Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management


# Project Fund Management and Performance of Great Lakes Trade Facilitation Project of Minicom, Rwanda

**KABOGO RUKUNDO Emmanuel & Dr. RUSIBANA Claude (PhD)**

**ISSN: 2616-8464**

*Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing*
*Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management*
*Volume 5||Issue 2||Page 46-67||June||2021|*
*Email:* **info@stratfordjournals.org** *ISSN: 2616-8464*

# Project Fund Management and Performance of Great Lakes Trade Facilitation Project of Minicom, Rwanda

***[1]KABOGO RUKUNDO Emmanuel & [2]Dr. RUSIBANA Claude (PhD).**
**[1]Post graduate student, School of Business and Economics, Mount Kenya University**

**[2]Lecturer, School of Business and Economics, Mount Kenya University**

***Email of the corresponding author: runtwari@gmail.com**

**How to cite this article: Kabogo, R.E, & Rusibana, C. (2021), Project Fund Management and Performance of Great Lakes Trade Facilitation Project of Minicom, Rwanda, *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management. Vol* 5(2) pp. 46-67.**

## Abstract

Project performance is shown by its achievement in realizing project quality, cost, and time. Generally, many projects in world, in regional and in Rwanda are failing to achieve their goals as an outcome from various aspects includes poor fund management. As a result, the purpose of this study was to look into the effects of fund management on project performance in a public institution (Rwanda) using a case study of the Great Lakes Trade Facilitation Project, which was run by the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MINICOM). The study's objectives were to examine the impact of budget on project performance in the public sector, assess the influence of fund allocation on project performance in the public sector, and assess the impact of fund control on project performance in the public sector in Rwanda. The study employed a population of 119 as staff working in the Great Lakes Trade Facilitation Project under a single project implementation unit under MINICOM, and used a descriptive and correlation research method. Interview guide and questionnaires were used to collect the data. Data processing was done with SPSS 23th Version. The data was processed and displayed in tables. Throughout, the findings, it was established that there is a favorable association between financial budgeting and project performance, a positive correlation between budget allocation and project performance, as well as a correlation between fund control and project performance. The regression analysis revealed a positive relationship between the independent and dependent variables. This means that the change from project management to budgeting, fund allocation, and fund control will necessitate a greater focus on budgeting, money allocation, and money control. According to the conclusions of the study, funds should be adequately budgeted, allocated, and controlled for project performance. In general, the findings concluded that the ways money of the project managed has determined project success. When project finances are successfully managed, the project meets its objectives; nevertheless, when project funds are badly handled, the project's objectives and goals are not met. From the conclusion drawn, it was recommended that during the phase of project planning; partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries should be involved for effective fund budgeting and allocation. The study also recommends that people involved in project monitoring and control must carry out this activity in effective way because the study found that project performance depends on project fund control. People involved in project monitoring and control should oversee how the project funds are being used.

**Keywords***: Project Fund Management and Performance of Great Lakes Trade Facilitation Project.*

*Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing*
*Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management*
*Volume 5||Issue 2||Page 46-67||June||2021|*
*Email:* **info@stratfordjournals.org** *ISSN: 2616-8464*

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

For something like a long time, funding and implementing initiatives in Rwanda had been a struggle; as a result, projects were funded and implemented through procurement of works and supplies to meet public needs, and Rwanda had used the royal order, which was elaborated in 1959 by the King to address the problems that arose in acquiring the first transportation infrastructure, as he had full accountability and ruling power on all public issues. The royal order only applied to funds for labor & commodities, while advisory activities were also not considered an urgency at the moment because government projects were too minor to necessitate extensive resource planning (Rwanda Public Procurement Authority [RPPA], 2012).

The same royal command was followed after the country's independence in 1962. Because the judgment authority was no longer vested in a single individual, obtaining the government's requirements became more difficult. Soon after the Tutsi genocide in 1994, when Rwanda was experiencing several concerns linked to the restoration of the entire nation because several facilities had been demolished, the Reagan administration created the National Tender Board in 1997 with the goal of solving the increasing budget for procurement and challenges. This entity was initially tasked with overseeing procurement processes, checking the integration of effective initiatives, and dealing with contract administration concerns (Technical Information Report [TIR], 2011).

However, national officials were still preoccupied with a variety of concerns, so budgeting directors were hired and entrusted to oversee public monies, the majority of which came from foreign assistance and debts. Since then, none of these individuals have indeed been charismatic; a few have utilized the assigned budget to benefit themselves, while others lacked budget management abilities and squandered the budget, and so on. Following the misappropriation of public funds in various projects, the Rwandan government, in collaboration with other stakeholders and sponsors, established a reform policy in 2011 that must be followed for the release of funding for various projects. The strategy of disbursing project money depending on their performance was implemented, and procurement entities no longer have project monies in their bank accounts, as they did prior to the implementation of the reforms policy. Following that, it's become requisite to democratize the system up to the district level, and the former National Tender Board was renamed Rwanda Public Procurement Authority, which was established by law No 63/2007 of December 30, 2007, and was tasked with establishing public procurement regulations, Capability advancement of state bodies in the purchasing sector, evaluating public institutions' procurement systems, and monitoring the execution of various public procurement plans and project implementation procedures (TIR, 2011).

The goal of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which was drafted in 2008, was to “make aid more effective and responsible to the benefiting communities by establishing dedicated mechanisms for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programs”. The term "parallel" refers to implementation process units (PIUs) that are established only at request of stakeholders and operate outside of the country's regular institutional and administrative processes. They regularly undercut development accountability, disrupt national capacity-building projects, and skew pay (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee, 2011). The Rwandan

government (GoR) and development partners should see the construction of single Project Implementation Units (SPIUs) as part of their efforts to improve aid quality. The idea that the SPIU model will improve project performance underpins this research.

From 2008, the GoR has made a determined effort to improve the project aid modality's quality. Consolidating project implementation units (PIUs) into a single PIU for each ministry is one strategy to do this. The SPIU is part of the Rwandan government's larger endeavor to streamline project administration. This means that funded projects both external and internal can be included in an SPIU framework. In order to meet its needs in this area, the GoR developed a policy for the Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) within each Ministry and other public institutions, as well as within each district, through the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning's Central Public Investment and External Finance Bureau (CEPEX), a semi-autonomous body (MINECOFIN). As a consequence of CEPEX's closure, authority for SPIUs was transferred to MINECOFIN's budget department. For project management of domestically and internationally funded projects, a new organization called the Public Investment Technical Team was established. One individual is currently committed full-time to SPIU inside the team.

The reasoning behind SPIUs is to increase coordination and synergy, achieve economies of scale, minimize transaction costs, time spent on team recruiting for freshly starting projects, and reduce personnel turnover in project management; to make project execution more prompt and donor oversight missions more effectively coordinated, as well as to be more cost effective (Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning, 2011). Currently, all monies for all government projects are held at the central bank and paid out in accordance with payment orders from the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning; payments are made only for work completed, and the remaining funds are utilized to fund other projects (MINECOFIN, 2011).

In this study the researcher conceptualizes fund management (Independent Variable) with regard to aspects related to budgeting, fund allocation and fund control as key dimensions of that approach. Underlying this study is the assumption that fund will enhance project performance. The fund management will be examined against the project performance (dependent variable) in terms of economic, time and quality performances. This study relating to fund management and the project performance has been conducted in Ministry of Trade and Commerce (MINICOM), since it is in charge of industries and trade regulation projects. All business projects under MINICOM are managed under the SPIU umbrella and were part of the present research.

### 1.1 Problem statement

Roque and Carvalho (2013) demonstrated that adopting fund management practices has a major beneficial impact on the project's success. The study of Ofori (2013) contradict that the performance of the project depends on funds management. According to his findings, top management support, efficient communication, clarity of project purpose and goals, and project stakeholder involvement are all essential aspects that contribute to project performance. Different studies suggested different reasons that should cause the performance of the projects, but some projects are still failing, where the World Bank's project failure rate in Sub-Saharan Africa was over 50% (Lavagnon, Amadou & Denis, 2012). In a study carried out by Lawrence (2015) on performance of construction project in Rwanda revealed that imperfect

allocation of architects and consultation have negative effects on project planning. The evidence shows that majority of projects did not benefit from professional in implementation phase. The study also reports 45.2 percent of examined projects recoded low performance. Another study by Umulisa (2015) found out that 39.6% of project in Rwanda delayed or end up by collapsing. In addition, reports shows that 38.7% of the project under MINICOM in various areas of country fails to achieve their goals and objectives due mainly to delay in completion, hence ending up by being privatized (Gashuga, 2016) Therefore, the above findings from different studies allow the researcher to say that Neither employers nor academics seems to concur on what constitutes effective finance management and project execution. It appears to be a difficult concept to describe. However, from the empirical literature and critical review, the researcher recognized that different researchers from different countries did not have same understanding on the contribution of funds management on performance of the project in their case studies. This indicates a lack of academic expertise in the field of financial management and performance of the project context which the current study seeks to bridge by availing data on the same subject using a case study of great lakes trade facilitation project, MINICOM.

### 1.2 objective of the study

#### 1.2.1 general objective

Present study aimed at examining the impact of Fund management within SPIU the success of public projects in Rwanda Ministry of trade and industry (MINICOM).

#### 1.2.2 Specific Objectives

i. To analyses the impacts of budgeting on the success of public project /MINICOM.

ii. To assess the impact of fund allocation of project performance in public sector/MINICOM;

iii. To examine the impacts of fund control on the success of public project /MINICOM

iv. To establish correlation between finance management and project success in the public sector/MINICOM.

### 1.3 Research Questions

i. Is there any impacts of budgeting in project success in Public Sector?

ii. What is the impacts of funds allocation in project success in public sector?

iii. What is the effects of fund control on project success in public sector in Rwanda?

iv. To what extent to funds management correlated with project performance in public sector/MINICOM?

## 2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

Mutodi (2014) conducted a research to explored influence of funds allocations on project achievements in South African. His study aimed to establish correlation between funds management and project success. He employed a quantitative study design and data was collected through questionnaire administered to 114 respondents. The results of the study indicated a negative correlation of two variables. From funding, other characteristics that influence the performance of projects carried out by NGOs in South Africa were also discovered.

Gwahula (2016) also examined the impacts of fund management on the efficiency of projects in Government financed construction projects in Tanzania. In this study, 80 respondents working in the construction industry were given a closed-end questionnaire with 20 performance factors and asked to rank them on a 5-point Likert scale. Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 16 was used to analyze the data (SPSS). According to the findings, project financing processes, contractors' construction industry experience, project technology, plant and equipment availability, procurement system and processes, and project manager knowledge and skills are all critical factors that have a direct impact on the quality of government-funded construction projects. The creation of a multiple regression model demonstrated that project quality and fund management have a positive linear relationship. Positive coefficients with an appropriate degree of significance were found for all of the variables under fund management.
In Jordan's Ministry of Environment, Hani (2017) evaluated the influence of finance management on thesuccess of a project in North south and central of the country. The sample of 62 were used to collect the data through descriptive technics. The computation and analysis were done with the help of SPSS, findings reveal considerable link between the two variables.

Gashuga (2016) conducted research in Rwanda to determine the impact of financial control on project success. This research used a mixed-methods approach. There were 91 people in the target population. As data gathering instruments, questionnaires were utilized. Descriptive statistics such as mean, percentages, and frequencies were established, Pearson correlation used to draw relationship, while effects were established through regression model all calculation was supported by SPSS version 22$^{nd}$. The findings supported a positive relationship between financial control and project success.

Siborurema (2015) conducted a study titled "The Effects of Project Funding on Project Performance in Rwanda," which included a case study of the construction of the BUKOMANE-GIKOMA Road in Rwanda's GATSIBO District. The study's main purpose was to determine the impact of project financing on project performance. The target population was divided into two groups: one made up of persons involved in project planning and funding, and the other made up of persons involved in project implementation management. Data was collected using a specially designed questionnaire, consultation of existing documents, and interviews. According to the statistics, both cost estimation and technical design interfere with the project finance strategy and have a negative impact on the anticipated project implementation time. The purpose of this research was to see how budgets affected the financial performance of manufacturing enterprises in Nairobi County. The study used all population i.e., all 18manufacturing industry in Nairobi. The findings have revealed that budgeting contribute a lot on project efficiency.

## 3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

According to Kothari (2012) research design was defined a as framework create to look for answers to scientific problems. For the sake of triangulation, this study used a descriptive research design with both quantitative and qualitative methods. The target population of this study was 119 people who are staff at Ministry of Trade and Commerce (MINICOM) more specifically financial department unit and Project planning Unit.

In the view point of Orodho and Kombo (2012), sample size was defined as the procedure for selecting people or objects from the population to participate in the study as representative. In similar ways, Pamela (2014), explained sample size as a group of subjects drown from total population in order to be tested in details and make generalization. Last not the least, Grinnel and Williams (2013) explained sampling as act of selecting a limited number of objects from a big population to make conclusion on the general population. This study used census technics since all population were involved in the study.

Sampling technique **:** Sampling is the process of selecting a set number of people to represent a study population (Kombo & Tromp, 2011). As the study population was small survey or census was used. This means that, all people were involved in the study. Amin (2011) suggested that when the population is too small the best method to be used is census or survey.

Data Collection methods t: he study involved both primary and secondary data. Secondary data in this study were collected from past studies by consulting different sources such as textbooks, journal articles, government reports, unpublished thesis and internet. On the other hand, primary data was collected from the field using research instruments constructed by the researcher. In this study both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. Quantitative data were collected with the aid of a questionnaire while qualitative data were collected using interview guide.

Interview involves conversation or interaction between the researcher and the respondents (Creswell, 2011). The purpose of interview was to collected qualitative data from a small number of respondents. The interview was used in order to supplement quantitative data collected using a questionnaire. In this study, the interview was conducted with top managers.

According to Fisher (2010) questionnaire was defined as cheap and easy tool of collecting data. The questionnaire method was chosen for data collecting because it ensures privacy, helps to prevent anxiety and shame that may arise from direct interaction, and allows respondents to respond at their own time and speed. It allows the researcher to collect enormous amounts of data from a vast area and a large number of respondents at varied intervals. Data was collected using a questionnaire instrument created by the researcher. The items on a questionnaire are designed to provide answers to well-formulated research questions. The questions are divided into two sections: the first seeks information on personal data, while the second contains material organized to address the major study topics. Strongly agree (SA), agree (A), uncertain (U), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD) Likert rating scales are employed, as well as nominal values of 5,4,3,2, and 1.

### 3.1 Reliability and validity

Ochieng (2011) argues that, for a study to be real meaning, it has to apply valid and reliable instruments. Before actual research to be done, pretest was done and validity and its reliability were established. The extent with which a test is consistent and stable to evaluate is known as validity. Mugenda and Mugenda (2013) define validity as the degree to which the results of data analysis accurately represent the phenomenon under research. As a result, it is linked to how well the data collected in the study accurately reflect the study's variables. Content validity refers to how well a sample of an instrument item represents the content that the instrument is designed to measure (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2013). To increase the instrument's validity, a pilot research with a certain number of respondents was conducted. The extent to which the content that the instrument is designed to monitor is known from an instrumentation item's

proper platform A pilot study was done on a certain number of respondents to improve the instrument's validity.

Reliability refers to the degree to which a data collection generates consistent results or data after multiple trials (Mugenda, 2013). A pilot research was undertaken to investigate data dependability using the Test-Retest methodology, which entails giving the identical instrument to the same group of people again, with a time delay between the first and second tests. To assess how items connected to one another, the Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient was calculated using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) Software. According to Amin (2011), the Coefficient must be 0.7 and above to certify that the instrument is reliable. Reliability was at .964 Cronbach's Alpha, results obtained using SPSS computer software. As pointed out by Amin (2011), the Coefficient must be 0.7 and above to certify that the instrument was reliable.

### 3.2 Data analysis procedure

Content analysis was used to analyze interviews. The term "content analysis" refers to the process of analyzing the contents of an interview in order to determine the primary themes that emerge from the respondents' responses. Content analysis is a method of determining the presence of specific words or concepts in texts or collections of texts (Garbrah, 2012). The presence, meanings, and relationships of such words and concepts were quantified and evaluated, and inferences about the messages inside the texts were drawn. The quantitative questionnaires were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 23.0) software. SPSS Statistics is a statistical analysis software program (to analyze quantitative data).

## 4.0 Findings and Discussion

### 4.1 Analysis of the effect of budgets in project performance

The first sub variable of project fund management used in this study was fund budget. This section describes opinion of respondents on fund budget as shown in Table 1

**Table 2: Perception of respondents on fund budget**

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean | Std. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Budget reduces financial task dependence | | 3 (2.6%) | 7 (6.0%) | 32 (27.6%) | 74 (63.8%) | 4.52 | .72 |
| Actual and Original budget is a crucial tool for project outcomes | | 9 (7.8%) | 16 (13.8%) | 42 (36.2%) | 49 (42.2%) | 4.12 | .97 |
| Budget helps in control over money | 2 (1.7%) | 4 (3.4%) | 10 (8.6%) | 53 (45.7%) | 47 (40.5%) | 4.19 | .86 |
| Budget helps in avoiding spending unnecessary | 3 (2.6%) | 7 (6.0%) | 10 (8.6%) | 19 (16.4%) | 77 (66.4%) | 4.37 | 1.04 |
| Budget helps in organizing spending and saving | 7 (6.0%) | 6 (5.2%) | 7 (6.0%) | 58 (50.0%) | 38 (32.8%) | 3.98 | 1.07 |
| Budget helps better investment decision on future phase | | | 5 (4.3%) | 30 (25.9%) | 81 (69.8%) | 4.65 | .61 |
| **Average mean** | | | | | | **4.30** | **.87** |

Source: *Field Data, 2021*

The statistics in Table 1 describes the perception of respondents on the items related to the fund budget. As shown by the statistics in the Table, majority of respondents revealed that budget reduces financial task dependence on the percentage of 63.8% of strongly agree and 27.6% of agree where this high positivism leads to the mean of 4.52 which is interpreted as high mean. A few number of respondent representing 2.6% disagreed about this item while 6.0% of respondents did not take any decision about this item.

In examining whether actual and original budget is a crucial tool for project outcomes, 42.2% of respondents strongly agreed and 36.2% agreed leading to the high mean of 4.12. Few respondents disagreed that actual and original budget is a crucial tool for project outcome as show by 7.7% of disagreement and 13.8 of respondents did not either disagree or agree. Moreover, findings in table 4.5 indicated that 45.7% of respondents agreed that budget helps in control over money and 40.5% strongly agreed about this item leading to the mean of 4.19 which express as high mean. 1.7% of respondents and 3.4% strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively about this item while 8.6% of respondents did not take decision about this item.

In analyzing whether budgeting helps in avoiding spending unnecessary, a large number of respondents representing 66.4% strongly agreed and 16.4% agreed influencing the mean to be 4.37 which is interpreted as high mean. The remaining number of respondents 6.0% and 2.6% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively whereas 8.6% of respondents chose to abstain about this item. Furthermore, a great number of respondents representing 50.0% agreed that budget helps in organizing spending and saving and 32.8% of respondents strongly agreed about this item leading to the mean of 3.98 which is expressed as high mean. 6.0% of respondents strongly disagreed and 5.2% disagreed that budgeting helps in avoiding spending unnecessary whereas 6.0% of respondents chose to abstain about this item. Regarding the item that budget helps better investment decision on future phase, 69.8% of respondents strongly agreed while 25.9% of respondents agreed about this item leading to the mean of 4.65 which is expressed as high mean.

The remaining number of respondents representing 4.3% did not decide about this item. From the statistics in Table 1., it is clear that most of respondents involved in this study were in agreement that fund budgeting is a crucial factor that influence project performance as shown by overall mean of 4.30 which is expressed as high mean. With the interview with top management, most of them indicated that project performance greatly depends on fund budgeting. Effective fund budgeting positively influences project performance. To triangulate the findings collected using a questionnaire, interview was conducted with top management. The results of interview indicated that if you plan poorly, you run out resources or fund and therefore close the project. Any project that has limitation on budgeted resources will perform poorly, while a project that has no limitation on budgeted resources will perform well.

**4.2 Assessment of the impact of fund allocation of project performance**

The second sub variable of project fund management used in this study was fund allocation. This section describes opinion of respondents on fund allocation as shown in Table 2.

*Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing*
*Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management*
*Volume 5||Issue 2||Page 46-67||June||2021|*
*Email:* **info@stratfordjournals.org** *ISSN: 2616-8464*

**Table 2: Perception of respondent on fund allocation**

| | **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** | **Undecided** | **Agree** | **Strongly agree** | Mean | Std. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fund allocated to a project influence project performance | | 35 (30.2%) | 15 (12.9%) | 48 (41.4%) | 18 (15.5%) | 3.42 | 1.08 |
| Committed donors' contracts influence project performance | | 26 (22.4%) | 13 (11.2%) | 65 (56.0%) | 12 (10.3%) | 3.54 | .95 |
| Number of donors and partners influence project performance | | 13 (11.2%) | 13 (11.2%) | 71 (61.2%) | 19 (16.4%) | 3.82 | .83 |
| Funds well allocated influence project performance. | | 15 (12.9%) | 28 (24.1%) | 53 (45.7%) | 20 (17.2%) | 3.67 | .91 |
| Participation of beneficiaries in funds allocation influence project performance | 7 (6.0%) | 18 (15.5%) | 9 (7.8%) | 56 (48.3%) | 26 (22.4%) | 3.65 | 1.16 |
| **Average mean** | | | | | | **3.62** | **.41** |

Source: Field data, 2021

As far as fund allocation is concerned, statistics in Table 2 indicated that 41.4% of respondents agreed that fund allocated to a project influence project performance, 15.5% strongly agreed about this item leading to the high mean of 3.42. 30.2% of respondents disagreed that fund allocated to a project influence project performance whereas 12.9% of respondents did not decide about this item. In assessing whether committed donors contracts influence project performance, a great number respondents representing 56.0% were in agreement and 10.3% strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.54 which is expressed as high mean. 22.4% of respondents disagreed while 11.2% did not decide about this item. Moreover, 61.2% of respondents agreed that the number of donors and partners influence project performance and 16.4% strongly agreed. The remaining respondents representing 11.2% disagreed that the number of donors and partners influence project performance whereas 11.2% did not agree or disagree about this item. Regarding the item that funds well allocated influence project performance, 45.7% of respondents agreed about the item and 17.2% strongly agreed leading to the high mean of 3.67. A few number of respondents representing 12.9% disagreed that funds well allocated influence project performance whereas 24.1% did not either agree or disagree about this item. Furthermore, 48.3% of respondents agreed that participation of beneficiaries in funds allocation influence project performance and 22.4% strongly agreed about this item influencing the mean to be 3.65. 6.0% of respondents strongly disagreed, 15.5% disagreed and 7.8% did not either disagree or agree that participation of beneficiaries in funds allocation influence project performance. From the statistics in the Table 2, it is clear that fund allocation influence project performance as confirmed by the majority of respondents.

The overall mean of 3.62 expressed as high mean indicated that a great number of respondents in this study confirmed that fund allocation greatly influences project performance. When the research asked the extent to which fund allocation influence project performance, most of them revealed that proper allocation of funds during the design phase play a great importance on the project performance. They added that during design phase of the projection much attention should be put on fund allocation to ensure project success. They also indicated that factors such as financial support, skills acquisition, availability

of man power, communication channel, project organization, stakeholder management, project planning and control, environmental factors, mutual relationship and innovation concept greatly impact on project performance. Results of interview indicated that fund allocation is the distribution of resources to different component of the projects. In allocating a specific amount we take into consideration several factors some of these are fixed, some are variables. If this is done wrongly, ultimately the performance of one component delays performance of another component and thus the entire project is affected. Allocation is the effective and efficient determination of resources needed in specific components of the project in order to finalize successfully.

### 4.3 Evaluation of the effect of fund control of project performance

The third sub variable of project fund management used in this study was fund control. This section describes opinion of respondents on fund control as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Perception of respondents on fund control**

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean | Std. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Monitoring of fund use influence project performance | | 7 (6.0%) | 12 (10.3%) | 70 (60.3%) | 27 (23.3%) | 4.00 | .76 |
| Involvement of stakeholders in fund control influence project performance | 8 (6.9%) | 37 (31.9%) | 10 (8.6%) | 41 (35.3%) | 20 (17.2%) | 3.24 | 1.26 |
| Donors and partners participation in control of funds influence project performance | 5 (4.3%) | 19 (16.4%) | 15 (12.9%) | 59 (50.9%) | 19 (16.4%) | 3.56 | 1.07 |
| Registering the expenditure and income influence project performance | 8 (6.9%) | 11 (9.5%) | 9 (7.8%) | 50 (43.1%) | 38 (32.8%) | 3.85 | 1.18 |
| Auditing in project management influence project performance | 4 (3.4%) | 12 (10.3%) | 16 (13.8%) | 65 (56.0%) | 19 (16.4%) | 3.71 | .78 |
| **Average mean** | | | | | | **3.67** | **.78** |

Source: field data, 2021

Statistics in Table 3 describes the opinion of respondents on the influence of fund control on the project performance. As shown in the table, majority of respondents representing 60.3% agreed that monitoring of fund use influence project performance and 23.3% strongly agreed about this item leading to the high mean of 4.00. 6.0% of respondents disagreed that monitoring of fund use influence project performance while 10.3% of respondents did not either disagree or agree about this item. When the researcher asked the respondents whether the involvement of stakeholders in fund control influences project performance, 35.3% of respondents agreed whereas 17.2% of them strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.24 which is expressed as moderate mean. 6.9% of respondents strongly disagreed, 31.9% disagreed whereas 8.6% did not either disagree or agree about this item. The findings in the table also revealed that 50.9% of respondents agreed that donors and partners participation in control of funds influence project

performance and 16.4% strongly agreed leading to them mean of 3.56 which is expressed as high mean. 4.3% of respondents strongly disagreed, 16.4% disagreed whereas 12.9% did not either disagree or agree that donors and partners participation in control of funds influence project performance. The Table 3 further examined whether registering the expenditure and income influence project performance, the results indicated that 43.1% of respondents agreed and 32.8% of respondents strongly agreed leading to the high mean of 3.85. A small number of respondents representing 6.9% strongly disagreed, 9.5% disagreed while 7.8% did not either agree or disagree about the item. Regarding the last item that auditing in project management influence project performance, 56.0% of respondents agreed whereas 16.4% of respondents strongly agreed leading to the high mean of 3.71. The results on this item also show that 3.4% of respondents strongly disagreed, 10.3% disagreed while 13.8 % did not either disagree or agree about this item. From the statistics in the table it is concluded that fund control influence project performance due to the high mean of 3.67 which indicates that majority of respondents were in agreement about the items used to measure fund control. When top management asked the extent to which fund control influence project performance, most of them indicated that monitoring of project activities is a crucial factor for project performance. To ensure the success of the project, the use of funds should seriously control. Audit of fund use should be regularly carried out.

### 4.4 Project time performance

The first indicator of dependent variable used in this study is project time performance. This section describes the opinion of respondents on project time performance as shown by the statistics in the Table 4

**Table 4: Perception of respondents on time performance**

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean | Std. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project activities are timely designed | | 12 (10.3%) | 15 (12.9%) | 59 (50.9%) | 30 (25.9%) | 3.92 | .89 |
| Project activities are closely monitored to avoid delay in their completion | 9 (7.8%) | 14 (12.1%) | 22 (19.0%) | 54 (46.6%) | 17 (14.7%) | 3.48 | 1.12 |
| Project activities are completed on time | 6 (5.2%) | 31 (26.7%) | 7 (6.0%) | 61 (52.6%) | 11 (9.5%) | 3.34 | 1.12 |
| Projects activities are delivered within estimated budget | 6 (5.2%) | 17 (14.7%) | 9 (7.8%) | 52 (44.8%) | 32 (27.6%) | 3.75 | 1.16 |
| Project employees are always punctual | 15 (12.9%) | 20 (17.2%) | 15 (12.9%) | 45 (38.8%) | 21 (18.1%) | 3.31 | 1.30 |
| **Average mean** | | | | | | **3.56** | **.76** |

*Source: Field Data, 2021*

Statistics in Table 4 describe the opinion of respondents on project time performance. As depicted in the table, 50.9% of respondents agreed that project activities are timely designed and 25.9% strongly agreed

leading to the high mean of 3.92. A few number of respondents representing 10.3% disagreed that project activities are timely designed while 12.9% did not either disagree or agree about this item.
In examining whether project activities are closely monitored to avoid delay in their completion, a large number of respondents representing 46.6% agreed while 14.7% strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.48 which is express as high mean. 7.8% of respondents strongly disagreed, 12.1% disagreed whereas 19.0% did not either disagree or agree about the item. Furthermore, when the researcher analyzed whether project activities are completed on time, 52.6% of respondents agreed, 9.5% strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.34. 5.2% of respondents strongly disagreed, 26.7% of respondents disagree while 6.0% of respondents did not either agree or disagree.

Results in Table 4, further indicate that projects activities are delivered within estimated budget as confirmed by majority of respondents representing 44.8% of agreement and 27.6% of strongly agree leading to mean of 3.75 which is expressed as high mean. 5.2% of respondents strongly disagreed and 14.7% of respondents disagreed that projects activities are delivered within estimated budget while 7.8% of respondents did not either agree or disagree about this item. As for as the last item is concerned, 38.8% of respondents agreed that project employees are always punctual and 18.1% of respondents strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.31. A few number of respondents representing 12.9% strongly disagreed, 17.2% of respondents disagreed about this item whereas 12.9% of respondents did not either agree or disagree. As conclusion on this variable, it is clear that majority of respondent were in agreement that project time performance is indicator of project performance as shown by high mean of 3.56.

**4.5 Project quality performance**

The second indicator of dependent variable used in this study is project quality performance. In this section therefore, the researcher was interested in knowing the perception of respondents on project quality performance. The statistics in table 5. describes the respondents' opinion on the items used to evaluate project quality performance.

*Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing*
*Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management*
*Volume 5||Issue 2||Page 46-67||June||2021|*
*Email:* **info@stratfordjournals.org** *ISSN: 2616-8464*

**Table 5: Perception of respondents on quality performance**

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean | Std. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Local community involvement | 5 (4.3%) | 8 (6.9%) | 8 (6.9%) | 58 (50.0%) | 37 (31.9%) | 3.98 | 1.02 |
| Availability of enough resources and materials | | 8 (6.9%) | 14 (12.1%) | 54 (46.6%) | 40 (34.5%) | 4.08 | .86 |
| Management skills and Knowledge | 8 (6.9%) | 5 (4.3%) | 3 (2.6%) | 75 (64.7%) | 25 (21.6%) | 3.89 | 1.01 |
| Project financing process | | 10 (8.6%) | 8 (6.9%) | 67 (57.8%) | 31 (26.7%) | 4.02 | .82 |
| Completed on time with expected budget | | 8 (6.9%) | 7 (6.0%) | 73 (62.9%) | 28 (24.1%) | 4.04 | .76 |
| Decision making by clients | 5 (4.3%) | 5 (4.3%) | 6 (5.2%) | 73 (62.9%) | 27 (23.3%) | 3.96 | .92 |
| Project team member performance | | 10 (8.6%) | 8 (6.9%) | 62 (53.4%) | 36 (31.0%) | 4.06 | .85 |
| **Average mean** | | | | | | **4.00** | **.74** |

*Source: Field Data, 2021*

According to the statistics in Table 5, majority of respondents representing 50.0% agreed that project quality performance depends on local community involvement and 31.9% of respondents strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.98. A limited number of respondents representing 4.3% strongly disagreed, 6.9% disagreed whereas 6.9% did not either agree or disagree that project performance depends on local community involvement. Statistics in table 4.9 also show that 46.6% of respondents agreed that project performance is influenced by availability of enough resources and materials and 34.5% of respondents strongly agreed about this item leading to the mean of 4.08.

6.9% of respondents disagreed about this item whereas 12.1% of respondents did not either disagree or agree about the item. The researcher went further to examine whether project performance is influence by management skills and knowledge. Table 4.6 indicates that 64.7% of respondents agreed and 21.6% of respondents strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.89 which is interpreted as high mean. 6.9% of respondents strongly disagreed, 4.3% disagreed while 2.6% did not either agree or disagree about the item. The findings in Table 4.9 also show that 57.8% of respondents agreed that project performance depends on project financing process and 26.7% of respondents strongly agreed influencing the mean to be 4.02 which is expressed as high mean.

Furthermore, the findings show that 62.9% of respondents agreed that project quality performance depends on project completed on time with expected budget and 24.1% strongly agreed about this item leading to the mean of 4.04 which is expressed as high mean. 6.9% of respondents disagreed whereas 6.0% did not either agree or disagree about this item. The study also found that project quality performance

is influenced by decision making by clients as indicated by majority of respondents representing 62.9% of agreement and 23.3% of strongly agree leading to the mean of 3.96 which is interpreted as high mean. Similar number of respondents representing 4.3% strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively while 5.2% did not either agree or disagree about the item. Regarding the last item, 53.4% of respondents agreed that quality project performance depends on project team member performance and 31.0% of respondents strongly agreed leading to the mean of 4.06 which is interpreted as high mean. 8.6% of respondents disagreed about this item whereas 6.9% of respondents did not either agree or disagree. From the statistics in the Table,4.6 it is therefore concluded that quality project performance is indicator of a projector performance as confirmed by majority of respondents on the high mean of 4.00.

### 4.6 Project cost performance

The third indicator of dependent variable used in this study is project cost performance. In this section therefore, the researcher was interested in knowing the perception of respondents on project cost performance. The statistics in Table 6 describes the respondents' opinion on the items used to evaluate project cost performance.

**Table 6: Perception of respondents on cost performance**

| | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly agree | Mean | Std. D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Proper project costing and financing indicates project performance | 4 (3.4%) | 12 (10.3%) | 16 (13.8%) | 65 (56.0%) | 19 (16.4%) | 3.93 | .92 |
| Proper cost control is an indicator of project performance | | 7 (6.0%) | 7 (6.0%) | 70 (60.3%) | 32 (27.6%) | 4.06 | .86 |
| Efficient management indicates project performance | 7 (6.0%) | 6 (5.2%) | 5 (4.3%) | 63 (54.3%) | 35 (30.2%) | 4.09 | .75 |
| Accurate estimation of original cost indicates project performance | 12 (10.3%) | 5 (4.3%) | 12 (10.3%) | 67 (57.8%) | 20 (17.2%) | 3.97 | 1.05 |
| Sufficient funds indicate project performance | 5 (4.3%) | 15 (12.9%) | 19 (16.4%) | 59 (50.9%) | 19 (16.4%) | 3.61 | 1.19 |
| **Average mean** | | | | | | **3.93** | **.85** |

*Source: Field Data, 2021*

According to Table 6, results indicate that majority of respondents representing 56.0% agreed that proper project costing and financing indicates project performance and 16.4% strongly agreed leading to the high mean of 3.93. Findings on this item also show that 3.4% of respondents strongly disagreed and 10.3% disagreed whereas 13.8% did not either agree or disagree. The results in table 4.10 also show that proper cost control is an indicator of project performance as expressed by a great number of respondents representing 60.3% of agreement and 27.3% of strongly agrees leading to the mean of 4.06 which is interpreted as high mean. 6.0% of respondents disagreed while 6.0% did not either agree or disagree about the item. Moreover, the findings in table 4.10 indicated that 57.8% of respondents agreed that efficient

management indicates project performance and 30.2% strongly agreed leading to the mean of 4.09 which is interpreted as high mean. 6.0% of respondents strongly disagree and 5.2% disagreed whereas 4.3% of respondents did not either agree or disagree.

In evaluating whether accurate estimation of original cost indicates project performance, 57.8% of respondents agreed and 17.2% strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.97 which is expressed as high mean. 10.3% of respondents strongly disagreed and 4.3% disagreed while 10.3% did not either agree or disagree. Regarding the last item, 50.9% of respondents agreed that sufficient funds indicate project performance and 16.4% of respondents strongly agreed leading to the mean of 3.61 which is expressed as high mean. The results on this item also show that 4.3% of respondents strongly disagreed and 12.9% disagreed whereas 16.4% of respondents did not either agree or disagree about this item. From the statistics in table, it is clear that majority of respondent indicated that project cost performance is a good indicator of a project performance.

**Table 7: Relationship between project fund management and project performance**

| | | Time performance | Quality performance | Cost performance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fund budget | Pearson Correlation | .578** | .724** | .695** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| Fund allocation | Pearson Correlation | .524** | .495** | .604** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| Fund control | Pearson Correlation | .832** | .840** | .903** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 |

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

Source: *Field Data, 2021*

Table 7 show the correlation Project fund management and project performance are inextricably linked. As indicated in the table the Pearson correlation between fund budget and project time performance of 0.587** shows that there is a positive relationship and that relationship is statistically significant since the Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.000 is less than 0.01 p-value taken as reference. The relationship between fund budget and project quality performance is positive due to the Pearson correlation of 0.724** and that is statistically significant because the Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.000 is less than 0.01 p- value taken as reference. In addition, there is a link between fund budget and project cost performance, due to correlation coefficient of 0.695** and that is statistically significant because the Sig. (2-tailed) is less than 0.01 p-value taken as reference. In terms of fund allocation and project performance, the correlation value of 0.524** indicates that there is a positive connection between money allocation and project time performance, which is statistically significant because the p-value of 0.000 is less than 0.01p-value chosen as reference.

*Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing*
*Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management*
*Volume 5||Issue 2||Page 46-67||June||2021|*
*Email:* **info@stratfordjournals.org** *ISSN: 2616-8464*

**4.7 Regression analysis**

This section illustrates model summary, ANOVA and coefficient of effects.

**Regression analysis between independent variables and time performance**

This section illustrates the regression analysis between independent variables and time performance. It shows the model summary, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Regression Coefficients.

**Table 8 Model summary**

| model summary | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .850[a] | .722 | .715 | .40939 |

a. predictors: (Constant), fund control, fund budget, fund allocation

*Source: Field Data, 2021*

Table 8 illustrates a model summary between indicators of independent variable (project fund management) and time performance.

Table 8 shows R-squire which is also a coefficient of determination of 0.722. this means that the combined effects of project efficiency explain 72.2 percent on the project success.

**Table 9: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)**

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 48.797 | 3 | 16.266 | 97.052 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 18.771 | 112 | .168 | | |
| | Total | 67.568 | 115 | | | |

a. dependent variable: time Performance

b. predictors: (Constant), fund control, budget, allocation

***source: Field Data, 2021***

From the Table 9, it is shown that the calculated value of level of significance was 48.797 while at the same level, the mean square was 16.266. Because sign. Was .000< .05. The above consideration show that the general approach was significant and that the indicators of independent variable (fund control, fund budget, fund allocation), all have a positive impact on time performance.

**Table 10: regression coefficients**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .947 | .374 | | 2.532 | .013 |
| | Fund budget | .269 | .078 | -.195 | -3.455 | .001 |
| | Fund allocation | .210 | .121 | .114 | 1.738 | .085 |
| | Fund control | .821 | .062 | .836 | 13.335 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Time performance

***Source: Field Data, 2021***

The findings in Table 10 indicate the effects of fund management indicators to the projects time performance. The results indicate that regression analysis equation is 0.947+ 0.269 budgeting + 0.210 allocation + 0.821 controlling. The results also show that significance level for fund budget was at 0.001p-value/alphas which is less than 0.05, significance level for fund allocation was at 0.085 p-value/alpha which is greater than 0.05 whereas significant level for fund control .000 < .05. This tells us that proper use of project funds requires efficiency allocation of budgets and proper control. Negative signs on standardized coefficient indicate that if the project managers do not focus on budgeting, fund control and fund allocation, the project may fail on the rate of the figure shown in Table 10.

## 5.0 Conclusion

Based on the findings in this study, the following conclusions were drawn; firstly, the study concluded that project budgeting influence performance as shown by the mean of 4.30 which is expressed as high mean with positively influence. Secondly fund allocation has an impact on project performance as confirmed by many respondents with positive and high mean of 3.62. Thirdly, the study concluded that fund control influences project performance as indicates that majority of respondents agreed about the items used to measure fund control as shown by high mean of 3.67. Furthermore, the study concluded that there is a positive relationship between project management and project performance on the correlation coefficient of 0.782 and that is statistically significant since the Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.000 is less than 0.01p-value taken as reference. Generally, the study concluded that project performance is greatly influenced by the project fund management. When project funds are well managed, the project achieves its goals but when the project funds are poorly managed, the project objectives and aims are not effectively achieved.

## 6.0 Recommendations

From the study findings, the researcher suggested the following recommendations; firstly, during the phase of project planning; partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries should be involved for effective fund budgeting, allocation and control. This is because the study found that project performance is influenced not only project fund control but also fund budget and fund allocation. Secondly, the study recommends that people involved in project monitoring and control must carry out this activity in effective way because the study found that project performance depends on project fund control. People involved in project monitoring and control should oversee how the project funds are being used.

## 7.0 Suggestions for further Sstudy

The researcher recommends a need for a study similar to this to be conducted in other projects such as private sector, to see how the situation is portrayed. The researcher further recommends a need to carry out a study on influence of stakeholders' involvement on project performance in Rwanda. Further study can also be carried out impact of environmental factors on project performance.

## REFERENCES

Abdul R., H. (2014). Delay Mitigation in the Malaysian Construction Industry. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, 3*(2): 125–33.

Ahn, M. (2011). The Effectiveness of Fund Raising: an Analysis of Project Risk Planning Across Industries and Countries. *Journal of Fundraising, 31*(1), 25-37.

Albert, J., David, P., & Ada, N., (2012). Comparing Contributors to Time and Cost Performance in Building Projects. *Building and Environment* 3(4), 31 – 42.

Amalraj, H. (2010).*Public Financial Management Performance Assessment Framework* (PEFA)'.Washington, DC: PEFA Secretariat, World Bank.

Amin, M. (2011). *Social Sciences Research Conception, Methodology and Analysis.* Kampala, Makerere university Press .

Archibald, R. D. (2012). *Managing High-Technology Programs and Projects*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Asian Development Bank (2005). *The Role of Project Implementation Units. Special Evaluation Study.* Operations Evaluation Department.

Barney, T., (1991). Project Success. A Survey. *Journal of Construction Research,* 5(2), 11 – 31.

Bechange, S. (2010). *Retracted: Determinants of Project Success among HIV/AIDS Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Rakai*, Uganda' 'the New African, Phenomenon.

Bharat JR. (2013). Analysis of Critical Causes of Delays in Indian Infrastructure Projects. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development, 2*(3): 251–263.

Brown, L. (2013). Role of Civil Society as Catalysts for Transnational Social Learning Voluntas: *International Journal of Nonprofit Organizations, 17* (1), 1-16.

Brown, R. & Howard, J. (2012). *Project Management: Planning and Control Techniques, 4th edition West Sussex,* England: John Willey and sons Inc.

Business Development Funds (BDF). (2015). *New Initiatives to Improve Quality of Rwanda is Locally Processed Products.* Kigali: Business Development Funds.

Chai, C. S., Yusof, A. M., & Habil, H. (2015). Delay Mitigation in the Malaysian Housing Industry: A Structural Equation Modelling Approach. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries, 20*(1), 65–83.

Chan, A. P. (2012). Key Performance Indicators for Measuring Construction Success Benchmarking. *International Journal, 11*(2), 203-221.

Chan A. (2010). Time-cost Relationship of Public Sector Projects in Malaysia. *International Journal of Project Management,* 19, 223-229.

Chan, P., & Chan, A. (2012). Factors Affecting the Success of a Construction Project. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management,* 3(5), 123-145.

Creswell, J. W. (2011). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th Ed.). New Delhi, PHI Learning.

Enock, O., (2013). Budgetary Control and Project Performance in Real Estate Sector.*Journal of Asia Economic and Financial, 3*(6), 749-761.

Fisher, D.T (2010). *Budgetary Control and Managerial Performance*. Unpublished PHD Dissertation University of Manchester.

Forsythe, G., (2010). A New Framework for Determining Critical Success/failure Factors in Projects. *International Journal of Project Management* 14(3), 41 – 51.

Garbrah, R. (2012). Project Management: Cost, Time and Quality, Two Best Guesses and a Phenomenon, it's Time to Accept other Success Criteria. *International Journal of Project Management*,17(6), 337 -342.

Gashyuga, D., (2016). Effects of Managing Funds in Project Success in Rwanda. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publication, 6*(10), 628-649.

Gilbert, A., & Ron, J., (2014). Sustainability in Project Management Competencies. Analyzing the Competence Gap of Project Managers. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies, 2*(4)40-54.

Gkritza, K., & Labi, S. (2013). Estimating Cost Discrepancies in Highway Contracts: Multistep Econometric Approach. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 134(12), 935-962.

Grinnel, B., & Williams, D., (2013).Time – Cost Relationships in Australian Building Construction Projects. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 131(2), 187 -194.

Gunduz. M. (2013). Quantification of Delay Factors Using the Relative Importance Index Method for Construction Projects in Turkey. *Journal of Management in Engineering, 2*(6), 133–139.

Gwahula, R. (2016). Effects of Fund Management on Performance of Government Financed Construction Projects: Evidence from Tanzania. *Business Management and Strategy*, 7(2), 34-39.

Hamilton, P., (2011). The Financing Preferences of Small Firm Owners. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research 4*(3), 239-248.

Hani, M. (2017). Impact of Fund Management on Project Success. An Empirical Investigation in Jordanian Ministry of Environment. *European Journal of Business and Management, 9*(19), 55-61.

Heerkens, M. (2012). Human Resource Allocation in a Multi-Project Environment: Resource Capacity Allocation and Project Portfolio Planning in Practice. *International Journal of Project Management*, 17(3), 181-188.

Ika, L. A. (2012). Project Management that Facilitates Sustainable Development in Africa: The Reason why Projects are Having Challenges and Possible Mitigation. *Project Management Journal, 4* (7), 32-35.

Institute of Cost and Management Account (1990). *Cost and Management Account Regulations*. Gulshan, Karachi- Pakistan

Kothari, C. R., (2012). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. (2nd Ed.), New York.

Kerzner, H. (2011). *Project Management: A systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling, and Controlling (10th ed.).* New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons.

Kevin, J., & Lynne, S. D. (2012). Dynamism, Capital Structure, and Performance in a Sub-aharan Economy: Extending the Institutional Difference Hypothesis.

Khosravi, S., & Afshari, H. (2011). *A Success Measurement Model for Construction Projects. International Conference on Financial Management and Economics*, IPEDR, IACSIT Press, Singapore. *Organization Science, 24*(5), 1422–1438.

Kikwasi GJ. (2012). Causes and Effects of Delays and Disruptions in Construction Projects in Tanzania. *Australasian Journal of Construction Economics and Building Conference Series, 1* (2):52- 63.

Kombo, D. K. & Tromp D. L. (2011). *Proposal and Thesis Writing: an Introduction*.Nairobi, Kenya: Pauline Publications Africa.

Kusters, C. (2011). *Improving the Use of Monitoring & Evaluation Processes and Findings.* Wageningen: Centre for Development Innovation.

Lan, Y., C. (2012). *Management of Information Technology Issues in Enterprise Globalization*. Master Thesis. University of Western Sydney.

Lavagnon, A. I., Amadou, D. & Denis, T. (2012). Critical Performance Factors for World Bank Projects: An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Project Management, 30*,105 – 116.

Lawrence, V. (2015). *Evaluation of Programs: Reading Carol H. Weiss. University of South Africa, College of Education, Department of Education Leadership and Management*. Pretoria, South Africa: Horizon Research Publishing.

Love, R., Tse, E., & Edwards, L. (2011). Merger Performance Under Uncertain Efficiency Gains. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 2(7)64-73.

Lyer, K., & Jhan, F., (2011). Factors Affecting Cost Performance: Evidence from Indian Construction Project. *International Journal of Project management 2*(3), 83 – 95.

Matnick, D., (2014). Key Performance Indicators for Measuring Construction Success Benchmarking. An *International Journal*, 11(2), 203 – 221.

Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (2011). *The Annual Economic Performance Report. Fiscal Year July 2010, June 2011.* Kigali-Rwanda.

Moriaty, L. (2011). *Methodology of Educational Research*. New Delhi: Publication of Vikas House.

Mugenda, O.M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2013). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Nairobi: ACTS Press.

Muller, R. & Jugdev, K. (2012). Critical Success Factors in Projects. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 5*(2), 757-775.

Mutodi, T., (2014). *Exploring the Effects of Fund Managed and Performing ProjectsWithin South Africa*. Master's Thesis University of Pretoria.

Nalianya, R. (2018). *Fund Management and Performance of Agricultural Projects by Community-Based Organizations in Bungoma County, Kenya*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kenyatta University.

Ochieng, C. (2011). *Addressing Cultural Issues When Managing Multicultural Construction Project Teams.* Nottingham: Londan University Press .

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee (2013). *Annual Report on the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises*. Saint Petersburg. Russian Federation

Ofori, D. F. (2013). Project Management Practices and Critical Performance Factors–A Developing Country Perspective. *International Journal of Business and Management, 8*(21), 14 -31.

Olaoye, F. O. & Adeduro, A. (2014). Budgetary Control and Project Performance in Public Corporations in Osun State. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 19*(7), 59-62.

Orodho, A.J. & Kombo, D.K. (2012) *Research Methods*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University, Institute of Open Learning.

Osama, M., & Abdulhadi, R., (2013). The Impact of Budgetary Participation on Managerial Performance. *Journal of Applied Finance and Social Science,19*(7), 14-31.

Pamela, H. (2014). *Educational Research (7th edition).* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Polit, D., & Beck, C., (2012).*Essential* of Nursing *Research. Principles and Methods*, (7th Ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Prabhakar, G. P. (2013). What is Project Success: A Literature Review. *InternationalJournal of Business and Management, 3*(9), 3-12.

Project Management Institute Guidebook (2012). *Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide) (4th Ed.).* Pennsylvania, USA: Project Management Institute Inc.

Project Management Institute (2013). *Annual Report.* Newtown Square Pennsylvania.

Reeler, D., (2010). *A Three-fold Theory of Social Change and Implications for Practice, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation*. Cape Town: Centre for Developmental Practice.

Rwanda Public Procurement Authority (2012). *RPPA Annual Activity Report 2011-2012*. Kigali-Rwanda.

Roque, M., P., & Carvalho, D. (2013). Understanding the Impact of Project Fund Raising on Project Performance: an Empirical Study. *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation, 8*(2), 64 - 78.

Sadeh , A., Divr, D., & Shenhar, A. (2010). The Role of Contract Types in the Success of R & D Defense Projects under Increasing Uncertainty. *Project Management Journal*, 31(3), 14 – 22.

Scott, R., (2010).*Project management: planning, scheduling and controlling*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw – hill.

Siborurema, J. (2015). The Effects of Project Funding on the Performance in Rwanda. A Case Study of Bukomane-Gikoma Road. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management, 3*(8), 564-595.

Siyanbola, T. T. (2013). The Impact of Budgeting and Budgetary Control On project Performance. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research, 2*(12), 11 - 24.

Soanes, G., & Stevenson, K., (2013). The Role of Project Management in Achieving Project Success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 14(2), 127-134.

Steinfort, P & Walker, D.H.T (2013). *Critical Success Factors in Project Management Globally and How they May be Applied to Aid Projects,* 4th Annual Project Management Australia Conference.

Technical Information Report, (2011). *Report of the Forty- Seventh Session of the TIR Executive Board (TIRE&B).* Hawall, Honolulu.

Tumi, R., (2011). The Influence of Project Managers on Project Success Criteria and Project Success by type of Project. *European Management Journal*, 2(4), 2 – 9.

Umulisa, J. (2015). The Real Performance Factors on Projects. *International Journal of Project Management, 20*, 185–190.

Wood, C. (2011).Quality in Qualitative Research. *Medical Journal of Australia, 8*(4), 3-5.