

Stakeholder Engagement Principles' Contribution to Improved Project Performance: A Case Study of Food for the Hungry Rwanda

Sitati Dawo¹, Joseph Mungatu²

* Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kigali, Rwanda.

** Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kigali, Rwanda

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.8.6.2018.p7866

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.8.6.2018.p78X66>

Abstract- The practice of stakeholder management and recognition of the significance of stakeholders in project management is very paramount. A stakeholder is anyone or organization that has interest in an organization. They can affect or be affected by an organization's actions, objectives and policies. Stakeholder engagement on the other hand is a process of how organizations involves people(s) who may be either affected by the decisions of the organization or can affect the implementation of the decisions in order to improve decision making, accountability and performance. This process is used as a risk management, buy-in catalyst, performance input and lately corporate governance tenet. The purpose of this study is to determine how stakeholder engagement principles of inclusivity, materiality, completeness and responsiveness contribute to improved project performance. Improved project performance is the dependent variable whereas stakeholder engagement is independent. The general objective of the researcher is to ascertain the contribution of stakeholder engagement principles to improved project performance. Specific objectives of this study are to determine the effect of Inclusivity principle on performance of Food for the hungry project, to assess the effect of Materiality principle on Food for the hungry project and to examine the effect of responsiveness principle on Food for the hungry project. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative designs. Reasons for this approach are; there is limited data and concrete literature on the study area. This project focused on Kamonyi District which has seventeen (17) cooperatives and all are considered in the study. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. Interviewer administered questionnaire with semi structured questions made up of a five point Likert and open ended questions and was used to collect data The researcher will employ convenience sampling for this study. The sample will be a census and the scope within Kamonyi district of Rwanda.

This means that there is a moderate relationship between stakeholder engagement principles on project performance, this project management principles are important in effective and efficient management of community projects.

Index Terms- Stakeholder Engagement, Project Performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

The world today is more concerned with sustainable development which inspires the ability to meet present day needs without compromising the ability of future generations to cater for their needs and aspirations too. Corporate governance structures are rapidly changing and adopting this paradigm shift as best practice requirement. Stakeholder relationship management is one of the options available for addressing this. The notion of organizations understanding and managing stakeholders is common knowledge and practice in present management and academic spheres. An organization's success is determined by its exchange of value with stakeholders. Organizations create and deliver value to their core stakeholders, and they receive value from them Napier R & McDaniel R (2006).

However, there are different approaches, cases, models, contradictions and arguments on stakeholder concept and theory with less discussion on the diversity and implications of the variety (Donaldson 1995). To demonstrate the importance and validity of stakeholder engagement, global leading consultancies like PWC (Pricewaterhouse Coopers), Deloitte & Touche and KPMG have standards and publications dedicated to this (King III, Accountability and Integrated Reporting respectively) under corporate governance best practice. "There are a range of frameworks, standards and codes, which organizations can draw on to provide guidance for the process of stakeholder engagement and which aim to improve the sustainability performance of the organization. These include the GRI Sustainability Reporting Guidelines (on reporting), SA8000 (on labour standards compliance), the AA1000 Series (on systematic accountability, including engagement), and the EFQM Excellence Model (on quality management). At the national level various bodies have issued guidance and standards on social responsibility, for example the SD21000 in France, SIGMA in the UK, AS8003 in Australia and Standard SI 10000 in Israel. At an international level, these will be complemented by the current ISO process to develop international guidance on social responsibility, in which stakeholder engagement will feature prominently. There are also a number of useful resources from organizations including The World Business Council for Sustainable Development, Business for Social Responsibility,

CSR Europe, The Future 500 Initiative, the UK Environment Council, the South African Calabash Project, the Brazilian Instituto Ethos, the Indian Development Alternatives Group and the International Association for Public Participation” Thomas .K. et al, (2005).

Stakeholder engagement process value can be greatly enhanced whereas reducing the risk of missing important perspectives that can adversely affect reputation, project buy in and performance through a formal stakeholder engagement policy (Accountability 2008).

Meaningful engagement occurs when organizations, aware of the changes in the wider society a how they relate to organizational performance, choose to establish relations with stakeholders as a means to manage the impact of those changes, such as those created as a result of global economic downturn. Organizations can either seek to mitigate risk through the use of stakeholder management, or exploit these new trends to identify and establish new opportunities through the use of meaningful stakeholder engagement (Brunswick, 2013).

Edward Freeman is the man heavily credited to popularization of the stakeholder concept, when he wrote his famous book *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach* in 1984. It is also presumed that the word stakeholder had previously appeared in management internal memo at the Stanford Research Institute in 1963, according to Friedman & Miles (2006).

Stakeholder theory justification is further dissected by Preston (1995) into; “Descriptive justifications attempt to show that the concepts embedded in the theory correspond to observed reality. Instrumental justifications point to evidence of the connection between stakeholder management and corporate performance. Normative justifications appeal to underlying concepts such as individual or group "rights," "social contract," or utilitarianism” He further declares that since the descriptive approach to grounding a stakeholder theory is inadequate, justifications based on a connection between stakeholder strategies and organizational performance should be examined. “Consider, for example, the simple hypothesis that corporations whose managers adopt stakeholder principles and practices will perform better financially than those that do not”. This study has borrowed aspects of this approach.

The PMBOK (2013) defines project stakeholders as “individuals, groups, or organizations who may affect, be affected by, or perceive themselves to be affected by a decision, activity, or outcome of a project”. This is the go to resource on technical and professional project management matters.

Thomas .K. et al, (2005) sums up stakeholder engagement as; an umbrella term that covers the full range of an organization’s efforts to understand and involve stakeholders in its activities and decisions. Engagement can help organizations meet tactical and strategic needs ranging from gathering information and spotting trends that may impact their activities, to improving transparency and building the trust of the individuals or groups whose support is critical to an organization’s long-term success, to sparking the innovation and organizational change needed to meet new challenges and opportunities.

There are existing gaps in the stakeholder engagement according to Hillman (2001); who noted the lack of sufficient

literature and skills in the area of stakeholder management and engagement.

The uniqueness and the importance of engagement in project management has ignited curiosity, and prompted this study to investigate engagement and the ways it improves or can improve project performance. A clear distinction of stakeholder engagement from crisis management and stakeholder management is clearly highlighted by the Jaffery (2009).

The PMBOK (2013) as a respected reference guide for project managers also reiterates the importance of stakeholder engagement as a critical link to project performance; “Managing stakeholder engagement helps to increase the probability of project success by ensuring that stakeholders clearly understand the project goals, objectives, benefits, and risks. This enables them to be active supporters of the project and to help guide activities and project decisions. By anticipating people’s reactions to the project, proactive actions can be taken to win support or minimize negative impacts.”

Brunswick Insight (2013) in their report established that most (80%) staff believes that their senior management understand and appreciate the value of stakeholder engagement to their organizations. On the other hand, whereas the team at the top appears to understand the value of engagement, buy-in and levels of understanding generally wanting.

“Stakeholders, at different levels and stages, are crucial to the success of an adaptation project. Through listening to the views of others, stakeholders can build a shared understanding of the issues. Priority areas for action emerge that take account of everyone’s perceptions. This process requires time to build trust between the groups and individuals involved, and can be empowering, as solutions are worked out collaborative” Conde and Lonsdale (2004).

Stakeholder management has shown relevance and cemented its place in commercial, civic and development spheres formidably thereby catching the attention of Project Management Institute (PMI – a respected professional authority in project management training and accreditation) and prompting PMI to elevate it from a process to a full knowledge area in the Project Management practice. This has given Stakeholder Management a new impetus and prominence since effectively managing stakeholders is one of the hardest tasks in a project. Projects are change agents and there tends to be a resistance reaction to change, and people need to be prepared for those changes for acceptance and smooth transition. This has a great bearing of the overall success and performance of the project and engagement is the basis for buy in. Anderson and Anderson (2010), explained engagement in change as human needs (inclusion and connection) being necessary input for effective and smooth change process.

Furthermore, Stakeholder Engagement Tool Kit (2007) noted the inadequacy in shared understanding and effective communication among interest groups in spite of the growth in engagement practice thereby limiting opportunities for shared learning and development of engagement theory and practice. This study seeks to improve on this status quo.

“Ultimately, stakeholder engagement can help the organization identify material issues – risks and opportunities – that it should respond to and address” *Integrated Reporting Issue-2*, 2012.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The importance of stakeholder management is well documented and efforts channeled towards adoption under corporate governance. However, how meaningful stakeholder engagement is, especially with the final end user (stakeholder) in consideration regarding improving project performance is not specifically spelled out.

Brunswick Insight (2013) in their report established that most (80%) staff believes that their senior management understand and appreciate the value of stakeholder engagement to their organizations. On the other hand, whereas the team at the top appears to understand the value of engagement, buy-in and levels of understanding generally is wanting. This gives significance to this study and more impetus since it seeks to investigate the relationships in the engagement, their causes and effects. Consequently, this will add to the growing literature of understanding tangible aspects of stakeholder engagement even to the middle and lower levels of organizational staff.

The lack of “one size fits all” approach to stakeholder engagement adds more weight to this study in the quest to contribute to the already existing knowledge. The study strives to specifically explain the relationships of the principals involved and how they improve overall project performance.

Stakeholder Engagement is quite diverse challenging and there is no panacea or standard approach and application for success. A combination of tools and techniques are employed depending on the situation, level of engagement and the purpose for engagement, Conde and Lonsdale (2004). This gives momentum to the study to investigate the specific approaches and tools for this very specific case study.

1.3 Purpose of the study

Descriptive justifications attempt to show that the concepts embedded in the theory correspond to observed reality. Instrumental justifications point to evidence of the connection between stakeholder management and corporate performance Donaldson (1995). This study seeks to examine specific principles of stakeholder engagement and how they can be employed to improve project performance. Relationships that exist between stakeholder engagement and project performance will also be explored in terms of scope, purpose and context.

1.4 Objectives of the study

This study seeks to find out the contribution of Inclusivity, Materiality, Completeness and Responsiveness to improving project performance.

1.4.1 General objective

The general objective was to establish the relationship between stakeholder engagement principles on project performance in Rwanda.

1.4.2 Specific objectives

1. To determine the effect of Inclusivity principle on performance of FCG project.
2. To assess the effect of Materiality principle on FCG project
3. To examine the effect of Responsiveness principle on FCG project

1.5 Research questions

1. What is the effect of Inclusivity principle on performance of FCG project?
2. What is the effect of Materiality principle on FCG project?
3. What is the effect of responsiveness principle on FCG project?

1.6 Research design

The study employed both qualitative and quantitative designs. Reasons for this approach are; there is limited data and concrete literature on the study area in regards to Rwandan context, variation in data collection mixed approach leads to greater validity, it approaches and answers the research question from various perspectives, it also minimizes chances of gaps in data collection and it tackles assumptions of the study. Garbarino and Holland (2009) commend this design by stating “while quantitative methods produce data that can be aggregated and analyzed to describe and predict relationships, qualitative research can help to probe and explain those relationships and to explain contextual differences in the quality of those relationships”.

1.7 Target population

The *population* for the entire project was sixty three (63) cooperatives in Rwanda. These cooperatives were under FGC project which FH is operating in three districts in Rwanda namely, Kamonyi, Muhanga and Ruhango. This project focused on Kamonyi District which has seventeen (17) cooperatives and all are considered in the study.

1.8 Sampling frame

The register of cooperatives at FH Rwanda office was used as the register and the membership entry register at the cooperatives for the purposes of identifying and screening the desired respondents for the study.

1.8.1 Sampling (or sample size)

The study took a non-probability sample of one out of the three districts where the project is implemented in Rwanda. This was the Kamonyi District constituting seventeen (17) cooperatives. Census data were collected from the representatives of the seventeen cooperatives in Kamonyi District supported by FH.

1.9 Sampling design

The researcher together with an interpreter interviewed one leader of each of the cooperative available during the field visits arranged by FH, and collected and recorded their responses through interviewer administered questionnaire.

Cooperative leaders were the primary respondents; however, members who have been with the cooperative from the inception of FGC project were also to be considered just in case it became challenging to find the leaders so as to take care on non-response. Fortunately, all the leaders were reached during the data collection exercise.

II. INSTRUMENTS

The study employed both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. Interviewer administered questionnaire with semi structured questions made up of a five point Likert and

open ended questions and was used to collect data. Observation while FH staff and cooperative members went about their business was also noted on a note book for augmenting questionnaire data during analysis.

2.1 Data collection procedure

The researcher with the assistance of FH staff used interviewer administered questionnaires with structured questions to capture the needed data to test the study variables. For quantitative data, a five point likert scale was employed for the study.

Documentary review of other literature and reports from FH Rwanda and other relevant sources were explored in order to find insights and aspects relevant to the study. Reviewing documents, reports, studies and findings from prior FCG project and FH work supported the study in concretizing aspects being studied for better understanding and deduction.

2.2 Data Processing and analysis

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1: Gender of the respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	15	68.2
Male	7	31.8
Total	22	100.0

Source: Primary Data, 2018

From table 1 show that, 68.2% were female while 31.8% male. This shows that data obtained is free of gender bias since both male and female were represented.

Age structure of the respondents

Table 2: Age structure of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent
21 - 30	3	13.6
31 - 40	4	18.2
41 - 50	12	54.5
51 and above	3	13.6
Total	22	100.0

Source: Primary Data, 2018

From table 2 shows that, 54.5% of the respondents were between 41 – 50 18.2% between 31 40, 17, 13.6% between 21-30 and above 51 years respectively. This implies that there was fair representation of the population as almost all classes were represented and the data provided reflected the views of the entire population and the majority of the respondents are matured which means they can gave a matured view for the purpose of the research.

Educational level of the respondents

Table 3: Educational level of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Secondary	11	50.0
Diploma	7	31.8
Degree	3	13.6
Masters	1	4.5
Total	22	100.0

Source: Primary data, 2018

The researcher counterchecked the questionnaires after filed data collection for completeness and edited for coding purposes. The filled and coded questionnaires were fed into SPSS and MS-Excel software for storage, analysis and reporting as contained herein.

Qualitative data was thematically coded and then statistically analyzed. Qualitative data which is from the open ended questions was analyzed using content analysis. The findings from the qualitative data were then presented in a prose form.

2.3 RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents empirical findings in reference to the research questions in chapter one. These findings were obtained from both primary and secondary sources. They were presented and analysed using frequency tables and percentages were used was to establish the relationship between stakeholder engagement principles on project performance in Rwanda.

Table 3 shows that, 50.0% of the respondents were secondary, 31.8% diploma, 13.8% degree and 4.5% masters. This implies that the respondents are educated meaning they could read, understand and interpret questionnaires reliably. The data collected is believed to be reliable and was thus processed to present findings.

Experience level of the Respondents

Table 4: Experience level of the respondents

	Frequency	Percent
1 - 3 Years	7	31.8
3 - 7 Years	6	27.3
7 years and above	9	40.9
Total	22	100.0

Source: Primary data, 2016

From table 4 shows that, 40.9% of the respondents had served for a period between 7 years and above, 31.8% between 3 - 7 years and 27.3% between 1-3 years. This implies that almost all respondents had taken reasonably enough time in the project and thus the data they provided was believed to be reliable.

Inclusivity principle and performance of FCG Project

Table 5: Mean and standard deviation analysis on inclusivity principle

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Project stakeholders were committed to project management	22	3.00	5.00	4.4545	.59580
Project stakeholders had respects for each other	22	3.00	5.00	4.5000	.67259
Project stakeholders were treated fairly in the project management	22	3.00	5.00	4.3636	.58109
Valid N (listwise)	22				

Source: Primary data 2018

Table 5 describes respondent’s views effect of inclusivity principle on project performance and the findings were as discussed below;

Project stakeholders were committed to project management: This was indicated by a strong mean of 4.4545 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .59580. This implies that to a large extent stakeholders were committed. On whether Project stakeholders had respects for each other: This was indicated by a very strong mean 4.5000 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .67259. This implies that Project stakeholders had respects for each other. Lastly on whether Project stakeholders were treated fairly in the project management, this was indicated by a strong mean of 4.3636 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .58109. This implies that there was fair treatment in the project.

Regression Analysis on inclusivity principle in FCG Project

A multivariate regression analysis was used to establish the relationship between inclusivity principle in Food for the Hungry Project in planning which is the independent variable and Projects performance which is the dependent variables.

The multivariate regression model was:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon$$

Where; Y = Project performance;

β_0 = Constant Term;

$\beta_1, \beta_2,$ and β_3 = Beta coefficients;

X_1 = Inclusivity principle;

X_2 = Materiality principle;

X_3 = Responsive principle;

ε = Error term

Table 4.6: Model Summary on inclusivity principle in FCG Project

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.883 ^a	.780	.769	.45998

a. Predictors: (Constant), Independent Variable

b. Dependent Variable: Project Performance (improved yield; improved livelihood)

R-square =0.883a (88.3). 88.3% variations in project performance have been captured by the model used. Since the p-value is 0.000, the model performance is statistically significant

Table 7: Anova table on inclusivity principle in FCG Project

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	15.041	1	15.041	71.087	.000 ^b
	Residual	4.232	20	.212		
	Total	19.273	21			

a. Dependent Variable: Project performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), inclusivity principle in Food for the Hungry Project

Table 8: Coefficients of inclusivity principle in Food for the Hungry Project

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.663	.779		3.416	.003	1.037	4.288
	Independent Variable	.490	.058	.883	8.431	.000	.368	.611

Project performance

Regression equation shows relationship between inclusivity principle in planning and project performance

Where; Y = project success;

B₁ = Constant Term

β₁= Beta coefficients

X₁ = inclusivity principle

Y= 2.663+ 0.490X₁ (inclusivity principle).....Equation (i)

The results indicate that inclusivity principle has a relationship with project performance. The significance is 0.000 which indicates that there is positive relationship (0.490) between inclusivity principle and project performance. These results provide reasonable evidence to the consistent view that, there is improvement in yield and livelihood hence they improved project performance. The beta of inclusivity principle is 0.883 with a t-statistic of 8.341. The positive coefficients mean a unit change in inclusivity principle leads to a .490 units increase in project performance while keeping responsive principle and responsive principle in implementation constant and since the P- value = 0.000 < 0.05, the positive t-statistic value indicates that the effect is statistically significant at 5 % test level reject H0 in favor of H1 the alternative.

Materiality principle and performance of Food for the Hungry Project

Table 9: Mean and standard deviation analysis on materiality principle

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Project stakeholders were able to identify major issues affecting the project	22	2.00	5.00	4.2273	.75162
Project stakeholders were able to priorities issues to be addressed in the project milestone	22	3.00	5.00	4.3636	.65795
Project stakeholders were able to share information about project milestone	22	2.00	5.00	4.2273	.92231
Valid N (listwise)	22				

Source: Primary data 2018

Table 9 describes respondent’s views effect of materiality principle on project performance and the findings were as discussed below;

Project stakeholders were able to identify major issues affecting the project: This was indicated by a strong mean of 4.2273 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .75162. This implies that to a large extent Project stakeholders were able to identify major issues affecting the project. On whether Project stakeholders were able to priorities issues to be addressed in the project milestone, this was indicated by a very strong mean 4.3636 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .65795. This implies that stakeholders were able to priorities issues to be addressed in the project milestone. Lastly on whether Project stakeholders were able to share information about project milestone, this was indicated by a strong mean of 4.2273 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .92231. This implies that stakeholders were able to share information about project milestone.

Regression Analysis on Materiality principle

A multivariate regression analysis was used to establish the relationship between Materiality principle which is the independent variable and Projects performance which is the dependent variables.

The multivariate regression model was:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon$$

Where; Y = Project performance;

β_0 = Constant Term;

$\beta_1, \beta_2,$ and β_3 = Beta coefficients;

X_1 = Inclusivity principle;

X_2 = Materiality principle;

X_3 = Responsive principle;

ε = Error term

Table 4.10: Model Summary on Materiality principle

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.764 ^a	.583	.562	.63366

a. Predictors: (Constant), Materiality principle

R-square =0.764(76.4%). 76.6% variations in project performance have been captured by the model used. Since the p-value is of 0.000, the model performance is statistically significant.

Table 11: Anova table on Materiality principle

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.242	1	11.242	27.999	.000 ^b
	Residual	8.031	20	.402		
	Total	19.273	21			

a. Dependent Variable: Project performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Materiality principle

Table 12: Coefficients on Materiality principle

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	5.032	.796		6.324	.000	3.372	6.692

IV1	.324	.061	.764	5.291	.000	.196	.451
-----	------	------	------	-------	------	------	------

a. Project Performance: Materiality principle

From the table, the researcher deduces the regression equation

Where; Y = project performance;

B₂ = Constant Term

B₂= Beta coefficients

X₂ = Materiality principle

Y= 5.032 + 0.324X₂ (Materiality principle).....Equation (ii)

The results indicate that materiality principle has relationship with project performance. The significance is 0.000 which indicates that there is positive relationship (.324) between materiality principle and project performance. These results provide reasonable evidence to the consistent view that, there is improvement in yield and livelihood hence they improved project performance. The beta of materiality principle is .764 with a t-statistic of 5.291. The positive coefficients mean a unit change in materiality principle leads to a 0.324 units increase in project performance while keeping Inclusive principle and Responsive principle constant and since the P- value = 0.000 < 0.05 the positive t-statistic value indicates that the effect is statistically significant at 5 % test level. The effect of Stakeholders involvement in control on project success is statistically significant; reject H₀ in favor of H_i the alternative

Responsive principle and performance of Food for the Hungry Project

Table 13: Mean and standard deviation on responsive principle

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Project communication was done in time among the different stakeholders	22	3.00	5.00	4.5000	.59761
Projects stakeholders were flexible in making required changes in project plan and operations	22	2.00	5.00	4.2273	.68534
Projects stakeholders were sensitive to critical activities of the project	22	3.00	5.00	4.4545	.67098
Valid N (listwise)	22				

Source: Primary data 2018

Table 13 describes respondent’s views effect of responsive principle on project performance and the findings were as discussed below;

Project communication was done in time among the different stakeholders: This was indicated by a very strong mean of 4.5000 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .59761. This implies that to a large extent Project communication was done in time among the different stakeholders. On whether Projects stakeholders were flexible in making required changes in project plan and operations, this was indicated by a very strong mean 4.2273 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .68534. This implies that stakeholders were able to priorities issues to be addressed in the project milestone. Lastly on whether Projects stakeholders were sensitive to critical activities of the project, this was indicated by a strong mean of 4.4545 and a heterogeneity standard deviation of .67098. This implies that Projects stakeholders were sensitive to critical activities of the project.

Regression Analysis on responsive principle

A multivariate regression analysis was used to establish the relationship between Responsive principle which is the independent variable and Projects performance which is the dependent variables.

The multivariate regression model was:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \varepsilon$$

Where; Y = Project performance;

β_0 = Constant Term;

$\beta_1, \beta_2,$ and β_3 = Beta coefficients;

X₁= Inclusivity principle;

X₂= Materiality principle;

X₃= Responsive principle;

ε = Error term

Table 14: Model Summary on Responsive principle

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.856 ^a	.733	.719		.50768

a. Predictors: (Constant), Responsive principle

Table 15: Model Summary on Responsive principle

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.118	1	14.118	54.775	.000 ^b
	Residual	5.155	20	.258		
	Total	19.273	21			

a. Dependent Variable: Project performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Responsive principle

Table 16; Coefficients of Responsive principle

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	3.231	.811		3.982	.001	1.539	4.923
	Responsive principle	.451	.061	.856	7.401	.000	.324	.579

a. Dependent Variable: Project performance

Table above deduces the regression equation

Where; Y = project performance;

B₃ = Constant Term

B₃= Beta coefficients

X₃ = Responsive principle

Y= 3.231+ .451 X₃ (Responsive principle).....Equation (iii)

The results indicate that Responsive principle in implementation has a relationship with project performance. The significance is 0.000 which indicates that there is positive relationship (0.451) between responsive principle and project performance. These results provide reasonable evidence to the consistent view that, there is improvement in yield and livelihood hence they improved project performance. The beta of Responsive principle is .856 with a t-statistic of 7.401. The positive coefficients mean a unit change in Inclusivity principle and Materiality principle in constant and since the P- value = 0.000 < 0.05 the positive t-statistic value indicates that the effect is statistically significant at 5 % test level. The effect of project performance on project performance is statistically significant; reject H₀ in favor of H_i the alternative

Summary of the chapter

Table 17: Correlations between stakeholder engagement principles and project performance

		Stakeholder engagement principles	Project performance
Stakeholder engagement principles	Pearson Correlation	1	.883**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	22	22
Project performance	Pearson Correlation	.883**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	22	22

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

Table 17 is giving the relationship between stakeholder engagement principles on project performance in Rwanda whereby the respondents N is 22 and the significant level is 0.01, the results indicate that independent variable has positive moderate correlation to dependent variable equal to .834** and

the p-value is .000 which is less than 0.01. When p-value is less than significant level, therefore researchers conclude that variables are correlated and null hypothesis is rejected and remains with alternative hypothesis. This means that there is a moderate relationship between stakeholder engagement

principles on project performance, this project management principles are important in effective and efficient management of community projects.

Challenges faced by Food for hungry project

The respondents identified some of the following challenges; inadequate funds for financing the project, inadequate communication between the stakeholders, lack of transparency with some stakeholders.

2.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.3.1 Summary of Findings

The summary of findings was according to three specific objectives namely; to determine the effect of Inclusivity principle on performance of Food for the hungry project; to assess the effect of Materiality principle on Food for the hungry project and to examine the effect of responsiveness principle on food for the hungry project

2.3.1.1 Effect of Inclusivity principle on performance of Food for the hungry project

The results indicate that inclusivity principle has a relationship with project performance. The significance is 0.000 which indicates that there is positive relationship (0.490) between inclusivity principle and project performance. These results provide reasonable evidence to the consistent view that, there is improvement in yield and livelihood hence they improved project performance. The beta of inclusivity principle is 0.883 with a t-statistic of 8.341. The positive coefficients mean a unit change in inclusivity principle leads to a .490 units increase in project performance while keeping responsive principle and responsive principle in implementation constant and since the P- value = 0.000 < 0.05, the positive t-statistic value indicates that the effect is statistically significant at 5 % test level reject H₀ in favor of H₁ the alternative.

2.3.1.2 Effect of Materiality principle on performance of Food for the hungry project.

The results indicate that materiality principle has relationship with project performance. The significance is 0.000 which indicates that there is positive relationship (.324) between materiality principle and project performance. These results provide reasonable evidence to the consistent view that, there is improvement in yield and livelihood hence they improved project performance. The beta of materiality principle is .764 with a t-statistic of 5.291. The positive coefficients mean a unit change in materiality principle leads to a 0.324 units increase in project performance while keeping Inclusive principle and Responsive principle constant and since the P- value = 0.000 < 0.05 the positive t-statistic value indicates that the effect is statistically significant at 5 % test level. The effect of Stakeholders involvement in control on project success is statistically significant; reject H₀ in favor of H₁ the alternative

2.3.1.3 Effect of responsiveness principle on performance of Food for the hungry project

The results indicate that Responsive principle in implementation has a relationship with project performance. The significance is 0.000 which indicates that there is positive relationship (0.451) between responsive principle and project performance. These results provide reasonable evidence to the consistent view that, there is improvement in yield and livelihood

hence they improved project performance. The beta of Responsive principle is .856 with a t-statistic of 7.401. The positive coefficients mean a unit change in Inclusivity principle and Materiality principle in constant and since the P- value = 0.000 < 0.05 the positive t-statistic value indicates that the effect is statistically significant at 5 % test level. The effect of project performance on project performance is statistically significant; reject H₀ in favor of H₁ the alternative

2.4 Conclusion

In conclusion it can be stated that stakeholder engagement principles like inclusive principle, materialistic principles and responsive principle have significant relationship with project performance inform of improved yield and improved livelihoods. The regression equation established that taking all factors into account project performance comes as a result of stakeholder engagement principles in Hunger project, Table 4.17 gave the relationship between stakeholder engagement principles on project performance in Rwanda whereby the respondents N is 22 and the significant level is 0.01, the results indicate that independent variable has positive moderate correlation to dependent variable equal to .834** and the p-value is .000 which is less than 0.01. When p-value is less than significant level, therefore researchers conclude that variables are correlated and null hypothesis is rejected and remains with alternative hypothesis. This means that there is a moderate relationship between stakeholder engagement principles on project performance, this project management principles are important in effective and efficient management of community projects.

2.4 Recommendations

The researcher has identified the following recommendations in order to improve the performance of the projects: Project stakeholder should be transparent for effective project delivery, The level and extent of engagement will relate to the performance achievement levels, The engagement needs to be stakeholder focused and not organizational focused, For better results engagement should start early and run throughout the project execution.

REFERENCES

- [1] Babbie, E. (2009). Survey research methods (2nd ed.). Belmont: Wodsworth.
- [2] Baccarini, D. (1999). The logical framework method for defining project success. Project Management Journal, 30
- [3] Baker, N., Murphy, D. and Fisher, D. (1988). Factors affecting project success. In Cleland, D.I and King, W.R. (Eds), Handbook of Project Management, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, NY.
- [4] Baroudi, J.J., Olson, M.H. & Ives, B. (2006) An Empirical Study of the Impact of User
- [5] Involvement on System Usage and Information Satisfaction, Communications of the
- [6] ACM, 29(3), 232-243
- [7] Bond, A., A. Morrison-Saunders, J. A. E. Gunn, J. Pope, and F. Retief. 2015. Managing uncertainty, ambiguity and ignorance in impact assessment by embedding evolutionary resilience, participatory modelling and adaptive management. Journal of Environmental Management 151:97-104.
- [8] Carpenter, B.W. & M.W. Dirmsmith (1992). Early debt extinguishment transactions and auditor materiality judgments: A bounded rationality perspective. Accounting, Organizations and Society, 17(8), 709-739
- [9] Creswell, J.W. (2005). Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand

- [10] Oaks: CA Sage.
- [11] Cleland, D.I. (1999). *Project Management Strategic Design and Implementation*, (3rd ed), Mc Graw-Hill, Singapore
- [12] Cooper, SC (2004). *Corporate Social Performance: A Stakeholder Approach*. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- [13] Clarkson, B.E., Donaldson, T., Preston, L.E. and Brooks, L.J. (2000). Principles of Stakeholder Management. <http://www.rotman.utoronto.ca/~stake/Principles.htm> Accessed 7 November 2005.
- [14] Donaldson, T. and Preston, L. (2015). The stakeholder theory of the modern corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*
- [15] Drury-Grogan M.L. (2014). Performance on agile teams: Relating iteration objectives and critical decisions to project management success factors, *Information and Software Technology* 56 506–515
- [16] Edgley, C. (2013). A genealogy of accounting materiality. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 25(3), 255–271.
- [17] Eilifsen, A. & W.F. Messier Jr. (2015). Materiality guidance of the major public accounting firms. *Auditing*, 34 (2), 3-26
- [18] Frederick Ato Armah, David Oscar Yawson & Alkan Olsson Johanna, 'The Gap Between Theory and Practice of Stakeholder Participation: The Case of Management of The Korle Lagoon, Ghana', 5/1 Law, Environment and Development Journal (2009), p. 73, available at <http://www.lead-journal.org/content/09073.pdf>
- [19] Freeman, R.E., Harrison, J.S., Wicks, A.C., Parmar, B.L. & De Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder theory: the state of the art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [20] Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic management: a stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman
- [21] Greenley, Gordon E. and Gordon R. Foxall (1998), "External Moderation of Associations among Stakeholder International Federation of Accountants (IFAC), 2009. International Standard on Auditing 320 "Materiality in planning and performing an audit", Available on: <http://www.ifac.org>;
- [22] IASB (2010). *The conceptual framework for financial reporting*. IFRS Consolidated without early application. London, IFRS Foundation, IASB.
- [23] ISO 21500:2012(E). *Guidelines on project management*
- [24] Luk, Chung Leung, Oliver H. M. Yau, Alan C. B. Tse, Leo Y. M. Sin, and Raymond P. M. Chow (2005), "Stakeholder Orientation and Business Performance: The Case of Service Companies in China," *Journal of International Marketing*, 13 (1), 89-110
- [25] Mainardes, E.W., Alves, H. & Raposo, M. (2011). 'Stakeholder theory: issues to resolve',
- [26] *Management Decision*, 49(2), 226–252.
- [27] Markison, Lee Elizabeth, "A Dynamic Approach to Stakeholder Theory: A Case Study of Labor - Management Relations at General Motors" (2010). Honors Theses. 17.
- [28] Messier, W. 1983. The effect of experience and firm type on materiality/disclosure judgments. *Journal of Accounting Research* 21 (Autumn): 611-618
- [29] Mitchell, R.K., Agle, B.R. & Wood, D.J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review*, v 22, no 4, 853-886.
- [30] Mugenda M. Olive and Mugenda G. Abel (2013). *Research Methods: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Nairobi, Acts press.
- [31] Müller, R., Turner, R. (2007). The influence of project managers on project success criteria and project success by type of project. *Eur. Manag. J.* 25, 298–309.
- [32] Nyandika, O. F & Ngugi, K. (2014). Influence of Stakeholders' Participation on Performance of Road Projects At Kenya National Highways Authority. *European Journal of Business Management*, 1 (11), 384-404
- [33] Bassey, B., Dada, E., Adejompe, A. (2018). The Effects of Materiality Concept on Auditing Practices and Decision Making. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting* Vol.9, No.2, 2018
- [34] Oakley, P. (2013). *Projects with people: The practice of participation in rural development*.
- [35] Geneva: International Labour Office
- [36] Parmar, B.L., Freeman, R.E., Harrison, J.S., Wicks, A.C., Purnell, L. and de Colle, S. (2010),
- [37] "Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art", *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 403–445
- [38] Post, J., Preston, L., & Saschs, S. (2002). *Redefining the Corporation. Stakeholder Management and Organisational Wealth*. Stanford Business Books. California: Stanford University Press.
- [39] UNEG SO2: 2017. *Principles of Stakeholder Engagement; Use of Evaluation 2017*
- [40] Unerman, J. & Zappettini, F. (2014) Incorporating materiality considerations into analyses of absence from sustainability reporting. *Social and Environmental Accountability Journal* 34(3), 172–186.
- [41] Van Hemelrijck, A. and Guijt, I. (2014). *Balancing Inclusiveness, Rigour and Feasibility: Insights from Participatory Impact Evaluations in Ghana and Vietnam*.
- [42] Wasieleski, D. (2001). *Agenda-building theory: a stakeholder salience approach for determining agenda placement*. *The Journal of Behavioural and Applied Management*. Winter/Spring – v 2 (2), 113.

AUTHORS

First Author – Sitati Dawo, {joemajor@gmail.com} Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kigali, Rwanda.

Second Author – Joseph Mungatu, {j.mungatu@fsc.jkuat.ac.ke}, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kigali, Rwanda.