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Abstract

This study investigates the performance of the projects implemented by UP. The performance of the projects is assessed on the basis of satisfaction of the local people. The performances of the projects are influenced by some internal and external factors. The internal factors are: time, cost and scope. The external factor is patron-client relationship. These four factors are the independent variables of the study. The dependent variable is project success, which measured by satisfaction of the local people. It tries to correlate whether rightly implemented project in terms of time, cost, scope and other social factor can ensure satisfaction or not. This study maps the challenges of these four independent variables to understand these challenges have any impact on the satisfaction of the local people.

In this regard a mixed method with the combination of both quantitative and qualitative techniques has been developed. A questionnaire survey was conducted among 100 local people of two implemented projects in a union. The survey collected quantitative and qualitative data on the indicators of the dependent and independent variables of the study. In addition, qualitative data were collected from 12 KIIs through semi-structured interviews. The interviews have identified some problems of time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship.

The study is conducted in Gazirbhita union of Haluaghat upazila. Two projects, one successfully implemented and one challenged are selected for the study. This case study based study goes deep into the interest areas of the study to identify what worked in successful project and what did not in the changed project.

The triple constraints theory suggests that local people’s satisfaction of the projects depends on time management, cost management, scope management. It is assumed that patron-client relationship contributes in shaping satisfaction of the local people. It is further assumed that the quantitative data analysis will quantify the correlation between the dependent and the independent variables. Hence it will also shed some light on key areas of the study. In the qualitative data analysis the issues identified by the quantitative data analysis is further examined and validated.
The study was designed and the questions of the study are developed on the basis of triple constraint theory and policy implementation model by Van Meter and Van Horn (1975). It is assumed that fits into each other to explain the project implementation scenario in UP of Bangladesh.

It is found that the indicators of the independent variables have significant correlation with local people’ satisfaction. A total 21 of challenges of time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship have been identified which have shaped satisfaction of the local people. However, it is found that user’ satisfaction cannot be fully defined by these four variables. Project success in terms of local people’s satisfaction depends on some additional variables. Two identified in the study is service value provided by the project and participation in the project. Hence the study found that success in project management in terms of time, cost, scope, and patron-client relationship cannot ensure satisfaction of the users.
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Chapter-1
Introduction

1.1 Background of the study:
This chapter provides an introductory brief about the issues related to the study. These are the success of a project, the satisfaction of the local people, the contextual issues of UP, etc. The significance, objectives, scope, limitations of the study and a brief on the chapters in the study will be discussed as well.

Project is accepted as an instrumental method for development. Projects are implemented with some specific goals. So, definite targets can be achieved by projects. Likewise, projects can be instrumental in the development of socio-economical contexts of Bangladesh, for example, rural infrastructure, health, education, women empowerment, etc. Especially, for the rural areas, a large number of projects are implemented for infrastructural development. Lack of adequate infrastructure is a big barrier for the development of rural economy. Quality infrastructure is a valuable asset. Also, it contributes to the development of other socioeconomic contexts.

A project is defined in many ways in the literature. Here two of them are given: A project comprises of a group of people working for reaching some particular targets. Uniqueness, the huge size of the work, big cost and high risks characterize a project which is obtained within the limited time, money and showing some performances. In a nutshell, a project has certain goals and resources to reach the goal (Steiner 1969, p 498). Again, Cleland and Kerzner (1985, p 19) finds a project as a combined effort of human and other resources for certain purpose.

Whereas, a project, in brief, refers to attaining some specific goals, implementation of a project is a process where ‘project inputs are converted into outputs’. In other words,
project implementation refers to executing the activities of a project or what is proposed in the project document which Pinto and Slevin (1988) found complex for its need of simultaneous attention in ‘human, budgetary and technical areas’. However, an inadequacy of the study of human areas in comparison with budgetary and technical areas is observed.

In the case of Bangladesh public sector projects are implemented by agencies and Local Government Institutions (LGIs). In this study, project implementation by the lowest tier of local government, namely Union Parishad has been studied. Union Parishad is a village based LGI. Aminuzzaman (2013) observed that each Union Parishad, where 28,000 people, on an average live, is usually around 33.3 square kilometer in size. There are 4,554 UPs in Bangladesh, each of which is divided into nine wards composed of around 15 to 18 villages (Aminuzzaman 2013). The current Union Parishad system was introduced by the British Colony Rulers in 1885 and reformed by different rulers over the last century.

Article 47 of Local Government (Union Parishad) (Amendment) Act, 2010 of Bangladesh describes 4 key responsibilities of Union Parishad: administrative and establishment issues, public order, public welfare related services and planning and implementing for local socio-economic development.

LGIs in many Asian countries, such as Indonesia, Philippines and India are playing a vital role in socio-economic development. But empirical evidence shows that UP, the most important grassroots level LGI, cannot play an effective role in Bangladesh (Adhikari 2010, p7). Different political regimes, since Bangladesh got independence after a bloody war in 1971, ignored making local government system effective. They rather preferred to politicize this institution. Like UzP, UP remains weak due to inefficiency, lack of resources, political influences, and corruption.
In the case of Bangladesh, laws authorize all LGIs for collecting revenue from local resources in different ways. No concrete data of revenue collection is available. However, the usual sources of collecting revenue are as follows:

- Income from taxes, rates, tolls, fees and other charges
- Rents and profits from property
- Grants made by the government, donors
- Profits from investments [Article 53, Local Govt. (Union Parishad) Act, 2010 of Bangladesh]

So, locally generated resources are scant and to implement development activities at Union level the main source of funds for the local governments comes from the central government. Union Parishad body gets different types of funding like Test Relief (TR-Rural Infrastructure Development and Maintenance Program), Food For Work (FFW), block grants, Annual Development Program (ADP). The infrastructural development like renovation and development of graveyards, ponds, roads, educational institutions, religious institutions, clubs, sports ground; establishing solar plants in social, educational, religious institutions are implemented under these funding.

Each year government makes huge expenditure through these funds for rural infrastructure development. For example, in 2014-'15, 27,561 numbers of projects were implemented at the cost of 2,80,216.5435 metric ton crops and 6.267 numbers of projects were implemented at the cost of 220,26,15,999.45 taka under FFW (Food-For-Work) Program whereas, 1,12,063 numbers of projects were implemented at the cost of 2.27.722.6080 metric ton crops and 96,221 numbers of projects were implemented at the cost of 4,16,84,83,612 taka under TR (Test Relief) (GoB, 2015).

But these projects face big challenges while being implemented. For implementing projects properly an implementing agency demands support from both internal and external
environment. But unfortunately, in the case of UPs in Bangladesh, the challenges for implementing projects properly come from both environments. Internally, UP’s lack capacity and resources making it difficult for it to perform high tasks like project implementation (Adhikari 2010). Besides, some forces, mostly from political contexts exert influences on different activities, including project implementation of UP (Aminuzzaman 2014). These are likely to affect the satisfaction of the users (general people) of the projects.

1.2 Statement of the problem:
Satisfaction of the general people is the key objective of the government expenditure. Government spends huge money through LGIs for the rural development. The funds are allocated for serving different objectives of the government. Particularly, TR, FFW, block grants and ADP aim at improving infrastructural conditions as well as creating employment in the rural areas, increasing income of the rural people, striking a balance in food supply everywhere in the country and ensuring food security, making a positive impact on poverty reduction, meeting the power demand by using solar energy and power and improving life standard as a whole. But it is observed that satisfaction level of the general people at the grassroots level is low. This problem may have roots in the implementation process of the development activities.

In recent study on service delivery by LGIs in Bangladesh Bhattacharya et al (2014) observed that people are not satisfied with the services from LGIs. There is increasing demand on increasing their quality of services. In some cases even after having capacity for providing services, failed to provide quality service which dissatisfy local people. The condition of new LGIs is worse than old LGIs.

However, while implementing the developmental activities, a number challenges come up on the way to successful implementation. Empirical evidence shows that in many cases,
projects are not implemented but shown implemented only on papers. Besides, misappropriation of the funds happens where sometimes, project implementation bodies are also involved. These phenomenon present weakness of project management and may have some effects on the satisfaction of the local people. In this context, question arises whether the projects are successful or not.

How to gauge the success of a project is very difficult task. But Project Management Institute (PMI) identified that it is necessary to define and assess the success of project implementation in 1986 (Baccarini 1999, p. 25). In its simplest terms, accepted as one of the oldest concepts, project success takes root in four criteria. A project is successfully implemented if all the goals and objectives of it are completed within the allotted time, monetary resources ensuring client satisfaction (Pinto and Slevin 1987, Mbaluku & Bwisa, 2013). The first criteria, ie, goals and objectives are sometimes referred as performance, scope or quality (Dobson 2004). Time, cost and performance (scope) are traditionally known as ‘the triple constraints’. Atkinson (1999) has identified the triple constraints as the iron triangle based on the fact that changes in one of these three constraints are interlinked with another and is balanced through tradeoffs. Dobson (2004) has rightly observed that the triple constraints cannot be overlooked in project implementation and hence bound the universe of a project.

However, the real scenario of project implementation is pretty different. Delay and cost overrun cannot be overcome in most projects. For example, for infrastructure project Flyvbjerg et al. (2004) has observed cost overrun in as much as in ninety percent cases; 45 % in rail projects, 34% in fixed links (like bridges and tunnels) and 20% in road projects.

In this context, many scholars do not agree to define project success within triple constraints (De Wit 1988; Linberg 1999). Likewise, Turner (2009, p757) stipulates that besides the project constraints, stakeholder satisfaction should be considered as a
determining factor in project success. In this context, Mbaluku & Bwisa (2013) have included the idea of acceptance of the project by the local people, as a crucial factor, along with triple constraints. Atkinson (1999) finds benefits of the users as one of the criteria for an effective project. His study further observed that satisfaction of the end-users of a project to a great extent depends on the project product and its service quality.

So it is observed that the definition of project success has been dichotomized (Baccarini 1999; Cooke-Davies 2002). In the first perspective, which is the old one, the definition of the project success is based on the success of the management. Here success of a project is based on time, cost and scope. The second perspective, which is the new one, takes its root in the satisfaction of the end users of a project product. The current study accepts the latest definition of project success.

On the other hand, patron-client relationship largely supported by political influence also affects project success in the context of UP. Slevin and Pinto (1987) finds that determination of projects and contracts on political considerations affect project implementation. Ashley et al. (1987) identified sociopolitical environment as a critical determinant for project success. For example, Dang (2015) political interference interrupts socio-economic activities at grassroots level done by local government.

However, in the context of Bangladesh, impact of political influence on the satisfaction of the local people of the local government project has not been significantly studied. But studies on administrative culture, norms and practices show that political interference evolving from the sociopolitical context has taken a deep root in the society (Jamil et al. 2013; Jamil 2007). LGIs face an informal political influence from people actively involved in politics in Bangladesh. For the sake of own interest, local dominant stakeholders try to exert their political, social and economic influence over UP. This practice creates a big barrier towards the participation of other people (Samad, 2002). Mohammad (2010) opined that
interests of the local top political leaders alongside bureaucrats gets priority over other causes and is the most influential determining factor. Satisfaction of the local mass people does not influence in project selection, rather the interest of top political leaders in the locality shapes the whole system of project selection. ‘From time immemorial a politico-cultural factor i.e. patron-client relationship has engrained in the local community of Bangladesh’ (Mohammad 2010 p 27).

1.3 Objectives of the study:
Rural infrastructure development is one the thrust sectors of development in Bangladesh. The government makes huge expenditure each year through allocating funds in different channels, like ADP, block grants, EGPP, TR, and FFW, etc. The objectives of the study are

- To investigate the satisfaction level of the local people about the projects
- To investigate how funds for implementing projects by UP are allocated
- To understand the local sociopolitical dynamics in project implementation at UP level
- To understand the interplay between National Government and Union Parishad in project implementation
- To investigate the capacity of UP in implementing projects

1.4 Research questions:
The key research questions are:

1. What are the challenges of implementing projects successfully by Union Parishad?
2. Do these challenges affect the satisfaction of the local people?

Other related questions are:

1. Does patron-client relationship influence project implementation?
2. Are these challenges related to the capacity of Union Parishad and PIC/WC?
3. Are these challenges related to procedural factors?
4. Does project management success ensure local people’s satisfaction?
1.5 Scope of the study:
There is a gap of research dealing with project implementation issues, particularly on the satisfaction of the people at local government level in Bangladesh. For the study, a union has been selected randomly out of 4554 Unions. The scope of the research is identifying the problems and challenges of successful project implementation in terms of time management, cost management and scope management and patron-client relationship. Furthermore, how these problems and challenges affect local people’ satisfaction will be found out. As defining a project success and failure is a very difficult success, the scope of the study will be served by studying two projects in a Union Parishad. For making a comparative picture, case studies of a successful and an unsuccessful or challenging project will be performed. The logic of taking two projects is to go in depth of the scenario in that specific Union Parishad.

1.6 Rationale of the study:
Rural infrastructure development is one the thrust areas of development in Bangladesh. But unlike Local Government Institutions (LGIs) in many Asian Countries, such as Indonesia, Philippines and India Union Parishad, the oldest and the most important grassroots level LGI cannot play an effective role in Bangladesh (Adhikari 2010, p7). There is debate over the implementation of the projects properly for ensuring satisfaction of the local people and hence the effectiveness of public expenditure under ADP, block grants, TR and FFW. Previous studies have unfolded the administrative culture and values of Bangladesh. But within the framework of these factors, no study so far is visible investigating project implementation challenges in the context of Bangladesh. Challenges for satisfying the users of the local government project and the nature and ground of these challenges are yet to be understood here.
The rationale of the research is that studies have been conducted to understand administrative culture and values in Bangladesh. But very few researches on the factors working for successful implementation of these projects, especially on satisfaction of the local people is visible.

1.7 Methodological overview: A mixed approach will be followed. Both qualitative and quantitative methods will be followed using primary and secondary data. Quantitative data on the perception of the local people will be used to find out the aspect of challenges of the project in the contexts of time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship. Then qualitative data analysis method will be used to discover the challenges from those aspects. The independent variables are: time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship. The dependent variable of the study is project success which will be indicated by local people’s satisfaction.

A questionnaire survey will be conducted among 100 users of a union. Perceptions of the local people on time, cost and scope, patron-cent relationship and their satisfaction in the project will be collected during the questionnaire survey. Besides, the questionnaire survey will collect qualitative data regarding perceptions of the local people on the indicators. Qualitative data on them will be collected from open-ended interviews KIIs like representatives of UP, members of PIC or WC, UNO, PIO, officials at concerned ministries. For secondary data books, research articles, project documents, etc. will be studied. SPSS will be used for data analysis.

1.8 Limitation:
Data collection from the rural areas is a difficult task. To give the study a success, utmost attempts were taken. Even after that, the study has some limitations.

1. Local people’s perception can be biased by persona choice and affiliation.
2. Key Informant Interviewee may provide twisted data against another interviewee due to clashes of interest.

3. Perception of a project may be influenced by the overall experience of service delivery by the UP. In that case, individual project based perception may be missed.

4. No document of patron-client relationship is available. The study relied on questionnaire survey and KII to get data on the patron-client relationship.

1.9 Chapter Outline

Seven chapters make up the structure of this thesis. The First Chapter outlines the problem statement and background of the thesis. It goes further detail of the problem of the thesis through proposing research questions, objectives, rationale, scope and limitations of the study. The theoretical and analytical framework, which is the foundation of the thesis, is presented in the Chapter Two. It studies relevant literature that discusses the concepts of project implementation challenges and provides the framework, which has been used for the study. It also discusses on dependent and independent variables with making them operational. Theoretical and analytical frameworks are developed on the basis literature review and the dependent and independent variables. Chapter Three contains the methodology followed to pursue the study. It discusses the methods and techniques applied for data collection and analysis. Chapter Four presents an overview of resource mobilization at Union Parishad. Chapter five presents the findings from the field study and its analysis on project implementation. Chapter Six broadly assesses project implementation. Finally, Chapter Seven gives concluding remarks about the study.

1.10 Summary:

Project is a widely practiced system for development. LGIs are incrementally getting importance and support for implementing development activities. In the recent years, UPs are entrusted with the duty of planning and executing the development activities at the grassroots level. Central government provides financial support to UP through different
programs ie TR (Test Relief), FFW (Food-For-Work Program), block grants and ADP (Annual Development Program). However, while implementing the developmental activities, a number challenges come up on the way to successful implementation. These changes affect the satisfaction of the local people, who are the targets of the projects.

A huge expenditure is made every year in the public sector for implementing projects. However, the state of affairs of implementation of the projects in terms of satisfaction of the local people in Bangladesh is rarely studied. A large volume of studies is available dissecting administrative culture and values in Bangladesh. The lenses in most of these studies broadly how up under the umbrella of public administration. However, studies of the project implementation challenges with the lens of local people’s satisfaction are scarce. This study attempts to investigate the challenges of UP project implementation and the nature and ground of them from the perspective of satisfaction of the users. In line with this, two recently implemented projects of a union have been studied here.

In the next chapter existing literature on project implementation reviewed to identify the variables of the study. It’ll also discuss the theoretical and analytical framework of the study. The variables and the indicators of the research will also be discussed.
Chapter-2

Literature Review and Theoretical and Analytical Framework

This chapter is split into two broad parts. In the first part, a review of relevant literatures has been done. The second part covers theoretical and analytical framework, operational definition of variables and indicators of the variables.

2.1 Literature review:

According to Sekeran (2003, p 63) literature review actively contributes in choosing the key variable of a problem. The following literature review ensures that no important aspects of project management are overlooked those could be important for the satisfaction of the local people in the projects implemented by Union Parishad.

Literature shows that project success is a very complex issue and it depends on numbers of variables making it unmanageable in real project world. The literature review attempts to reduce the number of these variables to the minimum. Through reviewing the literature the independent variables, likely, scope, time, cost and the patron client relationship in project implementation are attempted to be justified.

2.1.1 Definitional aspects of project implementation

What is a project? This question is addressed in many ways in literature. Maylor (2010, p. 4) has presented a very simple definition of project: ‘a project is a task that has a beginning and an end’. Maylor (2010) identified some characteristics inherently carried by a project. A project is supposed to be finished in the limited time which is divided into small timeframes for individual works under the project. Besides, a project aims at some target which is its objectives (Maylor, 2010). Since this thesis focuses on challenges on project implementation it does not go through the plethora of definitions of project found in the literature. Rather, the issues of project
success or failure in implementing project are discussed in the following paragraphs of literature review.

However, defining project success is not easy task as different stakeholders define success in different ways. In this context the example of Freeman and Beale (1992, p. 8) on difference in views on project success may be mentioned: ‘An architect may consider success in terms of aesthetic appearance, an engineer in terms of technical competence, an accountant in terms of dollars spent under cost, a human resource manager in terms of employee satisfaction, and chief executive officers rate their success in the stock market.’

Whereas a project, in brief, refers to attaining some specific goals, implementation of project refers to a process where ‘project inputs are converted into outputs’. In other words, project implementation refers to executing the activities of a project or what is proposed in the project document (Franco 2010, pp 85-87). Pinto and Slevin (1988) observed that a lot of variables under three main categories like human, budgetary and technical affairs should be taken care of during project implementation. Pinto and Slevin in their earlier work have identified four basic elements of successful project implementation: A project may be recognized as successfully implemented if it completes within the due time and allotted cost, reaches the targets mentioned in the project documents and is accepted and used by the clients. Apparently, this definition precisely covers the core issues of project implementation. It takes into account the variables that encompass both the internal and external environment of a project. For this reason, this definition is used as the benchmark for success of projects under the thesis.

However, empirical evidence of project implementation presents a different scenario where delay and cost overrun are regular happenings in implementation. On this issue, what Sterman (1992) observed is that time and cost overrun happen in almost all sorts of projects. However, the most interesting thing Sterman (1992) found that surpassing the time schedule and the cost
is taken as granted rather than exception in these projects. This is reflected in other findings as well. Only 40% of project on change management of IBM. (IBM 2008) was finished in time and cost while achieving the goals. Flyvbjerg & Budzier (2011) conducted their study on 1,471 IT projects where it was revealed that about one in six projects heavily suffered from cost overrun and time overrun.

Likewise, Standish Group, a market-based research organization on IT projects, in 2012 found that more than 60% of the projects were either challenged due to time and cost overrun and implementing less features or failed, i.e., not implemented (Standish Group, 2013).

A research on infrastructure projects Flyvbjerg et al. (2004) observed cost escalation in 90% projects. In the same vein, Price Waterhouse Coopers (2012) in their projects in 38 countries found that 86% of projects could not maintain cost, time, scope, quality and benefits framework. However, rate of failure in maintaining these four frameworks is not homogenous. More than 60% of the project failed to deliver against their cost and schedule and less than 10% failed to deliver on their quality and scope against each criterion.

However, the weakness of these empirical studies is that these literatures cover the scenario of mostly developed countries. Information on Bangladesh about project success ratio is not available in literature. Studies covering project management is very limited. Ahmed (2010) observed cost and time overrun in 81% projects under ADP. In few projects cost overrun was more than 300% (p 22). He also observed that political commitment, influence and pressure play the most dominant role in implementing ADP.

Barriers in ADP project implementation observed in the study include ‘delay in procurement’, ‘lack of skill and technical knowledge of PD / DPD’, procedural complexities, slow project approval process, shortage of funds and manpower, flaws in project design (mainly in
construction projects) and project document, poor knowledge on procurement rules, inefficient contractors, lack of coordination among different agencies, etc (Ahmed 2010, pp 26-28).

2.1.2 Classifications of project ending:
A significant number of literature kept their scope fixed around the factors which make a project successful or not (Shenhar et al. 2002, p. 111), But the classification of the projects on the basis of ending (whether it is successful or not) is not available in the academic world. However, the Standish Group, who prepares Chaos report on project success since 1993 has classified projects into three resolution types:

‘i. Resolution Type 1 (project success): The project is completed on-time, on-cost, fulfilled all functions and features as specified.
ii. Resolution Type 2 (project challenged): The project is completed and operational but over-cost, over the time estimate, and offers fewer functions and features than originally specified.
iii. Resolution Type 3 (project impaired): The project is canceled at some point during the development cycle’ (Clancy 1995, p2).

2.1.3 Project success:
Baccarini (1999, p 2) (Also, Cooke-Davies 2002) stipulates that the notion of project success is split into two unrelated components: ‘project management success’ and ‘project product success’.

‘Project management success’ looks into the management activities of project. ‘Cost, time and quality objectives’ are key focus variables for determining success in project management (Baccarini 1999, p 2). To Pinkerton (2003, p. 337) these three variables indicate the degree of the ‘efficiency of project execution’.

However, for public sector projects satisfaction of the people is a big concern for the projects. Besides, the theorist recently shifted their focus from efficiency oriented project success to
local people’s satisfaction oriented project success. These scholars find that time, cost and specifications are not sufficient to measure project management. They find triple variable dependent project management as a narrow concept. They propose an extension of traditional triangle subsuming some other variables like quality of the management process, stakeholders’ satisfaction, etc. may provide a better view of project management success (Baccarini 1999; Kerzner 2013; Jiang et al 2002).

Shenhar et al (1997) observed that satisfaction of the users is the first criteria for project success. According to Kerzner (2001, p. 6) the definition of project success should include the idea of project acceptance by the target people of the project. Likewise, De Wit (1988) and Turner (2009) found the satisfaction of the users give the true success of project. Mbaluku & Bwisa (2013) in their definition of successful project implementation have included the idea of acceptance of the project by the users. Lang (2012) considers the users are the ultimate judge of what constitutes quality and which features are necessary.

Furthermore, managers of projects of international engineering company, CH2M Hill (2001) find satisfaction of the local people’s is the most important criterion for project success for many organizations. The managers observe that the users are not concerned about going beyond time and cost in project implementation, rather they are more interested about whether project will be any benefit for them.

Pinkerton (2003) stipulates: ‘If the venture is not a success, neither is the project’ (p. 344). Instead of having linkage between them, there rarely exists any cause and effect relationship. For example, even a project may not reach its cost, time or scope targets, it can still be a successful one. A cost or time overrun project, seemingly an example of project management, can still be accepted and used by the users (Pinkerton 2003, p. 338). Therefore dimensions user/customer satisfaction (Jiang et al 2002 p. 18) must be an indicator of the definition of project success.
According to Kerzner (2001, p. 6) the definition of project success should include the idea of project acceptance by the target people of the project like customer, client or user. Mbaluku & Bwisa (2013) in their definition of successful project implementation have included the idea of acceptance of the project by the users. Lang (2012) considers the users are the ultimate judge of what constitutes quality and which features are necessary.

Regarding satisfaction the literature have provided some idea of its definition. Satisfaction measures the level of happiness of the stakeholders (Chan et al, 2002). Customer satisfaction addresses their needs, requirements and expectations. It is also indicative of the quality of the product (Dobson and Feickert 2007). Torbica and Stroh (2001) observe that if projects need to satisfy the end users it will be appreciated, anyway, as successful at the end of the day. Likewise, Takima and Adnan (2008) find satisfactions for clients and end-users critically influence project success.

The review of literature shows that the satisfaction of the users of the project is the most important indicator of measuring project success by the scientist in the recent time. Besides, for public sector projects satisfaction of the users is the most important factor. Because, government provides funds for development activities in order satisfy people. In line with findings from literature review, this research adopts local people's satisfaction as the indicator of project success (dependent variable of the study).

2.1.4 Triple constraints:
Oisen (1971) introduced the idea of triple constraints time, cost and performance. These constraints create a triangle. In this way, it bounds the universe of project where the targets of these three variables must be reached (Dobson 2004). The triangle of triple constraints implies that there exists a balance among the three variables, sitting at three corners of a triangle, affecting successful project implementation (Wayngaad et al. 2012). The relationship among
these variables is such that if any one of the three constraints changes, at least one other parameter is likely to be affected (Anastasios 2007).

Likewise, Project Management Institute (PMI), the global leading professional organization in project management field includes the triple constraints (time, cost, scope) alongside quality in the definition of successful project (PMI (2008). Scope, in a nutshell, refers to the deliverables with the specified features and functions (Newton 2015). However, for the same reason of mutual trade-off, Atkinson (1999) considers criteria of time, cost and quality as an ‘iron triangle’. However, Dobson (2004) has found that triple constraints have variations and dimensions. For example, the idea of scope or quality is interchangeable with performance.

There are some other features of internal dynamics among the three variables. Dobson (2004) observed that for each and every project is unique in terms of constraints created by triple constraints. These three constraints are not equally constraining. For example, for a cost constraint project, costs may push it to be completed with the stipulated time and pressure for finishing within the stipulated time may affect performance (Dobson & Feickert, 2007, p 5).

Likewise, Turner (2009) observed that there exists in a hierarchy of ‘driver, ‘middle’ and weak’ constraint where the driver variable is (slightly) more important than the rest. The driver constraint will, for a large part, determine the success of a project. Other constraints may change to meet the accomplishment of the driven constraint. An example of a project where time is the driven constraint is an Olympic stadium, the project has to be finished before the game starts even if that means that more cost has to be made, quality is less or the scope is simplified (Turner 2009 ). The weak constraint is much more flexible than ‘driver’ and ‘middle’ variables and if maneuvered creatively can be instrumental in maintaining the driver variable (Dobson 2004).
In further analysis, De Wit (1988) suggested for a clear understanding of project manager about the most important (driver) variable. But reality shows that most important variable varies for different activities and stages of project implementation. For example, at the early stage scheduling is the key and cost gets more important in the later part of project cycle. In implementation phase quality (scope) gets higher priority than the other two (De Wit 1988).

Literature review finds triple constraints very basic criteria for successful project implementation. It is a widely used and well-cited model in its case. That is why, the thesis works on finding out challenges of successful projects implemented by Union Parishad in Bangladesh in the perspective of these three variables, along with variable of patron-client relationship discussed later.

2.1.5. Patron-client relationship in rural context of Bangladesh:
Patron client relationship is traditionally found in agrarian societies. In literature this term is used with a negative connotation indicating an overall backwardness of the society (Hopkin 2006). This relationship is closely intertwined with some other undesired practices like ‘corruption, nepotism, and favoritism’ (Sargin 2001). Some other negative impacts Wood (2000, p. 222) observed including ‘rent-seeking, cronyism, arbitrariness, and secrecy’. In one of the early work on this relationship, Scott (1972) observed it Southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa and some countries in Europe. (It is interesting to see South Asia is absent in Scott’s finding). However, it is also traced in the developed countries reflected in lots of studies on ‘pork-barrel’ and ‘special interest’ politics (Hopkin 2006). In an extended scenario, international politics is also largely influenced with this relationship.

The patron client relationship in the South Asian countries has been portrayed in different studies. Jamil et al (2013, p 21) observed that the hierarchical and paternalistic social values in South Asian region have taken its deep root in the administrative culture reflected in patron client relationship in bureaucracy. They also observed that this predominant informal practice
of service delivery have created vacuum of professionalism in public sector. In a separate research Jamil (2007) observed existence of informal groups formed on the basis of unconditional loyalty and patron client relationship from which officials at lower and higher rank in the group are mutually benefited.

Like other South Asian countries, Bangladesh has political elites who are the major patrons in the society. The political parties foster a patron client relationship to continue their dominance in the society. Aminuzzaman (2008; cited in Aminuzzaman 2014) observed that political elites nourish young generation to create a power base.

This is reflected in other findings as well. For example, Ahmed and Sharifuddin (1983, p 198, cited in Chowdhury 2009) observed political parties are powerful element in village social structure, where Union Parishad works as the center of party politics. Villagers can get access to local power system through active participation in political parties. Chowdhury (2009, p 281) found that due to dominance in patron client relationship UP as a body does not contribute to people’s empowerment, rather local elites who become UP representatives give favor beyond rules and regulations to their clients. In this way, the decentralization has spread out corruption to the grassroots level adversely affecting people’s participation in local government (Khan 2004).

Chowdhury (2009, p 272) has identified some characteristics of patrons in rural Bangladesh. These are: i) patrons own vast land, ii) they are well connected with local bureaucracy, iii) they have direct or indirect involvement with local political parties, iv) they are backed by their clients and v) they are professionals, including local bureaucrats, UP chairmen, members, NGO personnel etc (Chowdhury (2009, p 274). Additionally, Jansen (1983) observed that patrons in a locality face scarcity of resources and try to get control over it, for example, land of a poor farmer, government resources like credit, agricultural inputs, tube wells etc. When confrontational situation among local patrons over the distribution of these resources arises,
clients rally in favour of their patrons that may push the lives of clients at stake. On the other hand, clients are basically village farmers (Chwodhury 2009, p 272). Jahangir (1979, p 242) identifies that patron considers himself as a *murubbi* (senior who is entitled to lead) and never admits that he exploits his clients.

In search of the impact of the patron client relationship on project implementation, it is observed that project management literatures do not address the issue of political influence or patron client relationship properly. On this issue the focus of the literature seems to be limited to pointing the finger to the of issue political influence as a barrier to successful project implementation. Project management literatures do not go further deep down to investigate the dynamics in the real world. But empirical evidences show that it can thwart project success, especially in the developing countries. Probably, it is left for social scientists as a social issue. However, literature on patron client relation is limited to anthropological context.

### 2.1.6 Empirical evidence of time, cost, scope and patron-client relationship on local people’s satisfaction:

Empirical evidence shows that time, cost and scope affect local people’s satisfaction (Shenhar et al. 1997). For example, Thomson (2011) observed satisfaction of the users is shaped by these three variables in a study on UK health services. However, he observed that ‘time, cost and scope management’ and the satisfaction of the users are not fully inter-related. Likewise, Zwikael and Globerson (2006) observed a linear correlation between triple constraints of a project and the satisfaction of the users.

In addition, delay in service delivery negatively affects the satisfaction of the users (Clemmer and Schneider 1989: and Katz, Larson and Larson 1991). Delay creates uncertainty and anxiety about the services (Maister 1985) and anger (Sawrey and Telford 1971).
On the other hand, empirical evidence shows that changes in budget negatively affect satisfaction of the users as the users believe that cost reduction reduces the scope of the project (Nibyiza et al 2015).

It has been found that patron-client relationship create feelings of deprivation and exclusion among the users of service (Sekeris 2010). Chowdhury (2009) in a study on social forestry policy in Bangladesh observed that patron-client relationship restricts the participation of the local beneficiaries of the policy.

2.1.7 Summary of literature review:
A huge debate and discourse go in the existing literature of project management on the concept of defining project success. Debates on this idea exist not only in the academia but also in the arena of the practitioners. However, Pinto and Slevin (1988) provide widely recognized criteria for a successful project, where the core issues of the project implementation are taken into account. In their definition, they incorporated conditions of ending project in due time and cost, achieving the target of the project and finally acceptance of the project by the clients.
However, Baccarini (1999) and later, Cooke-Davies (2002) indentified that the concept of project success presents dichotomy, where the components are independent: ‘project management success’ and ‘project product success’. In project management success the key variables are cost, time and quality of the work (Baccarini 1999). Pinkerton (2003) finds these variables refer to ‘efficiency of the project execution.’ On the other hand, ‘project product success’ refers to values created by the project products to the end users. In this connection satisfaction of the users becomes the key variable of defining project success. Recent theorist show more on satisfaction of the users in defining project success (see Anastasisos 2007; Kerzner 2013; Jiang et al 2002).

Reasons of choice for new definition of project success are identified in other studies. Pinkerton 2003; CH2M Hill 2001 observed that a cost and time overrun project can still turn
into a successful project through achieving acceptance and satisfaction of the users. Furthermore, Jiang et al (2002) mentioned user satisfaction as an unavoidable variable for project success. Users belong to the external environment of a project. But literature shows that their satisfaction significantly matters in project success.

Empirical studies conducted recently show that triple constraints have effects on users satisfaction of the projects (Zwikael and Globerson 2006; Thomson 2011; Nibyiza et al 2015).

However, taken into account the socio-political context of Bangladesh, project implementing bodies face huge influence and challenges from the external environment. In particular, political institutes exert the strongest influence on the implementing bodies. Jamil et al (2013) observed paternalistic settings in the social systems have inserted patron-client relationship in administrative practices in the South Asian countries. Ahmed and Sharifuddin (1983) observed that political parties are the central bodies in power practices in the village level. They also observed a role of party office of the political parties of Union Parishad. In a recent study by Chowdhury (2009), the scenario of patron-client relationship at the UP has not improved after the study of Ahmed and Sharifuddin (1983).

Effect of patron-client relationship on local people’s satisfaction of a project is observed in empirical evidences. Sekeris (2010) found that patron-client relationship create feelings of deprivation and exclusion among the local people’s of projects. Likewise, Chowdhury (2009) observed that patron-client relationship restricts the participation of the local beneficiaries of the forest policy in Bangladesh. However, a scarcity dealing patron-client relationship in project management has been felt during the study.
2.2. Theoretical and analytical framework

2.2.1. Selection of variables:

*Independent variables (Time, cost, scope and patron-client relationship):* At local level projects are mostly implemented by public sector organizations. Recently, LGIs have started implementing projects with their own capacity by using funds from central government. Observations show that even after gaining substantial institutional knowledge, public sector projects in Bangladesh suffer from delay, cost overrun, frequent change in work specification. This reflects a weak capacity of managing projects by public sector organization incurring a huge loss on government. But these three variables are at the core assessing project success measure. It reflects the capacity of implementing organization. In this context, how LGIs are doing in keeping time, cost and scope in project implementation could be an interesting study.

Project management literature lacks a depth on studying patron-client relationship. As powerful people in rural areas are involved with patron client relationship, it is likely to insert some influence in project implement. Empirical evidences show that it can thwart project success, especially in the developing countries.

The four independent variables used in the study have different context of challenges. The challenge of time management is related with maintaining the schedule of different activities of a project. The challenge of cost management is related to getting the resources and proper utilization of them. The challenge of scope management is implementing the works with quality. Finally, patron-client relation itself is a problem for a project. It trespasses into the management of the project and reshapes the management.

*Dependent variable (Project success):* Public sector projects are meant for the benefits of public. Government spends lots of money every year for implementing different projects for socio-economic development in rural areas. These are spent from public money. So satisfaction of the users should the key indicator in defining project success. Furthermore, De Wit (1988) and
Turner (2009) in separate studies observed that benefit and satisfaction of the users are the most crucial element for project success. Shenhar et al (1997) observed that satisfaction of the users is the top ranking criterion project success.

2.2.2 Theoretical framework:
A theoretical framework represents a conceptual model where the factors are logically integrated with problem stated (Sekaran 2003). In brief it puts together the concepts derived from literature review to create a total idea of the problem.

Also, a practice of patron client relationship, predominantly practiced in local areas may affect development activities at the grassroots. As patron client relationship is the practice of powerful people here, it restricts the participation of the general people in the local development process. Narrow opportunity of participation may affect the satisfaction of the local people.

Triple constraints theory:
The triple constraints constitute the basic element in planning and monitoring and controlling process groups in project implementation (Dobson and Feickert 2007). Project time addresses the scheduling and duration of the project, cost addresses the cost and resources of the project, and scope addresses the requirements and work of the project (Wayngaard et al. 2012, p 1991).

The key idea of triple constraints theory is that time, cost and scope variables form the triple constraint in the shape of a triangle. In this way, the triangle bounds the universe of project where the targets of these three variables must be reached (Dobson 2004).
Studying on public sector projects in UK Thomson (2011) found that time, cost and scope management show some effect on local people’s satisfaction with an observation that ‘time, cost and scope management’ and the satisfaction of the users are partially independent.

Likewise, Shenhar et al. (1997) found that time, cost and scope management has an impact on the satisfaction of the users. Zwikael and Globerson (2006) collected data from 280 projects. They found a linear correlation between management of three constraints of a project and the satisfaction of the users (value of R^2 is .37 with p<0.001).

Consultation of existing literature suggests that the relationship between project efficiency (in terms time, cost and scope management) and project success (in terms of satisfaction of the users) are not studied much on empirical evidence. This study attempts to add value to this relationship in the context of challenges lied in project management. It wants to assess the perception of the users in regards with the challenges entangling the projects.

Empirical studies show that delay in service delivery has a negative impact on the satisfaction level of the users (Clemmer and Schneider 1989: and Katz, Larson and Larson 1991). Delay creates doubt and anxiety about the services (Maister 1985) and anger (Sawrey and Telford 1971).

Changes in budget and scope go hand in hand while shaping the satisfaction of the users. Nibyiza et al (2015) in their research in Akazi Kanoze, Rwanda for 2011 to 2014 studied perception of the users regarding scope management. The perceptions of the users of the projects suggest that lowering cost produces an uncertainty about quality of service from the project. The users in the assumed that service that the implementing agency uses less quality raw materials in a project if cost is lowered down.
Policy implementation model:

Police implementation is a complicated process (Cerna 2013). It depends on many factors, which vary with contexts like culture, institutional settings, etc. Some of these factors come from inside and some from outsides.

The issue of policy implementation was first coined by Pressman and Wildavski (1973). But still the theory fails to reach a concrete shape. O’Toole (1986) observed around 300 variables that could possibly influence implementation. In the implementation process of projects UP as an implementing agency delivers the service in the form finishing the works under the project. In this context this study will take its roots in policy implementation process (project as a policy instrument) and the role and activities of UP as an institution.

Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) have proposed a model of policy implementation process. The independent variables of this model are: Standards and objectives; resources; inter-organizational communication and enforcement activities; characteristics of the implementing agency; economic, social, and political condition; and disposition of the implementers. The dependent variable of the model is performance. The variables of the policy implementation model are contextualized for the current studies as follows:

**Standards and objectives:** It refers to goals and objectives of a project.

**Resources:** Resources refer to funds allocated from the central government to UP for implementing a specific project.

**Inter-organizational communication and enforcement activities:** UP works under supervision of UzP. There are separate PICs/WCs for each project. They work under supervision of UP. There are legal frameworks on how these institutions will interact with each other for the implementation of a project.

**Characteristics of the implementing agency:** It refers to capability of UP and its relation with UzP and PIC/WC. Participation of different stakeholders is key element of this variable.
**Economic, social, and political condition:** This variable refers to the influence of different actors on project implementation. External influence exerted on the projects is the key interest of this variable in the study.

**Disposition of the implementers:** It refers to knowledge, skill of UP and PIC/WC. The attitudes of the individuals involved in the implementation towards the project are area of interest of this variable.

**Performance:** Rendering service that is implementation of the project.

However, the exclusive support that this study takes from policy implementation model is the economic, social and political condition of the project. In the context of UP this is very powerful factor. Project implemented by UP face influences from local powerful and elite people. They try to influence service delivery system on favor of them. This study adopts the variable patron-client relationship and its indicator ‘influence of local powerful and elite people on the project’ from the policy implementation model.

Patron-client relationship may affect local people’s satisfaction through creating different feeling, including feeling of deprivation and exclusion, among them. Sekeris (2010) observed that the role of patron-client relationship in the distributive process could affect transparency. Chowdhury (2009) in a study on social forestry policy in Bangladesh observed that patron-client relationship restricts the participation of the local beneficiaries of the policy.

**Narratives on the choice of theories:**

Triple constant theory is a basic theory of project management. It has foundation on three variables: time, cost and scope. Empirical studies have revealed that time, cost and scope has correlation with the satisfaction of the users (Zwikael and Globerson 2006; Shenhar et al. 1997). The negative influences of time, cost and scope change on satisfaction are also studied (Maister 1985; Sawrey and Telford 1971; Nibyiza et al 2015).
However, this theory does not address the variable patron-client relationship, which is very crucial in the settings where UP implements the project. Besides, the theory does not include the intricacies, for example, external influence, communications between agencies involved, participation of the stakeholders, knowledge and skill of the individuals involved in the implementation process as determining factor.

To fill this theoretical gap the study further adopts policy implementation model by Van Horn and van Meter (1975). This model provides some additional theoretical construct that has strengthened the theoretical foundation of the study. The independent variable patron-client relationship and its indicator ‘influence of local powerful and elite people on the project’ are exclusively adopted from this model. The model is instrumental to explain the intricacies and challenges in the implementation process. In this way policy implementation model provides additional support to construct the analytical framework of the study.

However, policy implementation model lacks an understanding on whether there is any correlation between the six independent variables of policy implementation model and the project success in terms of local people’s satisfaction. The dependent variable of policy implementation model (that is performance) does not encompass project success in terms of local people’s satisfaction.

2.2.3 Analytical framework:
The analytical framework of the study is given in the figure-1. The variable and their indicators are as follows.

**Dependent variable:**
Project success:

*Indicator:* Local people’s satisfaction

**Independent variables:**

1. Time:
**Indicator**: Implementation of works within the specified timeframe

2. **Cost**:
   - **Indicators**: a. Up’s capability in managing resources
     - b. PIC’s/WC’s capability to implementing project utilizing the resources
     - c. Transparency

3. **Scope**:
   - **Indicators**: a. Complete implementation of the works
     - b. Quality of the implemented works

4. **Patron-client relationship**:
   - **Indicator**: Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects

---

**Figure-1**: Analytical framework of the study.
2.2.4 Operational definition of the variables:

**Project scope management:**
For the scope criterion the thesis looks into the deliverables under the project. Project scope is described in project documents. It usually includes a description of the business needs that the project results are intended to address and a description of the expected results. The scope criterion is not actually measurable. It is all about changes control and management (Anastasios, 2007, p 31)

This study analyzes the project documents and does a questionnaire survey to 100 local people and open ended interview of UP representatives, members of Project Implementation Committee (PIC), Ward Committee (WC) and UNO and other related government officials study scope..

**Project time management:** For the time criterion the thesis focuses on project schedule. A project schedule captures the planned dates for activities and milestones.

**Project cost management:** For the cost criterion the thesis focuses on a project’s cost. Cost criterion is easily measured since most projects have a set cost that need to be hold (Bardh, Bokedal & Stensson 2011). Cost management here refers to the exact use of the funds as per given in project document with no poor management of financial resources, misallocation and misappropriation occurred in project.

**Patron client relationship:** This is reflected through influence of local elite and powerful people over UP body and PIC/WC for protecting unlawful interest of them or others and giving access to financial resources owned by a project for winning support and loyalty in return. This disturbs the regular activities of project implementation.
Project success: Project success is measured in terms of overall satisfaction of the local people about the projects.

2.2.5 Summary: This chapter has presented a snappy detail on the literature on project implementation. It has discussed the choice of theories and analytical framework. The variables and their indicators were identified and operationalyzed here. In the next chapter methodologies adopted in the study is discussed.
Chapter-3
Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction:
This chapter gives an idea on the methodology used in the study. Techniques used in collecting data from field and analysis of the data for finding the challenges of implementing projects by UP are discussed here.

3.2 Prelude: Literature review shows that the whole research field of public sector project implementation in Bangladesh has rarely been studied by academics. Public sector projects are usually implemented by line departments of different ministries. However, UPs are recently empowered to implement small projects with funds from government. So, this study attempts to shed some light on a huge grey area with tremendous untapped potentialities. The thesis starts with finding the key factors in global perspective in project implementation. These factors were identified with theoretical perspectives alongside empirical evidences. Later five factors have been identified that fit best in socio-political context of UPs of Bangladesh. In the study the challenges faced by Union Parishad are identified in the context of these factors. For this purpose an in-depth research was conducted. Interviews of Key Informants of project implementation at Union Parishad level were taken. Besides, a questionnaire survey was conducted among the local people about the projects to know their perception about the projects.

3.3 Research Methods
A combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods has been used in the study. For quantitative data a questionnaire survey was conducted among 100 people, who are beneficiaries of the projects in the union. There are follow up questions for each Likert questions to have qualitative data on the perception of the local people. Besides, KIIls were conducted for qualitative data. Two projects have been selected through consulting
projects documents. A comparative study of the two projects has been done in this study to identify the challenges that UP faces while implementing projects. Table 3.1 contains clusters of people participated in the study.

The study uses a mixed method to validate its findings. Usually, quantitative and qualitative data support each other to overcome their weaknesses. Here in this study, the mixed method collect data from different perspectives. The quantitative data will be taken from the local people’s perspective. Here questionnaire survey will help to collect data from a higher number of respondents. As a result, it will strengthen the findings about satisfaction of the local people and their perception on the variables of the study. From the quantitative data correlations between the independent and dependent variables are obtained. On the other hand, qualitative data is mostly collected from KII, who are on the delivery side. Besides, the respondents also provide some qualitative data through some follow-up questions in the questionnaire. The qualitative data from two different sets of people are correlated thematically. The qualitative data are used together with the quantitative data in triangulation technique to reach the findings of the study. The correlations from quantitative data are further qualified by qualitative data. In this way, quantitative data is explained, expanded and validated by qualitative data.

**Table 3.1** Clusters of people participated in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Name of the cluster</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Data collection techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UP representatives and PIC/WC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Field level government officials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local civil society representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Concerned officials at ministries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Users of the project</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Questionnaire survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Selection of Study Area

Union Parishad is the unit of analysis of the study. For the study a remote union like, Gazirbhita union under Haluaghat Upazila has been selected randomly. This union is adjacent to Indian border and weak in socio economic infrastructure like roads, mobile network, etc. Besides, this union has not been included in Union Parishad Governance Program (UPGP). However, the union is getting support from Local Government Support Project (LGSP). The assumption is that socio economic weaknesses can foster challenging environment towards implementing projects.

3.5 Techniques of Data Collection

This is a case study type study. Primary and secondary data have been collected though Key Informant Interview, questionnaire survey, project documents, existing literature, consulting concerned rules and acts during August to September 2016.

3.5.1 Selection of the projects:

The current study is based on case study. To investigate the challenges of implementing projects by UP, two recently implemented projects of Gazirbhita union were studied extensively. These projects were selected with the consultation of project documents and local UP representatives. Recently implemented projects are selected for the study to get full support of the memory of the respondents regarding the projects. After going through the projects documents of all the projects in the last two fiscal years (2014-‘15 and 2015-‘16) two projects have been purposively selected for the study. One challenging project and one successful project have been selected for the study.

The design of the research is to find what caused problems in the challenging project but did not happen in the successful project. These projects will be termed as ‘Project A’ and ‘Project B’ in the further discussions of the thesis.
Project A: The first project is ‘Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union’. It started in June 2014 and finished in June 2015-16. It was implemented fund from FFW and EGPP. The project was implemented in four phases. The first three phases were implemented by FFW. 2 tons of rice was allocated in each phase. However, the allotted rice was cashed in local market. The last phase was implemented by EGPP. The project documents have identified this project as a challenging project which is further certified by the local UP representative.

Project B: The second project studied in this study is ‘Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa’. It was implemented in May 2015 (as fiscal development project of 2014-15 under LGSP-II). The project documents (after completion assessment of the project) have identified this project as a successful project which is further certified by the local UP representative. According to the observation of UP chairman this project was implemented smoothly.

Conditions: Four conditions have been found in the project documents and have been applied for differentiating the successful and the challenging projects. These are: 1. was the work done in the specified time? 2. was the cost managed properly? 3. were the work specifications was fully maintained with quality? and are the user satisfied with project?. Data on these questions were taken from the project documents for both of the projects. For ‘Project A’ the documents consulted are: measurement book (pre-work and post-work), measurement and allocation documents, regular master role and finalized master role, records on food rain storage, reports on earthen works done, report after the end of the work. For Project B the documents consulted are: scheme implementation review form, records on scheme implementation, detailed estimate of LGED and environmental and social impact assessment form.
However, among four conditions data on time, cost and scope were available in the documents of both projects. But data on satisfaction of the local people were found only in the documents (Implementation Records) of the ‘Project B’. No data on the local people’s satisfaction ‘Project A’ available in the documents.

However, in this context a question is pertinent: Are the projects comparable? In this context the objective of the study may be recalled here that it is to find out the challenges of implementing the projects. The deliverables, measurable variables of the study between the projects will not be compared but the ground that affect these deliverables and measurable variables. The projects implemented by UP are small in cost and scope. The projects are implemented by the same body in the same locality. So the internal environment of the project implementation (UP) and its external environment (the locality with same users and socio-political context) remain constant for both projects. In this way the projects can be accepted as similar.

3.5.2 Questionnaire Survey
Quantitative data have been collected from local 100 people through a questionnaire survey. They were the beneficiaries of the projects. The author reached one in every fifteen homesteads to collect data and asked anyone from the homestead to fill the questionnaire. There was no bias towards the socio-demographic indicators like age, gender, educational status or income while inviting the respondents to fill the questionnaire.

The questionnaire contained both closed and open ended questions. Likert scale survey questions have been used for the closed ended questions. Each Likert question has five rating scale, starting from 1 to 5. ‘1’ refers to the lowest rating and ‘5’ refers to the highest rating. Likert scale questions help to easily measure the level of satisfaction and perception of the local people about the projects. Besides, there were follow up questions (open ended) to get comments, feedbacks on each Likert scale questions. Here the respondents
got opportunities to justify the choices in the Likert question. The data collected in the follow up questions are qualitative in nature. Such questions were instrumental to get into the depth of the perception of the respondents about the problem. The respondents were encouraged to give opinions on different aspects of the projects. The questionnaire contained question on in-time implementation, financial transparency, complete implementation of the project works, quality of works, influence of local elites, level of satisfaction, UP capabilities, PIC capabilities, etc.

Prior to final filed study the questionnaire has been pretested in Rajabari union in Sripur Upazilla of Gazipur district for validation. Some changes were brought in the questionnaire after pretesting. The finalized questionnaire for survey (Appendix-1) has been used to collect data from local people.

### 3.5.3 Key Informant Interview

Key Informant Interview is one of the most widely used techniques for getting answers of the research questions. It can thus enrich and develop the existing body of knowledge through addition or refinement. In interview open ended questions are used. The interviews were conducted by researcher. The list of key informant interviewees is presented in the table 3.2

**Table- 3.2: The list of Key Informant Interviewees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGED engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP chairmen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women member of UP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of PIC/WC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local civil society representatives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry officials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.4 Secondary Data
Secondary data are very useful for developing insights about various aspects of the research topic. For this research, secondary data were collected from journals, project documents, books, related government documents, related acts, rules and regulations. Contents of the secondary data sources were analyzed in the study.

3.6 Data Processing, Analysis and Validation
All the data used in the study are collected, sorted and analyzed in line with objectives of the study. The qualitative and quantitative data were collected by researcher himself through Key Informant Interview and questionnaire survey techniques respectively. Qualitative and quantitative data give information from different perspective. They are used in complementary style in the study. It is assumed that qualitative and quantitative data cannot be alternatives to each other. Therefore, a combination of both of them can validate of collected data.

In this study, qualitative and quantitative data are collected in the parallel way and analyzed through an integrated design. Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) is used to analyze the quantitative data. The quantitative data are presented in the study in tabular style. Besides, qualitative data have been gathered through Key Informant Interviews, questionnaire survey and studying related documents. Qualitative data are analyzed thematically.

3.6.1 Triangulation technique used in the study:
To validate the findings of the study it uses triangulation technique to fit qualitative and quantitative data into each other (O'Donoghue and Punch 2003). The quantitative is analyzed by using statistical techniques. This includes frequency distribution of responses, correlation, etc. Quantitative data on perception regarding independent variables and the
dependent variable are analyzed to find some correlations between them. On the other hand, qualitative data from the local people and KIIIs are collected. The local people will provide qualitative data about satisfaction on the variables of the study. The KIIIs provide qualitative data on the challenges in the context of time, scope, cost, and patron-client relationship. The qualitative data from two different sources is correlated thematically to find the linkage between the challenges and their effect on satisfaction.

3.7 Summary:
This chapter elaborately discusses the methods adopted for the study with the reasons of choices for the study. The techniques of collecting data are also reviewed in this chapter. Besides, conditions applied in the study and techniques of analyzing data are also discussed in this chapter. In the following chapter a brief on resources management in UP is presented.
Chapter-4
Projects and resources at Union Parishad

A brief on resources mobilizations, with special attention on the project resources is narrated below.

4.1 Structure of Union Parishad:
According to the Act, Deputy Commissioner of the corresponding district declares a Union comprised of 9 wards. Each Union consists of few villages. Union Parishad (UP) is the elected body for 5 years of a Union. UP consists of an elected chairman and 12 elected representatives of whom 9 members are general and 3 are reserved for women. UP is entrusted with four key responsibilities within its area. These are: Administration and establishment related issues, maintaining public order, public welfare related services and planning and implementing local socio-economic development (Article 47). A bunch of 39 activities in line with these four responsibilities are enlisted in the Schedule two of the act. UP has 13 standing committees, most of which are involved in development activities and managing revenues within its jurisdiction (Article 45).

4.2 Activities of Union Parishad:
Union Parishad is at lowest tier of local government for rural areas in Bangladesh. It is the oldest LGI in Indian Subcontinent. Role of local government in development has been recognized in different policy document, like National Rural Development Policy and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) with special emphasis on Union Parishad for a ‘strong and accountable’ local government (Aminuzzaman 2010, P3). In 1998 the World Bank conducted a review on decentralization process in 19 countries where Bangladesh scored lowest in decentralization scale (Williams, McLean and Kerr 1998). Several attempts have been made to improve local government since independence in 1971 they continue to
be managed and controlled by the central government administrative structures (Aminuzzaman 2010, p 4).

However, newly enacted Local government (Union Parishad) Act, 2009 contains specific sections on ward committee, participatory planning and implementing of development activities and comprehensive role of the standing Committees. UP Standing Committee members in particular noted that they have not enough authority to oversee / monitor the activities of the extension workers of the government (Aminuzzaman 2010, p 12). Government of Bangladesh, to strengthen UPs fiscal role, has recognized UP as a primary economic and a part of administrative unit of rural local governments. However, Aminuzzaman (2010, p 4) finds that mechanisms for implementing these new sections are yet to develop. Empirical data across the continents reveal that at least 3 Fs are essential to make any decentralization process successful (Ahmed 2007). These are: Functions, Finance and Functionaries.

**4. 3 Financial management of Union Parishad:** UP has three different types of sources of revenue which together form a fund. These are: local revenue, grants from national government and others (Union Parishad Operation Manual, 2012). Tax, rates, tolls, fees, income from its own properties and other resources local sources of revenue whereas, the national government supports the local government by different types of grants and loans (Article 53). A detailed description of local and national government sources of revenues is discussed at the later part of this chapter. The act dedicates a whole chapter (twelfth chapter, Article 65-70) on local taxation. Besides, scopes of imposing tax are enlisted in the Schedule four of the Act. Besides, rates of tax for different taxable items have enlisted in a separate ‘Union Parishad Model Tax Schedule, 2012’. UP fund is used in paying salaries and allowances of the personnel, meeting up different charged expenses and other expenses as directed by national government (Article 54).
However, Local government (Union Parishad) Act, 2009 has given huge control and influence (narrated in the 13th Chapter) of the national government over UP, which can neutralize the effective UP playing its role for development.

Fiscal capacity of rural local governments is related to fiscal decentralization. Fiscal decentralization is the devolution by the central government to local governments (states, regions, municipalities) of specific functions with the administrative authority and fiscal revenue to perform those functions. Development partners and policy makers are recently emphasizing on rural local government’s fiscal capacity to integrate development program through citizens’ participation and to encourage local government’s autonomy. Developed country like Japan has already been devolved finance functions and responsibilities to the local government by mobilizing local revenues. Now, local and national government sources of revenue are discussed.

4.3.1 Local sources of revenue:
In case of Bangladesh, all local governments have the power to levy taxes and rates. There are no aggregate figures available; however, the local sources of local government revenue are income from taxes, rates, tolls, fees and other charges, rents and profits from property, profits from investments, etc. Articles 53-56, 65-70, 4th schedule of Local Government (Union Parishad) Act, 2009 discuss on local revenue sources and the major expenditures that should be made by these funds.

To increase and promote the local revenue collection Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives has issued ‘Strategy for Union Parishad Tax Assessment and Collection’, ‘Union Parishad Model Tax Schedule, 2012’ and a ‘Block Grants’ system for UPs. However, Aminuzzaman (2010, pp. 11-12) has observed that the political reality and overall socio-cultural and economic conditions, do not permit the UP to collect tax up to the potential target.
For the local government institutions, the major own sources of revenue include taxes, rates, fees and charges imposed by them. It is to be noted that holding taxes are the most important source of revenue for local government institutions. Besides, they also receive rents and profits from leased out properties and assets owned by them, and also the sums received by way of providing different types of services (UNESCAP 1999).

But Union Parishads are not fully motivated to create own revenue from taxes, rates, fees and charges for either they have low revenue mobilization capacities or unwillingness to mobilize revenues for fear of political backlash (CPD-CMI 2013, p 10). In a study on three Union Parishads, Ullah and Pongquan (2010) found ‘despite revenue potentials, weak revenue administration, inadequate adjustments and assignments of local revenue sources including lack of union functionaries training become impediments on local revenue enhancement’ (p 95). Given this, they can generate only a small amount of revenue from own sources relative to their needs, which leaves these institutions in constant shortage of funds. As a result, the block grant is the major source of revenue for local government institutions in Bangladesh. (CPD-CMI 2013, p 10). However, there are some legal issues which are demotivative for UP in collecting revenue locally. UP and UzP have overlapping issues in more than eight categories of revenue collection. To motivate UP for collecting more revenue locally, the overlapping issue should be settled (JICA 2015, p 13).

Explanation for poor performance in local revenue collection by the Local Government Institutions is found in the study of Fox and Menon (2008). People in Bangladesh cannot afford to pay taxes. It may be mentioned that there are two different ways of collecting local taxes and fees: by local governments themselves and by the central government on their behalf. In the latter case, the central government shares a portion of the revenue collected in relevant jurisdictions with the concerned local government. However, Fox and
Menon (2008) find this as an evidence of low political will and excuses for poor management.

4.3.2 Government sources of revenue:

UPs get resource supports from the government regularly, though the volume is not significant. A recent estimate suggests that only about 2 percent of national development cost is channeled through local government system. (Akash 2009). Fox and Menon (2008) have identified that local governments cannot undertake and execute as many development projects as they would like, and cannot provide basic services to local communities due to poor collection of taxes and insufficient grants received from the national government.

For poor local revenue collection, LGIs in Bangladesh largely depend on national government for revenue. In Bangladesh, the central government is responsible for making a major annual fiscal transfer to the local governments in terms of block grants under the Annual Development Program (ADP). ADP funds the development cost of the central government which is financed by the surplus revenue cost, domestic borrowing, external borrowing and aid from donor agencies (CPD-CMI 2013).

There are four broad expenditure headings of ADP allocation, namely, sector/program allocation, block allocation, self-financed allocation and food assistance. Of these, the block allocations fund the local government block grants. A significant share of ADP allocation goes to vertically driven sectoral programs, which are directly controlled by the ministries. Only a small part of the ADP fund is allotted to the local block grant, while, in reality, an even smaller share is designated as transfers to the local governments (CLGF 2015). ADPs are mostly implemented by DPHE (Department of Public Health Engineering) and LGED (Local Government Engineering Department).
Ministry of Local Government, Cooperative and Rural Development has introduced performance grants in 2003. Later, in 2004 government has introduced discretionary Basic Block Grants (BBG) for UPs on flat rate basis and is confined to small infrastructure investment and maintenance in the core local public goods sectors (roads, education, sanitation, water, etc.). CLGF (2015) has identified that the use of the Block Grant is tied to strict guidelines, its local allocation is not always transparent and the timing often not synchronized to the local cost process.

Since 2006 the Government of Bangladesh has undertaken the Local Governance Support Project (LGSP) through which direct block grant for UPs was introduced. This fund changed the inter-governmental fiscal transfer ensuring transparency, community participation and accountability for and in Union Parishad. Following the success of LGSP, the government and development partners have initiated LGSP-II through which Union Parishads are receiving Basic Block Grants (BBG) and Performance Block Grants (PBG) under particular conditions. An increase in revenue including tax, rate, fees is an important factor for receiving PBG in LGSP-II (CLGF 2015).

However, UPs were largely dependent upon district and Upazila administration for receiving the BBG, while the EBG is directly sent to the respective UP’s bank account from the ministry. Moreover, the size of the annual EBG to a union is substantially higher than that of BBG. Furthermore, EBG is disbursed in two installments during the fiscal year instead of four installments that took place at the time of BBG (Barkat et al. 2011).

Apart from the ADP, other sources of funds for local government are raised through Special ADP (which is allocated by the Members of Parliament), Food for Works (FFW), Vulnerable Group Development (VGD), Vulnerable Group Feeding (VGF), Rural Infrastructural Maintenance Program, Old Age Pensions, etc (CLGF 2015).
4.4 **Summary:** UP mostly relies on central government for implementing development works within its jurisdiction. The central government has different modalities for providing resources to UP. In the next chapter the state of affairs of the projects under the study are discussed. This is done on the data collected from field study.
Chapter-5

Project Implementation by Union Parishad: Field findings

Findings of the field study are discussed in this chapter. The field study is conducted in Gazirbhita union of Haluaghat upazila in Mymensing district.

5.1 A brief on Gazirbhita Union:
Gazirbhita union is under the jurisdiction of Haluaghat Upazila of Mymensingh district. The union with an area of 7869 acres has a population of around 21 thousand. The literacy rate of this union is 39 percent. Though this rate much lower to average literacy rate of the country, this union has the highest literacy rate in the whole upazila. The union was brought under the umbrella of LGSP in 2012-13. But UPGP (Union Parishad Governance Program) has not incorporated this union yet.

5.2 Project implementation by Union Parishad:
In the recent years, UPs are implementing gradually more number of projects with funds provided by the central government. Earlier, the projects were mostly implemented by line departments of the government. Evidences show that instead of having relatively substantial institutional knowledge, professional expertise and experience, the success of these departments in project implementation is not very significant. Rather frequent delay, cost overrun, changes in work specifications are pulling down the scale of success of the departments.

However, UPs have got the opportunity for implementing projects in line with decision of the central government for making the UPs more empowered. In this regard, as an implementing agency, who works in the remotest areas and at the grassroots level of local government system, UP faces different challenges originating from the very inherent nature
of the project management as well as the local socio-cultural and administrative cultural practices. Finding out these challenges is the core objective of the study.

As for the variables used in the study, Baccarini (1999, p 2) observed time, cost and scopes are three basic variables to determine project success. Pinkerton (2003, p. 337) has linked these three variables with the efficiency of the implementing agency in project implementation. For an inherent balance and nature of mutual pay off among the three variables, a triangle can be formed with them where three corners of the triangle are occupied by the three variables (Wayngaad et al. 2012). Same has been reflected in Dobson’s (2004) study where it is revealed that these three variables affect successful project implementation.

In addition to that patron-client relationship is a very strong cultural trait in socio-cultural and administrative practices in South Asia. But the current literature of project management literatures does not give proper attention on patron-client relationship. One of the probable causes for absence of patron-client relationship in project management literatures is political and administrative culture in the developed countries where most of the previous studies were done. The presence of strong democratic values in the developed countries has cornered this relationship in the society.

However, the current legal framework provides huge authority to UP for implementing projects. It has been observed that patron-client relationship surrounds each and every aspect of UP. From MP to UP chairman himself all try influence development activities run by UP. This was reflected in the previous studies also. Aminuzzaman (2014) observed a practice of patron-client relationship in elite-dominated Union Parishad. Influential and powerful people participate in UP chairmen election and traditionally, they practice patron-client relationship. So we can conclude that patron-client relationship can be a very
dominating factor in project implementation and it can create barrier in successful project implementation.

On the other hand, public sector projects are adopted to ensure satisfaction of the people. Besides, satisfaction of the people determines the appropriateness of public money expenditure. In this way, it also helps in increasing popularity of the incumbent government. Furthermore, De Wit (1988) and Turner (2009) found that benefit and satisfaction of the users give a long term success to a project. Likewise, Smith (2007) observed that acceptance of the users as key criteria along with the time, cost scope for project success.

Time, cost, scope, and patron-client relationship create some challenges during project implementation which may have some effect on the satisfaction of the local people. To find out these challenges two projects have been selected in a randomly selected Gazirbhita union of Haluaghat upazila of Mymensingh district. With consultation of the project completion documents and discussion with UP representatives two projects, one successful and one problematic have been selected for the study. The point of taking two projects for the study is to find out why something worked for one project but that did not work in the right way for another. The comparison of the two projects will provide the insights about the challenges of successful project implementation.

For this purpose, 12 Key Informant Interviews have been conducted. The interviewees are UNO, PIO, LGED engineer, UP chairman, members of UP, members of two PICs, local civil society members and concerned ministry officials. Besides, a questionnaire survey among 100 local people of the two projects has been conducted. The survey data provides quantitative information about what factors in the local people’s satisfaction in project implementation. Survey data and data from the Key Informant Interviews (KII) are used to mutually complement, explain and validate the thoughts and perceptions of the users and
executioners about the selected projects. This process validates the findings to a greater extent.

5.3 Demographic characteristics of the respondents: For collecting data 100 people of Gazirbhita union have been surveyed by a questionnaire. The researcher reached one out of fifteen houses in the union and asked a member of the house to give answers to the questionnaire. The questionnaire contained Likert scale survey questions. Besides, there are open ended question following each Likert scale questions. These questions aim at getting the feedback and explanations for their opinions given in the corresponding previous Likert scale question.

It has been observed that the member who gave response to the questionnaire was mostly a male and educated member of the family. That’s why the male to female ratio in the study is bigger than average ratio of the country. Also, educational status of the respondents is much higher than average educational status of the union or the country.

Among the respondents 66 percent is male and the rest 34 percent is female. Provided the socio-cultural context in rural areas of Bangladesh reaching the village females for their response faces many difficulties. They were very shy and uninterested to give response in the study. This caused a low participation of the women in the study.

Regarding age most of the respondents (74 percent) range between 27 to 45 years, with an average age of the respondents 38.89 years. People at this age range are matured, that is, politically and socially informed, experienced and engaged. So it is expected that their responses will be authentic and significant for sketching a detailed scenario of their union about the research topic.
Regarding educational status of the respondents, 43 percent of the respondents have educational status up to secondary level. 28 percent have received up to primary level education. 14 percent has educational status of higher secondary, 3 percent has attained up to degree/ honors degree level education and 12 percent respondent is illiterate. So it can be inferred that the research has covered all spheres of educational status.

Regarding occupation, 39 percent are engaged with agriculture. Second most frequent occupation of the respondents (19 percent) is small business. 11 percent percent is in service profession. Other professions of the respondents are home making, rickshaw pulling, studentship, teaching, fishing, poultry farming, etc. Besides, 4 percent of the respondents are jobless. It can be inferred that the research has covered representative cross sections of occupations of the union.

In the following part of this chapter, variable-wise findings (the study has four independent variables) from both questionnaire survey and interviews will be presented in an integrated way. This will be done for the sake of mutual enrichment, complement and validation of questionnaire data and interview data. It may be recalled that two projects of Gazirbhita union have been selected for the study. The projects are ‘Construction of one kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union’ and ‘Construction of a foot bridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa’. They will be represented as ‘Project A’ and ‘Project B’ respectively in the following write up.
5.4 Findings and analysis of independent variables: time, cost, scope and patron-client relationship

5.4.1 Time management
Each project maintains a timeframe within which the project must be implemented. Projects implemented by UPs are small in cost size. They require less time for implementation. The projects under the current study are funded by LGSP (Project B); and FFW and EGPP (Project A).

Timeframe of the projects:
Different funding sources have different timeframe. One kilometer earthen road with a culvert was constructed in Gazirbhita union under ‘Project A’. It was implemented with funds from FFW and EGPP. Projects under FFW should be implemented within 60 days after getting allocations of funds from Department of Disaster Management. On the other hand, EGPP projects run for 40 days. According to the yearly plan of Gazirbhita UP of 2014-15, the earthen road (Project A) was planned to be implemented in 100 days. But it took more than a year to finish the project. It was started in June 2014 and finished in June 2015.

Under ‘Project B’ a footbridge was constructed in Gazirbhita union. It was implemented by LGSP. Projects funded by LGSP have timeframe ranging from 15 days to 90 days. ‘Project B’ has the timeframe of 45 days. But the project was implemented in 15 days. It was finished in May 2015.

In this study implementation of the project in the specified timeframe is the indicator of time management. The perceptions of the respondents in regards with implementing the projects in time have been studied. Information on time schedule for implementing projects is available from project documents and signboard of the project. However, the
information is double checked with the perception of the local people. The assumption is that the reality may not be reflected in project document.

Literature shows that delay in implementation of the project will create uncertainty and doubt among the users about the project.

**Indicator: Implementation of the works within the specified timeframe:**

Table 5.1 shows the perception of the respondents regarding implementation of the projects within the specified time framework. For easy understanding of the findings the categories ‘completely successful’ and ‘less successful’ is merged together ‘successful’ and ‘less unsuccessful’ and ‘neither successful nor unsuccessful’ together as ‘unsuccessful’. Now it shows that for ‘Project A’ 65 percent respondents consider UP is ‘successful’ and 35 percent respondents consider UP is ‘unsuccessful’ in implementing it time. For ‘Project B’ 82 percent considers UP is ‘successful’ and 18 percent respondents consider UP is ‘unsuccessful’ in implementing it in time.

**Table-5.1 Perception of the local people on timely finishing of the projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In implementing the project in the specified timeframe how much is the UP successful?</th>
<th>Project A (in percent)</th>
<th>Project B (in percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely unsuccessful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less unsuccessful</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither successful nor unsuccessful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less successful</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely successful</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 100 percent, Source: Field data

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa
Planning documents of Gazirbhitia UP show that UP had the plan for finishing the ‘Project A’ (construction of the earthen road) within 100 days. But it took around thirteen months to finish the project. It was started in June 2014 and finished in June 2015. It was funded by FFW and EGPP. On the other hand, ‘Project B’ (construction of the footbridge) was implemented in May 2015 (in the fiscal development project of 2014-15 under LGSP-II). The total stipulated time for the Project B was 25 days from the day of the work order signature but its construction ended in 15 days.

So, from findings from both quantitative data (perception of the local people) and project documents it can be summed up that ‘Project A’ was not implemented in time. But ‘Project B’ was implemented within the stipulated time.

**Correlation of ‘implementation of the works within the specified timeframe’ with ‘local people’s satisfaction’:**

To learn about how much ‘implementation of the works within the specified timeframe’ and local people’s satisfaction correlate, Pearson correlation test was performed between them for both of the projects. The analysis test came across with a high degree of correlation between these two variables. For ‘Project A’, r value is .457 and for Project B, the value is .411 with significant level .000 for the both projects.
Table-5.2: Correlation of ‘implementation of the works within the specified timeframe’ with ‘local people’s satisfaction’; mean and standard deviation of the indicator for the projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indicator of time management</th>
<th>Project A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Project B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implementation of the works within the specified timeframe</td>
<td>.457***</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.411***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the study, ***p<.001

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

So it can be inferred that ‘implementation of the works within the specified timeframe’ has significant relationship with the ‘local people’s satisfaction’. However, 65 percent respondents observed that ‘Project A’ was implemented in time and 82 percent observed that ‘Project B’ was implemented in time. So, it can be assumed that ‘Project A’ faced some changes during implementation.

The challenges of implementing ‘Project A’ in time is revealed in qualitative analysis. However, it also identified the success factors of time management in ‘Project B’. Qualitative data on the challenges of were collected from KIIIs and surveying the project documents. Besides, qualitative data on whether and how these challenges influenced in building perception regarding poor time management are collected from the questionnaire survey.

Challenges for implementing ‘Project A’ within the timeframe:

*Delay due to seasonality:*

Development works like building a new earthen road (‘Project A) largely depend on support and favorable time of weather (in terms of rain). Because earth gathered for building the
road washes away with rain. It is easier to implement such project between September-October to March-April. But due to rain the construction of the earthen road was disturbed at least twice. Rain stopped the work at inception of construction during June-July 2014 and at the ending stage in June 2015.

In addition to that lands for digging out earth are not available. Most of the lands go under water during rainy season. Under the circumstances, the construction works required to defer to prevent wastages of resources. Otherwise, incurring losses of the cost is unavoidable as well as the quality of the work have to be sacrificed.

Complicacy in process:
According FFW guideline, each project under FFW must be implemented within 60 days after getting allocations of funds from Department of Disaster Management. But it has been found that any phase under FFW of the ‘Project A’ was not finished within the timeframe (the part implemented by FFW was competed in three phases and funds for it came in three installments). The allocation reaches UP from central government through district and upazila administrations. District administration prepares allocations for the UzP under it. Likewise, UzP make allocations for unions under its jurisdiction. ‘The process was very lengthy. Each step took much more time to prepare allocations for next level’ says the UP chairman. From project documents (measurement book and reports on earthen works done) it is found that each phase delayed around 30 to 40 days to finish.

Last minute resource allocation:
A huge resource allocation arrives from the central government to upazila level for implementing different development works. Due to procedural aspects and technical nitty-gritty at the ministry level this has become a regular phenomenon, for all sources of funds ADP, LGSP, EGPP, TR FFW funds.
Consequently, UzP becomes too busy with preparing proposals of different projects from these funds. UzP prepares projects plans for itself, different departments and the unions under the jurisdiction of UzP with these funds. According to an official at field administration UzP becomes so busy in planning and designing projects and it is difficult to focus on implementation of the projects for this short period. Because, the whole fund must be utilized before the ending of fiscal. Under this circumstance, the construction of the road in the first phase delayed.

*Interruption of continuous flow of FFW fund:*
During the construction of the earthen road (Project A) funds for it were not available in a continuous manner. The construction of the earthen road was separately implemented by under FFW and EGPP. First 750 meter was done by FFW. The next 250 meter was implemented by EGPP. EGPP phase started 30 days after the completion of FFW.

Again inflow of the funds from FFW (total 6 tons of rice) did not occur at a time. Rather, the fund was provided in three installments. 2 tons of rice was provided in each installment. Because, according to FFW guideline each installment should not have more than 25 percent of the total allocation. However, UNO must send requisition for next installment to Upazila Food Controller just after finishing 75 percent of previous installment. The objective of this process is to continue the project uninterrupted. But, the process at this stage (between two installments) is lengthy. After completion of work for an installment, the volume and quality of the work done and benefits (rice/cash) under FFW to the workers (also the beneficiaries) are assessed by PIO and UNO. As a result, ‘Project A’ halted around 30 to 40 days after each phase. An official involved with this project identified long bureaucratic process for the delay.

*Slow progress in EGPP part of the road:*
The last part of the road was implemented by EGPP. It was a 40-day program. The workers (beneficiaries) get BDT 200 per day for 40 days. However, unlike FFW there is no fixed volume of earth that is to be collected everyday by a worker to have the benefit in EGPP. But benefit for a worker was fixed. So the workers were lazy and reluctant to work in the last phase of the road.

**Success factors in timely implementation of the ‘Project B’:**

*Not interrupted by seasonality:*
For the case ‘Project B’ (construction of footbridge) it was completed at the beginning of May 2015 and its implementation was not affected weather. The availability of fund and favorable weather made it possible to implement the project without any delay.

*Strict adhering to time schedule:*
As an LGSP project ‘Project B’ was strictly supervised and monitored by DF. Time schedules are properly maintained. Most of the LGSP projects should be implemented 15 to 90 days. Failing to implement the project in time will affect its performance, which in turn affect its Performance Block Grant (PBG). This drove UP to finish ‘Project B’ in time. The period of implementation of ‘Project B’ was 25 days from the day of the work order signature. But it was implemented in 15 days.

*Availability of the whole fund together:*
For the construction of the footbridge it took BDT 350 thousand. Gazirbhita UP has got the whole fund for this project all together. This has made possible for the UP to implement the project in a single attempt.

*Perception of the users on time management of ‘Project A’:*
From the open ended questions in the questionnaire survey perceptions of users on time management of ‘Project A’ are gathered. These are presented below.
Those who opine UP was unsuccessful in implementing ‘Project A’ in time (30 percent respondents), many of them observed that for the more than a year the road is being constructed. A 68 year old man said ‘Work goes for some days. Then it stops. Then after month later it starts again’. Perceptions of the users on poor time management in ‘Project A’ are given below in a descending manner.

**Poor office management:**
The respondents blame the UP representatives for their lack of capability of managing resources quickly for the delay of ‘Project A’. They found UP representatives reluctant and slow in their works. Furthermore, some respondents uttered that project are taken mostly to satisfy political supporters.

**Opportunist beneficiaries:**
The respondents observed that many of the beneficiaries under social safety net programs are politically connected. As a result, those who really deserve are deprived from this practice. A local unemployed man of 41 years age expresses frustration ‘Government sends money for us. But we do not get it’. However, the respondents observed that these politically connected people do not work. They only walk around the site of construction.

**Lack of commitment:**
The respondents show reservation on implementing projects around the rainy season. Some respondents even asked why they (UP) have to start construction of the road when rainy season is near. According to them completion of the road is not the target of UP/PIC rather fulfilling some personal interest is the key target of UP representatives and PIC.
It can be inferred that delay in implementation of ‘Project A’ created uncertainty and doubt about the implementation of the project. So it is evident that the respondents are dissatisfied about delay in the implementation of the ‘Project A’.

**Summary on time management:**
Quantitative data analysis shows that time management of ‘Project B’ is better than ‘Project A’. This is supported and explained by qualitative data analysis. The challenges identified by the KII's like delay due to seasonality, complicacy in process, last minute resource allocation, interruption of continuous flow of FFW fund are related to FFW funding process and procedures. But the respondents translated these challenges into capacity issues of UP, like poor office management and lack of commitment.

On the other hand, the challenge identified by KII's for EGPP part of ‘Project A’ is slow progress during EGPP part of the road. The respondents perceive that this challenge is due to the political influence on the project.

Both the project is significantly correlated with the ‘local people’s satisfaction’.

The challenges of time management in implementing project and the perceptions of the users regarding poor time management of ‘Project A’ are summarized in the Table-5.3.
Table-5.3: Summary of the challenges of time management in ‘Project A’ and perception of the users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Challenges observed by KII</th>
<th>Qualitative data on perception of the users</th>
<th>Quantitative data on perception of the uses</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Delay due to seasonality</td>
<td>Poor office management</td>
<td>Project A: 65%: ‘successful’ 35%: ‘unsuccessful’</td>
<td>Challenges in ‘Project A’. But these are mostly originated from local environment, rules and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunist beneficiaries</td>
<td>Project B: 82%: ‘successful’ 18%: ‘unsuccessful’</td>
<td>But the respondents translated them into some negative perceptions encompassing capability of UP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of commitment</td>
<td>Correlation: Project A: .457*** Project B: .411***</td>
<td>Doubt about the implementation is observed The challenges may have affected satisfaction of the users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complicacy in process</td>
<td></td>
<td># Qualitative data supports and explains quantitative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last minute resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interruption of continuous flow of FFW fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slow progress in EGPP part of the road cost estimation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
<td>No challenge is observed</td>
<td>Perception is not negatively affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the study, *** p<.001

From the nature of perception regarding the challenges of time management in ‘Project A’ it can be inferred that the local people had doubt and uncertainty about the implementation of the project. However, it appears that the challenges originated from seasonality and procedures are translated into poor commitment and office management in the mind set of the respondents.
5.4.2 Cost management:
Cost management is one of the knowledge areas of project management. UP gets cost from central government through different allocations from different authorities: TR, FFW, EGPP from MoDM&R under social safety net programs, ADP from LGD and LGSP (currently, its second phase in running) from LGD. Besides, UP gets a small share (1 percent) of the locally collected revenue from UzP.

Budget allocations of the projects:
Information on budget allocations about the projects is collected from project documents and signboard of the projects.

‘Project A’ (construction of an earthen road with a culvert) was implemented by FFW and EGPP. 6 tons of rice was provided in three phases under FFW. The rice was encashed in local market with the approval of the concerned ministry for the construction of the culvert and providing cash to the beneficiaries instead of rice. The last phase of the road was implemented under EGPP, 40 local poor people worked for 40 days. Each of the beneficiaries got BDT 200 per day. About BDT 355,000 was allocated for the construction of the last phase of the road.

On the other hand, ‘Project B’ (construction of a footbridge) was implemented under LGSP-II. LGSP funds reach Gazirbhita UP in two installments. Usually, first installment reaches around December-January and the second installment does in June. Besides, PBG (based on performance of the UP) reaches around February-March of the year. The footbridge was constructed at the cost of BDT 350,000 under fiscal development work of 2014-15. It was not a labor intensive project and cost of the project is less than BDT 500,000. So following the Union Parishad Operational Manual the footbridge was constructed under RFQ process, where three private farms competed.
In consultation with the literature three basic elements cost management have been identified suitable in the context of UP. These are: capability of UP in managing project resources, capability of PIC/WC in implementing project with the costs and transparency.

**Indicator-1: Capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP:**

UP is responsible for the resources management of any project. Table 5.4 show perception of the respondents regarding UP’s capability in this regard. For simplification of the findings categories ‘less incapable’ and ‘very less capable’ are merged into ‘incapable’ and ‘less capable’ and ‘completely capable’ are done into ‘capable’. Then Table 5.4 shows that 70 percent respondents perceived that Gazirbhita UP is completely capable in managing the resources. It can be inferred that UP is significantly capable in managing the resources of the projects.

**Table-5.4: Perception on capabilities of UP in managing resources for the projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much UP is capable in managing the resources for the projects?</th>
<th>Both projects (in percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely incapable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less incapable</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very less capable</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less capable</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely capable</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 100 percent, Source: Field data
Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

**Correlation of ‘capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP’ with ‘local people’s satisfaction’:**

Pearson correlation test was performed to measure the level of correlation between ‘UP’s capability in managing project resources’ and ‘local people’s satisfaction’. A positive
correlation is observed for both ‘Project A’ (r=.238 with significant level .015) and ‘Project B’ (r=.330 with significant level .000) (See Table 5.10).

Challenges of ‘Capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP’ for ‘Project A’:

The KII s identify the following challenges in regards with capability of managing the resources of the ‘Project A’ by UP:

*Old standard of allocation:*

Government follows some allocation standard while allocating resources for some union or a project. However, the standard of funds allocation is old and inadequate as opined by the chairman. The chairman explained with an example, for digging on an average 1000 cubic feet earth allocation of 1 mound of rice is not enough. This allotment standard has not improved significantly. The chairman expressed in the following way: ‘Government policy does not match the ground reality. My father worked as a chairman for the last time in 1998. He used to get 1 mound of rice for digging 1000 cubic feet earth. It has not improved significantly till today.’ The shortage of funds interrupts the PIC of ‘Project A’ in implementing the project.

*Less resource provided by UzP:*

UzP has significant authority over resources of all projects of UP except those belong to LGSP. As the ‘Project A’ was implemented by FFW, Haluaghat UzP had significant authority on planning and implementing of the project. The UzP divides the FFW funds allocated by the central government among the unions for different projects. Gazirbhita UP sent project proposals to UzP and formed PICs and implemented the project with the approval of Haluaghat UzP.

However, a portion of FFW fund earmarked for unions is kept by UzP for the purpose of homogenous development in all unions so that no union is deprived. According to FFW
guideline UzP can preserve maximum 20 percent rice for the same purpose. However UP chairman of Gazirbhita union accused that Haluaghat UzP kept around 30 percent of the allocated resources of ‘Project A’. This is beyond rules and regulations. The chairman further said, ‘The reserved rice is used for some commitment projects of MP, UzP chairman and UNO’.

Less resource has undermined the capability of Gazirbhita UP and PIC of ‘Project A’ in managing the resources and its implementation. During the study it was identified as one of the reasons for narrowing down the earthen road. According to the ‘measurement and allocation documents’ of the ‘Project A’ the earthen road was planned to be 12 feet wide. But at some place the road was as narrow as 8 to 10 feet.

*Volume of funds is not known:*
Due to procedure and practices around FFW allocations, total funds allocated in a year is not known and cannot be guessed. Same way, the number of installments is not known. This affected the cost management Gazirbhita UP and PIC of ‘Project A’ (construction of an earthen road).

*Less volume of fund in each installment:*
Resources allocated in each installment is not significant for the ‘Project A’ especially in the first three phases implemented by FFW. The project got only 2 tons of rice in each installment. The total price of the rice according to rate fixed by Ministry of Finance at the time of implementation of ‘Project A’ (2014-‘15) is BDT 70,000 (BDT 35000 per ton). This is not a significant amount for the construction of a one kilometer earthen road.
Perception of the users regarding 'Capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP' for 'Project A':

During questionnaire survey the respondents have presented the following perceptions.  

*Misuse funds:*
For ‘Project A’ many respondents said the fund allocated by government is adequate. Rather they pointed finger towards UP in their capability of managing resources. According to them UP representatives are not trustworthy. They misuse funds. Two respondents informed that a pond was renovated with funds from ‘Project A’. However, other respondents could not give information on this.

*Illegal nexus:*
According to them UP representatives has illegal nexus with contractors and government officials. Using this nexus the UP representatives make money for themselves.

*Inadequate funds from central government:*
Some respondents opined that government provides small funds for the development of rural areas for ‘Project A’. As a result, UP faces challenges is managing resources for the project.

Challenges of ‘Capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP’ for both project:
The challenges identified for both projects are as follows.

*Improper project cost estimation:*
A part of ‘Project A’ (construction of a box culvert on the earthen road) and the whole of ‘Project B’ (construction of a footbridge) have civil works. Respective rules and regulation instructs the UP to depend on LGED engineer for making cost estimation of the projects.
However, according to one of the PIC members of ‘Project A’ the cost estimation for project is not proper. The PIC member explained that LGED engineer has a tendency to make low estimation of projects. He went further into the issue depicting the ground reality. The cost estimated for the box culvert on the earthen road was BDT 105 thousand but the actual cost was BDT 150 thousand. However, the engineer explained the issue. He had to follow the standard set by LGED and it is low in comparison with the current market price.

Regarding ‘Project B’ where bricks were required for the construction the Chairman of UP picked another example. ‘A piece of brick costs BDT 9 in local market but in the estimation of the project the price is given BDT 7 to 8’. He also added that cost like carrying cost is not included in cost estimation. While going through the project document (estimate of LGED), the allegations made by UP chairman matched the reality for ‘Project B’.

Perception of the users regarding ‘Capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP’ for both project:

*Misuse funds:*

The respondents pointed finger towards trustworthiness of UP. According to them, the funds sent by government are used for some other activities, including political functions. As a result funds for implementing projects fall short.

Summary on ‘Capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP’:

Table-5.5 summarizes the findings of the ‘Capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP’.
Table 5.5 Summary of the indicator ‘Capability of managing the resources of the projects by UP’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Challenges observed by KIIs</th>
<th>Qualitative data on perception of the users</th>
<th>Quantitative data on perception of the uses</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project A  | Old standard of allocation  
Less resource provided by UzP  
Volume of funds is not known  
Less volume of fund in each installment | Illegal nexus  
Inadequate funds from central government | 70%: ‘capable’ for both projects.  
Correlation:  
Project A: .238**  
Project B: .330*** # Qualitative data complements quantitative data | UP has capability to manage the resources. But there are many challenges for both projects.  
Challenges mostly originate from the procedures involved.  
But there is weaknesses in trust and understanding between UP and local people.  
The challenges may have affected satisfaction of the users. |
| Both project | Improper project cost estimation  
Misuse funds |  |  |  |

Source: Findings from the study, ***p<.001, ** p=.015

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union  
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

**Indicator-2:** Project implementation capability of PIC/WC by utilizing the resources:

There is individual PIC/WC for implementing each project. PIC/WC works under the supervision and monitoring of UP. So capability of PIC/WC affect the capability of UP. In that way, indicator-1 depends on the indicator-2 of cost management. Table 5.6 shows the perception of the respondents regarding PIC’s/WC’s capability in implementing the projects utilizing the resources. From the Table 5.6 categories ‘less incapable’ and ‘very less capable’ can be merged into ‘slightly capable’; and ‘less capable’ and ‘completely capable’ into
‘significantly capable’. Now the Table 5.6 shows that 68 percent respondents observe PIC of ‘Project A’ is ‘significantly capable’. For ‘Project B’ 85 percent respondents observe WC of ‘Project B’ is ‘significantly capable’.

**Table-5.6:** Perception on local people on capabilities of PIC/WC in implementing projects using the resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much PIC/WC is capable in implementing the projects using the resources?</th>
<th>Project A (in percent)</th>
<th>Project B (in percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely incapable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less incapable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very less capable</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less capable</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely capable</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 100 percent, Source: Field data

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union

Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

Correlation of ‘project implementation capability of PIC/WC by utilizing the resources’ with ‘local people’s satisfaction’:

Pearson correlation test shows a significant correlation exists between ‘PIC’s/WC’s capability to implementation projects utilizing the resources’ and ‘local people’s satisfaction’. For ‘Project A’ the correlation value is .570 (significant level .000) and for ‘Project B’ the value is .304 (significant level .000) (See Table 5.10).
Challenges in PIC’s/WC’s capability of implementing the projects for ‘Project A’:

The challenges identified by KII’s are as follows.

Syndicate:

Rice provided by the central government for ‘Project A’ under FFW was sold in the market to have cash for the implementation. With the approval of the MoDM&R Gazirbhita UP encashed the whole rice provided. A PIC member of ‘Project A’ explains the reason for selling rice ‘The workers (beneficiaries) of the project do not want to take rice. They prefer cash instead. They are not happy with the quality of rice’.

However, the PIC could not sell rice in the local market at the rate fixed by government (The rate of rice is fixed by Ministry of Finance) for the presence of a syndicate. At the time implementation of the ‘Project A’, the price of rice fixed by the government was around BDT 35,000 per ton. But PIC was able to sell just around BDT 20000.

The presence of a syndicate is acknowledged by a government official working at field level ‘the syndicate gets backup from local influential people’ the official says. For low selling rate of the food grains cash in hand for implementing the projects fell short. As a result, quality of the work and scope of the ‘Project A’, especially in terms of its width was largely affected. At the same time, the number of the people employed was less than the targeted number. 150 beneficiaries were selected for the project. But around 140 got employment opportunity form ‘Project A’. Furthermore, 4 respondents, who worked in the construction road, during the questionnaire survey, informed that they got less money for the work they did. So it is evident that PIC of ‘Project A’ falls shortage of funds for implementing the project.
Perception of the users regarding PIC’s capability of implementing the projects for ‘Project A’: 

Very submissive PIC:

Regarding PIC/WC some respondents showed sympathy to them for not having any power in reality. On the other hand, some harshly criticized them for following instructions of UP representatives and elite people. To many others they are doing fine.

Summary on the indicator ‘PIC’s/WC’s capability to utilizing the resources’:

Table 5.7 summarizes the findings of the indicator PIC’s/WC’s capability to utilizing the resources.

Table-5.7 Summary of the findings of the indicator PIC’s/WC’s capability to utilizing the resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Challenges observed by KIIs</th>
<th>Qualitative data Perception of the users</th>
<th>Quantitative data on perception</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Syndicate</td>
<td>Very submissive PIC</td>
<td>Project A: 68%: ‘significantly capable’ 32%: ‘slightly capable’ Project B: 85%:’significantly capable’ 15%:’slightly capable’ Correlation: Project A: .570*** Project B: .304*** # qualitative data supports and explains quantitative data</td>
<td>Challenge is observed in ‘Project A’. Credibility and respect of the local citizens on PIC is affected. The challenges may have affected satisfaction of the users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
<td>No challenge</td>
<td>The perception of the users is not affected negatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the field data, *** p<.001

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa
**Indicator-3: Transparency:**

Transparency refers to proper utilization of the funds. Table 5.8 represents the perception of the users regarding transparency in the projects. For easy understanding of Table 5.8 the categories ‘low transparency’ and ‘mid level transparency’ can be lumped together as ‘low transparency’ and ‘quite high transparency’ and ‘complete transparency’ can be merged into ‘high transparency’. Now the Table 5.8 shows that 59 percent observe ‘high transparency’ in ‘Project A’. For ‘Project B’ 72 percent respondents observe .high transparency’.

**Table-5.8:** Perception on local people on transparency in projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much transparency was maintained in the projects?</th>
<th>Project A (in percent)</th>
<th>Project B (in percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No transparency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low transparency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid level transparency</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite high transparency</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete transparency</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 100, Source: Field data

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

So it is evident that the respondents perceive ‘Project B’ more transparent than ‘Project A’. But **it seems that lack of transparency prevails in both projects.**

**Correlation of ‘transparency’ with ‘local people’s satisfaction’:**

The correlation between ‘transparency’ and ‘users satisfaction’ is not strong. For ‘Project A’ the Pearson correlation value (r) is .238 (significant level .000) and the value of ‘r’ for the ‘Project B’ is .216 (significant level .031) (See Table 5.10).
Challenges of ‘Transparency’ in ‘Project A’:

The challenges identified by KII are as follows.

Poor monitoring:
UzP and related government official are responsible for monitoring and supervising ‘Project A’ as a FFW project. But a poor monitoring is observed from UzP. ‘Most of FFW projects are not properly supervised by UzP. Officials did not come very often during the construction of the road.’ says a UP representative. However, lack of manpower and transport facility and occupation in other public dealings at upazila level have been identified as the main cause for it. Proper monitoring may improve the capability of managing resource for the project and implementing the project.

Perception of the users regarding ‘Transparency’ in ‘Project A’:

Illegal nexus:
The respondents observe that UP representatives has illegal nexus with contractors and government officials. Using this nexus the UP representatives make money for themselves.

Challenges of ‘Transparency’ for both projects:

Contingency expenditure:
The projects have some costs for administrative and communication costs of PIC. But there are some other costs like, expenses of different committees and union secretary, etc. that UP has to look after for practical reasons. These costs need to be met up from project funds as there is no other means. This, in turn, nibble away at fund for different funds. Capability of UP and PIC/WC of managing resources of the projects and transparency utilizing those were affected by such measures.

Corruption:
Corruption is a challenge in cost management for both of the projects. A UP representative claimed that audit people and engineer need to be bribed irrespective whether there is any irregularity or not in any project. It has a direct influence over transparency.

Perception of the users regarding ‘Transparency’ for both projects:

**Lack of information about resources:**
The respondents are significantly dissatisfied about transparency of the projects. They do not know about the funds incoming and how they are used.

It can be inferred that cost management of both of the projects, especially in ‘Project A’ influenced confidence, reliability, respect and trust of local citizen on UP and PIC/WC. So it is evident that the respondents are dissatisfied about cost management for both projects.

**Illegal nexus:**
According to them UP representatives has illegal nexus with contractors and government officials. Using this nexus the UP representatives make money for themselves.

**Summary on the indicator ‘transparency’:**
Table 5.9 summarizes the findings of the indicator ‘transparency’.

**Table 5.9 Summary of the findings of the indicator ‘transparency’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Challenges observed by KII</th>
<th>Qualitative data on perception of the users</th>
<th>Quantitative data on perception of the users</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Poor monitoring</td>
<td>Illegal nexus</td>
<td>Project A: 59%: ‘high transparency’ 41%: ‘low transparency’ Project B: 72%: ‘high transparency’ 38%:‘low transparency’</td>
<td>Transparency is affected in both projects. The reliability and credibility of UP is affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both project</td>
<td>Contingency expenditure</td>
<td>Lack of information about resources</td>
<td>Correlation: Project A: .238*** Project: .216*</td>
<td>The challenges may have affected satisfaction of the users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency expenditure</td>
<td>Corrupt</td>
<td>Lack of information about resources</td>
<td>Illegal nexus</td>
<td>Qualitative data supports and explains quantitative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the study, ***p<.001, *p<.01

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

Success factors in cost management in ‘Project B’:

Stern position of the ministry:
LGD has adopted stern position about LGSP funded projects. LGD takes punitive actions against the UPs who have misused the LGSP project funds. A better perception of the respondents regarding transparency in ‘Project B’ can be manifested by the strict position of the government regarding misuse of LGSP project funds.

Amount of allocation is known to UP:
Resource to be allocated under LGSP is known to UP. UPs are informed about the incoming volume of fund by around February/ March to UP earlier to development planning of the year. UP starts planning for the next fiscal through open meeting at ward level around March/April. As a result, development planning can be adopted according to funds would be available and subsequently implemented. That is why ‘Project B’ did not fall short of funds and could be implemented in one attempt.
**Adequate volume of fund:**

BDT 350,000 was allocated for ‘Project B’ (construction of the earthen road) in a single installment. This is an adequate fund for the construction of footbridge. As a result, it could be finished in just 15 days.

**Supervision:**

Supervision matters in cost management. Data from the interviews show that proper supervision and monitoring can make difference. It has been observed that supervision in cost management has significantly contributed in making ‘Project B’ more successful than ‘Project A’.

District Facilitators (DF) kept a keen eye over ‘Project B’ (construction of the footbridge) from initiation to ending. Furthermore, Gazirbhita UP was under the pressure of constructing the footbridge properly. Because, otherwise, the Performance Block Grant (PBG) was likely to be affected. Besides, the LGSP projects are regularly audited by LGD and Audit department of the government. All of these supervisory measures contribute in better performance of the ‘Project B’.

**A Comparison among the indicators of cost management:**

Three indicators of cost management have been studied in the quantitative data. These are: 1. UP’s capability of managing resources 2. PIC’s/WC’s capability to utilizing the resources for implementing the projects and 3. Transparency. In these three indicators ‘Project B’ appears to be better the ‘Project A’ according to the perception of the respondents. These three indicators have positive relationships with the satisfaction of the users in different level. Table 5.10 presents the correlation value for these indicators with user’ satisfaction for both projects in a descending order.
Table 5.10 The correlation values (with local people’s satisfaction), mean and standard deviation for the indicators of cost management for the projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indicators of cost management</th>
<th>Project A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Project B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PIC’s/WC’s capability to utilizing the resources for implementing the projects</td>
<td>.570***</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.304***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UP’s capability of managing resources</td>
<td>.238 **</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.335***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>.238***</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.216*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the study ***p<.001, ** p=.015, *p<.01

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

Summary of cost management:

Cost management analysis was studied on three indicators. These are: UP’s capability of managing resources, PIC’s/WC’s capability to utilizing the resources for implementing the projects and transparency. The perceptions of the respondents with regards to these indicators show that cost management of ‘Project B’ is better than ‘Project A’. These indicators correlate the local people’s satisfaction in different extents among the two projects.

UP is significantly capable in managing the resources of the projects. For ‘Project A’ PIC’s capability to utilizing the resources for implementing the projects is identified as the key source of poor cost management. Besides, regarding transparency both of the projects show lack of it. Within a project these three indicators follow a similar sequence for the both projects.
The challenges of cost management in implementing both of the projects and the perceptions of the users regarding poor cost management are summarized in the Table-5.11.

**Table 5.11**: Summary of challenges of cost management and their effects on the perception on the users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges of cost management</th>
<th>Perception of the users</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>UP’s capability of managing resources</td>
<td>Old standard of allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less resource provided by UzP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volume of funds is not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less volume of fund in each installment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC’s/WC’s capability of implementing the projects</td>
<td>Syndicate</td>
<td>Very submissive PIC/WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Poor monitoring</td>
<td>Illegal nexus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both projects</td>
<td>UP’s capability...</td>
<td>Improper project cost estimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Contingency expenditure</td>
<td>Lack of information about resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>Illegal nexus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings from the study

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union

Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa
So it can be inferred that the challenges of cost management influence the perceptions of the users regarding confidence, reliability, respect and trust on UP and PIC/WC. So it can be inferred that the challenges of cost management affect the satisfaction of the users.

However, KII identified many other challenges originated from the procedures followed during the resource allocation of the projects. But for a lack of understanding the users may relate these challenges with capacity of UP and PIC as well as transparency. Thus these procedural elements also affect the satisfaction of the users.
5.4.3 Scope management:
In project management scope refers to the deliverables of a project. In simpler terms it means what is intended to be done under the project. For a successful project all of the works under the project must be delivered as per specified in the project document. It is very crucial because through being successful in scope management, project goals and objectives are reached. It implies that scope, by nature, incorporates the notion of quality.

Scopes of the projects:
Scope of a project contains technical details about a project. For the nature and design of the research, a detail analysis of technical essence of the projects is avoided in the study. Rather, here scope refers to some broad information about the dimensions and structure of the project product. Information on scopes was collected from project documents and signboard of the projects.

‘Project A’ intended to build an earthen road of 1 kilometer length, 12 feet width and 4 feet height. It includes a culvert of 10 meter long and 3.7 meter width. The road helps the local people for communicating to local primary school, bazaar and mosque.

Under the ‘Project B’, a footbridge on a canal was constructed. It is 12 meter long, 5.5 meter wide. It was important for the local madrasha (religious educational institute for Muslims) going students. Prior construction of the foot bridge their teaching activities are interrupted for the presence of canal on the way to the madrasha.

This thesis has taken into account two basic elements scope management: complete implementation of the works under the project and quality of the works done. Both of these indicators are measurable from the project documents. Project documents show that both of the projects were implemented as per specifications in the project documents with ensuring the quality of the works as specified in the project. However, it is double checked with the users
of the project in the study. The assumption is that the reality of scope management may not be reflected in the project documents.

**Indicator-1: Complete implementation of the projects:**

Table 5.12 shows the perception of the respondents regarding full implementation of the project works. For making it simple, ‘less agree’ and ‘mid level agree’ can be merged together as ‘weakly agree’ and ‘quite highly agree’ and ‘completely agree’ as ‘strongly agree’. Now the Table 5.12 shows that for ‘Project A’ 67 percent respondents ‘strongly agree’ that the works under the project are completely implemented and 33 percent of the respondents ‘weakly agree’ on it. For ‘Project B’ 75 percent respondents ‘strongly agree’ that the works under the project are completely implemented 25 percent respondents ‘weakly agree’ on it. So in terms of complete implementation of the project works, more percentage of respondents observe that ‘Project B’ is better done than ‘Project A’.

**Table-5.12:** Perception on local people on full implementation of the project works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much do you agree that the works under the project is fully implemented?</th>
<th>Project A (in percent)</th>
<th>Project B (in percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid level agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Highly agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 100, Source: Field data

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union

Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa
Correlation of ‘complete implementation of the projects’ with local people’s satisfaction:
Pearson correlation test between complete implementation of the works of the project and local people’s satisfaction shows significant correlation between them. The values of r for both of the project are almost equal, .373 for Project A and .393 for Project B with significant level .000 for both Projects (See Table-5.16).

Challenges of ‘Complete implementation of the projects’ of ‘Project A’:
Land management:
Managing lands for construction of the earthen road was a key challenge for ‘Project A’. UP has to manage the land from the donation of local people. It cannot acquire land. But according to FFW (funding source of Project A) guideline failure to manage land may cause cancelation of a project. However, there were some problems in managing land in time. As a result, the starting of the road construction delayed about one instead of having fund.

On the one hand, some people who had land along the road were not interested to donate land for the road. On the other hand, some people wanted to donate land. But in that case the direction of the road would be significantly changed. This would be violation of the regulations. A member of PIC shared his experience ‘...we did not get land where we wanted. But we could not change the direction of the road to somewhere else, where lands were available.’

However, chairman of PIC of the project with the support of UP chairman and other local elites had to convince people to donate land highlighting the benefits of the road. But he observed that some people were unhappy leaving their land for the road. On the other hand, during questionnaire survey it is revealed at 5-7 spots direction of the road changed in favor of some influential people.
Perception of the users regarding ‘Complete implementation of the projects’ of ‘Project A’:

Feeling of loss:
For some respondents a feeling of losing their important belongings like land and earth worked. They were not interested to donate them. Even the chairman of the UP observed dissatisfactions in some of the donors of and earth. However, these donated those under persuasion of UP chairman, ward member and other influential people.

Feeling of exclusion:
For the influence of some elite people the direction of the road changed in 5-7 places. Change in direction of the road creates a feeling of exclusion for some respondents from the service of the road.

Perception of the users regarding ‘Complete implementation of the projects’ of ‘Project A’:
Though no challenges were identified in KII, some respondents show a negative perception whether the work is fully implemented or not. They do not have adequate information on it.

Summary of ‘Complete implementation of the projects’
Table 5.13 summarizes the findings of ‘Complete implementation of the projects’.

**Table 5.13** Summary the findings of ‘Complete implementation of the projects’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Challenges observed by KII</th>
<th>Qualitative perception of the users</th>
<th>Quantitative data on perception of the users</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Land management</td>
<td>Feeling of loss</td>
<td>Project A: 67%: ‘Strongly agree’ 33%: ‘weakly agree’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of exclusion</td>
<td>Project B: 75%: ‘Strongly agree’ 25%: ‘weakly agree’</td>
<td>The weakness in ‘Project A’ is identified but not in ‘Project B’. Frustration and lack of trust are observed among the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation:
Project A: .373***
Project: .393***

# Qualitative data supports, explains quantitative data

The challenges may have affected satisfaction of the users.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project B</th>
<th>No challenge</th>
<th>Lack of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, ***p<.001

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

**Indicator-2: Quality of the implemented works:**

Table 5.14 presents the perception of the respondents regarding quality of the implemented works. For easy understanding of the Table 5.14 ‘less dissatisfied’ and ‘neither satisfied nor dissatisfied’ are merged as ‘low satisfaction’; and ‘less satisfied’ and ‘completely satisfied’ as ‘high satisfaction’. Now Table 5.14 shows that 58 percent respondents have ‘high satisfaction’ about the quality of works done in ‘Project A’ and 42 percent respondents have ‘low satisfaction’ about it. For ‘Project B’ 72 percent respondents have ‘high satisfaction’ about the quality of works done and 28 percent respondents have ‘low satisfaction’ about it. So, more respondents are satisfied about the quality of the works in ‘Project A’ than ‘Project B’. **But it also seems that they may have some dissatisfaction regarding quality of both projects.**

**Table-5.14:** Perception on local people the quality of the project works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you satisfied with the quality of the projects’ works?</th>
<th>Project A (in percent)</th>
<th>Project B (in percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less dissatisfied</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely satisfied</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation of ‘quality of the implemented works’ with ‘local people’s satisfaction’:
To explore how much quality of the projects’ works correlates local people’s satisfaction, Pearson’s correlation test was performed. The analysis shows that the quality of the projects’ works has significant correlation with the overall satisfaction of the users for both of the projects (for ‘Project A’ $r= .513$ and for ‘Project B’, $r= .329$ with a significant level of .000 both projects) (See Table-5.16).

Challenges of ‘Quality of the implemented works’ of ‘Project A’:

Collecting earth for the road:
As an earthen road the construction of ‘Project A’ largely depended on the availability of earth. Earth is usually collected from the donation of the local people. But it was a challenge for the ‘Project A’, for the lands adjacent to the road are cultivatable. A woman member of UP explains the perception of the local people ‘People are afraid that collecting earth from a cultivatable land may affect land. Their production may decrease’. On the other hand, if earth is to be collected from distant area, it adds costs.

For scarcity of land and earth, the road was not constructed as wider as it is specified in the project document (measurement book and LGED estimate). According to some respondents the width of the road could not be maintained 12 feet in everywhere along the road. In some (around 7-8) places the width is reduced down to even 8-10 feet. The PIC member also agreed with it. He pointed towards scarcity of earth for it.
Perception of the users regarding ‘Quality of the implemented works’ of ‘Project A’:

Degradation of service:
Most of the respondents who are dissatisfied showed dissatisfaction regarding width of the road. In 7-8 places along the road width were not equally maintained. Respondents near the narrow parts of the road informed that two vehicles cannot run together on the narrow parts of the road. Thus the quality of service from the road is affected.

Challenges of ‘Quality of the implemented works’ of ‘Project B’:

Contractor’s bad tendency:
For LGSP funded projects. The non-labor oriented projects with allocation less than BDT 500,000 has to be contracted through Request For Quotation (RFQ) process (Union Parishad Operational Manual).

Chairman of the Gazirbhita UP expressed his experience in this regard. The contractor of footbridge (Project B) showed a tendency to use the construction materials as worse and less as possible. For that reason the contractor was kept under continuous vigilance for exact implementation of the scope ensuring quality of the work.

From previous experiences the chairman observed that if not properly supervised, contractors give poor quality of materials and always seek opportunity to use as less quantity of cement, rod or low quality sand etc. as much possible. They try to use pieces of bricks where gravels are supposed to be used. ‘Gravels are presented only for show but pieces of bricks are used instead’.
Perception of the users regarding ‘Quality of the implemented works’ of ‘Project B’:

Lack of information:
Respondents observed an unethical connection among UP representatives, particularly chairman, contractors and some dishonest government personnel. They have dissatisfactions on this issue and anticipate that the quality of the work of ‘Project B’ was not properly maintained for lack of information.

Summary of the indicator ‘quality of the implemented works’:
Table 5.15 summarizes the findings of the indicator ‘quality of the implemented works’

**Table 5.15** Summary of the findings of the indicator ‘quality of the implemented works’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Challenges observed by KIs</th>
<th>Qualitative perception of the users</th>
<th>Quantitative data on perception of the users</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Collecting earth for the road</td>
<td>Degradation of service</td>
<td>Project A: 58%: ‘high satisfaction’&lt;br&gt;42%: ‘low satisfaction’&lt;br&gt;Project B: 72%: ‘high satisfaction’&lt;br&gt;28%: ‘low satisfaction’</td>
<td>Challenges in both projects.&lt;br&gt;Frustration and lack on reliability on UP is observed among the respondents.&lt;br&gt;The challenges may have affected satisfaction of the users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
<td>Contractor’s bad tendency</td>
<td>Lack of information</td>
<td>Correlation: Project A: .513***&lt;br&gt;Project B: .329***&lt;br&gt;# Qualitative data supports, explains quantitative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Field data, ***p<.001

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

A comparison between the indicators of scope management:
Two basic indicators of scope management have been analyzed in the quantitative data. These are: 1. complete implementation of the projects and 2. quality of the implemented works.
According to perception of the users on these two indicators, scope management of ‘Project B’ is better than ‘Project A’. These indicators have positive relationships with the satisfaction of the users in different level. Table 5.16 represents the correlation values of both projects.

**Table 5.16** The correlation values (with local people’s satisfaction) for the indicators of scope management, mean and standard deviation for the projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indicators of cost management</th>
<th>Project A</th>
<th>Project B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of the implemented works</td>
<td>.513***</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete implementation of the projects</td>
<td>.373***</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the study, ***p<.001

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhipa union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

**Summary of scope management:**

Perception of the respondents shows the respondents are less satisfied about ‘complete implementation of the project work’ and ‘quality of work implemented’ under ‘Project A’. ‘Complete implementation of the projects’ and ‘quality of the implemented works’ show different correlations the local people’s satisfaction in different extent for the two projects. However it is revealed that ‘quality of the implemented works’ is a key factor of poor scope management of ‘Project A’.

The challenges of scope management and the perception of the users on scope management are given in the following Table-5.17.
**Table-5.17:** Summary of the challenges of scope management and perception of the users on scope management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Perception of the users</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Complete implementation of the projects</td>
<td>Land management</td>
<td>Feeling of loss</td>
<td>1. Frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
<td>Quality of the implemented works</td>
<td>Contractor’s bad tendency</td>
<td>Lack of information</td>
<td>2. A shortage of trust and reliability on UP and PIC/WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
<td>Quality of the implemented works</td>
<td>Collecting earth for the road</td>
<td>Degradation of service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the study

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

It is apparent that challenges of scope management, especially in ‘Project A’ influenced ensuring service for all as well as the quality of services. Besides, it has influenced the trust of the users on the UP and WC in ‘Project B’. So it can be inferred that the challenges of scope management have shaped the local people’s satisfaction.
5.4.4 Patron-client relationship:

Patron-cent relationship is a deeply rooted attribute of administrative culture from thousands of years in Bangladesh, like many other South Asian countries. It has created a settings in the society where prevails a kind of control and dominance by the local elite people over the general people. This relationship is more acute in politico-administrative norms and practices in Bangladesh. Due to socio-economic variances patron-client relationship is more visible in rural areas than urban areas.

In this study patron-client relationship broadly refers to influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects. Patron-client relationship and influence of the local influential and elite people will be synonymously used in the study.

**Indicator: Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects:**

Table 5.18 represents the status of influence of the local people in the implementation of the projects. For the sake of explanation of the scenario categories ‘low influence’, ‘mid level influence’ and ‘high influence’ are merged into ‘existence of influence’. Now the Table 5.18 shows that 68 percent respondents observe external influence of the local elites and powerful people in ‘Project A’ and 32 percent do not observe any influence on it. For ‘Project B’ 63 percent respondents observe influence of the local elites and powerful people and 37 do not observe so. So it can be inferred that external influence from the local influential and elite people almost equally worked for both projects.

**Table 5.18- Respondent’s perception of influence of the local influential and elite people in the projects.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent did the local influential people influence in project implementation?</th>
<th>Project A (in percent)</th>
<th>Project B (in percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low influence</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid level influence</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High influence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation of ‘Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects’ with ‘local people’s satisfaction’:

In search of whether ‘influence of the local influential and elite people on the project’ correlates the ‘local people’s satisfaction’ in the implementation of the projects, Pearson correlation test was conducted. It shows that a higher degree of negative correlation exists between them. For Project A, Pearson correlation value (r) is -.545 and for Project B, the value is -.435 (with significant level .000 for both of the projects) (Table-5.19).

**Table-5.19** Correlation of ‘Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects’ with ‘local people’s satisfaction’, mean and standard deviation for the projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indicator of patron-client relationship</th>
<th>Project A</th>
<th>Project B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects</td>
<td>-.545***</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the study, *** p<.001

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union

Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

The challenges originated in the context patron-client relationship for both projects are revealed in qualitative analysis. Qualitative data on the challenges of were collected from
KII s and surveying the project documents. Besides, qualitative data on the perception regarding patron-client relationship are collected from the questionnaire survey.

**Challenges of validating qualitative data on patron-client relationship:**
Patron-client relationship is an informal phenomenon. All influences exerted from the local influential people on the projects are done orally. These are formalized in the best possible means. That is why documented data on external influence was not available. KII s and qualitative data from questionnaire survey were the only sources for qualitative data. However, collecting qualitative data from different clusters of KII s saved the data from being biased.

The qualitative study finds some challenges in the context of patron-client relationship individually for ‘Project A’ and collectively for both ‘Project A’ and ‘Project B’. These are discussed in the following.

**Challenges of Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects for ‘Project A’:**

*Recommendations in beneficiary selection:*
‘Government sends money for us. But we do not get it’ a local unemployed middle aged man expresses exasperation during questionnaire survey. The man was frustrated because he was not included in the beneficiary list of ‘Project A’, though he is unemployed.

It has been found that the most of the beneficiaries under ‘Project A’ were selected on the basis of recommendation of the top influential people of the union. They include MP, Upazila chairman and members, Union chairman and members and local top political party leaders.
‘Project A’ was implemented with funds from FFW and EGPP. Both of these projects are employment generating programs of the government. Local poor people get employment opportunity. Criteria for EGPP beneficiary is being landless, earning less than BDT 4000 per month or no animal resources or being unskilled local people. On the other hand, FFW projects are also for employing the poor unemployed people. But unlike EGPP the criteria are not clarified in FFW guideline.

But these guidelines are not properly followed in the case of ‘Project A’. Rather the list of beneficiaries is finalized with the consultation of the MP. Around 150 local people were benefited in different phases of the construction of the earthen road. Almost all of them were taken according to the choice of local elites.

Furthermore, the implementation process of the project was affected, in terms of time and cost by the practice of recommendation for beneficiaries. Some people due to connection to the power did not show interest to work but took the benefits. The progress of the project slowed down. According to a member of PIC of ‘Project A’...they have their leaders. They do not care us.’

*Influence in decision:*

Generally, the local elite people try to control development activities. However, in ‘Project A’ their role was, to some extent, helpful. A new road was built under ‘Project A’. That is why, obtaining land and earth was a burning issue for constructing the earthen road. UP does not have the authority to acquire land. Settling the land issue appeared as a very difficult challenge for UP. It is the UP chairman, local ward member and other influential members of the society who influenced people in donating their lands.

However, instead of having some benefits such practices have a negative effect on the participation of the genera masses. Decisions taken by such practice in the case of ‘Project
A’ were not participatory and could not satisfy some of the local people. It is observed during the questionnaire survey that some of the respondents were dissatisfied with the land and earth donation issue.

Perception of the users on Influence of the local influential and elite people on the Project A:

Satisfying the supporters:
The respondents observed that keeping the supporters satisfied is the key concern of the top faces in the local development activities. Five aspirant beneficiaries of ‘Project A’ who were not selected as beneficiaries explained ‘you need to be their supporter to get enlisted as beneficiaries’.

Unilateral way decision making:
Some of the respondents were angry about the role of local elite people including chairman in the land management issue of ‘Project A’. They did not donate land spontaneously rather they were under compulsion.

Challenges of Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects for both projects:
Satisfaction of the local elites:
For both projects it has been found that satisfaction of local powerful people gets more priority over satisfaction of general masses.

For ‘Project A’, direction of the road changed in favor of some wealthy people. At many places along the one kilometer road the direction changed for the interest of local influential people. They were eager to donate lands for this purpose. Because it will increase the price of the land and they will enjoy better communication facility.
On the other hand, for ‘Project B’ there was strong *tadbir* from an upazila level influential leader in favor of the footbridge. This footbridge was required to go his business. UP agreed on adopting the project for keeping the leader satisfied. That leader lobbied even in concerned ministry for the approval of the project.

*Monopoly of the UP chairman:*
According to members of local civil society, interest of the UP chairman and some of his close associates were served in both projects. ‘Project A’ was implemented by UP according to the guideline of FFW program. Operational Manual of UP and Local Government (*Union Parishad*) Act 2009 suggest that all the decisions at UP level should taken in consensus with the members of UP. A UP woman member said ‘chairman keeps relation with MP and Upazila chairman. Our opinions are mostly overlooked.’ Furthermore, a PIC member of ‘Project A’ accused that the chairman took most of the decisions alone about the project. Even the resources were under the complete control of the chairman.

Regarding ‘Project B’ during the questionnaire survey four respondents informed that the contractor who won the contract of the project (construction of a footbridge) is a close associate of the UP chairman. The respondents got higher education. They were doubtful about transparency in the process of awarding the project to the contractor.

*Perception of the users on Influence of the local influential and elite people on the both projects:*

*Negligence of the general masses:*
A good number of respondents consider that the need of the general people is not considered in the development activities. A development initiative sees daylight when it fulfills interest of some powerful people in the locality.
A lack of trust:
The role of the influential people in the project has fallen down the level of trust on resources management, particularly over UP. The respondents show doubt about the quality in the construction civil works.

Though quantitative data show that external influence are equally effective for both projects qualitative data present that Project A faced more changes than Project B in the context of external influence. However, It is evident that challenges of patron-client relationship influenced in local citizens’ private decisions and their participation in the society. Besides, transparency and credibility on UP are also negatively affected by external influences. So it can be inferred that the challenges of patron-client have shaped the local people’s satisfaction.

Summary of patron-client relationship:
The respondents observe an equal extent of external influence from the powerful people. KIIS identify some changes for ‘Project A’ which create some negative feeling among the respondents. For the challenge of a practice of recommendations in the beneficiary selection process the respondents perceive that the development project are taken to satisfy the supporter group of MP, UzP chairman, UP chairman, members, local political leaders, etc. Besides, the role of local elites in settlement of lands for the earthen road (Project A) was taken unilaterally. The opinions of some of the affected people were neglected.

On the other hand, the challenges identified by KIIs for Project B are satisfaction of the local elites and monopoly of the UP chairman. The respondents perceive that their demands and interest are neglected by UP and they do not trust completely UP for they have undue connectivity with the conductors and dishonest government officials.
The challenges in the context of patron client relationship and the perception of the users on it are summarized in the Table-5.20

**Table-5.20: Summary of the findings of patron-client relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Challenges observed by KIIs</th>
<th>Qualitative perception of the users</th>
<th>Quantitative data on perception of the users</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Recommendations in beneficiary selection</td>
<td>Satisfying the supporters</td>
<td>Project A: 68%: ‘existence of influence’</td>
<td>Challenges in both projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Influence in decision</td>
<td>32%: ‘No influence’</td>
<td>Frustration, narrow participation, lack on reliability and trust on UP is observed among the respondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settling disputes</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Correlation:</strong> Project A: -.545***</td>
<td>The challenges may have affected satisfaction of the users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both project</td>
<td>Satisfaction of the local elites</td>
<td>Negligence of the general masses</td>
<td>Project B: 63%: ‘existence of influence’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monopoly of the UP chairman</td>
<td>A lack of trust</td>
<td>37%: ‘No influence’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomhoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

It is evident that challenges of patron-client relationship influenced in local citizens’ private decisions and their participation in the society. Besides, transparency and credibility on UP are also negatively affected by external influences. So it can be inferred that the challenges of patron-client have shaped the local people’s satisfaction.
5.5 Findings and analysis of dependent variable:

5.5.1 Project success:
Defining success of a project is not an easy task. There are many definitions for the
definition of success of projects. However, these perspectives are broadly divided into two
categories (Baccarini 1999; Cooke-Davies 2002). These are: project management
perspective and local people’s satisfaction perspective. In project management perspective
the key variables are cost, time and scope. They give knowledge on efficiency of the
implementing body (Baccarini 1999, Pinkerton 2003). On the contrary, local people’s
perspective shows interest to the satisfaction of end users. In the recent time, theorists
have shown more interest on this perspective of project success (see Anastasisos 2007;
Kerzner 2013; Jiang et al 2002). This study has adopted local people’s satisfaction
perspectives of project success. ‘Overall satisfaction of the local people’s is the only
indicator of project success (dependent variable) in this study.

Indicator: Overall satisfaction of the user:
Project management literature identifies satisfaction of the users as a determining indicator
in project success (see Mbaluku & Bwisa 2013; Turner 2009; Aktinson 1999). In a recent
study Kerzner (2013) gave strong emphasis on the satisfaction of the local people’s in the
definition of project success. Furthermore, De Wit (1988) found it is satisfaction of the users
that gives success to project.

Furthermore, for the public sector projects, satisfaction of the users is a very pertinent
issue. Government provides funds for development projects for the satisfaction of the
people. Besides, local people’s satisfaction indicates successful expenditure of public
money.
Data on local people’s satisfaction from the documents:

The documents of ‘Project A’ show that local people’s satisfaction is not assessed in any stage of the project. This project was implemented by FFW and EGPP. In the guidelines of both FFW and EGPP, there is no instruction on measuring satisfaction of the users at any stage of the project.

On the other hand, project documents (Implementation Records) of ‘Project B’ show that the users are satisfied with this project. According to Union Parishad Operational Manual for the projects funded by LGSP satisfaction of the users should be done through survey or meting. However, in the during the questionnaire survey none of the respondents said that the satisfaction of the users are assessed.

Table 5.21 represents the overall satisfaction level of the users about the projects. For the sake of easy understanding the categories ‘less satisfied’ and ‘completely satisfied’ is clustered into ‘satisfied’ category. And the category ‘neither satisfied nor dissatisfied’ is renamed ‘neutral’. Now the Table 5.21 shows that equal percentage (90 percent) of the respondents is satisfied about the projects.

**Table 5.21- Overall satisfaction of the local people about the projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how much are you satisfied with the projects?</th>
<th>Project A (in percent)</th>
<th>Project B (in percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely satisfied</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=100 percent, Source: field data

‘Project A’: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

Interestingly, it is observed that none of the respondents was dissatisfied about the projects to any level. This runs against the conventional notion that people are not satisfied with the public sector projects. Also it is notable that equal percentage of the respondents in satisfied about both of the projects. However, considering the ‘completely satisfied’ category in the Table 5.15, the users appear to be more satisfied about ‘Project A’ [A higher satisfaction for ‘Project A’ is observed even from mean value (See 5.22)]. This is interesting. In the analysis of the independent variables- time management, cost management scope management and the patron-client relationship it has been found that ‘Project B’ is in better position ‘Project A’. But now after analyzing the overall local people’s satisfaction it seems that users are a little more satisfied about ‘Project A’ than ‘Project B’.

Challenges of overall satisfaction of the users:
Klls did not provide any data or information on overall satisfaction of the users on any of the projects. They observed that satisfaction of the users on the projects is not measured. However, there is clear instruction in Union Parishad Operational Manual for measuring the satisfaction of the users through survey or open discussion. However, the chairman of the UP claimed that the users are happy with the projects. He explained that any development work in the union gives more or less benefits to everyone in the union.

Perception of the respondents on overall satisfaction of the users:
According to the respondents, they are more benefited from ‘Project A’ than ‘Project B’. Both the earthen road and the footbridge improved communication system in Gazirbhita union. They use the earthen road constructed under ‘Project A’ more frequently that the footbridge constructed under ‘Project B’. The earthen road provides much more connectivity to the local people than the footbridge. Many respondents said they rarely use
the footbridge as it is located at a remote side of the union. On the other hand the earthen road goes though the heart of the union and it has improved the communication backbone of the union significantly.

However, there could be some other reasons for being more satisfied with ‘Project A’. One probable reason could be that local people worked physically in the construction of the ‘Project A’ (an earthen road). They toiled and earned their livelihood from construction of the earthen road. But local poor people were not involved the construction of ‘Project B’ (a footbridge). Physical involvement and earning opportunities may give local people a greater feeling of ownership and satisfaction for the ‘Project A’ than ‘Project B’.

**Summary of overall satisfaction of the users:**

Table 5.22 summarizes the findings of ‘users’ satisfaction’.

**Table 5.22 Summary of the findings of ‘users’ satisfaction’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Challenges observed by KIs</th>
<th>Qualitative perception of the users</th>
<th>Quantitative data on perception of the uses</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A and Project B</td>
<td>Satisfaction of the local people’s is not measured instead of having instructions</td>
<td>‘Project A’ is more frequently used than ‘Project B’.</td>
<td>Project A: 90%: ‘Satisfied’ 10%: ‘Neutral’ Mean:2.16 Std. Dev:1.02 Project B: 90%: ‘Satisfied’ 10%: ‘Neutral’ Mean:2.12 Std. Dev:1.06</td>
<td>No qualitative information on challenges Time, cost, scope and patron-client relationship cannot define satisfaction. It may also depend on service value added by the project and level of active participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Project A’ has contributed more on communication infrastructure development than ‘Project B’.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The researcher observe that participation in the construction of ‘Project A’ and earning opportunity from it may contribute in higher satisfaction in ‘Project A’. ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mutual contribution of qualitative and quantitative analysis cannot be determined for shortage of qualitative data.
Source: Findings of the study

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa
5.6 Conclusion on the findings:

The dependent variable of the study is project success. Its indicator is local people’s satisfaction. The independent variables are time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship. The indicator of time management is implementation of the works within the specified timeframe. The indicators of cost management are UP’s capability in managing project resources, PIC’s/WC’s capability to implementation projects utilizing the resources and transparency. The indicators of scope management are quality of the implemented works and complete implementation of the projects. The indicator of patron-client relationship is influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects.

The perceptions of the users signify that ‘Project B’ (construction of footbridge funded by LGSP) is in better position than ‘Project A’ (construction of earthen road funded by FFW and EGPP) in all indicators of independent variables. But, surprisingly, overall satisfaction level of the users is higher in ‘Project A’ than ‘Project B’.

This finding suggests that efficiency in project management (in terms of time, cost and scope) does not ensure project success (in terms of local people’s satisfaction). It depends on some more variables. They include service value added by the project and participation of the users in the implementation of the project.

The challenges create some negative perceptions about both of the projects. These negative perceptions are very likely to make the respondents dissatisfied. It is evident that from the perspective of the users none of the projects are successful. Rather both of the projects can be enlisted in ‘challenged’ category of projects (Clancy 1995). The users are dissatisfied in both projects in time, cost and scope variables. Table-5.23 summarizes the challenges of project implementation and perception of the respondents on the challenges related to the four independent variables of the study.
### Table-5.23: Summary of challenges and perceptions in regards to the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Summary on perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Poor time management | 1. Delay due to seasonality  
2. Complicacy in process  
3. Last minute resource allocation  
4. Interruption of continuous flow of FFW fund | 1. Doubt about the implementation  
2. Negative perceptions encompassing capability of UP for lack of understanding of the users |
| Poor cost management | 1. Old standard of allocation  
2. Less resource provided by UrP  
3. Volume of funds is not known  
4. Less volume of fund in each installment  
5. Syndicate  
6. Poor monitoring  
7. Contingency expenditure 8. Corruption | 1. Negative perceptions encompassing capability of UP for lack of understanding of the users  
2. Local citizen lack confidence, credibility and reliability of on UP and PIC/WC.  
3. Respect and trust of local citizen on UP and PIC are affected |
| Poor scope management | 1. Land management  
2. Collecting earth for the road  
3. Contractor’s bad tendency | 1. Frustration  
2. A shortage of trust and reliability on UP and PIC/WC |
| Patron-client relationship | 1. Recommendations in beneficiary selection  
2. Influence in decision  
3. Satisfaction of the local elites | 1. Frustration  
2. Feeling of exclusion of the local people;  
4. Reliability, transparency and credibility on UP are affected |

Source: findings of the study

Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhita union

Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa

**Correlation matrix of the independent variables with local people’s satisfaction**

Table 5.24 presents the correlations of the independent variables with local people’s satisfaction of the projects separately.
### Table 5.24
The correlations of the independent variables with local people’s satisfaction of ‘Project A’ and Project B’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Project A</th>
<th>Project B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Implementation of the works within the specified timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td>.457 ***</td>
<td>.411 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>PIC’s/WC’s capability to utilizing the resources for implementing the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>.570 ***</td>
<td>.304 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UP’s capability of managing resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>.238 **</td>
<td>.335 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td></td>
<td>.238 ***</td>
<td>.216 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Quality of the implemented works</td>
<td></td>
<td>.513 ***</td>
<td>.329 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patron-client relationship</td>
<td>Complete implementation of the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>.373 ***</td>
<td>.393 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.545 ***</td>
<td>-.435 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Findings of the study ***p<.001, ** p=.015, *p<.01

A correlation matrix of merged data:

The indicator local people’s satisfaction shows correlations with the indicators of independent variables. The values of correlation for the indicators do not notably differ for projects (See Table 5.24). So the survey data for the two projects are merged together and correlations were conducted among the indicators used in the study. A generalized idea about the variables can be developed from merging the data of the two projects. Table-5.25 presents the correlation matrix of the indicators after merging the data.
### Table 5.25: Correlation matrix of the indicators used in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project success</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Local people’s satisfaction</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implementation of the works within the specified timeframe</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UP’s capability to manage the project resources</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td>.154*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PIC’s/WC’s capability to implementation projects utilizing the resources</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transparency</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>.187*</td>
<td>.140*</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Complete implementation of the projects</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Quality of the implemented works</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.272**</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td>.191**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patron-client relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>- .486**</td>
<td>- .250</td>
<td>- .174*</td>
<td>- .269**</td>
<td>- .293*</td>
<td>- .223**</td>
<td>- .304**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Serial number in the top row refers indicators stated in the left column]

Source: Findings of the study, ** p< 0.01 level, * p< 0.05 level

The indicators having correlations with the local people’s satisfaction can be ordered in a descending as follows: 1. Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects, 2. PIC’s/WC’s capability to implementation projects utilizing the resources, 3. Implementation of the works within the specified timeframe, 4. Complete implementation of the projects, 5. Quality of the implemented works, 6. UP’s capability to manage the project resources and 7. Transparency.
From correlations (Table 5.25) it is evident that by and large, external influence of the local elite people has the strongest influence (negative in nature) than other variables in the study on project success. The table also shows that this external influence has significant negative correlations (which are statistically significant) with other indicators of the study. However, transparency has the weakest correlation with satisfaction of the users. This may indicate that people are more interested about the services from the project works than the transparency. Value of services from the projects matters more for the local people than integrity in resources management.

Regression analysis:

A regression analysis of local people’s satisfaction (indicator of the dependent variable project success) and 7 indicators of the independent variables were conducted. The analysis shows that they are related with an $R^2$ value .495 with .000 significant level. It suggests that around 50 percent project success (in terms with satisfaction of the users) can be predicted by time, cost and scope management and patron client relationship (Table-5.26). The regression analysis supports findings of qualitative data that satisfaction of the users is not fully explained by the time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table-5.26: Regression analysis of project success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the works within the specified timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete implementation of the projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the implemented works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP’s capability to manage the project resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIC’s/WC’s capability to implementation projects utilizing the resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2=.495, p<.001$
Project A: Construction of 1 kilometer (earthen) road in Mohajoni kanda with a box culvert in Gazirbhta union
Project B: Construction of a footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the katcha road from Gazirbhta to Madrasa

Both Pearson correlation test and regression test of the merged data show that influence of the local influential and elite people on the projects has a negative and a very significant correlation and B coefficient with the users’ satisfactions. A strong presence of patron-client relationship is likely to strongly impede the implementation process. However, statistical analysis shows that the some of the indicators of the independent variables have significant correlations with the users’ satisfaction. Particularly, the indicators like, ‘PIC’s/WC’s capability to implementation projects utilizing the resources’, ‘Implementation of the works within the specified timeframe’, ‘Complete implementation of the projects’ and ‘Quality of the implemented works’ also show significant correlations with the project success in terms of users’ satisfaction (Table 5.25 ). These are the indicators of time management, cost management and scope management, which indicate the efficiency of the projects. So it can be inferred that instead of changes from patron-client relationship the efficiency of the UP and PIC/WC was instrumental in making the projects successful.

The following chapter will provide a brief assessment of the findings of the study.
Chapter-6
Assessment of project implementation

In this chapter a broad observation from the findings of field study is drawn.

The efficiency of project management is determined by time, cost and scope of a project. Success in terms of these variables indicates success of project management. But they are not enough to bring success to the projects in terms of satisfying the users. Satisfaction of the users depends on some other variables as well. These variables can make even an unsuccessful project, in terms of time, cost and scope, into a successful one. This study identifies two such variables: service value added by the project and participation.

In this regard, it may be noted that LGSP are developing UPs’ efficiency in development activities. But the satisfaction of the users also should get due emphasis along with the efficiency to implement successful projects.

The correlations of the time, cost, scope, and patron-client relationship with local people’s satisfaction do not vary with projects. So the projects implemented by UP are almost identical in nature in terms of time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship.

However, among the variables studied in the thesis, patron-client has the highest (negative) influence over the project success (after merging the field data). A strong prevalence in the process of project implementation is likely to adversely affect the implementation of the projects. But is observed that the projects may have faced some challenges during its implementation process but in the long run both of the projects were implemented.
UP has the capability to manage resources for development activities. But transparency is an issue in resources management. One of objective of LGSP is to make UPs more transparent and accountable through engaging the UPs in development activities. But the finding indicates that still way to go in this regard.

However, regarding satisfaction of the users, sometimes the satisfaction is shaped by other issues that UP has nothing to do with. These are mostly procedural issues. But the users consider those issues as weaknesses of the UP and PIC. This is indicative of lack understanding of the users about the projects.
Chapter-7
Conclusion

This study attempts to investigate the success of the projects implemented by UP. It tries to find out the challenges of success of the projects to ensure satisfaction of the users in relation with time, cost, scope and patron-client relationship. It tries to understand how the internal factors shape the local people’s satisfaction. UP faces challenges in time management, cost management, scope management and from practices of patron-client relationship. What are challenges of internal factors that create challenges for the external factors is the key objective of the study. It assumes that challenges of time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship also create challenges for satisfying the users.

Two projects of Gazirbhita union of Haluaghat Upazila have been studied. Applying four conditions have been found in the project documents and have been applied for differentiating the successful and the challenging projects.

A mixed methodology in combination with both qualitative and quantitative techniques has been developed. In this study, qualitative and quantitative data were collected in the parallel way and analyzed through an integrated design. Combination of qualitative data is used here to enrich and explain and most importantly, to validate the findings from the quantitative data. The author reached one in every fifteen homesteads to collect data and asked anyone from the homestead to fill the questionnaire. Besides, 12 KII s have been taken from government officials at field level, UP representatives and members of PIC/WC, local civil society members and officials at concerned ministries.

The study has foundation on both triple constraints theory and policy implementation model by Van Meter and Van Horn (1975). These two theoretical constructs mutually reinforced each other to form solid theoretical concept for the study.
The first key research question addresses the challenges of implementing projects successfully by Union Parishad. The challenges are searched in the context of time, management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship. Some 21 challenges have been identified in the study. Some of these challenges have roots in rules, guidelines and procedures concerning the projects. These challenges have two dimensions. Sometimes rules, guidelines and procedures create the challenges. Sometimes, divergence of them creates the challenges. On the other hand, some problems are related to capability issues of the implementing bodies of the projects.

The second key research question addresses whether these challenges influence satisfaction of the users. Both qualitative and quantitative analysis shows that the challenges influence satisfaction of the users. These challenges influence in confidence, reliability, respect, trust, and creditability of the local people on UP and PIC/WC. Besides, the respondents have developed some frustrations like not getting up to the mark service, influence in their personal decision and participation, exclusion from the service, etc. It is evident that these challenges affect the satisfaction of the users.

However, it has been found that sometimes the satisfaction of the users is shaped by some challenges that UP has nothing to do with. These challenges originate from rules, guidelines and procedures related to the projects. But the users find weaknesses of the UP and PIC in these challenges. This is indicative of lack understanding of the users about the projects.

It has been found that success in projects management is not enough to bring success to the projects in terms of satisfying the users. Satisfaction of the users depends on some other variables as well. These variables can make even an unsuccessful project, in terms of time, cost and scope, into a successful one. This study identifies two such variables: service value added by the project and participation.
The correlations of the time, cost, scope, and patron-client relationship with local people’s satisfaction do not vary with projects. So the projects implemented by UP are almost identical in nature in terms of time management, cost management, scope management and patron-client relationship. However, it is also observed that among the variables in the study patron-client relationship has the highest (negative) influence (in terms of correlation) in local people’s satisfaction than time, cost and scope. But instead of patron-client relationship the projects were implemented, with some shortfalls and weaknesses. This can be credited to the efficiency of UP and PIC/WC.

Future research:

Based on the findings and methodology of the study some future research proposals can be suggested. The scope of the study is very narrow. It just studied two projects of a union. The findings of the study may be tested further in broader context adopting higher number of project from different unions across the country. To find the complete construct of the local people’s satisfaction, studies can be conducted with more number of variables. Besides, it needs to be further tested whether triple constraints theory and policy implementation model fits into each other. PIC’s/WC’s capability is found as a weak area of the projects implemented by UP. The reasons can be investigated in further study. Moreover, It can be tested again whether the projects implemented by UP vary with time, cost, scope, and patron-client relationship for ensuring local people’s satisfaction.
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Annex-1

Questionnaire for survey

Your opinion will be used for research work in Masters in Public Policy and Governance Course under North South University. Your identity will be secret. Thanks for your cooperation.

**Subject:** Project Implementation by Union Parishad

*(For local citizens)*

**Personal Information**

Name:

Age:

Gender:

Educational qualification:

Occupation:

Yearly income:

**Part-1**

Please give your opinion on the project titled ‘Construction of 1 kilometer earthen road and a box culvert in Mahajani kanda’ in Gazrbhita union under Haluaghat upazila of Mymensingh district.

1. How much are you benefited or harmed from the ‘Construction of 1 kilometer earthen road and a box culvert in Mahajani kanda’ project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely harmed</th>
<th>Less harmed</th>
<th>Neither harmed nor benefited</th>
<th>Less benefited</th>
<th>Completely benefitted</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. How are you benefitted or harmed from the project?

3. How much Gazirbhita UP was successful in implementing the project within the time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely unsuccessful</th>
<th>Less unsuccessful</th>
<th>Neither unsuccessful nor successful</th>
<th>Less successful</th>
<th>Completely successful</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Give your comment about implementation time of the project.

5. How much was the UP capable in managing the resources allocated to the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely incapable</th>
<th>Less incapable</th>
<th>Very less incapable</th>
<th>Less capable</th>
<th>Completely capable</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Give your opinion comment about capability in managing the resources of the project by UP.

7. How much the PIC was capable in implementing the project through utilizing the allocated resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Very less</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>Completely capable</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Give your comment about capability of implementing the project by UP.

9. How transparency was maintained the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No transparency</th>
<th>Low transparency</th>
<th>Mid level transparency</th>
<th>Quite high transparency</th>
<th>Complete transparency</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Give your comment about transparency in the project.

11. How much do you agree that the works under the project were completely implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not agree</th>
<th>Less agree</th>
<th>Mid level agree</th>
<th>Quite agree</th>
<th>Highly agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Give your comment about complete implementation of the project
13. How much are you satisfied with quality of the works implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>Less dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Less satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Give your comment about quality of the work of the project

15. To what extent did the local influential people influence in project implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Low influence</th>
<th>Mid level influence</th>
<th>High influence</th>
<th>Complete influence</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Give your comment on it?

17. Overall how much are satisfied with the projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>Less dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Less satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Give your comment on satisfaction level about the project?

19. Did UP ask about your satisfaction regarding the project? Yes/No.
20. Give comments to your answer.

Part-2

Please give your opinion on the project tilted ‘Construction of footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa road’ in Gazrbhita union under Haluaghat upazila of Mymensingh district.

21. How much are you benefited or harmed from the ‘Construction of footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa road’ project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely harmed</th>
<th>Less harmed</th>
<th>Neither harmed nor benefitted</th>
<th>Less benefited</th>
<th>Completely benefitted</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. How are you benefitted or harmed from the project?

23. How much Gazirbhita UP was successful in implementing the project within the time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely unsuccessful</th>
<th>Less unsuccessful</th>
<th>Neither unsuccessful nor successful</th>
<th>Less successful</th>
<th>Completely successful</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Give your comment about implementation time of the project.

25. How much was the UP capable in managing the resources allocated to the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely incapable</th>
<th>Less incapable</th>
<th>Very less incapable</th>
<th>Less capable</th>
<th>Completely capable</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Give your opinion comment about capability in managing the resources of the project by UP.

27. How much the WC was capable in implementing the project through utilizing the allocated resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely incapable</th>
<th>Less incapable</th>
<th>Very less incapable</th>
<th>Less capable</th>
<th>Completely capable</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Give your comment about capability of implementing the project by UP.

29. How transparency was maintained the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No transparency</th>
<th>Low transparency</th>
<th>Mid level transparency</th>
<th>Quite high transparency</th>
<th>Complete transparency</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Give your comment about transparency in the project.

31. How much do you agree that the works under the project were completely implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not agree</th>
<th>Less agree</th>
<th>Mid level agree</th>
<th>Quite agree</th>
<th>Highly agree</th>
<th>Completely agree</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Give your comment about complete implementation of the project

33. How much are you satisfied with quality of the works implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>Less dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Less satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Give your comment about quality of the work of the project

35. To what extent did the local influential people influence in project implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No influence</th>
<th>Low influence</th>
<th>Mid level influence</th>
<th>High influence</th>
<th>Complete influence</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Give your comment on it?

37. Overall how much are satisfied with the projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>Less dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Less satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>NO comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Give your comment on satisfaction level about the project?

39. Did UP ask about your satisfaction regarding the project? Yes/No.

40. Give comments to your answer.
Annex-2

Checklist for interview of key informants at local level

Subject: Project implementation by Union Parishad

For officials, UP representatives, members of PIC/WC involved in the projects

1. What are the challenges time management, cost management and scope (works under the project) management of the project ‘Construction of 1 kilometer earthen road and a box culvert in Mahajani kanda’ project?

2. What are the challenges time management, cost management and scope (works under the project) management of the project ‘Construction of footbridge on Ghomoria canal on the road from Gazirbhita to Madrasa road’?

3. How much did the local elite people influence during the implementation of these projects?

4. How much UP/PIC/WC is capable of implementing these projects?

5. Do these changes affect the satisfaction of the users?

6. How much are the local people’s satisfied with the projects?
Annexure-3

Checklist for interview of key informants at ministry level

Subject: Project implementation by Union Parishad

For the officials at ministries

1. What are the challenges of time management, cost management and scope management implemented by UP?

2. How much did the local elite people influence during the implementation of the projects?

3. How much UP/PIC/WC is capable of implementing these projects?

4. Do these challenges affect the satisfaction of the users?

5. How much are the local people’s satisfied with the projects implemented by UP?