary data, structured questionnaires and interview procedures were used. Using IBM SPSS version 20, descriptive and inferential analysis such as frequencies, percentages, and correlation were employed to provide quantitative data in the form of tables. Results from findings indicated that there was an agreement on how schedule influences performance of the project as 45% of respondents strongly agreed and 38% agreed that the schedule change affects the project to reach its completion with a mean 3.9767 and standard deviation of 0.34220. Besides, the results also revealed that the project execution influences the Performance of the project where 81% of the respondents agreed and 9% strongly agreed with a mean of 3.4884 and standard deviation of 0.68159. Further, the study also indicated that the project budget influences the Performance of the project as 84% of the respondents agreed with a mean of 4.0000 and standard deviation of

3.7573. Besides, the study found that there is insignificant negative correlation of r=-0.681 and p value=0.000 between variables statistically correlated given the p value is <0.005. Finally, the study recommended that to ensure effective Planning of all project activities, emphasis should be put on Work Break Structure in order to develop a project schedule, as it defines all the work that needs to be completed to achieve the goals and objectives of the project.

Key Words*: Project planning, performance of food sustainable initiative project, Rwanda*

1.0 Introduction

Most of the projects that are initiated start with great ideas and investments full of promising outcomes. However, in the course of their lifetime, these projects end up being faced with various challenges that hinder their promising prospective. The inability of project planners to define adequately the project deliverables and scope is one of the main contributing factors to failure. This makes all the project team members to fail understand the real basics of the project and hence leads to failure achieve maximum output.

Haddara and Paivarinta (2011) reported that the planning process perception is not quite the same in most countries around the world. In developed economy countries, the project planning process has mostly a positive impact to the success or Performance of project; the conducive economic environment in which the project is running (Kerzner, 2014) causes this. Henry (2011) supported by adding that project management includes constantly planning what to do, monitoring progress, comparing development plans, taking corrective measures to ensure that development is relevant to the plan if necessary. For instance, about eighty percent of people living and working in United Arab Emirates (UAE) are expatriates from different nationalities with majority from India, Malaysia and Philippines. This implies that majority of the projects are run by foreign managers the labor force and other supplies are foreign sourced.

Carkenord (2016) acknowledges that there is a wide view of the importance of project Performance in the project management literature.

Generally, in Africa, there are different authors who have evidenced the escalating problems of project delays in Ghana and other regions in Africa. For instance, Dalcher (2012) found that among the projects investigated only 18% of these projects are successful while over 43% and over 59% experience project delays and budget escalation respectively. One of the factors attributed to these failures is the project planning process that becomes uncontrolled due to their economic environment situation.

In Rwanda, the project planning change is inevitable but can be controlled. While changing it can create the extra resources or budget for many projects. Projects in Rwanda have succeeded, and their achievements become sustainable while for others Performance issues have remained a challenge. Before projects are allowed to commence their activities, they present their proposals and objectives to both funders and regulatory agencies, therefore as they commence their activities, they have a clear scope of the activities to be carried out. Project planning process in most projects affect the time projects would be strengthening the achievements for better Performance either during implementation or after implementation due to deviations in planned resources and time during project implementation (Camilleri, 2011). According to the RTDA, (2019) officers said that the change of scope in construction project affected the project delay due to the changes; every scope necessitates the added budget that sometimes is not available at the time of scope change. This is why it important for project managers to recognize the need for having a rigorous scope control. This helps in achieving project deliverables in time and within a stated budget frame.

As noted by Dalcher (2012), a change in the scope should always be accompanied by adjustments to the project costs or timelines. Failure to do this can lead to late project delivery

and budgetary problems. The sustainable food initiative project works with rural communities in supporting them to have sources of income and food so as to promote their self-reliance, the project has been in Rwanda for nearly 10 years, and has improved lives of people in as far as access to small sources of income is concerned in the districts of Eastern Rwanda. The project attributes its success to project management. However, the researcher could not confirm this without sufficient research in this area, hence necessitating the research on the effect of planning process on project Performance taking as a case of sustainable food initiative project.

1.1 Problem Statement

Project Performance is what most of the project strive to attain because they gain the capacity to carry out their activities uninterruptedly through Performance. However, Heller *et al* (2016) reported that the project planning process perception is not quite the same in most countries around the world. The project scope change has mostly a positive impact to the success or Performance of project; the conducive economic environment in which the project is running (Kerzner, 2014) causes this. Dalcher (2012) found that among the projects investigated only 18% of these projects are successful while over 43% and over 59% experience project delays and budget escalation respectively. One of the factors attributed to these failures is the project planning process that becomes uncontrolled due to their economic environment situation.

Sustainable food initiative project that has been working with rural communities was intended to provide support communities in districts of Eastern Rwanda in order to have sources of income and food to promote their self-reliance. According to UNDP terminal evaluation reports (2012) feedback for nearly 10 years, lives of beneficiaries has been improved however in as far as access to small sources of income has not been achieved as per project plan. This is because project planned activities are not finished on time and within required budget due to planning process which has led to the increased costs, poor time management as well as failure to meet project targets in the stipulated time which leads to increase in inefficient use of Performance of projects. most successful projects define well their scope and determine how best the they will be implemented and completed in time, by who and using which resources. However, this may sometimes not be possible due to different factors either from projects themselves or from the environment hence having a diverse effect or poor Performance on the project ability to sustain itself or sustain its achievement after completion.

The studies done on project planning process include one of Burek, (2016) who conducted it on developing a complete project scope statement in two days and in the same angle Safapour (2019) focused on the identification of indicators of manageable planning process for construction projects. There is no local study done on the influence of project planning process on Performance on Food sustainable initiative project. Different research have been conducted on Project planning process, but some did not provide more findings on its influence on Food sustainable initiative projects (FSIP). It is against that background that this research intends to carry out this research on the influence of project planning process on Performance with reference to sustainable food initiative project.

1.2 Objective Of This Study

The general objective of this study is to assess the influence of project planning process on performance of food sustainable initiative project.

The specific objectives used in this study were:

i) To determine how project scheduling influences performance of food sustainable initiative project in Rwanda.

ii) To examine the influence of project execution on performance of food sustainable initiative project in Rwanda.
iii) To assess the influence of budget on performance of food sustainable initiative project in Rwanda.

2.0 Literature Review

Tache (2011) conducted research in Romania on building an integrated planning system for long-term investment projects. The study's goal was to create a broad integrated flow that included both project planning for investment projects and cross-cutting social and environmental targets in order to measure their effectiveness.

Fatima, Alyaa, and Abdul investigated the role of change management in the effectiveness of project implementation in Malasia (2013).They employed documentary analysis to discover that the number of projects that fail is currently high, and that this is attributable to a variety of causes, the most important of which is bad project management. Furthermore, time passes quickly from day to day, making it difficult to create a dynamic structure. As a result, good management is necessary to ensure project execution efficacy. Because it focuses on enhancing project planning to cope with the present large change element in order to assure the outcomes and longevity of any company, advantage lucky change management is in great demand. In Ghana, Ofori (2013) conducted research on project management methods and critical success criteria. Their study's purpose was to identify and assess the quality of project planning using management techniques. With a sample of 200 managers from diverse economic sectors, the study employed an exploratory strategy and a survey method to collect data about Ghanaian enterprises' project management methods. According to the findings, top management support, avoiding risk management, an effective communication plan, clarity of project goals, and stakeholder involvement are all essential elements that contribute to project success.

Individual project team members' breaks must also be accounted for in the budget. People have various schedules, and in order to organize those jobs properly, their availability and vacation or leave dates must be documented (Loy, 2014). To keep project timetables on track, the project manager and project teams might employ a variety of strategies and technologies. According to the literature, the strategy can rapidly assist in changing the project schedule to fix delays before they become serious, particularly when activities are being blocked. Along with graphs and charts, the project team may automatically delve deeper, filter, and personalize findings to acquire timely and relevant information, according to Wray (2018). Bell and Opie (2012) agree with this viewpoint, claiming that project scheduling can summarize the logical relationship between various tasks.

Scheduling looks to be one of the more challenging jobs in project management, according to popular belief. However, majority of authors believe that a project is a one-of-a-kind undertaking, a one-of-a-kind effort that has never been done before. As a result, knowing exactly what activities must be completed in order to complete the project, as well as their cost and length parameters, is extremely difficult, if not impossible, at the original planning stage (Kelly, 2013).. As a result, some people may come to the opinion that planning isn't always beneficial or even desired.

Milestone planning, according to Andersen (2014), should be used instead of traditional planning. A milestone is a measurable objective that must be achieved. Because a milestone describes what must be done but not how it should be done, it supports result-oriented thinking rather than activity-oriented thinking. According to Bart (2014), the traditional approach of planning and supervising R&D projects tends to fail due to too much formal control, which

prevents creativity from playing a critical role in project execution. Bart proposes that formal control be reduced to the bare minimum required. Even if we agree with Bart and limit planning to a bare minimum, there is no denying that thorough and precise capture of end-user requirements is critical to project success (2015). This is because the requirements analysis stage's output will almost certainly decide the development process's overall outcome. According to Posten (2011), 55 percent of all errors in R&D projects arise during the requirement analysis and specification stage, whereas 43 percent are not discovered until the testing stage.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Complexity Theory

Much of the complexity theory research comes from the Santa Fe Institute in New Mexico, which was a destination for students studying the subject in 1985. Stuart Kauffman, an American medical doctor, theoretical biologist, and complex systems researcher who examines the origins of life on Earth, is one of the primary proponents of complexity theory.

Other scientists with a stronger focus on the commercial side of complexity theory include Howard Sherman and Ron Schultz, authors of Open Boundaries and fellows at the Santa Fe Center for Emergent Strategies in collaboration with the Santa Fe Institute. They believe that today's business is speedier and nonlinear (i.e., results are not proportionate to causes), and that "experts" cannot predict which products or businesses will succeed. According to Sherman and Schultz, competitive advantage is transitory, and changes can quickly turn assets into dead weight (Hiller, 2011).

Complexity theory as discussed by Curlee and Gordon (2011) is founded on the managers and practitioners' views that where there is order, there will be no enough space for flexibility which can effectively address changes as they come. In effect therefore, a worldview presents that order will always be broken in environments that are dynamic. Since project management is carried out in a dynamic environment, it is therefore inevitable to have various change springing out during the project life cycle. As such then, different projects are exposed to different situations that create a network of complexity. By their very nature, projects are complex endeavor to accomplish. The complexity theory reaffirms that projects are carried out through interrelated activities with different parties playing different roles.

Program Theory

Wholey and McLaughlin described program theory or logic models over thirty years ago, and Jordan (2014) summarizes their early evolution and utilization. "Cycles of reasoning," "theory of action," "performance framework," and "logical framework" are all terms used to describe the logic model method (Jordan, 2016). A program theory or logic model explains how the activities of an intervention are understood to contribute to a chain of results (short-term outputs, medium-term outcomes) that produce ultimate intended or actual impacts. It can be shown in the form inputs->processes->outputs ->outcomes -> impacts but sometimes other forms are more useful. A logical model is typically created by a group of people who have the experience and knowledge required to develop a project or a program that aligns with a desired set of outcomes or impact (Gaul, 2013).

A program theory explains how a particular intervention (a project, a program, a policy, or a strategy) is understood to contribute to a chain of events that leads to the desired or actual outcomes. It has both positive (beneficial) and negative (destructive) consequences (which are detrimental). It can also show how other elements, such as context and other projects and programs, play a role in the development of impacts. A program theory can be represented using a variety of diagrams. These are known as logic models because they depict the overarching

logic of how the intervention is thought to function (Kelly, 2013).Kelly (2013) has further asserted that this theory some limitation.

Theory of Constraint

Dr. Eliyahu M. Goldratt presented the Theory of Constraints (TOC) in his famous business fiction "The Goal" in 1984, and it quickly became popular. This overview of TOC's history highlights important turning points in the movement's evolution (Kother, 2015). Goldratt left academia to join a company named Creative Output after assisting many Israeli industries. The Optimized Production Technology software package was created and distributed by the company (OPT). OPT was described as the first software to give production environments with finite capacity scheduling.
A number of key articles studied this program and the principles behind it, forming the early seeds of the Theory of Constraints (Jeyz, 2014). Organizations can meet their financial goals while providing on-time-in-full (OTIF) to customers, avoiding stock-outs in the supply chain, lowering lead-time, and so on by using this constraint. Other frequent advantages of using the Theory of Constraints include improved control over operations, less inventory, fewer team disagreements, and significantly less firefighting. New capacity is frequently exposed without extra capital expenditure or the hire of additional staff (Hooler, 2011).

3.0 Methods

The researcher employed a descriptive design because it allows the researcher to obtain detailed replies from respondents, which served as the basis for analysis. The researcher used a census survey in this study as he found that the total population was small. According to United Nations Statistical Commission (2010), census survey is a survey conducted on the full set of observation objects belonging to a given population or universe. The researcher took all targeted population as sample size. Hence, the census population is 86 respondents and the researcher used census as a technique that is more applicable in situation where the target population is small and manageable because Kothari (2014) said that researchers should use census where target population is small for better result. In addition, 80 direct beneficiaries were targeted in this study and 6 technical staff from the project. Thus, the survey sample was 86 respondents. Before conducting the interview with the technical staff, the researcher received a list of direct beneficiaries who were all involved in the sample size due to their small number.

Data collection methods was done from food sustainable initiative project location. Data was collected through data collection form and the questionnaire was opened and closed questions. The sample size was 86. After the necessary data being collected and entering into a computer, they were running through SPSS software, version 20 for analytical purpose. Descriptive statistics were employed to analyze the data where mean score and standard deviations while inferential statistics (regression and correlation analysis) were employed to help provide further interpretation of data. In addition, data was presented in table form and by use of graphs.
The following regression equation was formulated.
$Y= \beta 0+ \beta x1+ \beta x2+ \beta X3+ \alpha$
Where Y is Performance of food sustainable initiative project
X1 is Schedule
X2 is project execution
X3 is budget
B1…. β3 is regression coefficient
α is error term

4.0 **Results**

Socio Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

This section focuses on the respondents' bio-data in order to determine their appropriateness for answering the questions based on their age, gender, and academic qualifications.

The study sought to identify the age of the respondents. Findings are presented in the table below.

Table 1 : Distribution of respondents according to their age

Age of respondents	Frequency	Percentage
Between 18 to 25	17	20.3
Between 26 to 35	38	45.2
Between 36 to 45	23	27.4
Between 46 to 55	6	7.1
Above 55 years	0	0
Total	84	100

Source: Primary data (2021)

According to the data, 38 respondents (45.2%) were between the ages of 26 and 35, 23 respondents (27.4%) were between the ages of 36 and 45, 17 respondents (20.2%) were between the ages of 18 and 25, 6 respondents (7.1%) were between the ages of 46 and 55, and no one was over the age of 55. The majority of the project's beneficiaries were young people, as evidenced by this.

Table 2: Gender Composition of the Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Male	49	58.3
Female	35	41.7
Total	84	100.0

Source: Primary data (2021)

According to table 4.4, 49 of the respondents (58.3%) were male, while 35 (41.7%) were female. This demonstrates that the majority of project beneficiaries were men rather than women, indicating a problem of gender bias in project selection in the area.

Table 4 : Academic Qualification of the Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Secondary level	68	81.0
Diploma holders	7	8.3
Bachelor's degree	8	9.5
Masters	1	1.2
PHD	0	0.0
Total	84	100.0

Source: Primary data (2021)

According to the findings in table 4.5, the majority of 68 respondents (81.0%), had secondary level, 7 respondents (8.3%), had diploma degree, eight respondents (9.5%) had bachelor's degree, 1respondent (1.2%) had a master's degree and no one had PhD. This means that the project's immediate beneficiaries were not well-educated, resulting in a high level of dependency.

Table 3: Level of agreement on how project scheduling influences performance of food sustainable initiative the project

Statements	SA (%)	A (%)	N (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	N(=84)	Mean	Std. Deviation
The schedule change affects the project to reach its completion	46	38	10	6	0	100	3.9767	0.34220
Planning progress affect the times completion of your project	26	63	4	3	4	100	4.7326	0.54068
Poorly done Work Break Structure delays the project	92	6	2	0	0	100	3.2209	0.51794
Setting schedule is a critical step of project Performance	4	77	14	5	0	100	4.0814	0.27505
Schedule compression is important skills for project	38	47	13	1	1		1.6395	1.16733

manager						100		
Ability to keep projects on time and to ensure effective completion with the given deadline	67	4	14	5	10	100	1.5465	1.08093
Managing the schedule and scope is the key to meeting project deadlines	83	10	6	1	0	100	3.9884	0.49691
A well thought Work Break Structure leads to the development of an accurate and robust project plan	90	8	2	0	0	100	4.2907	0.83829

Source: Primary data (2021)

According to the findings from table 4.6, the level of agreement on how schedule influences Performance of the project, 46% of the respondents strongly agreed and 38% agreed that the schedule change affects the project to reach it completion, 10% were neutral and 6% disagreed with a mean 3.9767 and standard deviation of 0.34220. Moreover, planning progress affect the time completion of the project as 63% of respondents agreed, 26% strongly agreed and 4% of respondents are undecided whereas 3% disagreed about that statement, with a mean 4.7326 with standard deviation of 0.54068. Furthermore, the majority respondents at 92% strongly agreed and 6%agreed that when the schedule is poorly done, Work Break Structure would delay the project, with a mean 3.2209 and standard deviation of 0.51794.

Additionally, the large number of respondents at 77% agreed and 4% strongly agreed that setting schedule is a critical step of project Performance, with mean of 4.0814 and standard deviation of 0.27505. Almost a half of respondents that is 41% strongly agreed and 38% disagreed that schedule compression is important skills for project manager with a mean of 1.6395 and standard deviation of 1.16733. Schedule compression, according to them, shortens the project schedule without affecting the project scope and helps to minimize schedule limitations, enforced deadlines, and other schedule goals.

There is an ability to keep projects on time and to ensure effective completion with the given deadline as 46% of respondents agreed and 67% strongly disagreed with a mean of 1.5465 and standard deviation of 1.08093. The majority of 83% respondents strongly agreed and 10% agreed that managing the schedule and scope is the key to meeting project deadlines, with a mean of 3.9884 and standard deviation of 0.49691. Moreover, this would be done when there is a well thought Work Break Structure, which leads to the development of an accurate and robust project plan as the big number of respondents strongly, agreed and 8% agreed.

Table 4: The Level of agreement on how the project execution influences performance of food sustainable initiative project

Statements	SA (%)	A (%)	N (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean	Std

Project execution change influence Performance of the project	9	81	3	1	6	3.4884	0.68159
The misinterpretations of project scope affect Performance of the project	57	13	15	3	12	3.5116	0.69864
There are strategies to tackle late project scope within the project implementation	14	82	1	3	0	4.0558	0.79151
The adjustment project activities influence the achievement of the desired outcome	49	42	8	0	1	3.5965	1.03804
Project scope (deliverable) change can affect and meet the need of the project	59	36	1	3	1	3.5826	0.91872
Effectively handling, project execution requires the project manager to act as a leader	13	84	1	1	1	3.3163	0.75644

Source: Primary Data (2021)

The Table 4.7 above indicates the level of agreement on how the project execution influences Performance of the project. The project execution change influences the Performance of the project as 81% of the respondents agreed and 9% strongly agreed with a mean of 3.4884 and standard deviation of 0.68159. Besides, 57% of respondents also strongly agreed and 13% agreed that the Performance of the project was affected by the misinterpretation of project scope but 12% strongly disagreed with that statement by a mean of 3.5116 and a standard deviation of 0.69864. Respondents also strongly agreed at the rate of 57% and agreed at the rate of 13% that there are strategies to tackle late project scope within the project implementation at FSIP with a mean of 4.0558 and standard deviation of 0.79151.

In addition, there are strategies to tackle late project scope within the project implementation as 14% strongly agreed and 82% agreed with a mean of 3.5116 and a standard deviation of 0.69864. On the statement regarding the adjustment project activities that influence the achievement of the desired outcome, the majority of respondents at 49% strongly agreed and 42% agreed, 8% were neutral and 1% strongly disagreed with a mean of 3.5965 and standard deviation of 1.03804. Moreover, the respondents were asked if product scope (deliverable) change can affect and meet the need of food sustainable initiative project" (FSIP), 59% agreed and 36% disagree to the statement with a mean of 3.5826 and standard deviation of 0.91872.

Each functional management team develops an information gathering meeting plan to determine the project's deliverables and priorities. The management and engineering delivery list, as well as the acceptance criteria for the project's deliverables, must be very clear. Further, effectively handling, project execution requires the project manager to act as a leader as the majority of respondents (84%) agreed and 13% strongly disagreed with a mean of 3.3163 and standard deviation of 0.75644.

Table 5: Level of agreement on how budget influences performance of food sustainable initiative project

Statements	SA (%)	A (%)	N (%)	D (%)	SA (%)	Mean	Std.
1)The project budget estimates, controls and cost to complete a project over a defined time	29	56	10	5	0	4.0000	3.7573
2)The project budget has clear goals and objectives	17	63	8	8	4	4.61630	0.68888
3)When budgeting outcomes, goals and objectives are linked to project activities	94	10	1	1	3	3.39530	0.72403
4) The project budget engages its stakeholders in making key budget decisions.	29	51	3	5	12	4.10470	0.3079
5)The management team reviews regularly the implementation of budgetary control measures in the project	23	45	29	1	2	3.78950	0.65817
6)The project's budget performance evaluation reports are prepared frequently	58	23	9	6	4	4.69770	0.66985
7)Sufficient consultation can lead to poor project specifications	12	71	15	3	0	3.26400	0.55834
8)The budget changes activities affect the project costs	0	81	13	3	3	4.10465	0.460922
9)Failure to consult with experts during budgeting may affect the project's goals and activities	75	6	4	9	6	3.47210	0.75889

Source: Primary data, 2021

The Table 4.8 indicates level of agreement on how budget influences performance of food sustainable initiative project. On the statement that the project budget estimates, controls and cost to complete a project over a defined time, 56% of respondents agreed and 29% strongly agreed with a mean of 4.0000 and standard deviation of 3.7573. Besides, the respondents were asked if the project budget has clear goals and objectives, the majority of 63% agreed and 17% disagreed that statement with a mean of 4.61630 and standard deviation of 0.6888.

They also strongly agreed (94%) and agreed 10% that when budgeting outcomes, goals and objectives are linked to project activities with a mean of 3.39530 and standard deviation of 0.72403. Moreover, every time the management team reviews regularly the implementation of budgetary control measures in the project as 45% of respondents agreed but 29% were neutral on

that statement with a mean of 4.10470 and standard deviation of 0.3079. Further, 58% of respondents strongly agreed and 23% agreed, 9% were undecided, 6% disagreed and 4% strongly disagreed with a mean of 4.69770 and a standard deviation of 0.66985 that he project's budget performance evaluation reports are prepared frequently. In addition, the majority of respondents 71% disagreed and 12% agreed that sufficient consultation could lead to poor project specifications with a mean of 3.2640 and a standard deviation of 0.55834. In terms of Performance of the project, the budget changes activities are affected by the project cost as disagreed by the majority of respondents at 81%. Once there is a failure to consult experts during budgeting, it may affect the project's goals, objectives and even activities as 75% of respondents strongly agreed and at same time agreed by 6% respondents, with a mean of 3.47210 and standard deviation of 0.75889. From the findings, the study revealed that budget is influences Performance of food sustainable initiative project by estimates and controlling projects cost, goals and objectives which are linked to project activities, engaging its stakeholders in making key budget decisions, regular reviews of the implementation of budgetary control measures in the project and by affecting the outcome of the project.

The results of the findings show that cost estimation is done at the planning stage and, therefore, everything is not yet set in stone. In many cases, project teams come up with multiple solutions for a project, and cost estimation helps them decide which way to go. These findings go along with Theodore (2012) who pointed out that cost budgeting can be viewed as part of estimation or as its own separate process. In addition, project objectives are what are planning to achieve by the end of your project.

This might include deliverables and assets, or more intangible objectives like increasing productivity or motivation. The project objectives should be attainable, time-bound, specific goals can be measured at the end of the project. During the interview with the key informants, when they were asked how budget is influenced by Performance of food sustainable initiative project, 33.3% said that one of the objectives of budgeting is to maintain planning. Budgeting is an essential step in an effective financial planning. Moreover, 50% among the key informants on the same questions accepted that in project budget, there is always the involvement of stakeholders. The role of stakeholders in the budgeting process is largely to ensure that advocacy for active and effective participation in the decision-making process, particularly on development initiatives in geographic areas, is strengthened. This also applied to how these efforts were funded, as defined by the stakeholders.

Table 8. Project Performance

Statement	SA (%)	A (%)	N (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean	Std
The project meets intended objectives/goals as scheduled	74	15	1	5	3	3.9667	0.45959
There is proper utilization of project resources	27	36	15	19	3	3.9767	0.61313
Projects are implemented and completed within the	36	62	6	3	3	3.6588	0.80995

expected timeframe

Costs are minimized in the projects during its implementation	27	42	8	6	17	3.5698	0.87502
Concluded projects normally meet the required quality/standard	69	23	5	3	0	3.8930	0.88475

Source: Primary data, 2021

This table 4.8 of the analysis highlights the results on project Performance. On the statement if the project meets intended objectives, 74% of respondents strongly agreed, 15% agreed, 5% disagreed while 1% of the respondents was unaware about, with a mean of 3.9667 and standard deviation of 0.45959. In addition, respondents were questioned if project resources were being used well. The results showed that 36% of respondents agreed, 27% agreed, 19% disagreed, 3% strongly disagreed, and 5% of respondents were indifferent, with a mean of 3.9767 and standard deviation of 0.61313. In addition, the study tried to determine if initiatives are implemented and completed on schedule. With a mean of 3.6588 and standard deviation of 0.80995, the results showed that 62 percent of respondents strongly agreed, 36 percent agreed, 3 percent disagreed, 3 percent strongly disagreed, and 6 percent were neutral.

Furthermore, the study wanted to see if project expenses are kept to a minimum throughout implementation. According to the study's findings, 42 percent of respondents agreed, 27 percent strongly agreed, 23 percent opposed, and 8 percent were indifferent, with a mean of 3.5698 and a standard deviation of 0.87502. Finally, 69% of the respondents strongly agreed that concluded projects normally meet the required standard, 23% agreed, 4% of them disagreed and 5% were neutral with a mean of 3.8930 and a standard deviation of 0.88475. The results showed that projects normally meet the required standard.

During the interview with the key informants to ensure the Performance of FSIP, project team discussed about the various processes and mechanisms that could be utilized for ensuring desired performance. Along with discussions, they came up with different mechanism used at FSIP. The first mechanism is long-term vision where the project after a period of 5 or 10 years would be seen. Once the long-term vision of the NGO was easily drafted, the various goals would be achieved. Another mechanism is to incorporate performance into all of your initiatives. Integrating performance concerns into a project from the start is always a good idea. This would assist in the early stages of project development in developing collaborations and relationships with important stakeholders.

Correlation Analysis and Regression Analyses

Pearson's correlation, a test statistic that quantifies the statistical link or association between two continuous variables, was utilized in the study the range of coefficient values is +1 to -1, with +1 indicating a perfect positive association, -1 indicating a perfect negative relationship, and 0 indicating no relationship. The following table gives details on the correlation between independent and dependent variable Result indicates the relationship between project planning process and project Performance. According to Pearson correlation, it is used when one wants to find a linear relationship between two variables. The table above shows that the correlation is

insignificant between project performance and required standard (r=-289, p=0.007) and insignificant correlation between project cost and project Performance (r=-0.227, p=0.035). Besides, results also shows that there is insignificant negative correlation between required standard and schedule (r=-0.681, p=0.000). Therefore, the study revealed that there is relationship between two variables that are project-planning process and project Performance with insignificant correlation.

4.2 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is a statistical technique for determining the relationship between two or more quantitative variables: a dependent variable whose value must be predicted and an independent or explanatory variable (or variables) about which knowledge exists. A graph or, more commonly, an equation can be used to show the relationship between the variables.

Table 10. Model summary of project planning process

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.777[a]	.7142	.711	.48832

a. Predictors: (Constant), Budget, Project execution, Schedule

The table above indicates the model summary and gives the value for multiple R and the adjusted R is 0.777[a] whereas R square is 0.711. This shows that the predictors planning process (budget, project execution and schedule) is constant.

Table 11: The variance of Project performance

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.249	3	1.083	4.542	.005[b]
	Residual	19.553	82	.238		
	Total	22.802	85			

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of food sustainable initiative project

b. Predictors: (Constant), Budget, Project execution, Schedule

The Table 4.12 indicates the regression ANOVA, which test for a linear relationship between the variables. F test is used to determine the significance of the function. The results of F test on 0.01 important level was F-estimate>-table, F-table, F estimate=4.542 and P is .005[b] which is <0.05. As such, the model was meaningful at 1% important level. The results showed the analysis of variance table and the F-value which explain the effects of independents variables on dependent

variable.

Table 12: Coefficients of Project process planning

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.028	.623		4.864	.000
	Schedule	.035	.113	.044	.311	.757
	Project execution	.185	.078	.245	2.369	.020
	Budget	-.195	.101	-.270	-1.933	.057

a. Dependent Variable: Performance of food sustainable initiative project

The following regression equation was formulated

$Y= \beta 0+ \beta x1+ \beta x2+ \beta X3+ \alpha$

Where Y is Performance of food sustainable initiative project; X1 is Schedule; X2 is project execution; X3 is budget; B1…. β3 is regression coefficient; α is error term

Table above indicates that Kernel of regression analysis in which Y=A+BX. The project planning which has three variables that are schedule, project execution and budget have unstandardized coefficients B equal to 3.028 and constant. The Std error is 0.623. Thus, according to Kernel formula, project planning process (schedule, project execution and budget) equal to $Y=3.028 + 0.035\ X_1 + 0.185\ X_2 + 0.195X_3 + \varepsilon$ is effective and efficiency of project Performance which is dependent variable.

The findings of this study reveals how schedule influence Performance of food sustainable initiative project (FSIP). The study concludes that project scheduling at FSIP is just as important as cost budgeting as it determines the timeline, resources needed, and reality of the delivery of the project and Work Breakdown Structure can be used for projects, programs, and even initiatives to understand the work that has to be done to successfully produce a deliverable. In addition, the findings of the study reveals that project execution influences the Performance of food sustainable initiative project at FSIP.

The study concludes that the misinterpretations of project scope influences Performance of the project because the project scope is part of project planning that involves determining and documenting a list of specific project goals, deliverables, tasks, costs and deadlines. The scope statement also provides the project team with guidelines for making decisions about change requests during the project. Finally, the study also reveals that there is an influence of budget on Performance of food sustainable initiative project. The study concludes that at FSIP, budget influences performance of food sustainable initiative project where estimating and controlling projects cost, goals and objectives are linked to project activities, engaging its stakeholders in

making key budget decisions, and regularly reviewing the implementation of budgetary control measures in the project and by affecting the outcome of the project.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are suggested: There is need for proper channel of resource mobilization for projects and a proper funding schedule to facilitate the completion of FISP. Moreover, it is utmost necessary to have a proper channel of resource mobilization for the projects, stakeholders need to be involved in the entire project budget as it helps in making key budget decision and emphasis should be put on Work Break Structure in order to develop a project schedule as it defines all the work that needs to be completed to achieve the goals and objectives of the project.

REFERENCES

Andersen, R. (2014). *Organizational Change: A Guide to Bringing Everyone on Board.* SPEA Honors Thesis, Indiana University, Indiana

Carkenord, H. (2016). *The complex nexus between informality and the law* .American Journal of Trade and Policy, 1(1), 51-55.

Carkenord, H. (2014). *Three proven ways business analysts help prevent scope creep. Paper presented at PMI Global Congress 2014 - North America, Phoenix, AZ. Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute.*

Dubnoff, K.(2015). Scanning dynamic competitive landscapes: a market-based and resource based framework. *Strategic Management Journal,* 24(10)(Special Issue), 1027-1041.

Echeme's, M. &. (2016). *IT project management: Infamous failures, classic mistakes, and best practices.* . MIS Quarterly executive, 6(2).

Eisenhardt, K. M. (2017). *Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges.* The Academy of Management Journal, 50(1), 25-32.

Farok, G. M. (2018). *Scope creep monitors level of satisfaction, cost of business and slippery slope relationships among stakeholders, project manager, sponsor and PMO to execute project completion report.* Journal of International Asso.

Golan, R. &. (2015). *Stock Market Analysis Utilizing Rough Set Theory, ProQuest. Master Thesis.* . Saskatchewan: University of Regina. .

Golan, R. (2016). *Stock Market Analysis Utilizing Rough Set Theory, ProQuest.* Regina: Master Thesis. Saskatchewan: University of Regina.

Grawizt, M. (2011). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques.,* . New Delhi.: 2nd Edition, New Age International Publishers.

Peter, V. A. (2013). *Megaproject management: Lessons on risk and project management.* Routledge, London.

Haddara, F. & Paivarinta, G.(2011). *Cost, Benefit and Financial Risk (CoBeFR) of ERP implementation. Advances in Manufacturing Technology XXVII — Proceedings of International Conference on Manufacturing Research (ICMR 2013), pp. 207–212 (19–20 September 2013).*

Hellen, O. (2013). *Project Risk Identification and Management*, AACE International Transactions.

Keller, B. A., Spaulding, A., Johnson, C. E., & Gamm, L. (2016, January-February). Success factors for strategic change initiatives: A qualitative study of Healthcare Administrators' perspectives. J. *Healthc Manag*, 59(1), 65-81.

Henry, K. (2011). *Managing projects*, Butterworth Heinemann, 3rdEdition, Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Hurst, I. (2017). *Navigating IT channels: integrate or outsource?.* London : Mac graw hills .

Ley, O. A. (2011). Direct cost of scope creep in governmental construction projects: A Critical Review. *Journal of Change Management*, 5(4), 369-380.

Inder, D.(2017). *Scope Creep–A Lethal Project Disease: Thoughts on Prevention and Cure.* Integrated Management Systems.

Iyer, D. (2016). Using a Risk Breakdown Structure in project management, *Journal of Facilities Management*, pp.85-97.

Johnson, R. L. (2011). *An assessment of function point analysis as an emerging software productivity technique. Master Thesis. .* Arlington, TX, USA: University of Texas at Arlington.

Kerzner, H. (2014). *Project recovery: Case studies and techniques for overcoming project failure.* John Wiley & Sons.

Kuprenas, J. A. (2013). *Controlling design-phase scope creep. AACE International Transactions, CS11.*

Larson, R. &. (2019). *Top five causes of scope creep... and what to do about them. In PMI Global Congress Proceedings. [Online]*.

Leeuw, F.L. & Donaldson, S.I. (2015). Theory in evaluation: Reducing confusion and Encouraging debate. *Evaluation*, 21(4): 467-480.

Loy, F. (2014). *Determinants of Project Success*, Boston College, National Aeronautics And Space Administration, Boston.

Gaul, K. L. (2013). *A triangular perception of scopecreep influencing the project success. International Journal of Business Information*, 4(2), 36-38.

Loanne, T. (2010). A strategy for Change: Concepts and Controversies in the Management Of Change. Routledge, London.

Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches (2 Ed.).* Nairobi: ACTS Press.

Newton and Jeonghun. (2010). *Research methodology: methods and techniques Assistant Professor,*. Bangladesh.: Premier University, Chittagong,.

Nielsen, J. S. (2011). *What am I doing wrong? Making project managementwork in your organization.* . Paper presented at PMI Global Congress 2011 – EMEA.

Nibud,N.(2016). Minimum essential standard essential standard for six household types. Hound mills: Macmillan Education LTD

Nunnally, I. (2010). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches.* . Nairobi.: Acts press.

Kothari, C.R. (2013). *Research Methodology Methods & Techniques 2nd Edition*. New Delhi, India. New Age International (P) Limited.

Orlando, D. (2013). *Scope and stakeholder management: pain points, perils, and.*

PMI. (2017.). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge*. 6 ed. Newtown.
Prabhakar, G. P. (2018). *Scope creep in software development.*

United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC) and Economic Commission for Europe (2010) "Terminology on Statistical Metadata". *Conference of European Statisticians Statistical Standards and Studies*, No. 53. New York: United Nations.

UNDP. (2012). *Terminal evaluation of the Samar Island Biodiversity Project (SIBP),* UNDP.

Wray, F.(2018). "*Success Factors of Project Management: The Critical Few: An Empirical Investigation*", Portland International Conference on Management of Engineering and Technology, 1(2), 375 –377.