

International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Project Management (IJEPM)

INFLUENCE OF PROJECT GOVERNANCE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF COMMUNITY BASED HIV PROJECTS IN KIAMBU, KENYA

Christine Nyawira Njogu, Prof. Gregory Simiyu Namusonge and Dr. Oluoch. Oluoch

INFLUENCE OF PROJECT GOVERNANCE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF COMMUNITY BASED HIV PROJECTS IN KIAMBU, KENYA

¹*Christine Nyawira Njogu

¹Post Graduate Student: Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

*Corresponding Author's Email: njoguxtine@gmail.com

²Professor Gregory Simiyu Namusonge

Lecturer: Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

³Doctor Oluoch. Oluoch

Lecturer: Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this study was to establish the influence of project governance on the performance of Community based HIV projects in Kiambu, Kenya.

Methodology: The study used descriptive survey research method and adopted stratified random sampling to identify a sample size of 151 respondents out of the target population of 249 NPOs implementing HIV projects in the 12 sub-Counties in Kiambu. A structured questionnaire with closed and open ended questions collected primary data. A pilot study was used to test the validity and reliability of the research instrument using Cronbach's alpha. The collected data was edited, cleaned and analyzed using descriptive statistics with the aid of SPSS version 21.0. Correlation and regression was used to determine the relationship between critical success factors and project performance of Community based HIV projects. Data was presented in tables, charts and figures.

Results: The study also concluded that project governance has a positive significant relationship with project performance.

Unique contribution to theory, practice and policy: The management should consider hiring a project manager who has the requisite professional background and competence, with high levels of specialized knowledge and expertise. CSF implementation in HIV projects should be supported by a government policy guideline alongside the effective and efficient management of projects in Kenya for sustained results.

Keywords: *Project governance, performance, Community based HIV projects.*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Project success was initially associated with achieving the project objectives and the intended results within time, cost and quality. However, with more research, this golden triangle was identified as insufficient to define project success (Beleiu *et al.*, 2014). Research in Critical success factors has not yielded a comprehensive list to address the needs of all projects (Ika, 2009) as these vary from project to project based on scope, uniqueness, and complexity (Wateridge, 1988). According to Ika (2009) the idea of a universal grouping of CSFs as proposed by subsequent authors (Lim & Mohamed, 1999; Westerveld, 2003) appear to be gaining momentum.

The critical success factors have in its underlying assumptions that all projects must be within the triangle of time, budget and quality to be successful. This is disputed by Prabhakar (2008) who argue that most projects are characterized by poor performance in relation to time, scope and budget yet they are perceived as successful. However, there are cases where community HIV projects are within this triangle but have been considered failed as they didn't address sustainability issues and community participation during the project cycle. The concern with project success is relevant as the number of projects failing is rising with more than one third of projects failing to reach their objectives (PMI, 2013). Mwaura and Karanja (2014) identified finance management practices, project management practices, community participation and Governance as factors affecting performance of community based projects.

The Kenya Health Policy 2014-2030 and the Kenya Health Sector Strategic and Investment plan 2014-2030 has put emphasis on elimination of HIV among communicable diseases. Articles 10(2) and 73 of the Kenyan Constitution outlines key elements of good governance and leadership. However, low country ownership, community participation, stakeholder engagement, coordinated development partner support, weak leadership capacity and declining donor financing are challenges facing the governance and leadership landscape of the HIV response (NACC, 2014). The focus is now moving towards decentralization of the HIV response with HIV policies and programs adopting County specific demands, with counties taking leadership role in the planning, implementation, monitoring and resource allocation of HIV programs. With the support of the NACC, and key partners, all the 47 Counties have been working towards the development of HIV plans that will respond to their county specific HIV issues at the community, health facilities, and the workplace. Most of the HIV interventions at the community level are undertaken through projects. These interventions include HIV testing, awareness creation and advocacy, psychosocial support for People living with HIV (PLHIV), orphan support and income generating activities to mitigate the impact of HIV on households (NACC, 2015).

The increased role of NPOs is gaining acknowledgment as bridging the gap and supporting the governments achieve social, economic and political development for its populations. Furthermore, this focus is attributed to the improvement in quality of life of poor populations associated with interventions undertaken by NPOs. The NPO projects financed with international development aid contribute significantly to the socioeconomic development of low income countries (Muller,

2016). Since resources are scarce and must be prioritized to interventions that realize maximum benefit, it is important that these projects succeed and achieve the desired outcome

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The social pillar which is among the three pillars identified in the Kenya Vision 2030 development blue print includes attainment of the highest standard of health as key to Kenya's development agenda. Further, the Universal Health Coverage which includes HIV response is among the four Kenyan government's development agenda. HIV response in Kenya is largely donor driven through projects, with the World Bank as the biggest funder for community based HIV projects. These projects are characterized by a rare complexity related to multiple stakeholders, cultural and geographical gap, bureaucratic rules and procedures (Ika *et al.*, 2012). A recent McKinsey-Devev survey suggests that 64% of donor-funded projects fail (Hekala, 2012). The U.S. Meltzer Commission (2000) found that more than 50% of the World Bank's various projects fail. The Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), in an independent rating, claimed that in 2010, 39% of World Bank projects were unsuccessful (Chauvet *et al.*, 2010). While the World Bank has invested more than US\$5 billion in more than 700 projects in Africa over the past 20 years (Dugger, 2007), its project failure rate is over 50% in Africa, which is greater than the 40% failure rate observed in other poor regions of the world and shows that African projects are lagging behind (Dugger, 2007). The World Bank's private arm, the International Finance Corporation (IFC), found that only half of its Africa projects succeed (Associated Press, 2007), a view supported by Ika, Diallo & Thuillier (2012) who argue that most projects fail to be delivered within the expected time frame, quality and budget.

According to Toor and Ogunlana (2009), evidence of poor performance can be found across various industries and types of projects with the wide consequences of project failures going unnoticed and often suppressed (Hodgson & Cicmil, 2008). In reality, the performance of HIV projects has been poor as evidenced by the high HIV prevalence, budget overruns, delay in completion of projects and inability to meet beneficiary expectations. HIV prevalence in Kenya stands at 5.4% with an estimated 1.6 million people living with HIV and AIDS, and 62000 new HIV infections and 36000 AIDS related deaths annually (UNAIDS, 2017). Budget overruns is also evident where total expenditure on HIV and AIDS interventions increased from Kshs 64,338 million (US\$ 826 million) in 2009/10 to Kshs 70,388 million (US\$ 853 million) in 2010/11, representing an increase of 9% from the 2010/11 expenditure estimates (U.S. Centers for Diseases Control and Kenya Ministry of Health, 2013).

The projectization of the development agenda to achieve success in HIV projects has increasingly been adopted by not for profit organizations. While development projects experience challenges related to their implementation and ultimately their success, social projects such as HIV projects have unique problems and challenges. Most of these projects are donor driven, with specific conditions related to planning, objectives, and implementation that must be met for continued aid. In addition to the project reflecting the donor's interests, delays in implementation, changes in scope and sometimes abrupt project cancellation are likely to affect project success (Ofori, 2013). Ideally, the performance of HIV projects in terms of timelines/schedule, costs, and continuity

should be high owing to the important nature of HIV prevalence and its impact on the economic and social development of Kenya's economy. While about 63% of HIV financing is channeled to the community through NPO (KNASA, 2016), this has not translated to equal results in HIV prevention, care and treatment, and mitigation. There is hence, a need for more innovative ways of running HIV projects for better performance. Project failure leads to financial losses and frustrations from stakeholders who had anticipated project benefits and return on investment. Hyvari (2006) observes that substantive projects exceed the intended cost, running late or failing to meet the targeted goals and objectives. To address this challenge where efforts are not commensurate with results, critical success factors that the project team need to focus on for better project performance need to be identified. Due to the restrictive nature of project scope, time frame for implementation, and restricted budgets for HIV projects as determined by funders, the need to identify critical factors that will lead to successful projects that meet beneficiary and sponsor expectations become important. Though projects have been implemented in Post-independence Kenya, there lack an authoritative documentation on the best practices which subsequent projects could borrow from. Whereas there are numerous Critical Success Factors affecting project performance, empirical and theoretical literature is not clear on which and how these affect community based HIV projects. This quantitative study sought to address this knowledge gap by identifying CSFs specific to community based HIV projects. Based on frequency of occurrence in CSF literature and on Belassi and Tukel (1996) proposed framework that classified project success factors into four groups; those related to the project, related to the project manager and team, related to the organization and related to the external environment, one CSF was identified for this study. This included project governance.

1.3 Objective of the Study

The objective of the study was to establish the influence of project governance on the performance of Community based HIV projects in Kiambu, Kenya.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Two theories have been discussed in this paper. These include the human capital theory and the Skills theory.

Gary Becker (1930–2014) developed the human capital theory. This, which he considered to be a method of analysis rather than an assumption about human motivations, became an attempt to explain various facets of human behaviour through a set of simplified assumptions regarding human behaviour, a result of individual choices characterized by utility maximization, a forward-looking stance, consistent rationality, and stable and persistent preferences (Becker, 1976). Those choices were constrained by income, time, imperfect memory and calculating capabilities, and the opportunities available (Becker, 1993). Managerial skills as well as leadership styles adopted by project managers are important in projects. Pinto and Slevin (1987) notes that though the project manager is expected to handle all elements of the project, often, they are constrained by insufficient budget, project team and delegated authority to make important decisions. A competent project

team is important for a successful project cycle. This theory supports project manager competence and technical skills as critical factors for performance of community based HIV projects. While the human capital theory looks at skills of the project manager and team, it fails to address attitude towards the project which is likely to affect acceptability and implementation of the project. This theory does not give indication on the specific skills required at what stage of the project cycle, nor the competences required by the project manager. Therefore, this theory is used to inform the relationship between project governance and project performance.

Skills theory are leaders centric and focus on what characteristics about leaders make them effective. This theory was proposed by Robert Katz in 1955 and Michael Mumfords in 2000. The two primary theories to develop from a skills approach were Katz's three-skill approach and Mumford's skills model of leadership. Leadership skills approach takes into account the knowledge and abilities that the leader has. Based on his observations Katz stated that the level of importance of each set of skills (technical, human and conceptual) was directly correlated with the level that the person has in the organization (Katz, 1955). Effective leadership is dependent on how leader competencies are affected by the leader's attributes, experiences, and the environment. It examines the relationship between a leader's knowledge and skills (i.e., capabilities) and the leader's performance (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs & Fleishman, 2000). Skills theory places leadership performance on learned skills rather than on traits. Therefore any person could learn and adapt to a specific set of skills to become a leader. This theory supports project governance variable and technical skills variable.

2.2 Empirical Framework

Ogwueleka (2011) investigated the critical success factors influencing project performance in Nigeria. The objectives were to identify success factors existing in projects and also to examine the important index of these success factors on project performance in Nigeria. Twenty-two success factors were selected from the literature for the research with sample size of 188 professionals. The data obtained from the questionnaire was analyzed using frequency, severity and important indices. The reliability test on the data using Crobach's alpha displayed, sixteen success factors were necessary for true satisfaction of successful project implementation in Nigerian Construction Industry. Based on the result, objective management, management of design, top management support and risk management were selected as the most critical success factors in project performance. Zulu (2007) determined the impact of top management on project performance. The relationship between top management and project performance was evaluated from a Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) perspective. The approach taken in this research argued for an extended understanding of the strength of the direct and indirect influence of the different project management influencing factors on project performance. A survey investigating the influence of project management processes on performance was conducted. Using structural equation modelling the direct and indirect causal influence of project management influencing factors was evaluated. The use of SEM was compared to other multivariate methods that have been used in similar studies. The findings show that the use of SEM improves the understanding of the direct and indirect relationship between project management influencing factors and project performance.

Ifinedo (2006) examined the impact of top management support on Enterprise Resource Planning success. He administered a questionnaire to 350 firms in Finland and 120 in Estonia to top managers. A structural equation modelling technique was used to examine the relationships among the constructs. The Partial Least Squares was chosen for use in this study. The result showed that top management support is high for an ERP initiative indicating that support, commitment, authority, and direction from top management for the software is necessary in ensuring its overall success. Zwikael (2008) examined the most critical top management support processes. He administered a questionnaire to 213 project managers involved in project execution in the software industry in Japan, Israel and New Zealand. He concluded that critical top management support processes have significant impact on project success and that these exist in each country and that each sectors has exclusive top management support needs. Joslin and Muller (2016) studied the relationship between project governance and project success. They administered a cross sectional questionnaire to collect quantitative data using snow ball sampling. The respondents were PMI chapter members in Switzerland, Germany and the USA. The questionnaire were administered through email and a link to the web survey. They obtained 266 responses of which 254 were used for analysis. ANOVA analysis showed no difference between early and late respondents, with the average respondents' experience of 22 years with 15 years project related work experience. Data was normally distributed, and analysis was done through unrotated factor analysis, varimax rotated analysis and regression analysis content validity was achieved using literature based measurement dimensions. Results indicated that governance is significantly correlated to project success where 6.3% of the variation in project success can be explained by the governance.

Alexandro and Ivanova (2012) studied critical success factors of European Union programmes. They conducted a survey of 132 project managers using a questionnaire with a 5 rank Likert scale. The respondents were asked to indicate the degree of importance of each potential factor on the basis of their background and experience originating from their work on the finalized projects. They identified competence of project manager, compliance with the rules and procedures, competence of project team, top management support and quality of services provided by subcontractors as CSF. Gitau (2015) investigated the extent of the risk management practices at planning phase and the effect of these practices on project cost and schedule performance. The risk management practices at construction project planning phase include: risk identification and profiling, architect/engineer selection; site selection and validation, needs identification and validation and cost and schedule development. The study targeted architects, engineers, project managers, quantity surveyors, contractors and regulatory authorities in operation in Rwanda and key clients with major investments in the construction industry. The study used both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection. Literature review, physical and email delivered questionnaires and structured interviews was used to collect data. The data was processed using SPSS. Correlation analysis was used to analyze the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The research project indicated that risk management practices at planning stage had an effect on project performance. The research project indicated that most projects in Rwanda had some input from a qualified engineer and architect. However most respondents had not studied risk management. While the study indicated that risk management was widely practiced at 92%, the process was mainly informal. The process of risk management was not

adequate and no measures were put in place to mitigate the risks. Various project team members had different chances in managing the various risks with the client having the best chance of managing most risks at the planning stage by involving skilled professionals in decision making.

White and Fortune (2002) in a survey of 995 project managers in United Kingdom identified clear goals or objectives, support from senior management and adequate resources/funds as three CSFs. Shenhar (1997) in their study of CSF for 127 projects reported 13 dimensions of project success which include technical specifications, budget, schedules, functional performance, customer satisfaction, a new product line, a large market share, new technology, use of the product by the customer, and product commercial success. Slevin and Pinto (1986) proposed ten factors which were within the control of the project team. These include project mission, top management support, project schedules, client consultation, personnel, technical tasks, client acceptance, monitoring and feedback, troubleshooting, and communication as CSF. Later, Pinto and Slevin (1988b) improved on their initial list by proposing four factors which were external and without the control of the project team. These are characteristics of the project team leader, power and politics, environmental events, and urgency. These studies only support project planning and project governance as CSF thus leaving out technical skills and environmental factors.

Bekker and Steyn (2008) conducted a study on the impact of project governance principles on project performance. The study provided a brief overview of how 'project governance' was defined, how a concept project governance framework (CPGF) was derived and how the principles were applied and evaluated against two primary case studies and fifteen secondary case studies. The primary case studies consisted of in-depth analysis of two large, cross-country projects and included broad literature studies, nominal group technique discussions and personal interviews with key role players. The secondary case studies were sourced from literature and their performance evaluated against the principles of the CPGF. This research confirmed the need for a formal definition of project governance and confirmed that the application or non-application of project governance principles could have influence on project outcomes.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive survey to determine the relationship between project governance on performance of community based HIV projects and adopted stratified random sampling to identify a sample size of 151 respondents out of the target population of 249 NPOs implementing HIV projects in the 12 sub-Counties in Kiambu. A structured questionnaire with closed and open ended questions collected primary data. A pilot study to test the validity and reliability of the research instrument using Cronbach's alpha was undertaken. The collected data was edited, cleaned and analyzed using descriptive statistics with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 21.0). Correlation and regression was used to determine the relationship between critical success factors and project performance of Community based HIV projects. Data was presented in tables, charts and figures.

4.0 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis for Project Governance

Statements	Totally Disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Totally agree	Mean	Std. Deviation	CV
Openly express support	5.40%	10.80%	6.20%	36.20%	41.50%	3.98	1.18	0.30
Resource allocation	3.10%	9.20%	10.00%	40.00%	37.70%	4.00	1.06	0.27
Task allocation	0.80%	10.00%	9.20%	42.30%	37.70%	4.06	0.97	0.24
Superiors availability	0.80%	6.20%	7.70%	58.50%	26.90%	4.05	0.82	0.20
Risk strategies	2.30%	13.10%	6.20%	45.40%	33.10%	3.94	1.06	0.27
PM is Experienced	1.50%	9.20%	3.10%	46.90%	39.20%	4.13	0.96	0.23
Ability to handle people	0.80%	3.10%	5.40%	51.50%	39.20%	4.25	0.76	0.18
Handling politics	1.50%	5.40%	4.60%	49.20%	39.20%	4.19	0.87	0.21
Trust	0.00%	9.20%	10.00%	45.40%	35.40%	4.07	0.91	0.22
Conflict management	5.40%	6.90%	12.30%	50.80%	24.60%	3.82	1.05	0.28
Multiple roles	3.10%	10.80%	6.20%	56.20%	23.80%	3.87	1.00	0.26
Average						4.03	0.97	0.24

Results in Table 1 indicated that majority of the respondents who were 77.7% (36.2%+41.5%) agreed with the statement that top management openly express support for the project. The statement had a mean score of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 1.18. This implies that most of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and response variation was very low. The results also showed that majority of the respondents 77.7% (40.0%+37.7%) agreed to the statement that there is sufficient resource allocation (human, financial, material, information). The statement had a mean score of 4.00 and a standard deviation of 1.06. This implies that most of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and the variation in response was very low. Further, the results indicated that majority of the respondents 80% (42.3%+37.7%) agreed to the statement that task allocation is done based on competence of project team members. The response had a mean score of 4.06 and standard deviation of 0.97. This indicated that most of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and that the response variation was low. Furthermore, the results showed that majority of the respondents who were 85.4% (58.5%+26.9%) agreed with the statement that project superiors are available to guide the project team as necessary. The statement response had a mean of 4.05 and a standard deviation of 0.82. This indicates that most of the respondents were

agreeing to the statement and the response variation was very low. Additionally, the results indicated that majority of the respondents who were 78.5% (45.4%+33.1%) agreed that effective risk management strategies (ability to handle unexpected problems) have been put in place. The statement had a mean of 3.94 and a standard deviation of 1.06. This indicated that most of the respondents were agreeing with the statement and the variations in responses were low. Meredith and Mantel (2010) observed that top management can support the project by defining the scope of the project, providing leadership, resources, delegating power to project managers and teams, and showing commitment to the project. Top management support highly influence the project tools and the way project managers run projects (Besner & Hobbs, 2008). Ogwueleka's (2011) result showed that objective management, management of design, top management support and risk management were selected as the most critical success factors in project performance. Ika (2009) and Andersen *et al.*, (2006) notes that project management is a channel for projects to be both efficient and effective, with the desirable outcome of the project increasing continually

In addition, results indicated that majority of the respondents 86.1% (46.9%+39.2%) agreed with the statement that project manager has experience in running projects. The statement had a mean of 1 and a standard deviation of 0.96. This is indicative that most of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and the variation in response was very low. The results too showed that majority of the respondents 90.7% (51.5%+39.2%) agreed that project manager has ability to manage people. The statement had a mean score of 4.25 and a standard deviation of 0.76 which implies that most of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and that the variation in responses was low. Moreover, results revealed that majority of the respondents who were 88.4% (49.2%+39.2%) agreed to the statement that project manager is competent to handle organizational politics. The statement had a mean of 4.19 and a standard deviation of 0.87 which indicates that most of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and that the variation in response was low.

The results also revealed that majority of the respondents 80.8% (45.4%+35.4%) agreed that the project team trust the project manager to discuss freely sensitive issues without fear of victimization. The statement had a mean of 4.07 and a standard deviation of 0.91. This means that most of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and that the variation in response was low. The results equally revealed that majority of the respondents who were 75.4% (50.8%+24.6%) agreed that mechanism for project manager to resolve conflict is available. The mean of the statement was 3.82 and the standard deviation was 1.05. This implied that majority of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and that the variation was low. Finally, majority of the respondents 80% (56.2%+23.8%) agreed that the project manager is assigned other responsibilities in the organization. The statement response mean was 3.87 and the standard deviation was 1.00. This implies that majority of the respondents were agreeing to the statement and the variation in responses was low. The results agree with Sudhakar (2012) who observed that for projects to be successful, the project manager should have competence such ability to take risks, handling of politics, communication skills, managing people, and conflict resolution The success of a project manager is determined by the project outcomes and performance, and most projects success is attributed to managerial and leadership skills of the project manager (Korrapati & Rapaka, 2009). Overall, the average mean of the responses was 4.03 which means that majority of the respondents

were agreeing to the statements in the questionnaire on project governance. The standard deviation was 0.97 meaning that the responses were clustered around the mean response.

4.2 Content Analysis

The respondents were also asked to indicate the role of top management in project performance for community based HIV projects. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Top Management Role in Project Performance

Top management role	Themes	Frequency (%)
1	Open communication	11
2	Expressing support for project	16
3	Team building	14
4	Providing required resources	40
5	Providing leadership	19
Total		100

Majority of the respondents (40%) indicated that managers could influence project performance in community based HIV projects by providing resources, whether finance, material or personnel for the project. The active involvement of senior managers of the performing organization can help project managers to successfully complete the project. Top management support positively contributes to project success (Besner & Hobbs, 2008; Zwikael and Globerson, 2004). These studies show that top management support is considered to be among project management critical success factors (CSFs). This means that the more top management processes are practiced in organizations, the higher the level of project success is. Critical top management support processes that an organization may consider to implement, include develop project procedures, involve the project manager during the initiation stage, support on-going project management training programmes, establish a project management office, develop a supportive project organizational structure, define clear project success measures and support projects in quality management (Zwikael, 2008). According to Young and Jordan (2008), top management support is the most important factor for project success.

Further, the respondents were asked to indicate the skills that a project manager should possess in order to effectively manage a project. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Project Manager's Skills

Skills	Themes	Frequency (%)
1	Communication	57
2	Resource management	21
3	Leadership skills	14
4	Organizational skills	8
Total		100

Most of the respondents (57%) indicated that managers should possess good communication skills. According to Abeid (2015), must have skills for project managers include; communication, leadership, team management, negotiation, personal organization and risk management skills. This is supported by the Project Management Institute who indicate that a project manager spends 90% of the project time communicating with stakeholders internal or external to the project (PMBOK, 2017). For projects to be successful, the project manager must have the requisite knowledge of project management which includes planning, organizing, leadership of all involved to achieve the project objectives within time and budget (Ofori, 2013).

4.3 Correlation Analysis between project Governance and Project Performance

Table 4: Correlation Analysis Results

Variable	Project performance	
Project governance	Pearson Correlation	.492**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000

4.4 Regression Analysis for Project Governance

Table 4 presents the model fitness for used for regression model in explaining the study phenomena.

Table 5: Model Fitness

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.484a	0.235	0.163	0.59125

The results in table 5 show that project governance was found to be satisfactory in explaining project performance. This is supported by coefficient of determination also known as the R square of 23.5%. This means that project governance explain 23.5% of the variations in the dependent variable which is project performance. Ika (2009) and Andersen *et al.*, (2006) observed that project management is a channel for projects to be both efficient and effective, with the desirable outcome of the project increasing continually.

Table 6 presents the ANOVA results for project governance

Table 6: ANOVA Results on Project Governance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	12.651	11	1.15	3.29	0.001
Residual	41.251	118	0.35		
Total	53.902	129			

Table 6 provides the results on the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). The results indicate that the overall model was statistically significant. Further, the results imply that the independent variable which is project governance is a good predictor of project performance. This was supported by an F statistic of 3.29 and the reported p value (0.001) which was less than the

conventional probability of 0.05 significance level. Zulu (2007) found a direct relationship between project management influencing factors and project performance.

Table 7 presents the optimal model for project governance.

Table 7: Optimal Model for Project Governance

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	2.35	0.238		9.872	0.000
Project governance	0.401	0.063	0.492	6.396	0.000

Regression coefficients in Table 7, revealed that there was a positive and significant relationship between project governance and project performance ($r=0.401$, $p=0.000$). This was supported by a calculated t-statistic of 6.396 which is larger than the critical t-statistic of 1.96 (Kothari, 2011). These results agree with Mathur, Jugdev, and Shing Fung (2014) brought about the need for managerial attention to project management assets as sources of competitive advantage, highlighting the need to have organizational support for the project management process through organizational integration, and emphasizing the importance of valuable project management knowledge-based assets and inimitable project management assets that are proprietary and tangible as well as those that are embedded and intangible.

The model for project governance is

$$Y=2.35+0.401X_2$$

Where:

Y= Project Performance

X₂= project governance

Hypothesis testing for project governance

The hypothesis to be tested was:

H₀: Project governance has no significant influence on performance of community based HIV projects in Kenya

The hypothesis was tested by using simple linear regression (Kothari, 2011) and determined using p-value. The acceptance/rejection criteria was that, if the p value is greater than 0.05, we do not reject the null hypothesis but if it's less than or equal 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore the null hypothesis is that project governance has no significant influence on performance of community based HIV projects in Kenya. Results in Table 4.31 show that the p-value was 0.000. This was supported by a calculated t-statistic of 6.396 which is larger than the critical t-statistic of 1.96. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. The study therefore adopted the alternative

hypothesis that project governance has significant influence on performance of community based HIV projects in Kenya.

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

The objective of the study was to establish the influence of project governance on the performance of Community based HIV projects in Kenya. The findings indicated that project Governance was satisfactory in explaining project performance. The analysis of the variance (ANOVA) results indicated that the overall model was statistically significant. Further, the results implied that the independent variable which is project governance is a good predictor of project performance. Overall results indicated that there was a positive and significant relationship between project governance and project performance.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the study findings, the study also concluded that project governance has a positive significant relationship with project performance. Top management should ensure that they offer support to the project implementation through allocating sufficient resources, doing task allocation based on competence of individuals, having supervisors to guide the team members and having an effective risk management strategy. The project managers should also be competent in managing resources as well as people.

5.3 Recommendations

The study made a conclusion that project governance influence project performance. Top management support for the project will help align the project objectives to the organizational goals and also provide the required resources. The nature and intensity of support from top management to the project manager and project team during the project lifecycle is important. Timely access to adequate resources in the organization is critical for effective execution of project activities. Management should therefore provide guidance and openly support the project and provide flexible and timely resources to the project manager and team. The project manager should be given room to run the project without interference from top management.

REFERENCES

- Abeid, C. (2015). 6 Essential Skills for Project Managers. Available at: <https://www.liquidplanner.com/blog/6-essential-skills-for-project-managers/> [Accessed 18 Jul. 2017].
- Alexandrova, M and Ivanova, L. (2012). *Critical success factors of projects management*:
- Amoako-Gyampah, K., Meredith, J. R., and White Loyd, K. (2018). Using a Social Capital Lens to Identify the Mechanisms of top Management Commitment: A Case Study of a Technology Project. *Project Management Journal*, 49(1), 79–95

- Andersen, E. S., Birchall, D., Arne Jessen, S., and Money, A. H. (2006). Exploring project success. *Baltic journal of management*, 1(2), 127-147.
- Becker, G. S. (1976). *The Economics Approach to Human Behaviour*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London.
- Becker, G. S. (1993). Nobel lecture: The economic way of looking at behavior. *Journal of political economy*, 101(3), 385-409.
- Bekker, M. C., & Steyn, H. (2008). The impact of project governance principles on project performance. In *Management of Engineering & Technology, 2008. PICMET 2008. Portland International Conference on* (pp. 1324-1330). IEEE.
- Belassi, W., and Tukel, O. I. (1996). A new framework for determining critical success/failure factors in projects. *International journal of project management*, 14(3), 141-151.
- Beleiu, I., Crisan, E., and Nistor, R. (2015). Main factors influencing project success. *Interdisciplinary Management Research*, 11, 59-72.
- Besner, C., and Hobbs, B. (2008). Project management practice, generic or contextual: A reality check. *Project Management Journal*, 39(1), 16-33.
- Chauvet, L., Collier, P., and Duponchel, M. (2010). *What explains aid project success in post-Dugger*, C. W. (2007). World Bank finds its Africa projects are lagging. *New York Times*.
- Dvir, D., Lipovetsky, S., Shenhar, A., and Tishler, A. (1998). In search of project classification: a non-universal approach to project success factors. *Research policy*, 27(9), 915-935. *Empirical evidence from projects supported by EU programmes*. 9th International ASECU Conference on systemic crisis: Current issues and perspectives. University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria.
- Hyväri, I. (2006). Success of projects in different organizational conditions. *Project management journal*, 37(4), 31-41.
- Hodgson, D. and Cicmil, S. (2008). The other side of projects: the case for critical project studies. *International Journal of managing projects in business*, 1(1), 142-152
- Ifinedo, P. (2006). Impacts of business vision, top management support, and external expertise on ERP success. *Journal of information technology management*, 17(1), 14-33
- Ika, A, L (2009). Project success as a topic in project Management Journals. *Project management Journal*, 40 (4), 6-19
- Ika, L. A. (2012). Project management for development in Africa: why projects are failing and what can be done about it. *Project Management Journal*, 43(4), 27-41.

- Joslin, R., and Muller, R. (2016). The relationship between project governance and project success. *International Journal of project management*, 34, 613-626
- Katz, R. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb.
- Korrapati, R., & Rapaka, S. R. (2009). Successful leadership styles in software projects in offshore centers in India. *Academy of Information and Management Sciences*, 13(2), 56-59.
- Kothari, C.R. (2013), *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques (2nd rev Ed.)*. New Age International (P) Ltd., Publishers. Mumbai, India
- Li, Y. (2014). *Governance, Regulation and Performance of Non-listed Small Corporations in Australia: a Structural Equation Modelling Approach*. Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University.
- Lim, C. S., & Mohamed, M. Z. (1999). Criteria of project success: an exploratory re-examination. *International journal of project management*, 17(4), 243-248.
- Mathur, G., Jugdev, K., and Shing Fung, T. (2014). The relationship between project management process characteristics and performance outcomes. *Management Research Review*, 37(11), 990-1015.
- Meredith, J.R and Mantel, S.J. (2010). *Project Management: A managerial Approach (7th Ed)*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Rio de Janeiro: LTC
- Muller, R.J. R. (2016). The impact of project methodologies on project success in different project environments. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 9 (2) 364-388
- Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Jacobs, T. O., & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 11-35.
- Mumford, M. D., Zaccaro, S. J., Harding, F. D., Jacobs, T. O., & Fleishman, E. A. (2000). Leadership skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), 11-35.
- Mwaura, M. and Karanja, N. (2014). Factors affecting performance of community based organization projects in Kisii County. *International Journal of Social Sciences Management and Entrepreneurship*. 1 (2), 51-67
- NACC (2015). *Kenya's Fast Track Plan to End HIV and AIDS among Adolescents and Young People*, Nairobi
- NACC, KNASA (2016). *Kenya National Aids Spending Assessment Report for the Financial Years 2012/13-2015/16*. Nairobi, Kenya

- Ofori, D.F. (2013). Project management practices and critical success factors- A developing Country perspective. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(21), 14
- Ogwueleka, A. (2011). The critical success factors influencing project performance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Science and Engineering Management*, 6(5), 343-349.
- Pinto, J. K. and Slevin, D. P (1987). Critical Success Factors in Effective Project Implementation. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 34, 22-27
- Pinto, J.K and Prescott, J.E. (1990). Planning and tactical factors in project implementation success. *Journal of Management Studies*, 27 (3), 305-28
- Pinto, J.K, and Slevin, D.P. (1988b). Critical success factors across the project Life cycle. *Project Management Journal*, 19(3), 67- 74
- Pinto, J.K, and Slevin, D.P. (1988b). Project success: Definitions and measurement techniques. *Project Management Journal*, 19 (1), 67- 73
- Pinto, J.K. and Slevin, D.P (1988a). Critical success factors across the project life cycle. *Project Management Journal*, 19 (3), 67-75
- Prabhakar, G.P. (2008). What is project success: A literature review? *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3-9
- Project Management Institute. (2008). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide) – 4th edition*. 14 Campus Blvd., Newton Square, PA 19073-3299, USA
Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/02/world/africa/02worldbank.html>
- Sudhakar, P.G. (2012). A model of critical success factors for software projects. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 25 (6), 537-558
- Toor, S.R and Ogunlana, S.O. (2009). Construction professionals' perception of CSF for large scale construction projects. *Emerald Insight*, 9(2), 149-167
- Wateridge, J. (1995). IT Project: A basis for success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 13,169-172
- Westerveld, T., & Arjen, P. (2003, July). De Vries, Experimental result analysis for a generative probabilistic image retrieval model. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (pp. 135-142).
- Zulu, S. (2007). Impact of project management on project performance: a structural equation modelling approach. In *23rd Annual ARCOM Conference* (pp. 3-5).

- Zwikael, O. (2008). Top management involvement in project management: A cross country study of the software industry. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 1 (4), 498-511.
- Zwikael, O. (2008). Top management involvement in project management- exclusive support practices for different project scenarios. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 1 (3).