

Causes of International Development Projects Failure in Afghanistan

***Nasir Ahmad Shafiei and ** Dr. Puttanna K**

**Research Scholar, Dept. of Business Administration, Mangalore University, India*

***Associate Professor, Dept. of Business Administration, Mangalore University*

Abstract

In developing countries, international development projects (ID projects) are undertaken with the principal goal of poverty alleviation, improving people's living conditions and economic development in general. Most of these projects do not meet the requirements for cost, time and scope and are unlikely to produce the intended outcome. The failure of these projects may be caused by a wide number of factors. This research aims to investigate the potential causes that may influence the failure of ID projects in Afghanistan. A survey using a structured questionnaire was conducted on three groups of respondents (senior managers, team members, and the general public) to collect their views on factors that cause ID project failure. Relative importance index RII was used as the basis to assess the relative importance and to rank each factor. Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient and Kendall's coefficient of concordance were employed to measure the degree of agreement among the three categories of participants on their perception. The top five most important ranked factors are identified as; (1) Corruption, (2) Political Interference, (3) Security, (4) Poor Monitoring, and (5) Inappropriate selection of Project Managers. The findings can help donors, ID project planners, project management practitioners and implementing partners to avoid and or reduce the ID project failure in Afghanistan.

Keywords: *International Development Projects, factors causing failure, Relative Important Index, Spearman's correlation.*

Introduction

International Development Projects are those specifically designed for the economic and social needs of developing countries and are usually financed by external donors (Ahsan & Gunawan, 2010). Afghanistan after more than three decades of war and civil unrest, became the center of attention with the establishment of the new government in 2001 in terms of development aid. The international community led by the United States has spent more than US\$ 100 billion for the rebuilding of Afghanistan's unbalanced economy over the last one and a half decades (Samim 2016). In the years 2008 to 2016 alone, more than \$60 billion was pledged for Afghanistan's rehabilitation and development, wherein more than 51 countries and financial institutions were involved in providing such a significant amount of financial aid (Shafiei & Puttanna, 2018).

The trend of project failures in the world, especially in developing countries, has attracted the attention of researchers (Damoah & Kumi 20018). Research points out that only one out of eight IT projects can fulfill the original time, cost and quality criteria and can be considered to be truly successful. (McManus & Wood-Harper, 2008). A recent report by SIGAR to the U.S. Congress reveals that reconstruction projects funded by the U.S. in Afghanistan are failing and costing millions of dollars (SIGAR report, 2015). In the years 2002 to 2013, the U.S. invested \$104 billion on relief work in the country, and the SIGAR reports suggest that a significant amount of that money was spent on dubious projects (Pager, 2015). A review of all SIGAR inspection reports on USAID reconstruction projects in Afghan between 2009 and 2017 indicate that construction projects have not always been completed in compliance with contract requirements and technical specifications (Laber, 2018). Similarly, a study on 53 development projects administered by the World Bank in Afghanistan reports huge cost and schedule variations (Shafiei & Puttanna, 2018).

In this paper, an attempt is made to identify the most significant causes perceived to be influential factors of ID project failure in Afghanistan. The results of this study will help international donors, implementing partners, project designers and project management professionals to handle ID projects more proactively to prevent or mitigate the risk of project failure. The finding also contributes to the ID project management body of knowledge.

Literature review

Ample literature is available exploring factors causing ID project failure. Discenza and Forman (2007) identified three categories of factors causing project failure - people-related factors, project processes factors and, project communication factors. In Strachan's (1978) perspective, ID project failure factors are long lead times in program development, heavy administrative expenditures, execution delays and hurdles, and leadership passivity and subterfuge. The literature reports other potential causes of failure in ID projects as; poor project design, lack of technical skill and low capacity, poor project planning, and ineffective leadership (Strachan's 1978, Rotner 1970, Palmer 1986, Shahibzada et al 1992, Agheneza 2009, Feedman and Katz 2007). Lead time is the delay between the initiation and the execution stages of the project life cycle. The reasons for prolonged lead times are the complex process of decision making. The process usually includes different layers of bureaucracy and also the involvement of a large number of stakeholders, and the efforts being put into planning and evaluation before a project is approved (Strachan's 1978). Poor project design may also lead to project failure. According to (Rotner 1970) International Development projects fail because of poor and inappropriate project designs. He argues that while designing ID projects, considering a mixture of 'fresh' and 'existing' characteristics is important to make sure that the design is appropriate for the particular government and the specific project. He also states that autonomy is another cause of failure. The project may not receive the necessary assistance and support from the host country if the project is extremely autonomous which can be subject to foreign domination. He further explains some other causes of ID project failure as; excessive dependence on imports of expertise, technology,

ignoring of local conditions, direct transplantation of procedures and systems into an incompatible setting, and the lack of local administrative and technical capacity building.

Inappropriate project planning is another cause of ID project failure as reported by (Shahibzada et al., 1992;Agheneza 2009). They provided a reasonable explanation as to how ineffective project planning can cause IDPs failure. The process of project planning and implementation suffers from some inherent problems including conceptual differences about the projects, hurriedly prepared feasibility studies which are deficient in proper technical and economic underpinning, the lack of basic information obtained through insufficient investigation and surveys, inadequate project monitoring and non-existence of in-depth evaluation studies (Shahibzada et al., 1992;Agheneza, 2009).

People are considered as the most valuable resource in all developing countries(Palmer 1986). Human factors cannot be overlooked as unimportant factor while exploring the causes leading to the success or failure of any ID projects. People related factors including lack of qualified project planners and managers, leadership across boarder, low administrative capacity (Palmer 1986,Rondinelli 1970,Discenza&Forman 2007) can also be considered as important causes of failure in development projects. Most of ID projects are managed by foreign leadership. According to (Feedman & Katz 2007) the leadership across borders is a potential cause of failure. Besides adaptation problems, international project leaders face important development problems as international work at the project level could still be considered as a new territory for those engaged. It is believed that the implementation of IDPs in a different country with a distinctive legal and political setting, security constraints, economic conditions, infrastructure limitations and requirements would further increase the complexity of projects and therefore mastering these numerous challenges would be required to reduce ID project failure. Feedman & Katz (2007) further explain that geographical distances, language barriers, cross-cultural gaps are typical of ID projects environment which will further create leadership challenges and more risks that cause ID project failure. Rondinelli (1970) states that low administrative capability levels,

qualified planners and managers' scarcity, and absence of appropriate physical, financial, or social preconditions make development projects risky from the beginning. Local resource scarcity for project support or maintenance, as well as budgeting and allocation issues often cause problems even for internationally aided projects. Hermano et al (2013) studied the critical success factors for ID projects and grouped them into four areas; factors related to the project, factors related to the team, factors related to the organizations, and factors related to the external environment. They also assessed the two most widely used project design and management methodologies namely the Logical Framework Approach (FLA) and PMD Pro1. They opine that LFA despite being the most widespread body of knowledge for managing IDPs can cause project failure in development projects.

In the literature, the explored and examined factors causing project failure vary in their scope and purpose (Damoah& Kumi 20018). They are monotonous and conflicting in nature. Therefore, it is difficult to come up with an agreement on a specific set of factors as the only factors responsible for the failure of ID projects. As (Rondinelli 1979) points out, this can be due to the experimental nature of ID projects and even apparently routine duplication, when transferring from one cultural setting to another, often faces unanticipated challenges. Besides, various factors affect ID projects at different stages of the project's life cycle. There may, however, be some underlying causes that lead to the failure of ID projects in one way or the other. Therefore, an investigation to further explore the reasons and causes of ID project failure takes on significance, particularly in a post-conflict environment with a different cultural setting like Afghanistan.

Objectives of the study

1. To examine the perception of respondents about the potential causes of failure in ID projects in Afghanistan
2. To identify the key factors causing ID project failure in Afghanistan.

Methodology

The study is empirical in nature carried out with the help of a structured questionnaire. The sample for this study includes ID projects senior management, ID projects team members and the general public residing in the capital city Kabul. The majority of ID project implementing partners have main offices in Kabul. A total of 500 hundred questionnaires (online and printed) were distributed to three categories of respondents, ID project senior management, ID project team members, and the general public to ascertain their perception of the factors causing ID project failure in Afghanistan. A sample of 217 respondents - 38 from senior managers, 55 from the team members, and 124 from the general public based a purposive non-probability sample method participated in the survey. The questionnaire was divided into two sections where the first section included questions on the demographic information of respondents and the second section included thirty variables on the potential causes of ID project failure identified through literature review. Each question was measured by a five-point Likert scale – strongly disagree to strongly agree. Descriptive statistics, RII method, Spearman's rank-order correlation, Kendall's coefficient of concordance, and exploratory factor analysis are used for data analysis.

Analysis and presentation of results

The data collected through the questionnaire was initially analyzed by RII method. This method was used to establish the relative importance of the factors causing ID project failure in terms of their criticality as perceived by the different categories of respondents. To determine the ranking of various failure factors from the viewpoint of senior management, team members and general public, the RII method as seen in the works of (Odeh & Battaineh 2002; Gunduz et al., 2013; Damoah& Kumi, 2018) was calculated using the following equation;

$$RII = \frac{\sum w}{A * N}$$

Where,

W = is the weight given to each factor by the respondents which ranges from 1 to 5, (where “1” is strongly disagree, and “5” is strongly agree).

A = is the highest weight (i.e. “5” in this case), and

N = is the total number of respondents in each category of respondents. In this case 38 for senior management, 55 for team members, and 104 for the general public. Table 2 illustrates the results of relative importance index calculations as well as their ranks for three categories of respondents. Subsequently, to determine and compare the level of agreement on the relative importance of each failure factor among senior management and team members, team members and general public, and senior management and general public, Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient is used. This is computed with the help of the following equation;

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6\sum d^2}{n(n^2 - 1)}$$

Where,

d = the difference between the ranks given by any two categories of respondents for an individual factor/cause, in this case, the three categories are project senior management, project team members and general public.

n = the number of factors/causes, 30 in this case.

The result of Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient found to be 0.86 for senior management and team members, 0.733 for team members and the general public, and 0.780 for senior management and general public respectively. This indicates that there is an agreement among the three categories of respondents because all the three coefficients are strong and positive. Furthermore, Kendall's coefficient of concordance is used to determine the level of agreement across three categories of respondents using a single coefficient. Kendall's coefficient

is directly related to the Spearman's correlation coefficient and is computed from mean (ρ) as under;

$$w = \frac{(m - 1)\bar{\rho} + 1}{m}$$

Where m represents the number of categories of respondents which in this case is 3, and $\bar{\rho}$ is the mean of the pairwise Spearman correlations, which in this case is 0.807. The computed Kendall's τ is 0.871 indicating that there is a high degree of agreement across the three categories (senior management, team members, and general public) on the causes of ID project failure in Afghanistan.

Table 1: Five most important causes of ID project failure

Factors causing failure	Senior Management	Team Members	General Public	Overall rank
1 Security issues and conflicts	2	1	3	1
2 Corruption	3	2	1	2
3 Political interference	1	9	2	3
4 Ineffective monitoring	5	3	4	4
5 Inappropriate selection of PM	11	4	5	5

Source: survey data

Result of relative importance and rankings

Table 2: RII results and Rankings for all the three categories of respondents

Factors/causes	Seniors		Teams		Public		Overall	
	RII	Rank	RII	Rank	RII	Rank	Mean	Rank
Inadequate project planning	0.82	8	0.82	8	0.77	10	0.8	8
Ineffective monitoring procedures	0.83	5	0.86	3	0.85	4	0.8	4
Frequent changes in project leadership	0.70	24	0.70	22	0.74	20	0.7	23
Inappropriate selection of project managers	0.79	11	0.86	3	0.83	5	0.8	5

Poor project team formation	0.82	7	0.83	6	0.82	6	0.8	6
Improper Task definition	0.76	13	0.74	18	0.76	13	0.8	17
Lack of active stakeholders involvement	0.78	12	0.77	15	0.71	24	0.8	15
Inappropriate project management technique	0.73	18	0.68	25	0.75	14	0.7	21
Lack of commitment to project	0.75	16	0.80	12	0.74	19	0.8	13
Poor Recruitment	0.84	4	0.77	16	0.79	8	0.8	10
Scope change amidst project implementation	0.75	17	0.68	27	0.73	21	0.7	22
Procurement processes	0.73	18	0.78	14	0.75	17	0.8	16
Weak Feasibility studies	0.82	8	0.85	5	0.77	11	0.8	7
Delayed release of funds	0.69	25	0.67	29	0.75	15	0.7	26
Inadequate Project funding	0.63	28	0.68	25	0.66	28	0.7	28
Labor (skilled labor and availability)	0.73	21	0.71	21	0.70	25	0.7	24
Lack of good Communication	0.76	13	0.79	13	0.73	23	0.8	14
Management practices	0.72	23	0.69	24	0.76	12	0.7	20
Weak Supervision	0.76	15	0.80	10	0.80	7	0.8	12
Bureaucracy	0.79	10	0.80	11	0.78	9	0.8	11
Lack of continuity	0.73	21	0.72	20	0.73	22	0.7	19
Political interference	0.88	1	0.81	9	0.88	2	0.9	3
Corruption	0.84	3	0.87	2	0.91	1	0.9	1
Regulations	0.69	25	0.73	19	0.69	26	0.7	25
Pressure groups	0.73	18	0.75	17	0.75	15	0.7	18
Natural disaster	0.61	30	0.59	30	0.57	30	0.6	30
Culture and belief systems	0.63	28	0.67	28	0.66	28	0.7	29
Low Capacity	0.83	5	0.82	7	0.75	17	0.8	9
Delays in payments	0.69	27	0.70	22	0.67	27	0.7	27
Security (conflicts and disturbances)	0.88	2	0.87	1	0.86	3	0.9	2

Source: survey data

Exploratory factor analysis

Data was further analyzed using exploratory factor analysis with the help of IBM Statistics SPSS v.25, to identify the potential key factors causing ID project failure in Afghanistan based on the interrelated variables. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was chosen as the

factor extraction method. The appropriateness of using factor analysis was confirmed by some tests including Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, Bartlett's test of sphericity and the presence of mild correlation among variables. The inspection of the correlation matrix showed that all variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater to the specified threshold of 0.3.

Table 3: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett's tests

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.745
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1185.439
	df	231
	Sig.	.000

Source: SPSS output, field survey

Table 3 demonstrates that the overall KMO measure is .745 which falls into the 'middling' classification of sampling adequacy as outlined by Kaiser (1974). Subsequently, the Bartlett's test of Sphericity is statistically significant $p < .000$, indicating that the data fulfills the basic assumptions of sampling adequacy and linearity, hence it is appropriate to employ Factor Analysis.

Five factors were extracted using orthogonal varimax rotation method. The factors were retained considering the eigenvalue criteria, the proportion of variance explained (Kaiser, 1960), factor meaningfulness criteria (Pituch & Stevens, 2016) and the scree plot method (Cattell, 1966). The retained factors have eigenvalues of greater than 1 and the proportion of variance explained by each factor is greater than 5% of the total variance. Subsequently, the visual observation of the scree plot reveals that five factors precede the inflection point on factor number six. Thus the retention of factors is meaningful and based on accepted widely used criteria.

The extracted factors show a cumulative variance of 51.6% of the total variance. The factor loading for each variable is greater or equal to 0.5 indicating that the factor variable is

significantly contributing to the factor. Factor 1, Funding Constraints accounts for as much as 20.5% of the total variance and is explained by variables - delays in payments, delayed release of funds, inadequate project funding, natural disaster, and culture and belief systems. Factor 2, Ineffective Staffing encompasses 6 variables namely – low capacity, poor recruitment, inappropriate selection of project managers, poor project team formation, weak feasibility studies, and security accounting for 11.6% of variance. Factor 3, External Forces contributes 7.5% variance and includes four variables – corruption, pressure groups, frequent changes in project leadership, and political interference. Factor 4, Project Leadership shares a 6.6% variance with three variables - improper task definition, regulations, and scope changes amidst project implementation. Factor 5, comprises of four variables – ineffective and poor monitoring procedures, lack of commitment to project, weak supervision and management practices with a contribution of 5.3% variance (see table 4).

Causes of failure	Funding constraints	Ineffective staffing	External forces	Leadership factor	Management practices
Delays in payments	.698	.177	.272	.109	.014
Delayed release of funds	.694	.059	.304	.142	-.135
Inadequate Project funding	.661	-.028	-.059	.301	.097
Natural disaster	.655	-.079	-.228	.118	.009
Culture and belief systems	.637	-.019	-.112	-.093	.318
Low Capacity	.257	.704	-.167	.013	-.040
Poor Recruitment	-.036	.674	.178	.170	.227
Inappropriate selection of project managers	-.115	.612	.204	.015	.115
Poor project team formation	-.065	.585	.103	.174	.422
Weak Feasibility studies	-.046	.579	-.069	.256	.044
Security (conflicts and disturbances)	.307	.531	.384	-.240	.073
Corruption	.009	.001	.765	.032	.162
Political interference	-.003	.111	.633	-.003	.056
Pressure groups	.008	.064	.565	.395	-.053
Frequent changes in project leadership	.065	.128	.058	.646	-.219
Improper Task definition	-.010	.163	.060	.620	.315
Regulations	.347	.020	.136	.578	.203
Scope change amidst project implementation	.200	.113	.009	.518	.124
Ineffective and poor monitoring procedures	.050	.090	.452	.001	.617
Lack of commitment to project	.052	.328	.033	.051	.593
Weak Supervision	.077	.385	.198	.121	.517
Management practices	.280	-.078	-.196	.348	.472
% of Variance Explained	20.502	11.579	7.5	6.6	5.30
Eigen value	4.51	2.547	1.649	1.447	1.167
Cronbach's Alpha	.728	.730	.60	.60	.60

KMO =.745, Bartlett's $\chi^2 = 1185.439$, $p < .000$, Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 4: Results of exploratory factor analysis (N = 217)

Source: SPSS output, survey data

Discussion

Security issues, corruption, political interference, poor monitoring procedures and inappropriate selection of project managers as perceived by three different categories of respondents are the top five significant factors that cause international development project failure in Afghanistan. These causes are considered, in addition to other factors, to be the most significant contributors to the failure of ID projects. Senior management perceive that the top five most important causes for failure of development project are political interference, security issues, corruption, poor recruitment, and ineffective monitoring procedures while the team members working in such projects think that security, corruption, ineffective monitoring procedures, inappropriate selection of project managers, and weak feasibility studies are the top most significant causes of ID project failure. On the other hand, the general public ranks corruption, political interference, security issues, ineffective monitoring procedures and inappropriate selection of project managers as the topmost significant factors influencing the failure of ID projects respectively. The top five ranked factors are discussed below.

Security

Security is ranked by senior management, team members and general public as number 2, 1, and 3 with RII index of 0.88, 0.87, and 0.86 respectively. Security issues and armed conflicts prevented the implementation of ID projects in most parts of the country. According to SIGAR (2019) report, the Afghan government has control only over 53.8 % of districts while 12.3 % of the districts are controlled or influenced by insurgents, and about 33.9 % of districts are

contested. This means to say that almost half of the country is not secure for undertaking any development activities. Therefore, lack of security is perceived as the biggest factor influencing the failure of ID projects in Afghanistan.

Corruption

Corruption is the second most significant factor for ID project failure in Afghanistan. Corruption is ranked as number 3, 2, and 1 by senior management, team members and the general public respectively. Corruption in Afghanistan has been the most debated topic in recent years. Transparency International reports that “endemic levels of corruption undermine the Afghan state-building projects and corruption has become a driver of conflicts in Afghanistan” (Back,2019). A survey conducted by the Asia Foundation in 2017 reveals that 83.7% of respondents believed that corruption is a major issue in Afghanistan. Moreover, as per the national survey, 72% of respondents participated in the survey believe that corruption has become a more significant problem in recent years (Integrity Watch 2018). The result, therefore, confirms the phenomenon that corruption is another significant factor causing ID project failure.

Political interference

Political interference as the causes of ID project failure was ranked as number 1, 9 and 2 by senior managers, team members, and general public. Senior management and the general public think that political interference in the management of ID projects in Afghanistan is a significant factor that can hinder the success of these projects. Although ID projects are initiated and funded by bilateral and multilateral organizations, the management of these projects is still influenced by political meddling to greater extents. Moreover, the recruitment of local project managers is most often influenced by political decisions.

Poor monitoring procedures

Poor monitoring procedures is overall ranked as the fourth most influential factor causing project failure in Afghanistan. While most international donors insist on strict monitoring of development projects, there are still instances of development activities with little or no monitoring and control. According to a recent SIGAR report "millions of dollars in emergency food assistance are at risk of waste, fraud and abuse because USAID is unable to monitor the distribution of food directly."The report also stated that USAID is not sure whether its funding projects are producing the desired outcomes.

Inappropriate selection of PM

Senior management, team members and general public ranked inappropriate selection of project managers as number 11, 4, and 5 respectively. Since the project manager is responsible for the overall implementation of the project, utmost care should be taken while recruiting. Lack of qualified project managers and low administrative capacity is considered as human factor related causes of ID project failure (Palmer 1986,Rondinelli 1970,Discenza&Forman 2007). Project leadership across the border can also contribute to the failure of ID projects (Feedman & Katz 2007). The international project manager besides adaptation problems has to deal with distinctive legal and political settings, security constraints, language barriers, and cross-cultural gaps (Feedman & Katz 2007). Therefore, inappropriate recruitment of project leadership can affect the success of development projects to greater extents.

The result of Exploratory Factor analysis proposes five factors as the potential causes of ID project failure. These factors are (1) Funding Constraint, (2) Ineffective Staffing, (3) External Forces, (4) Project Leadership, and (5) Project Management Practices. Delays in payments, delayed release of funds by donors, inadequate project funding, natural disaster, and culture and belief systems are all causes grouped under Funding Constraints. The variables low capacity, poor recruitment, inappropriate selection of project managers, poor project team formation, weak feasibility studies, and security constitutes the factor Ineffective Staffing. External Forces

includes variables such as corruption, pressure groups, frequent changes in project leadership, and political interference. Moreover, improper task definition, regulations, and scope changes amidst project implementation are grouped under factor Project Leadership, and the factor Project Management Practices includes ineffective and poor monitoring procedures, lack of commitment to project, weak supervision and management practices.

Conclusion and recommendations

The study explored the influential causes of ID project failure in Afghanistan. The main purpose of the study was to identify the most significant failure factors from the viewpoint of senior management, team members, and the general public. The results of relative importance analysis revealed that the top five most ranked causes of ID project failure in the order of importance are (1) Security Issues, (2) Corruption, (3) Political Interference, (4) Poor Monitoring Procedures and (5) Inappropriate selection of Project Managers. The results of Spearman's correlation and Kendall's tests indicate that there is an agreement among three different categories of respondents on their rankings. Furthermore, the result of exploratory factor analysis reveals five latent factors as the potential factors causing ID project failure. These factors are (1) Funding Constraint, (2) Ineffective Staffing, (3) External Forces, (4) Project Leadership, and (5) Project Management Practices

Lack of security and prevalence of corruption as well as political interference are the factors which can highly affect the success of ID projects. It is, therefore, recommended to the Government of Afghanistan to provide better security in the regions where ID projects are being implemented. Political interference in the management of ID project should be minimized and the project managers should be allowed to manage activities according to the agreed project plan. The government should also take appropriate measures to tackle the widespread prevalence of corruption across all sectors in the country. Moreover, monitoring and evaluation of any development intervention is necessary to make sure that activities are being conducted

effectively and efficiently thereby improving the project performance. The ID project management is required to follow appropriate monitoring procedures to have clear oversight and control over the project activities.

Furthermore, when recruiting project managers, international organizations and local government should be extremely careful. The project manager is responsible for all project activities and his/her knowledge, skills, experience can influence the success or failure of any project to a greater extent.

References

1. Agheneza, Z. (2009). Why Development Projects Fail in Cameroon. *International Journal of Rural Management*, 5(1), 73–90. doi:10.1177/097300520900500104
2. Asia Foundation (2017). A Survey of the Afghan People: Afghanistan in 2017.
3. Bak, Mathias (2019). Corruption in Afghanistan and the role of development assistance. Transparency International
4. Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1, 245-276.
5. Damoah, I. and Kumi, D. (2018), "Causes of government construction projects failure in an emerging economy", *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 558-582. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-04-2017-0042>
6. Discenza, R. & Forman, J. B. (2007). Seven causes of project failure: how to recognize them and how to initiate project recovery. Paper presented at PMI® Global Congress 2007—North America, Atlanta, GA. Newtown Square, PA: Project Management Institute.
7. Freedman, S. and L. Katz (2007). Critical success factors for international projects. *PM World Today*. 9(10): p. 1-8.

8. Freedman, S. and L. Katz (2007). Critical success factors for international projects. *PM World Today*. 9(10): p. 1-8.
9. Gunduz, Murat & Nielsen, Yasemin & Ozdemir, Mustafa. (2013). Quantification of Delay Factors Using the Relative Importance Index Method for Construction Projects in Turkey. *Journal of Management in Engineering*. 29. 133-139. 10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000129.
10. Hermano, V., López-Paredes, A., Martín-Cruz, N., & Pajares, J. (2013). How to manage international development (ID) projects successfully. Is the PMD Pro1 Guide going to the right direction? *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(1), 22–30
11. Integrity Watch. (2018) National Corruption Survey 2018.
12. Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychology Measurement*, 20, 141-151.
13. Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 32-36.
14. Laber, J. (2018). Can We Admit Now That Afghanistan Reconstruction Failed? | The American Conservative. Retrieved 19 December 2019, from <https://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/can-we-admit-now-that-afghanistan-reconstruction-failed/>
15. McManus, J., & Wood-Harper, T. (2008). A study in project failure. Retrieved 19 December 2019, from <https://www.bcs.org/content-hub/a-study-in-project-failure/>
16. Odeh, A. M., & Battaineh, H. T. (2002). Causes of construction delay: traditional contracts. *International Journal of Project Management*, 20(1), 67–73. doi:10.1016/s0263-7863(00)00037-5
17. Pager, T. (2015). Debate over the success of Afghanistan projects. Retrieved 19 December 2019, from <https://www.militarytimes.com/2015/01/28/debate-over-success-of-afghanistan-projects/>
18. Pituch, K., & Stevens, J. (2016). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (6th ed., p. 334). New York, NY: Routledge.

19. Rondinelli, D. A. (1979). Planning Development Projects: Lessons from Developing Countries. *Long Range Planning*, 12(3), 48–56.
20. Rondinelli, D. A. (1979). Planning Development Projects: Lessons from Developing Countries. *Long Range Planning*, 12(3), 48–56.
21. Rotner, E.R. (1970). Review: Development Projects Observed by A. O. Hirschman. *The Pakistan Development Review*,. 10(1): p. 112-115.
22. Sahibzada, S., Mahmood, M., & Qureshi, S. (1992). Why Most Development Projects Fail in Pakistan? A Plausible Explanation [with Comments]. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 31(4), 1111-1122.
23. Sopko, J.F (2019). Quarterly report to United States Congress, SIGAR. Accessed from; <https://www.sigar.mil/quarterlyreports/index.aspx?SSR=6>
24. Strachan, H.W. (1978). Side-effects of planning in the aid control system. *World Development*, 6(4): p. 467-478.