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ABSTRACT

The study concerned with the joint project management and organizational performance in Rwanda with the case study the Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture growth project (RCAG) in Cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. This study had the following objectives: (i) Find out the process Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth project (RCAG) used to respect the four stages of project life cycle management (Initiation, planning, execution/Implementation and closure); (ii) Assess the level at which RCAG project outputs/outcomes had contributed to the organizational performance growth (product quality, sales growth, assets etc.) of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli; (iii) Identify the degree to what RCAG project achievements are sustainable and satisfy the stakeholders around rice promotion in Mukunguli marshland. In the study both independent and dependent variables were discussed in relation to literature. A research design was employed using questionnaires to 80 respondents who are members and staff of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and its key RCAG Project stakeholders and partners using the simple random sampling techniques. Questionnaire and interview schedule had been the techniques used to obtain the primary data. All the 80 questionnaires distributed were returned with the respondent’s answers and data analysis was performed using SPSS version 22. Descriptive statistics including frequency tables indicating the number and corresponding percentages were used to summarize and present data. The study findings indicated that majority of informants are farmers (83.8%), suppliers of the MRPIE rice factory at the level of 82.5% within 80.0% members of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa. The respondent majority were aged between 25-50 years (65%), females (38.8%) and had a primary level of education (63.8%). This study revealed that RCAG project had followed the implementation stages of a project life cycle, 60.0% respondents recognized the baseline analysis in the initiation phase and the majority have strongly agreed and agreed of the good project planning (81.3%) and the good implementation of executive phase (78.8%) and the internal consistence analysis is acceptable with 0.703 Cronbach’s alpha test. The closing phase was not applicable because the project has two years remaining when conducted the study. From this study, the majority respondents (55.0%) recognize that RCAG project had contributed to improve the rice production and productivity and 57.5% majority respondents have agreed to the important role played by RCAG project to improve the cooperative agriculture infrastructures and assets. The high level (55.0%) of respondents have strongly agreed that the rice marketing is actually well organized and have strongly agreed (62.5%) to increase the problems resolution and leadership in cooperative. The majority of respondents (66.3%) have strongly agreed of the good collaboration observed between cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli and MRPIE rice factory, the only buyer of the paddy produced by the cooperative, this collaboration indicates the sustainability of the RCAG project outcomes in Mukunguli. There is evidence to support that the RCAG project management is respecting successfully the four stages of the project life cycle and had contributed to the improvement of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa performances. Findings from the study recommend the increase of productivity of rice and income to the cooperative members, the involvement of all stakeholders at all level of the RGAG project management and suggest that the evaluation of organizational performance in 15 cooperatives supported by the RCAG project deeply with other performances indicators.
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DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

**Organization:** A structured social unit or entity like association or cooperative formed by a group of members that has a collective development goal and organized to accomplish the assigned mission and objectives.

**Organizational performance:** Comprises the measurement of actual outputs or results of an organization as compared to goals and objectives assigned. Organizational Performance is the valued productive output of system in the form of goods service (Swanson, 2000).

**Performance:** The accomplishment of a given task measured against preset known standards of accuracy, completeness, cost, and speed. The term performance relates the activities that ensure that goals are consistently being met in an effective and efficient manner (Miles, 2004).

**Project:** Is a planned set of interrelated activities to be executed and produce specific outcomes over a fixed period (with a specific start and finish date) and within certain cost (specific allocation of resources) and other limitations.

**Project management:** Is the application of knowledge, skills and techniques to implement the project activities through the planning and guiding project processes from start to the end and evaluate the outcomes results.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This study is focused on assessing the joint project management and organizational performance. This first chapter of the research discusses the background of the study, the statement of the problem of the study, the objectives of study, the research questions and the significance of the study, the limitations and the scope of the study and finally the organization of the study.

1.1 Background of the study

Many measurement approaches suffer from the problem of providing a one-dimensional, short-term view of performance that is overly dependent on the start and end point of measurement (Yip, 2009). For years, financial performance measurement was seen as the only way, the correct and legitimate way of assessing effectiveness and efficiency in an organization (Cavenaghi, 2001). The measurement of organizational performance has undergone changes in relation to its measurement focus. From a uniquely financial perspective, it began to consider other nonfinancial perspectives, as well as to include a cause and effect relation between the operational dimension and the strategic dimension of organizations (Frederico, 2009). Richard (2008) asserts that the organizational performance encompasses three specific areas of firm outcomes: (1) financial performance (profits, return on assets, return on investment, etc.); (2) market performance (sales, market share, etc.) and (3) shareholder return (total shareholder return, economic value added, etc.).

The organizations usually conduct self-assessments to better understand their own performance and to address their strategic issues and thus, ultimately, to improve their performance. Organization’s performance is made visible through the activities it conducts to achieve its mission. Outputs and their effects are the most observable aspects
of an organization’s performance (Lusthaus, 1999). An organization’s success is dependent on understanding high project performance i.e. projects completed on time, on budget and meeting original goals. Performance indicators are designed to provide information on the quality of processes performed within an organization offering support to achieve the objectives on time and within a predetermined budget. But, to fulfill this role is necessary to understand their full and proper use (Gavrea, 2011).

According to Project Management Institute[PMI] (2000), project management is the application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to a broad range of activities in order to meet the requirements of a particular project. Then, project management is the process of planning, implementing, and monitoring of project activities by effectively controlling and balancing the constraint of time, cost, and scope in producing quality deliverables to meet the expectations of the project stakeholders. A project management process is the management process of planning and controlling the performance or execution of a project and the performance measurements must be created for each project, based on the project scope, the goals and objectives of the stakeholders (PM4DEV, 2007). In the organization, the performance will be related to the whole project cycle management and the achievement of the objectives and goals by measuring the outcomes.

1.2 Problem Statement

Traditionally, performance measurement based on financial information has mainly utilized by managers and the importance of non-financial performance measurement was recognized in the evaluation of the performance of the entire organizational functions (Ukko, 2009). Actually, every project commences with a clear deliverables on which the project activities are focused and still the key measures of success that contribute to the
organizational strategic goals. The project managers, the organizational representatives and other stakeholders ask themselves if the concern organization is performing efficiently or not and reason why the present situation regarding the performance of the organization. In the same range of needs, the donors are trying to understand deeply the performance of organizations which they fund, to support the achievement of results and outcomes of the funded projects. In all development projects in Rwanda, the midterm and final evaluation are done followed by the impact evaluation (sometimes rare) regarding the objectives of the project. But the influence of the management of this project on the entire organizational performance has been put aside. This study makes clear if really the project deliverables in organization do or do not contribute in the performance of the whole organization as far as the project management is concerned. This is why the study is about assessing the relationship between project management in the whole project life cycle and the organizational performance and it is conducted to the case study of the Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth Project (RCAG) in the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli.

1.3 Objectives of Study

In order to capture the study fully and give it a focus, the following objectives are set to be achieved.

1.3.1 General objective

The main objective of this study was to investigate the impact of project management on a performance of an organization.
1.3.2 Specific objectives

(i) Find out the process Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth project (RCAG) used to respect the four stages of project life cycle management (Initiation, planning, execution/ Implementation and closure).

(ii) Assess the level at which RCAG project outputs/outcomes had contributed to the organizational performance growth (product quality, sales growth, assets etc.) of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli.

(iii) Identify the degree to what RCAG project achievements are sustainable and satisfy the stakeholders around rice promotion in Mukunguli marshland.

1.4 Research questions

(i) How did the RCAG project respect the process of four stages of project life cycle?

(ii) What is the contribution level of the RCAG project outputs/outcomes to the organizational performance growth (product quality, sales growth, assets etc.) of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli?

(iii) Are the RCAG project achievements sustainable and satisfy the stakeholders around rice promotion in Mukunguli marshland?

1.5 Significance of the study

Study on the subject “Joint project management and organizational performance. A case of Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth (RCAG) project in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli” provides the following benefits to different levels:
1.5.1 To the researcher

The findings of the study was to allow the researcher practices and apply what was learnt in a theoretical study; The study was carried out to fulfil the partial requirement for the degree of master in Business Administration of Mount Kenya University which has been attendant by the researcher.

1.5.2 To the RCAG owners and stakeholders

The research provide information on the RCAG project successes and the role of its management to the performance of the beneficiary’s organizations such as COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli and the level of ensuring the impact durability of the RCAG project achievements.

1.5.3 Cooperatives, SMEs and the project sponsors in Rwanda

The findings of this research and recommendations guide decision-makers in different organizations to improve their performance from the good management of different projects they execute.

The research provide information on the RCAG project successes and the role of its management to the performance of the beneficiary’s organizations such as COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli and the level of ensuring the impact durability of the RCAG project achievements.

1.5.4 To MKU and other researchers

At the end of the research, the study will be provided to MKU library and will be a reference to the students and other researchers interested in similar research themes for further investigation in other areas.
1.6 Limitation of the study

The perceived major limitations to this study are the limitation that concerns the case study where the project is implemented in 15 cooperative organizations and we are taken only one organization for measuring the influence of the project management to the organization performance. Another major limitation concerns the particularity of the RCAG Project that have two main implementers’ organizations with different mission and objectives and that probably may influence the management of the project and the study will not focus separately to each one.

1.7 Scope of the study

This study carries out the information on the project management and the organizational performance of one project in one organization. The study was focused on the management process of Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth (RCAG) project, a project funded by the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD) through the grant agreement between DFATD the Canadian Cooperative Association (CCA) who is responsible for the project implementation. Additionally, the study was conducted to set out the performance improvement of the organization COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli, considered as the impacts of the RCAG project achievements. Geographically, the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli has its office in the Southern Province of Rwanda, Kamonyi district in Nyamiyaga sector. This cooperative conducts its agribusiness activities on rice crop in Kamonyi district (Mugina and Nyamiyaga sectors) and in Ruhango district (Kinazi sector). The study is limited in the time period of three years, from June 2012 to June 2015 to access the progress made by the cooperative during the implementation of RCAG Project action plans.
1.8 Organization of the study

This research consists of five chapters. Chapter one deals with the background, problem statement, objectives, research questions, significance, scope, limitation and organization of the study. Chapter two reviews literature related to the research topic, the theoretical literature and conceptual framework of the study. Methodological issues including the study area description are presented in chapter three. The fourth chapter presents the results of the study and their interpretation. The final chapter summarizes the research conducted, concludes, and presents recommendations and suggestions for further study.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

In this chapter we use different documents to show the related theories to the topic of our research. The purpose of the literature review is to provide an understanding of the strengths of the research, the conceptual reasoning of others about the similar problem of the study. This chapter deals with the concepts and theories on project and project management on one side and performance and organizational performance on the other side, the empirical review of past studies, the critical literature review, the conceptual framework and the summary.

2.1 Theoretical literature

Many organizations are constantly trying to work hard for performing. However, they are not always successful. To better understand what they can or should change to improve their ability to perform, they can conduct organizational performance analysis. Validly measuring performance requires allowing for the stakeholders for whom a performance measure is relevant, the landscape over which performance is being determined and the relevant timeframe in measuring performance (Richard, 2008).

Performance measurement provides a reliable process to determine if an organization’s current system is working well. Today’s economy, there is a demand for transparency and increasing security of an organization’s business practices. These reasons promote an organization’s use of process and outcome data as a means to demonstrate its performance. Performance measurement endorses a process perspective where the focus is on the internal process of quantifying the effectiveness and the efficiency of action with a set of metrics. From these, the fitting relation between an organization’s implementation of project management and its organizational context by exploring how the underlying
drivers of an organization’s strategy might influence not only the nature of the projects that it undertakes, but also the appropriateness of the arrangements that it makes to manage those projects, the project outputs, outcomes and impacts could serve as a measure of the performance of the organization (Neely, A. G., 1995).

In the theoretical review, the topic of project management and organizational performance will understand in partiality of keys words and been complete with the finding in empirical research.

2.1.1 Understanding organization and cooperative

An organization is a social unit of people that is structured and managed to meet a need or to pursue collective goals. All organizations have a management structure that determines relationships between the different activities and the members, and subdivides and assigns roles, responsibilities, and authority to carry out different tasks. There are a variety of legal types of organizations, including cooperatives. According the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA, 1995) the term "Cooperative" has been defined as "an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise." A cooperative is seen as an organization which makes a private business on the products or services and is controlled by owners and the users of its products or services. Indeed not so much different from the International Cooperative Alliance’s definition, Rwandan cooperative law defines cooperatives as associations of natural or legal persons operating together in activities aiming at promoting their members in accordance with values of mutual responsibility and self-help, democracy, equity and equal rights to its assets (Rwanda, 2007). The study is focused on the
cooperative COOPRIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli that makes its main agribusiness on the crop production of rice.

2.1.2 Performance and organizational performance

Concept of performance and organization performance

Performance refers to the activities that ensure that goals are consistently being met in an effective and efficient manner. The performance can be understood in several ways (i) performance refers to the actual results or outputs of certain activities; (ii) performance refers to how an activity is carried out, i.e. how something is being performed; (iii) performance may also refer to the ability to achieve results. Hence, performance may relate to actual results, activities, or the potential for results (Lönnqvist, 2004). Performance is divided into three domains: financial performance, business performance and organizational effectiveness. Financial performance centers on the use of simple outcome-based financial indicators, whereas business performance includes emphasis on indicators of operational performance (i.e. nonfinancial) in addition to indicators on financial performance (Venkatraman N., 1986).

Performance can also be identified and equated with effectiveness and efficiency of action (Neely, A. G., 1995), where the effectiveness refers to the extent to which customer requirements are met, while efficiency is a measure of how economically the firm’s resources are utilized when providing a given level of customer satisfaction (Ukko, 2009). Performance management can focus on the performance of an organization, a department, employee or even the processes to build a product or service, as well as many other areas (Miles, 2004). The performance of an organization is a complex phenomenon and involves the recurring activities to establish organizational goals, monitor progress
towards the goals, and make adjustments to achieve those goals more effectively and efficiently (Ukko, 2009).

Lebans (2006) provided a set of definitions to illustrate the concept of organizational performance:

(i) Performance is a set of financial and nonfinancial indicators which offer information on the degree of achievement of objectives and results

(ii) Performance is dynamic, requiring judgment and interpretation.

(iii) Performance may be illustrated by using a causal model that describes how current actions may affect future results.

(iv) Performance may be understood differently depending on the person involved in the assessment of the organizational performance (e.g. performance can be understood differently from a person within the organization compared to one from outside).

(v) To define the concept of performance is necessary to know its elements characteristic to each area of responsibility.

(vi) To report an organization's performance level, it is necessary to be able to quantify the results.

Categorization of the organizational performances

They are many ways to categorize organizational performance. One way is to distinguish the outcomes of organizational activities and the means by which these outcomes are reached (Govindarajan, 1990). Another way to characterize performance is to distinguish between financial and non-financial performance (Ittner, 2008). According to Lusthaus (1999), the organizational issues centre around effectiveness (how well your organization is performing in achieving its mission), efficiency (how well it is using its resources to reach its mission), relevance (how well your organization’s mission continues to serve the
purpose of your various stakeholders), and financial viability (whether you have adequate funding to ensure that your organization can continue to perform in the short and long terms). Every organization must determine a set of indicators to categorize the level of its performances. According the four last organizational performance issues, some indicators are identified of each one. Figure 2.1 lists the performance indicators of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and financial viability identified by Lusthaus (1999) and organized in the table by the researcher.

![Organizational performance issues](image)

Figure2.1: The indicators of organizational performance issues listed by Lusthaus (1999)

Organizational performance involves the recurring activities to realize and monitor the established organizational goals to attain of its mission more effectively and efficiently. To survive, the organization’s inflow of financial resources must be greater than the outflow to make an organization financially viable, and the organization must have the
multiple sources of funding to ensure the positive cash flow and financial surplus. And for relevance performance issue, the organization must adapt to changing contexts and capacities and keep its mission, goals, programs, and activities agreeable to its key stakeholders for its business durability.

**Measurement of the organizational performance**

Normally efficiency and effectiveness are two ways an organization can measure its performance through the success of a project’s outcomes. Performance measurement is a process by which an organization follows and monitors important aspects of its programs, systems, and operation processes. Data are collected to reflect how its processes are working, and that information is used to conduct an organization’s decisions over time. A typical performance measurement helps businesses in periodically setting business goals and then providing feedback to managers on progress towards those goals. Performance measurement is traditionally viewed as an element of the planning and control cycle that captures performance data, enables control feedback, influences work behavior (Flamholtz, 1985). According to Neely (2000), there are two basic types of performance measure in any organization, those that relate to results (competitiveness, financial performance), and those that focus on the determinants of the results (quality, flexibility, resource utilization and innovation). For years financial performance measurement was seen as the only way, the correct and legitimate way of assessing effectiveness and efficiency in an organization (Cavenaghi, 2001). Most analysts and investors tend to focus on return on equity (ROE) but it can obscure a lot of potential problems while others say that return on assets (ROA) is a better metric of financial performance than income statement profitability measures like return on sales (Hagel III, 2010). The non-financial performance can be measured using operational key performance indicators (KPIs); market share, innovation rate or customer satisfaction are prominent examples
According to Yazici (2009), the perceived organizational performance is measured by internal (saving benefits, sales growth, business performance compared to last year) and external (market share, competitive position, business performance compared to best worldwide competitor) performance measures. The highest internal organizational performance is reported for savings, followed by overall business performance compared to previous year and sales growth. In terms of external organizational performance, project managers perceived that projects resulted in an improved competitive position followed by an increased market share and a better business performance compared to best worldwide competitor.

Factors that affect organizational performance

Organizations today are continuously facing external and internal forces that drive them to change due to the world are more competitive in times. External forces such as new industries in the market and rapid changes in information technology are among the factors that shape the approach on how organizations handle their businesses (Gunasekaran, 2005). According Gavrea C. (2011), internal factors include leadership and internal management commitment, internal resources, performance-oriented culture, employee engagement, and maturity of Project Management Systems. Leadership is important in designing and developing effective performance measurement system and internal management commitment brings formality to the performance management reviews and as a consequence could influence employees’ commitment to achieving targets and improving performance.

The performance of the organization quantified on the bases of its outcome results. Gavrea C. (2011) designed a model depicted in the figure 2.2 that shows the dimension of the organizational performance.
Figure 2.2: Dimensions of the organizational performance model by Gavrea C. (2011)

From the figure 2.2, the variables used to analyze firms are divided into two categories. The external environment reflected by the variables of competition, customers and suppliers and the internal environment reflected through the strategy, leadership, employees, quality, performance measurement, innovation and development information technology and corporate governance variables.

2.1.3 Project and Project Management

Understanding project and Project management

A project is a unique endeavor to produce a set of deliverables within clearly specified time, cost and quality constraints (Westland, 2006). From the business point of view, a project is a proposal for investment to create, expand, and develop certain business activities that creates the production of goods or services in a community that gives mutual benefits to all the parties involved in the project during certain period of time.

Projects are characterized by four features: a group of people, a goal, limited time and money and a certain level of uncertainty regarding whether the goals will be achieved.
(Baars, 2006). Then a project is a time limited and goal-directed, it is major undertaking and requiring the commitment of different skills and a combination of human and non-human resources pooled together in a temporary organization to achieve a specific purpose. According to Carroll (2012) whatever the type of project is, there are three key characteristics that can be associated with it: (1) a project must have a goal (some of sort of specific outcomes) as there would be no point in carrying a project if it did not achieve anything of benefit; (2) a project must be started or initiated, as projects do not happen spontaneously; and (3) a project need someone (the project manager) to run it and steer in through to the achievement of the goal. In the same line Manktelow (2001) sets out the following common characteristics of sized projects (large or medium): (1) a series of complex and interrelated activities, many of which have to be carried out in sequence; (2) a predetermined timescale, with a clear beginning and end; (3) a fixed budget; (4) a specific deliverable and (5) the involvement of many people, often coming from different functions. So a project is unique (every project is different in some way) characterized by its name, implemented for change, to produce specific product or service using the people and money in the predetermined finite time.

Project management is the discipline of controlling the introduction of new initiatives of organization change and it is the centralized planning, organizing, controlling and monitoring of keys activities that will ensure the accomplishment of a project’s objectives (Manktelow, 2001). Then, the Project Management must provide an integrated framework for project organization (managing the project team), planning and control which is designed to ensure the timely and cost-effective production of all the end-products, maintain acceptable standards of quality (in according of all project specifications), achieve for the organization the benefit for which the investment in the project has been made.
**Project management life cycle**

Project management is a combination of steps and techniques for keeping the goals and objectives, budget and schedule in order. One of the methods of project management is the project management life cycle that includes a number of phases, starting with the initiation phase and ending with the termination phase. Waldt (2007) described the project management life cycle using the Method 123 Project Management Methodology (MPMM) which describes the Project Management Life Cycle in depth, helping to finish every phase, activity and task quickly and efficiently and providing all of the knowledge and tools required to deliver projects successfully. The following diagram resumes the MPMM Project Management Life Cycle.

![Diagram of the MPMM Project Management Life Cycle](image)

Figure 2.3: Description of four phases of MPMM Project Life Cycle by Waldt (2007)

The four phases as described by (Waldt, 2007) are the following:

a) **Project Initiation**: is the first phase in the Project Life Cycle. Initiation involves starting up the project, by documenting a business case, feasibility study, term of reference, appointing the team and setting up a Project Office.
b) **Project Planning**: After defining the project and appointing the project team, the following step is to enter in the detailed Project Planning phase. Planning involves setting out the roadmap for the project by creating the following plans: project plan, resource plan, financial plan, quality plan, acceptance plan and communications plan.

c) **Project execution**: With a clear definition of the project and a suite of detailed project plans, the third phase consists of the project execution. Execution involves building the deliverables and controlling the project delivery, scope, costs, quality, risks and issues.

d) **Project Closure**: Is the last phase of project management, it involves releasing the final deliverables to the customer, handing over project documentation to the business, terminating supplier contracts, releasing project resources and communicating project closure to all stakeholders. The last remaining step is to undertake a Post Implementation Review to identify the level of project success and note any lessons learned for future projects.

**Project deliverables and outcomes**

In project management, deliverables are the project outputs (product or service) that are given to the organization’s clients. Project deliverables are the results expected to be delivered by the end of a project. According to Burley (2013), deliverable is a term used in project management to describe a tangible or intangible object produced as a result of the project that is intended to be delivered to a customer (either internal or external). Regardless of the method used to construct each deliverable, careful monitoring and control processes should be employed to ensure that the quality of the final deliverable meets the acceptance criteria set by the customer. Outputs are short-term development results produced by project and non-project activities. They must be achieved with the resources provided and within the time-frame specified,
usually less than five years (UNDP, 2009). Project Output is the final measurable result received upon successful completion of a project when all planned tasks and activities are accomplished and project deliverables are produced. It is characterized by the quality, quantity and timeliness of project deliverables that are available for use at project conclusion. Project output refers to a particular measurable product, service or opportunity that is generated as a result of the project delivery process. Output of a project is received through a complex of activities that define the project lifecycle. All project activities are performed under certain requirements in order to develop a desired measurable output.

Outcomes can be considered as mid-term results, they are not seen immediately after the end of the project activities. According UNDP (2009), outcomes are actual or intended changes in development conditions that interventions are seeking to support, they are medium-term development results created through the delivery of outputs and the contributions of various partners and non-partners. Project outcomes mean how the project will impact or change in the organizational performance or behavior among individual or group in a particular region, country or community within a period of time. Unlike a deliverable, a project outcome does not consist of work, but of achievement related to the work; a project deliverable is measurable while a project outcome is not. Impact is usually a long-term result and it may not be achievable even during the life cycle of the project.

**Project success and project impact**

A project is successful when a satisfaction from the stakeholders on the final delivered product or service is achieved. At the end of the project the judgment of success by whether the scope is completed within the constraints of time and cost, and the project’s output is delivered to specification, in the months following the project success is judged
by whether the output performs as required and gives the desired benefit; and in the years following the project success is judged by whether the organization achieves higher order strategic objectives that improve organizational performance (Turner, 2012). Project success is best judged by the stakeholders from the sponsor to the final beneficiaries or customers. Shenhar et al (1997) note of the three traditional dimensions of project efficiency: time, budget and scope, scope has the largest role, as it also has an impact on the customer and their satisfaction and Turner (2012) suggests that project efficiency is important to success because if the project is completed late and over budget it will be more difficult for it to be a business success.

The project impact is the degree to which the outcomes observed by a project are attributable to its activities after a project completion. Project impact indicators measure lasting changes in the conditions or aspects of the quality of life of populations. According the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) of the World Bank, Project impact evaluation is an assessment of the impact of the project on final welfare outcomes rather than only at project outputs, or a process evaluation which focuses on implementation (World Bank, 2006).

**Project sustainability and stakeholder satisfaction**

Sustainability can be defined as the ability of a project to maintain its operations, services and benefits during its projected life time. However, the issue of sustainability should also be seen within time and changing social, economic and political contexts (Khan, 2000). According the IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010, sustainability is the ensuring that the institutions supported through projects and the benefits realized are maintained and continue after the end of the project (IFAD, 2007). Then the project sustainability beyond the project duration and replicability of the project strategy and methodology should be borne in mind throughout the implementation period and the designing of
project and the way a project is implemented can have considerable influence on its long-term sustainability. Several factors are responsible for poor sustainability. Some are simple, some are quite complex, some are within the control of the project management, while others come as external threats (Khan, 2000).

Project stakeholders are individuals and organizations that are actively involved in the project, or whose interests may be affected as a result of project execution or project completion. According to Bourne M. K. S. (2005), the project stakeholders are individuals or groups who have an interest or some aspects of rights or ownerships in the project, can contribute in the form of knowledge or support, or can impact or be impacted by the project. Then, during the project lifecycle, the project management team must identify the stakeholders, determine their requirements and expectations, and, to the extent possible, manage their influence in relation to the requirements to ensure a successful project and their satisfaction through the sustainable of project achievements.

2.1.4 Project management and organizational performance relationship

Projects are taking place in organizations and projects must align in structure of an organization that can have a significant impact on project selection. Projects implementation requires an organizational structure that supports those projects.

Cooke-Davies (2002) differentiates between project management success, where the project is well managed to finish the desired scope within time and cost, and project success, where the project achieves its business objectives. Researchers increasingly measure success by impact on the organization rather than success at only meeting the triple constraint (time, budget and scope) that conducts to the project efficiency because of sometimes the original objectives of the project are not met, but the client was highly satisfied or the initial project objectives were met, but the client was quite unhappy with
the results (Dr Serradora, 2014). Cooke-Devies (2004) proposed three distinct ways of looking at performance: project management success (time, cost, quality, etc.), project success (benefits), and corporate success (processes and decisions that translate strategy into programs and projects).

The success of an organization depends partly on its structure (the way in which tasks and responsibilities are formally allocated among its members) and partly on its management process (the way in which decisions are taken within the existing structure). According to Bourne L. (2005) the project organization is a part of the performing organization, with influences on the project from within the performing organization and outside it. The organization’s governance structure will provide the authorities for the project to commence and ensure that funds are allocated at the appropriate time. The project has its own organization and is also part of the performing organization.

Organizations that use a customized project management processes to fit objectives, practices and environments, can focus more on the important tasks of leading, innovating and delivering products and services, while at the same time improving efficiency and performance. For that, the project management can ensure that the project deliverables are relevant to the strategic direction of the organization. Bourne L. (2005) said that, as with any organization, the project organization (management) must operate in the context of the world outside itself, delivering according to the expectation of the performing organization within the constraints defined by the organization, in a highly complex conditions and ever changing environment. Then project management processes for planning, executing, and controlling are essential to ensure that we are able to implement organizational strategies effectively and efficiently that improve its performance.
2.1.5 Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth Project

The Rwanda Cooperative Agricultural Growth (RCAG) project works with 15 agricultural cooperatives in Rwanda, including Cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. The purpose of the project is to improve the agricultural production, productivity and marketing capacity of 22,000 members of 15 agricultural cooperatives in vulnerable, food-insecure communities in two provinces (6 districts) of Rwanda (CCA, 2014). Trainings on how to enhance productivity and avoid losses are also keys to the capacity building aspects of this project. The RCAG project has five year project (2011-2016) and implemented by UGAMA (Service Centre for Cooperatives) alongside its partners IWACU (Research and Training Centre for Cooperatives) and the Canadian Cooperative Association (CCA). The RCAG Grant Agreement is signed between the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD) Canada and the Canadian Cooperative Association (CCA).

2.2 Empirical Literature

The concept of organizational performance is not new. At the end of the 1950s and in the early 1960s, sustained efforts were made notably to understand the success of organizations and organizational performance has been approached in the literature using different sets of characteristics or variables (Aubry, 2010). Performance is often identified as the ultimate dependent variable in the literature on organizations; it is currently the focus of much attention in the project management literature (Thomas, 2008).
Project management was created in the 1990s as a tool for establishing standard practices for managing projects (Crawford, 2006). Projects have become important instruments for change and development in organizations (Balck, 1990). The advantages of project management have been well documented, but project failure rates still remain high (Dai, 2004). The financial approach alone cannot give a correct measure of the value of project management for the organization and the reduction of project management value exclusively to financial indicators underestimates major contributions that project management brings to organizational success like innovation, process and people (Aubry, 2010). The results of Aubry (2010) show that the rational goals and efficiency conception integrates the economic values of profitability, project management efficiency, and return on investment; the open systems and effectiveness conception includes variables that measure growth and take into consideration innovation and project effectiveness. There is, however, some support for the idea that project management maturity is connected to organizational performance i.e. market share, sales growth, etc.

A survey of 200 respondents in 30 countries conducted by Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) concluded that the greater an organization project management maturity (PMM), the greater the positive impact on overall project performance. However, there is no one optimum level of maturity that is appropriate for every organization (Wheatley, 2007). And the results of Yazici (2009) considering internal and external organizational performance, a highest internal organizational performance is reported for savings, followed by overall business performance compared to previous year and sales growth and in terms of external organizational performance, project managers perceived that projects resulted in an improved competitive position followed by an increased market share and a better business performance compared to best worldwide competitor. Surprisingly in the same research, the results show that the cost management is one of the
areas that needs improvement along with team and professional development, performance measurement, and risk management overall. It seems that organizations managed to standardize some of the control processes with respect to time and requirements, but not mastered planning, team development, cost and risk management. The empirical results contribute to a better understanding of the role of project management generally and Project Management Offices (PMOs) specifically. Globally, results of Aubry (2010) confirm the positive contribution of PMOs to organizational performance and the role of PMOs in project productivity is often recognized in the literature. Mohamed (2013) investigated the influence of knowledge management practices on organizational performance in small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Iran, the finding showed that knowledge acquisition, storage, creation and implementation have a significant factor loading on knowledge management; and also productivity, financial performance, staff performance, innovation, work relationships, and customer satisfaction have significant factor loading on organizational performance.

2.3 Critical review and research gap identification

A better understanding of organizational performance and the contribution that project management can make is the aim of our research. Furthermore the term ‘organizational performance’ is seen as an independent variable and the studies (very few) give different meanings and measures. Performance is often identified as the ultimate dependent variable in the literature on organizations (Aubry, 2010). It is currently the focus of much attention in the project management literature (Thomas, 2008). Several ways to categorize performance have been presented in the different literature. One way is to distinguish the outcomes of organizational activities and the means by which these outcomes are reached (Govindarajan, 1990). Then, from the literature the ‘core’ measures of organizational performance that have general application, to enable benchmarking and comparison
across sectors found is resumed in Productivity, profitability, quality, innovation and staff performance. Several words are used almost as synonyms to organizational performance, for example: efficiency, output, productivity, effectiveness, health, success, accomplishment, and organizational excellence (Savoie, 2002). Another way to characterize performance is to distinguish between financial and non-financial performance (Ittner, 2008). The management and accounting literatures suggest that financial, efficiency-based performance measures are less relevant while non-financial measures are more relevant for strategies of differentiation (Spencera, 2009). The literature has also examined the wider impact of projects on the organizational performance. Shenhar (1997) note three traditional dimensions of project efficiency: time, budget and scope, scope has the largest role, as it also has an impact on the customer and their satisfaction. In the same way Yazici (2009), perceived organizational performance measured by internal (saving benefits, sales growth, business performance compared to last year) and external (market share, competitive position, business performance compared to best worldwide competitor) performance measures. Although there is a lot of research on performance measurement, and little research in organizational performance, there is a distinct gap in research focusing on organizational performance measures for creating and sustaining competitive advantage in project management. Therefore, there is a need for research to better understand the management project processes and to understand the most appropriate leading performance indicators that should be used in the project management processes and by which would objectively assess the capability of the project management processes to sustain organizational competitive advantage.
2.4 Theoretical framework

According to Nahm (2004) organizational performance measures adopted are sales growth, return on investment, market share gain, and overall competitive position. Furthermore, Dvir (2006) used similar measures for project success, such as whether a project resulted in a new line of product or service. Addressing key performance issues, performance measures may also address any of a number of specific performance criteria usually involve making comparisons of some sort (ratios, percentages, etc.), often cutting across the log frame hierarchy levels or sometimes even involving other dimensions. Many examples are cited such as economy, efficiency, productivity, quality/excellence, customer satisfaction, effectiveness, cost-effectiveness, attribution and sustainability (Savoie, 2002).

The project management is successful when it is achieving its objectives. Cooke-Davies (2002) differentiates between project management success, where the project is well managed to finish the desired scope within time and cost, and project success, where the project achieves its business objectives. According to Yazici (2009), the PMM model developed by PM Solutions contains the PMBOK Guide’s 9 Knowledge areas those are: Project Integration Management (PIM), Project Scope Management (PSM), Project Time Management (PTM), Project Cost Management (PCM), Project Quality Management (PQM), Project Human Resource Management (PHRM), Project Communications Management (PCOMM), Project Risk Management (PRM) and Project Procurement Management (PPM). According to PMI (2008) Project Integration Management is a subsect of a project management that includes the processes to ensure that the various elements of the project are properly coordinated. It consists of:

(i) Project plan development: integration and coordinating all project plans to create a consistent and coherent document.
(ii) Project plan execution: carrying out the project plan by performing the activities included therein

(iii) Integration change control: coordinating changes across the entire project

Then, the Project Integration Management is the processes and activities needed to identify, define, combine, unify, and coordinate activities within the Project Management Process Groups, this includes all project lifecycle management.

Page (2006) developed a set of ‘core’ measures of organizational performance that have general application, to enable benchmarking and comparison across sectors. The ‘core’ set of measures include productivity, profitability and quality, innovation and staff performance. Furthermore, investigation may be warranted to develop a range of measures which are better suited to the service sector, particularly where work and products are non-routine and client-specific. Thus this research comprises three types of variables including the independent variables resumed in the project management which influence the dependent variables that englobe the organizational performance. The intervening variables grouped in different guidance documents such as the organizational policy and procedures, organizational Strategic plan, organizational Resources allocations and project plan documents do also come in to moderate in the influence of the independent variables on the dependent variables as shown in the following conceptual framework diagram.
2.5 Conceptual Framework

The relationships to be tested in this research are summarized in the following conceptual framework.

Source: Researcher
Figure 2.4: Conceptual framework

The independent variable for this study is Joint Project Management and dependent variable is the Organizational Performance. The relationship between project management and organizational performance status can be conceptualized in Figure 2.3 to show the relationship between the joint project management with a set of the causal factors of which project management life cycle (project initiation, planning, executing and controlling and closing) and project management success (time, cost and quality management) and project management success (time, cost, quality) on a series of which in turn determine the organizational performance (increased productivity, sales growth,
profitability or return on investment, market share gain, customer and other stakeholder’s satisfaction, gain an overall business performance compared to the preceding years).

The intermediate variables include organizational policy and procedures, organizational Strategic plan, organizational resources allocations that govern this organization. The project documents like project plans and reports, baseline and project proposal must be presents to serve the references of the project in different implementation phases. Therefore, the researcher developed the above model which will help him in carrying out the research based on independent and dependent variables.

2.6 Summary

The literature review of many authors talked about the organizational performance and focused principally on measurement of the performances regarding the models used. The organizational performance variables frequently cited are financial performance, financial performance measurement, organizational efficiency and effectiveness, benefices and stakeholder satisfaction. The organizational performance in the relationship of project management still a gap to be addressed and the project management is studied in its components like project management life cycle, project management success and project management performance.

Gaps identified in previous studies that the researchers shall seek to address include project management in relation to organizational various types of measurement of its performance (financial and non-financial). The non-financial would be focused on the indicators that justify the customer satisfaction, shareholders welfare and organizational business growing. The ‘core’ measures of organizational performance include productivity, profitability and quality, innovation and staff performance.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The chapter three presents the research methodology used in assessing the impact of project management on the organizational performance; a case study of the Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth (RCAG) project in cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. This cooperative operates in Southern Province of Rwanda, Kamonyi District and its business concerns the production and commercialization of rice produced in Mukunguli marshland. This chapter describes in details the research design, the target population, sample design and sampling procedure, data sources and techniques and finally data analysis techniques.

3.1 Research design

In this study the research design was a case study, conducted using both quantitative (the mostly used) and qualitative methods. The quantitative methodology has introduce statistical data from larger samples to address the questions of how many, how often, who, when, and where, those to explain the relationship between the project management and the organizational performance.

3.2 Target population

The research has focused on analyzing the impact of project management of Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth (RCAG) Project on the performance of organization COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. To this end, the first category of our target population is the members and staff of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa represented by 307 people members in General Assembly of the cooperative who are active in the implementation of the RCAG project activities. The second category groups 38 people composed by staffs and shareholders of MRPIC Rice mill factory as the principal
outcome of RCAG Project in Mukunguli. The last category of our target population is composed by other stakeholders of the RCAG Project and partners of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli estimated to 50 people. Then the total target population is composed by 395 people (COOPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA, 2015).

3.3 Sample design

3.3.1 Sample size

The limited resources available did not make possible to survey all members of latest cited population groups as our target population. The research will focus on members of Mukunguli COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA as the one of the beneficiaries of Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth (RCAG) project and other direct stakeholders of RCAG project in Mukunguli. However some of the different partners of COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA that have any direct or indirect relationship to RCAG project was been part of our targeted population. The table 3.1 shows the number of the sample category and the number of respondents per category using the SLOVIN’S formula.

The sample size was obtained by applying the Slovin’s formula as:

\[ S = \frac{P}{1 + P(0.1)^2} \]

Where S= Sample size

P= Population

0.1= Marginal error

The Slovins’s formula is used to determine the minimum sample size from the 395 population that is direct partner of RCAG project and COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. And our sample size are \( S = \frac{395}{1 + 395 \times 0.1^2} = 80 \) people
Following the Slovene’s formula, the sample population of our target population at 10% marginal error is 80 respondents and the table 3.1 shows the repartition per category.

Table 3.1: Category of respondents and sample size population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of population</th>
<th>Sample units per category</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COOPORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRPIC Rice factory</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others main stakeholders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>395</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher

Therefore, 62 respondents are from COOPORIZ Abahuzabikorwa (members and staffs). They are the rice producers and suppliers the rice (paddy) to the MRPIC Ltd rice factory. Other respondents are composed by eight people from MRPIC Ltd Rice factory (staff and shareholders) and ten people that have any contribution in Mukunguli rice value chain development.

### 3.3.2 Sampling techniques

The study has used the simple random sampling techniques, where everybody in group of population had the equal chance to be selected and then the respondent filled the questionnaire. As for a simple random sampling, it is a method which executed in a manner that every element of the population has equal probability of being included in the sample and a complete frame including units of population is needed (Elsayir, 2014). In the simple random sampling all the members of the population are included in the list and then randomly select the desired number of subjects.
3.4 Data Collection methods

The study has used a survey technique to collect primary data. Secondary data were collected from the existing documentations on the research topic. Therefore, the instruments are used to collect primary and secondary data.

3.4.1 Data Collection instruments

The data collection instruments employed by the researcher include: questionnaire, documentary review and interview guide. These were leading the researcher to attain the intended objectives of the study.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire is a set of questions for gathering information from individuals. The first stage of quantitative information includes collection of primary data. For that, the design structured questionnaire with closed questions has been addressed to the direct key stakeholders of RCAG project such us COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa, MRPIC rice factory staff and shareholders and other partners of the Cooperative and the project.

Documentary review

The researcher has also explored available libraries of Universities, Government entities, and visit internet. Also the RCAG project plans and reports, Mukunguli paddy production and commercialization reports, COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa strategic and activity plans, annual reports and the other documents regarding the rice promotion in Mukunguli marshland had been consulted.

Interview guide

Structured and unstructured interviews with the target key respondents had been conducted by meeting the respondents and asking them questions of which the researcher
recorded all the responses by himself. Interview guide helps the researcher to know what to ask about and these concerns rice promotion in Mukunguli. Personal interview is useful to obtain detailed information about personal feelings, perceptions and opinions this method is used for supplement information got from the questionnaires.

3.4.2 Administration of data Collection instruments

Before the administration of the questionnaires, the following were stages undertaken by the Researcher: an introduction letter obtained from the MKU and the Researcher written a letter to the major respondent groups to solicit an approval to conduct the study using it as case study; after the researcher secured a list of the qualified respondents from the Cooperative COOPROZIZ Abahuzabikorwa, MRPIC Ltd rice factory staff and shareholders and other respondents. The respondents had explained about the study and were requested to accept to respond; more than enough questionnaires were produced for distribution; the researcher has selected the research assistants who would assist in the data collection; brief and orient the respondents in order to be consistent in administering the questionnaires.

During the administration of the questionnaires, the respondents were requested to answer completely and not to leave any part of the questionnaire unanswered and the researcher was conducted personally the structural and semi structural interviews.

3.4.3 Reliability and validity

In view of the following threats to reliability and validity, the researcher had claimed an allowable 10% margin of error at 0.1 level of significance. Measures had been taking to indicate in order to minimize if not to eradicate the threats to the validity of the findings of this study. The primarily data have been measured by the researcher involvement in the collection of those data when using the personal contact with respondents and the
secondary data sources are proved by their references. The focus had been oriented in the
data collection respondents of getting possible true information and make possible return
a maximum answered questionnaires and the instruments were tested before
administration on the field. For scale reliability, alpha test is used to measure the internal
consistency for data collected. Alpha test is determined by using the following
Cronbach's alpha formula:
\[ \alpha = \frac{N \cdot \bar{c}}{\bar{v} + (N - 1) \cdot \bar{c}} \]
Where N is equal to the number of items, c-bar is the average inter-item covariance
among the items and v-bar equals the average variance.

3.5 Data analysis procedure

After the collection of information, data have been analyzed using an Excel and Statistical
Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software programs and interpreted. All data have
been edited to detect errors and omissions, and make possible corrections and thereafter
coded to ease analysis.

3.6 Ethical considerations

In our study we ensure confidentiality of the information provided by the respondents and
to access to secondary data from any source does not require any written permission.
Whereas the publication of a document on information collected needs to present the
findings in a generalized manner and acknowledge the authors quoted in this study and
the author of the standardized instrument through citations and referencing. There was no
bias during the study. This research is my original work that was done for academic
purposes only.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

The main concern of this chapter is to analyze data collected from the sample from the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli and other respondents involved in the Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth (RCAG) Project as stakeholders of the project or partners of the cooperative. The presentation and interpretations of the findings had been shown in the light of the objectives which included (1) find out the process Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth project (RCAG) used to respect the four stages of project life cycle management (Initiation, planning, execution/ Implementation and closure); (2) assess the level at which RCAG project outputs/outcomes had contributed to the organizational performance growth (product quality, sales growth, assets etc.) of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli; (3) identify the degree to what RCAG project achievements are sustainable and satisfy the stakeholders around rice promotion in Mukunguli marshland. The findings are summarized before introducing the final part of this work.

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

It is crucial before presenting the research finding and brief interpreting them to describe the informants who participate in this study. The respondents are the sample from the members of cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa, sample from the Mukunguli Rice Promotion and Investment Company (MRPIC Ltd) both from rice factory staffs and shareholders and finally some partners of RCAG project and of the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. The researcher distributed the questionnaire to 80 respondents who constitute the sample size reached through purpose sampling technique. A total number of 80 individuals were interviewed through questionnaire,
comprising of men and women from COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa, MRPIC Rice factory and selected stakeholders of RCA project in Mukunguli.

For the easy parameterization of the questionnaire into the software SPSS version 22 to allow quick and easy analysis of the findings, the administrated questionnaire comprised of four main structured question groups focusing on the research questions guiding the research process towards achieving the objectives of the study.

With regard of respondent’s identification, the researcher was only interested on the informant’s age, gender, level of education, main activity of its income revenue etc. The age would give the information on the productivity of the respondent in process of ensuring the projects outputs/outcomes durability and maintain the strengthening of the achievements of organizational performances. Information on gender would inform the research on how best the RCAG project and the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli follow some government initiated policies including on gender balance for equitable and durable development. Knowledge and skills of the respondents and the same as their main income generating activity will inform the research about the deep responses of this study.

4.1.1 Age of respondents

Table 4.1: Age groups of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 25 and 50 years old</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 years old</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Table 4.1 indicates that most respondents have the medium age comprises between 25 up to 50 years old with 65% from the number of 52 respondents, the oldest are 32.5% of respondents who are over 50 years old but less than 75 years old while only 2.5% respondents are the youngest respondents with less than 25 years old.
Generally this figure shows that the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli has the work force seems active and also experienced in the rice production regarding the mean age. This organization has actually active work force that would be engaged in the performance of their organization when the opportunities are presented like the supporting projects.

4.1.2 Gender of respondents

Source: Field data
Figure 4.1: Gender of Respondents (%)

Figure 4.1 points out that out of 80 informants who responded to the administrative questionnaire, 31 with 38.8% were female whereas majority with 49 respondents representing 61.3% were male. This simply indicates that COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli is balanced in gender because the women are over 30% in the general assembly of the cooperative as the legislative framework to advance gender equality, the government of Rwanda recommends that women represent at least 30 percent of all public decision-making bodies.
4.1.3 Respondents’ level of education

![Respondents level of education](image)

Source: Field data

According to the questionnaire’s responses in Figure 4.2, 63.8% of the sampled respondents have a functioning primary school followed by 15% with functioning the adult education, 8.8% with functioning secondary school, and 3.8% with a university level. Only 8.8% of sampled informants do not have any education background. This would testify the members of cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa are able to understand and follow the activity of planning, executing monitoring and evaluation of different projects including RCAG Project and evaluate the impact performance of those projects in their organization. The general lack of awareness among small scale farmers can be attributed to their high level of illiteracy; this contributes to the low level of adoption of agricultural production technology (Ozawa, 1995).

4.1.4 Main job Category of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer only</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor employee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor employee and farmer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailer dealer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro dealer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
According to the questionnaire’s responses in Table 4.2, 83.8% of the sampled respondents are farmers, 7.5% have a contractor job and take care also of the farm works. Only 6.3% of sampled informants live on a contractor job in the services. This would testify that we are in the good way to test our research hypotheses knowing that we collaborate with the best respondents because the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli has agricultural vocation.

4.1.5 Members of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli

![Members of COOPRORIZ (%)](image)

Source: Field data

Figure 4.3: Respondent members of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa (%)

Figure 4.3 points out that out of 80 informants who responded to the administrative questionnaire, 64 respondents with 80% are members of the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and receive all services from the cooperative and 16 corresponding of 20% are non-members and have consequently some business relation with the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa as shown in the next table 4.3.

4.1.6 Business relation with the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa

Table 4.3: Respondent's business activity with COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input suppliers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddy suppliers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit suppliers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White rice retailers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other business activity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
In regard to the respondents, Table 4.3 demonstrates that 82.5% of farmers sell their rice produced to the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and the cooperative is charged to commercialize the paddy to the MRPIC rice factory. The table presents also a respective rate of 2.5% of the respondents as the input suppliers or the suppliers of credit to the cooperative while the retailer of the white rice is 1.3% because at the harvest the farmers get about 20% of their paddy is consumed at home after milling them in the MRPIC rice factory. The rest 11.3% are the services providers (employees of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and MRPIC rice factory or from the partners to the cooperative). The main relation of the respondents to the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa is the paddy supply and members of the cooperatives that produce and sell rice to the cooperative.

4.2 Presentation of Findings

4.2.1 Project life cycle management of the RCAG project in Mukunguli

The second major component presents findings on the process or steps that RCAG project has followed in its management. The questions actually asked to the respondents seek to gather information in regard to the first objective and the corresponding guiding research which tries to identify the process of project management in the organization in Rwanda. In the design and administrated questionnaire, the study gives four major steps involved in formal project management. According to Waldt (2007), project management life cycle comprises four phases (1) initiation phase that involves starting up the project, (2) planning phase that involves setting out the roadmap for the project, (3) execution phase that involves building the deliverables and controlling the project delivery and (4) closure phase that involves winding-down the project by releasing staff, handing over deliverables to the customer and completing a post implementation review.
a) RCAG project initiation phase

The questions attributed to give information on how the RCAG project is initiated in the cooperative COOPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA clarify how the respondents are known the way of RCAG project was started up in Mukunguli.

Table 4.4: The initiation of RCAG project in Mukunguli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiation system</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct baseline analysis</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting with stakeholders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting in COOPRORIZ</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCAG staff visit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

On the question to know how RCAG project is initiated in Mukunguli, regarding the Table4.4 an overwhelming majority with 60.0% of informants say that the project initiators had conducted a baseline in Mukunguli, completed by 31.3% of respondents that remember the meetings conducted in cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa. On the other hand, a little 3.8% of respondents said that the staff members of the RCAG project had visited them at home or in small groups while 2.5% of informants said that the project had contacted the stakeholders of the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and the same rate of 2.5% don’t have any information to the initiation of RCAG project. According Table4.4 the initiated phase of the RCAG project is respected justified by the baseline analysis and stakeholders are most often involved during the initiating process group. Outcome of this initiating project process were the RCAG project proposal and the contract negotiation signed to start the implementation of the project and the RCAG project baseline data report is the main supporting document. According to Barron M. ... (2000) a project is initiated to deliver the approved solution and a project manager is appointed (...) to move on the details planning phase.
b) RCAG project planning phase

Table 4.5: RCAG Project planning appreciation by respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of appreciation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

With regard to the project management through project planning, Table 4.5 shows that the appreciation degree of planning in RCAG Project management the respondents reported by 48.8% have strongly agreed followed by 32.5% of respondents who have agreed whereas 10.0% qualified neutral, 5.0% have disagreed and 3.8% have strongly disagreed regarding the degree of RCAG project is appreciated in its planning phase. According Barron, (2000) the planning phase refines the project’s objectives gathered during the initiation phase and plans the scopes necessary to meet those objectives by further identifying the specific activities and resources required to complete the project. The good planning of RCAG project reported by the respondents can been supported by different documents like the Project Implementation plan (PIP) and the Project Measurement Framework (PMF) and the hierarchical work plans done from annual plan, quarter plan, monthly plan, weekly plan and dairy work timesheet plan presented by the RCAG project implementers interviewed. According the interview with the CCA agent, the tool used in planning is the plan full results which means they plan for results.

c) RCAG project execution phase

In the RCAG project, the proposed questions to know how the informants are aware of the activities executed in Mukunguli, the project results and the degree of appreciation on the implementation phase ongoing are concerned. The respondents are also asked to
disclose if the RCAG project management process includes regularly the control in the project implementation activities for any activity reorientation.

Table 4.6: The RCAG project activities implemented in Mukunguli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCAG activities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training staffs and farmers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with stakeholders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of rice factory and other assets</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby on credit acquisition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

In the designed administrated questions, the study had include a question to knowing if the informants are aware of some activities conducted in Cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa in collaboration with the RCAG Project. Table 4.6 indicates the majority of respondents with 62.5% recognize that the training of cooperative staff and lead farmers is the main activity followed by 28.7% respondents who recognize the construction of the rice factory and others related assets. Only a little minority with 5% responded the lobby on credit supply and acquisition.

Table 4.7: RCAG Project main outcome results in Mukunguli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCAG outcome results</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing production and productivity</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better management of cooperative</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market organization of paddy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit acquisition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

In the implementation of the RCAG project activities, the respondents set out four outcome results that had made the positive change in the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa. According the Table4.7, majority with 55% of informants responded the main outcome is the increasing production and productivity, followed by 22.5% of informants responded the better management of their cooperative and the two last outcomes are organization of
the paddy market responded by 13.8% respondents while only 8.8% of informants said the acquisition of credit from the finances and microfinance institutions.

Table 4.8: Respondent’s appreciation level of RCAG project activity execution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of appreciation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

On the question to know the degree of which the respondents appreciate the RCAG project activities are executed in Mukunguli, Table4.8 shows that the appreciation of execution phase of the RCAG Project activities 57.5% of respondents followed by 21.3% of respondents have respectively strongly agreed and agreed that RCAG project activities are good executed whereas 11.3% of respondents are neutral, 6.3% and 3.8% have respectively disagreed and strongly disagreed. According to Waldt (2007) the execution phase of the project is the phase in which the deliverables are physically built and presented to the customer for acceptance and while each deliverable is being constructed, a suite of management processes are undertaken to monitor and control the deliverables being output by the project. Then Table4.9 indicates if the RCAG project in its implementation phase also combines the execution phase with the regularly project control.

Table 4.9: RCAG Project midterm evaluation recognized by respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

The project monitoring and control are another practice the study intended to identify in the research case study. To know this, respondents are asked if they are aware of any
midterm evaluation of the RCAG project and the new activities or reoriented activities the project stakeholders are proposed. Then, Table 4.9 indicates the big majority of respondents with 85% knew the midterm evaluation of the RCAG project and had participated in this evaluation. According the semi structural interview conducted with field agents of CCA and the UGAMA (project implementer organizations) staff said that the midterm evaluation is conducted and the report presented to the main project implementers. According the Midterm Evaluation Report of RCAG project, the evaluation was conducted over a period of 50 days, from February 18th to April 28th 2015 and the final report is submitted in June 2015. From the midterm evaluation report, for all outputs, in terms of physical implementation, most activities leading to the outputs were implemented above 60%, or in full (Muhereza, 2015).

d) RCAG project closing phase

The RCAG project’s inception is done in October 2012, and the project will last for 5 years from 2012 to 2017. According the interview conducted with RCAG staff members from CCA and UGAMA, the closing phase is not at its term (in the collecting data period) because the project has 2 more years to be accomplished. According them, the two remaining years are enough to make any necessary adjustments to improve well the project implementation and capitalize results for sustainability of the project achievements.
e) Reliability analysis on project life cycle management

Table 4.10: Reliability statistic on project life cycle management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>6.885</td>
<td>2.624</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

The overall alpha coefficient for the three questions on the respondent perception on scale of RCAG initiation, planning and implementation is 0.703. This value indicates that the three items have relatively acceptable internal consistency according the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency.

4.2.2 Performance of the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli

In the free years when the RCAG project is in execution phase in the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli, many positive improvement are observed and must been attributed to the contribution of the RCAG Project. Increasing production, productivity of rice and the profitability, better market organization, best cooperative management and leadership and the stakeholder’s satisfaction etc. are the important organizational performances elements of the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli that the study needed to observe the changes during the implementation of RCAG project.

(i) Rice production and productivity in Mukunguli marshland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area cultivated (are)</th>
<th>Production quantity (x10Kg)</th>
<th>Yield (kg /are)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 2012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2015</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Figure 4.4: Improvement (%) of rice production factors from 2012 to 2015
To analyze the agriculture improvement made by the members in the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli, the study presented in the questionnaire a table to be completed by the rice producers to compare the season before the RCAG project in Mukunguli and the last season in 2015. The analysis of Figure 4.4 shows the improvements made by the respondents where the area of rice production is increased by 77%, the quantity of rice they produced is increased by 153% and consequently the yield by 43%. To understand this positive change in rice production in cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli, through the RCAG activities the respondents indicated their livelihoods had improved since the start of the project, largely due to increased crop productivity. Many beneficiaries believe the knowledge gained from trainings in agricultural production techniques, the use of mineral fertilizer and good quality seeds and the introduction of new improved seed varieties (Buryohe and Rumbuka). Table 4.1 and Figure 4.5 explain more with the supporting data collected from the respondents in term of the agriculture technical adoption.

Table 4.1: Respondents used the mineral fertilizers in year 2012 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fertilizer users</th>
<th>Frequency 2012</th>
<th>Frequency 2015</th>
<th>Valid % 2012</th>
<th>Valid % 2015</th>
<th>Cumulative % 2012</th>
<th>Cumulative % 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over recommended fertilizers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low quantity of recommended fertilizers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fertilizers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimum recommended fertilizers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not rice producer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

Table 4.11 indicates that the majority of rice producer respondents 37.5% did not use the mineral fertilizers, 31.3% used the low recommended quantity while 13.8% used the optimum recommended mineral fertilizers in rice production in 2012. In 2015, from the same respondents only 10.0% do not use mineral fertilizers, 17.5% use the low
recommended quantity while 50% use the optimum recommended quantity of mineral fertilizers in rice production. This results show the positive improvement made in usage of mineral fertilizers to increase productivity of rice during the RCAG project implementation but not yet at the optimum recommendations dose for all rice producers.

With regard of improved seeds in the rice production, the respondents that use the improved and new varieties of rice seeds intend to increase production, 81.3% of respondents did not have quality seeds of rice in 2012 while in 2015, 80.0% said that they use the improved and new introduced varieties of rice and consequently increase production and produce the rice that is competitive in the national market.

Source: Field data

Figure 4.5: Usage of quality seed of rice by respondents in 2012 and 2015

To conclude with the rice production and productivity in Cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli, the general appreciation of the technical aspect improvement is presented in Table 4.12
Table 4.12: Respondents’ appreciation level on the good agriculture technical aspects in year 2015 in rice production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

According Table 4.15, the high number of respondents (38.8%) has agreed on the good agriculture technical aspects used in COOPRORIZ, the second level agreement are composed by 26.3% of respondents that have strongly agreed of the good technical aspects used actually in 2015. These results indicate that the efforts had been done in the technical aspects to produce the rice and must continue to increase the production of rice in Mukunguli marshland.

Table 4.13: Respondent's agreement on the good improvement of the COOPRORIZ agriculture assets in year 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

According Table4.13, the high number of respondents (57.5%) has agreed and 21.3% have strongly agreed on the good improvement of agriculture assets of the cooperative in 2015 compared the year 2012. The efforts had been done in the agriculture assets on the view of new/rehabilitated of paddy storages and drying areas, the cooperative meeting hall and the management offices of the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli.
(ii) Rice marketing organization and sales growth

Table 4.14 shows the level of agreement by respondents to the positive changes on the organization of the paddy market made during three years corresponding of the RCAG project implementation in the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli.

Table 4.14: Appreciation of rice market organization in year 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

The respondents agreement on how well the market of paddy is organized, 55.0% of respondents have strongly agreed, 25.0% of respondents have agreed while 11.3% of respondents are neutral and the rest 3.8% and 5% have disagreed and strongly disagreed on COOPRORIZ rice market is well organized. The improvement of the market of paddy is explained by the action taken by COOPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA when collects the paddy from its rice producer’s members and to sell it to MRPIC rice mill factory in front of the COOPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA office in comparison of the last period before the RCAG project when the paddy was sold to Kabuye Rice mill factory in Kigali. The transport cost was very high and the price was low compared to the actual price of paddy produced. The MRPIC rice factory is the outcome result of the implementation of the RCAG project in Mukunguli because of its initiative to sensitize the shareholders when COOPRORIZ Mukunguli took the lead.
(iii) Respondent’s profitability

![Figure 4.6: COPRORIZ profitability factors compared in 2012 and in 2015](image)

According to the questionnaire’s responses, the analysis of Figure 4.6 shows that the respondents had reduced the cost of rice production by 8% while the price of paddy rice is increased by 45% and the profitability by 131% during the implementation period of RCAG project in Mukunguli.

(iv) Internal reliability on technical aspects of performance

Table 4.15: Reliability statistic on the technical aspects for increasing performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>6.800</td>
<td>2.608</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table 4.15 displays the results that show the overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the three questions, the cooperative performance improvement of agriculture aspects, marketing and financial in year 2015 is 0.736. This value indicates that the three items have relatively acceptable internal consistency according the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency relationship in social science research situations.
(v) Organizational management and leadership

The cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli had improving its performances in term of leadership and general management of the organization, two questions regarding the agreement level of respondent to the problem resolution and improvement of general leadership, the findings are in Table4.18 and Table4.19.

Table 4.16: High Problem resolution level by leaders in the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

According Table4.16, the majority respondents represented by 56.3 % have strongly agreed followed by 22.5% of respondents that have agreed on high level the cooperative leaders resolve the problems in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli.

Table 4.17: Appreciation level of leadership in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

In the general leadership level agreement by the respondents, Table4.17 shows the results where 57.5% of respondents have strongly agreed, 28.7% of respondents have agreed that the leadership in the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli was improved. The respondents reported that before the training by RCAG project and other supports, the leadership and the problems resolution were seen as the very important problems to be dressed in the cooperative COOPRORIZ Mukunguli.
According the Table 4.18 Cronbach's alpha coefficient calculated using the reliability command in SPSS is 0.829. This value indicates that the questions of increasing performance on problem resolution and the improvement on general cooperative leadership have relatively good internal consistency.

Table 4.18: Reliability statistic on increasing leadership performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>8.5375</td>
<td>3.872</td>
<td>1.96774</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

4.2.3 Project achievement Durability and Stakeholder’s satisfaction

The durability of the RCAG project achievements in the COOPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA Mukunguli, the study proposed the questions of strong linkage with the potential partners in the rice value chain in Mukunguli as longer as the project will close. From this, the strong relationship between the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa with the MRPIC rice mill factory the unique customer of all rice produced, COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and financial institutions for rice campaign credit, COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and the agriculture state institutions like MINAGRI and RAB for agriculture extension services, marshland rehabilitation and its management etc. For this, an example in Table 4.20 indicates the level of respondent agreements to appreciate the very good business relationship actually between MRPIC rice mill factory and the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa.

Table 4.19: Collaboration between MRPIC rice factory and the COOPRORIZ Mukunguli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data
With regard to MRPI C rice factory and cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli business collaboration, Table 4.19 shows that majority of respondents (66.3%) have strongly agreed and (20.0%) have agreed on the very good collaboration between MRPI C rice mill factory and COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa in term of business on rice. In fact the collaboration between MRPI C rice factory and the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa exists and the good relation is seen in the common season planning and the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa receive from the MRPI C Ltd the additional technical support, inputs credits (seeds) to reimburse at the harvesting. The MRPI C rice factory had recently reward the best producer’s yield of paddy in the cooperative.

4.2.4 Project management and organizational performance

According the last results on the visible improvement made by the cooperative COOPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA in the period between 2012 and 2015, the questions are dressed to the informants to show in the list of the performance indicators, the well improved in the relation of the good management of RCAG project in Mukunguli.

(i) Increasing of production and marketing of paddy in relation to the RCAG project management

Table 4.20: Increasing the productivity and marketing in relation to RCAG project management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

The contribution of RCAG project management to the increasing of production of paddy and better organization of the market is recognized by the respondent in Table 4.20 where
42.5% have strongly agreed, 33.8% have agreed, 17.5% are neutral while 2.5% and 3.8% have respectively strongly disagreed and disagreed that the RCAG project has an important contribution to the increasing of productivity and market organization.

These contributions are explained in the precedent findings where the training on technical aspects, increasing the use of fertilizer and improved seed and the common planning with the MURPIC rice mill factory unique customer of paddy produced by the cooperative are cited by the respondents as are the outputs of the RCAG project implementation activities.

(ii) Increasing of problem resolution and leadership in COOPRORIZ in relation to the RCAG project management

Table 4.21: Increasing problem resolution and leadership in relation to the good management of RCAG project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

According Table 4.21, The contribution of RCAG project management to the increasing of leadership and problem resolution in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa is recognized by informants where 62.5% have strongly agreed, 17.5% agreed while 11.3% are neutral and 2.5% and 6.3% have respectively strongly disagreed and disagreed.
(iii) **Contribution of RCAG project to the COOPRORIZ general performance**

Table 4.2: Contribution of RCAG project to the general performance of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

According to the last results achieved by the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa in the period between 2012 and 2015 in Table 4.2, the respondents appreciate the contribution of the RCAG project to the overall management performance of the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. According to Table 4.2, 71.3% of respondents have strongly agreed, 13.8% of respondents have agreed the RCAG contribution to the general performance of the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa, while 6.8% of respondents are neutral, 2.5% and 7.5% have respectively strongly disagreed and disagreed of the contribution of the RCAG project to the observed performances of the cooperative in this case study.

(iv) **Reliability on the contribution of RCAG to the COPRORZ performances**

Table 4.23: Reliability on the contribution of RCAG project to the cooperative management performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>6.566</td>
<td>2.563</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data

The value 0.788 in Table 4.23 shows the overall alpha coefficient for the three questions, increasing the productivity and marketing, increasing problem resolution and leadership and the general performance of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa. This value indicates that the three items have relatively acceptable internal consistency according the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency relationship in social science research situations.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter five presents briefly the summary of the major findings and the answers to the research questions extracted in the interpretation of findings. In addition, the conclusions, recommendations are drawn before proposing at the end the suggestions for further study.

5.1 Summary of findings

Based on the research objectives, the major research finding have been presented under four main components including the demographical characteristics of the respondents, the project lifecycle of RCAG project, the internal performances of the organization COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli and the RCAG project sustainability and stakeholders’ satisfaction. The study findings set out that the respondents are majority members of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli with an active age and gender balanced. The COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli collects the rice (paddy) produced by members and sells it to the MRPIC rice factory. The respondent’s answers set out that RCAG project in cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli was successful managed and the majority of respondents said that the RCAG project had contributed to the major organizational performances indicators in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. Before the answers to research objectives, the respondents’ identifications findings in relation to respondent’s age, gender, level of education, business relation in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa etc. have been analyzed. Majority (65.0%) of respondents is between 25 and 50 years old and 38.8 % respondents were females. The study shows that 63.8% of the respondents frequented primary schools in
regard of education level, 83.8% respondents are farmers, 80% are members of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli and 82.5% of respondents supply the rice (paddy) to the MRPIC rice factory through the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. The summary per objective is resuming in the following points 5.1.1, 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 according the research questions.

5.1.1 Objective one.

The objective one of our study is focused on finding out the process Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth project (RCAG) used to respect the four stages of project life cycle management (Initiation, planning, execution/Implementation and closure). The study result showed that this project in its implementation follows the stages of project lifecycle as described by Waldt (2007) when the separated project phases initiation, planning, execution and closing are separately respected by the RCAG project. The first three phases are analyzed through the questionnaires to the respondents while the closing phase is not yet arrived because the project stills ongoing. The major findings supported by respondents on this first objective are summarized in the following data: (i) To the initiation phase, 60.0% of respondents recognized the baseline conducted before the project, followed by 31.3% of respondents remembered the visits to the cooperative conducted by project initiators group to prepare the project proposal after the beneficiary needs assessments. (ii) To the planning phase of RCAG project, the project had the Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA) working with two local partners, UGAMA and Centre IWACU, who are responsible for the main implementation, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of the project with the affiliated project staffs. From the respondents’ answers, the high rates of them (48.8%) have strongly agreed followed by 35.0% respondents who have agreed that the project work planning is done regularly. (iii) Regarding the execution RCAG project phase, the majority of respondents set out the
main activities conducted in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli, the first is the training of cooperative members and staff reported by 62.5% respondents and the second was the implantation of the rice factory in Mukunguli answered by 28.7% of respondents. And in the same execution phase, the majority informants (85%) was participated in the RCAG midterm evaluation and 57.5% respondents have strongly agreed to the RCAG execution phase is well implemented while majority of them (55%) recognize the main project outcome as the increasing of rice production and productivity. According to these results, the RCAG project is in a good implementation way of four phases of project lifecycle management.

5.1.2 Objective two.

The research objective two was to assess the level at which RCAG project outputs/outcomes had contributed to the organizational performance growth (product quality, sales growth, assets etc.) of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. According the respondents answers, 71.3% of respondents have strongly agreed to the high contribution of RCAG project to the recent performances of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. According the same respondents, 55% of them are convinced that the production and productivity of rice are significantly increased during the implementation phase of RCAG project in Mukunguli. According the respondents data collected, the production of rice was increased by 153% and the yield by 43% (from 3.6 metric tons/ha to 5.2 metric tons/ha) between year 2012 and 2015. Another organizational performance recognized by the majority of respondents (55%) is the improvement of the market organization of the paddy produced where the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli collects and sells all paddies harvested to the MRPIC Rice factory. Consequently the respondents’ profitability of rice production is increasing by 131% due to the reduction of the cost of production of paddy and the
increasing of the unity price to the farmer. In term of leadership in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli, 57.5% of respondents have strongly agreed on the improvement of leadership in their cooperative and 57.6% respondents have strongly agreed on how well their problems are resolved.

5.1.3 Objective three

The last objective of our research was to identify the degree to what RCAG project achievements are sustainable and satisfy the stakeholders around rice promotion in Mukunguli marshland. According the respondents answers, majority of them accept the important contribution of the RCAG project to the development of rice in Mukunguli. Through the study analysis, ownership on agribusiness around the rice value chain in Mukunguli is high from the individual farmer, the management of special groups in marshland, the cooperatives members and leaders, and MRPIC rice factory and other investors are involved to success each other. A sample convinced example is the appreciation majority of respondents (66.3%) who have strongly agreed on the good business relation between MRPIC rice factory and the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. Findings to support the stakeholders’ satisfaction as source of project achievement sustainability, from various answers of respondents, they said at the appreciation level combining strongly agree and agree to the 62.5% of respondents to the leadership and problem resolution performance indicators and to 42.5% of respondents to the improvement of productivity and market organization. The problems resolution and leadership, low productivity and problem of marketing were seen as the important problems observed in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa before the implementation of RCAG project in Mukunguli. These elements prove that many partners of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli and RCAG project stakeholders are
satisfied by the improved performances of the cooperative as the outcome results of the RCAG project.

5.2 Conclusions

The main purpose of this research was to achieve three critical objectives corresponding to the three major questions that have guided the research process which are: (i) How did the RCAG project respect the process of four stages of project life cycle? (ii) What is the contribution level of the RCAG project outputs/outcomes to the organizational performance growth (product quality, sales growth, assets etc.) of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli? And (iii) Are the RCAG project achievements sustainable and satisfy the stakeholders around rice promotion in Mukunguli marshland? In this regard, the study was also carried out to find out a solution to the crucial problem that the adoption of the entire project management in the organizational performance is obscure and vague. The research process involved consulting the relevant literatures which clarify on the concepts and theories corresponding to our research topic to make up the foundation of this study. The concepts and theories in relation to the thematic were reviewed under the project management and project management life cycle, project deliverables and outcomes, project sustainability and project stakeholder satisfaction in one hand; the performance and organizational performance, the organizational performance measurement and finally the project management and organization performance relationship in the other hand.

The research has used the descriptive research design with a sample size of 80 respondents calculated using the Slovene’s formula from 395 target population of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikowa Mukunguli and its main business partners. The questionnaire technique was used as the main data collection instrument, but structured-interview is also used to gather the additional information from the leaders of
The major findings have generally proved that Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth (RCAG) project has effectively contributed to improve the general performance of the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli where the RCAG project and cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa constitute the research case study. It was actually found out that the RCAG project in its implementation in Mukunguli is following the four stages of the project lifecycle, those are project initiation, project planning, project execution and control and finally the project closure. At the date of our research data collection only the three first stages were observed to be effectively followed when the closure phase is not reached because the RCAG project still ongoing.

In term of the improvement of the organizational performance, the study findings indicated that COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa had increased the production and productivity of rice by using good quality seeds and increasing the use of mineral fertilizers, including the technical and managerial skills gained through the RCAG project trainings. The other performance indicators improved by the cooperative are the better market organization of the rice produced by the members of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukungunguli and consequently their profitability increased; the better management and increasing of leadership in the cooperative including gender balance, ownership, sharing of the responsibilities and the power of directing are proved by the study. In term of the project durability of the RCAG project outcomes in COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli, the good business collaboration between Cooperative and MRPIC rice factory and the others stakeholders in Mukunguli is the predictor indicator of RCAG project sustainability because there is a win-win interest.
5.3 Recommendations

The study is carried on the impact of the RCAG project management and performance of the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli. The following are the recommendations made based on the objectives and results of the study for future improvements of RCAG project and the COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli:

(i) The good management and success of the RCAG project depend on some factors like the respect of the four phases of the project lifecycle management; those are project initiation, project planning, project executing and project closing. It’s therefore recommended to the RCAG project management and all stakeholders involved in project implementation to reinforce the participatory project implementation and preparing the exit strategies before the closing day of the project for full project success. It is also highly recommended to the project implementers’ organizations to make a greater effort to communicate the purpose and findings of the baseline and midterm survey with the cooperative and their members for further collaboration and success of the project.

(ii) The findings show that the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa has improved its performances like production and productivity, market organization, profitability, better organization management and leadership during the implementation of the RCAG project. It is recommended to reinforce the system of rice production to the farming level to increase the rice productivity to achieve the Rwanda government target of the 8 metric tons per ha of rice and getting more profitability.

(iii) The finding has also showed the less of usage of individual credit in the rice production showed by the useless of the mineral fertilizers to increase production. It is recommended to the RCAG project and the leaders of the cooperative COOPRORIZ
Abahuzabikorwa to increase the lobbying to the financial institutions and the reinforcement of the capacity of the cooperative members in credit acquisition and credit management to achieve the project objective of diversifying the beneficiary’s income generating activities and improving their access to financial institutions and better markets. It is recommended also to increase the training on rice fertility and fertilizers to optimize the usage of mineral fertilizers by all cooperative members to get better productivity and high production of paddy and consequently high profitability.

(iv) The finding has also indicated a good collaboration between the cooperative COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and the MRPIC rice factory as a supplier and customer of rice as the example of the durability of the RCAG project achievements. It is recommended to the RCAG project implementers to support this collaboration to go beyond on the planning season and simple technical support for receiving more paddy for the rice factory, but also to think about the sharing the benefice gain by the MRPIC rice factory with the rice suppliers as bonus before the MRPIC company shareholders.

5.3 Suggestions for future study

The study on the joint project management and the organizational performance was undertaken in only one project and one organization and may be amongst the first study has explored this aspect in Rwanda. For this reasons therefore, the study called upon other researchers to enlarge the research in the following areas:

(i) Conduct a study with same research topic with more than one case study organization and/ or one project would help to compare organizations and projects and to generalize the conclusions and give strong recommendations. To commence, due to limited time and resources for undertaking the present study, the RCAG project
management and organizational performance must be studied deeply in all 15 cooperatives to set out the general contribution of RCAG project to their performances.

(ii) Other studies would focus on project managements and both financial and operational performances; Project lifecycle management success and organizational performance.

(iii) To improve the success of the development projects in Rwanda and the performance of the organizations, the study propose a topic on project management success and organizational structure and leadership.
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SURVEY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA AND DIRECT STAKEHOLDERS IN RICE

Dear Respondent,

My name is Reverien LINDIRO. I am a student at Mount Kenya University (MKU) in KIGALI. As part of my studies, I am required to carry out a research and I have decided to conduct it on the Project management and organizational Performance.

In order to know how the project management in an organization contributes to the development of this organization’s businesses and serves as the measure indicators of its performance. I would like to discuss with you the following questions and I expect truthful answers from you.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

I.1 IDENTIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENT

Names (Facultative): ……………………….
Gender: Male □ Female □
Age (in years): Under 25 □ 25-50 □ above 50 □

I.2 CORE QUESTIONS

1. Education level
   Illiterate □ Adult education □ Primary education □
   Secondary school □ University level □ Other (Specify):………

2. What is your important current Job? Please tick as appropriate
   Farmer □ contractor employee □ contractor employee and Farmer □
   Retailer dealer □ agro dealer □ other (specify)………

3. Linkage to COPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa and RCAG Project

3.1 Are you member of COPRORIZ Mukunguli? a) Yes □ b) No □

3.2 What activities do you perform in collaboration with COPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa?
   a) Inputs supplier □, b) paddy supplier □, c) credit supplier □;
      d) Rice consumer □; White Rice retailer □ other (specify)………

3.3 Are you aware of the existence of RCAG project? a) Yes □ b) No □
   (i) If the answer is “Yes”; How the RCAG Project had known the activities it will perform with the COPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA?
      a) baseline analysis in cooperative and members □; b) Meeting with local authorities □;
      c) Meeting in our cooperative □; d) RCAG project staff visit □; e) Other (Specify)…………

   (ii) Do you know some activities conducted in Cooperative COPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA in collaboration with the RCAGA Project?
      a) Training staff and farmers □; b) organize the Meeting with the others stakeholders’ □;
      c) construction of the Rice factory and others related assets □; d) Lobbying and supply in credit acquisition □; other (specify)………

   (iii) When the RCAG project activities are in the implementation in Mukunguli, how level you have agreeing that the project initiation, planning and execution are well done and the success up now?
a) **Initiation:** strongly agree □; agree □; Neutral □; disagree □; strongly disagree □
   a) **Planning:** strongly agree □; agree □; Neutral □; disagree □; strongly disagree □
   b) **Execution:** strongly agree □; agree □; Neutral □; disagree □; strongly disagree □
   b) **Sucess:** strongly agree □; agree □; Neutral □; disagree □; strongly disagree □

(iv) Do you know some results from the activities the COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA does/did perform in collaboration with RCAG project?
   a) Increasing production and productivity □; b) Better management of the cooperative □;
   c) organization of the market of Paddy □; d) credit acquisition □; other (specify)……

(v) You know any midterm evaluation of the RCAG project and the reorientations of doing project activities in COPRORIZ Mukunguli? : 1: Yes; 2: No . If yes can you tell us any 2 new activities or reoriented activities?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4. **Performance of COOPRORIZ Abahuzabikorwa Mukunguli**

4.1 **Rice production and marketing**

(i) Can you compare your situation before the RCAG project in Mukunguli and Now? (Respond where you are right to answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Area cultivated with rice (ares )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Production of paddy ( kg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Cost of production (for 1kg of paddy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Market price (for 1kg of paddy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Market price (for 1kg of white rice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Market organization of white rice: 1: Yes/ well, 2: Yes/bad 3: No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Season and Market Planning: 1: Yes/ well, 2: Yes/bad 3: No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Bonus from cooperative/ company : 1:Yes; 2: No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Quantity of fertilizer inputs used (kg/are)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Volume of credit on rice production (RwF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Volume of white rice consumed (kg) per year in family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) New variety introduced with high productivity : 1:Yes; 2: No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Other improvement (specify)………….</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 **Cooperative management and leadership**

(i). How level you have agreeing that the COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA well answers the questions or well solves the member’s problems today? Strongly agree □; Agree □; Neutral □; Disagree □; Strongly disagree □

(ii). Do COPRORIZ Mukunguli plan together with the MRPIc rice factory to produce paddy in each season? a) Yes □ b) No □ ; If yes their work on a paddy supply contract? a) Yes □ b) No □

(iii). Overall, how level agreement the collaboration between COPRORIZ Mukunguli and MRPIc Rice Factory are very good?
(iv). How level you have agreeing the good improvement situation of the cooperative COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA in the last 3 years regarding the problems it had had before?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation of:</th>
<th>Strongly agree (5/5)</th>
<th>agree (4/5)</th>
<th>Neutral well (3/5)</th>
<th>disagree (2/5)</th>
<th>strongly disagree (1/5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Technical aspects in production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Financial aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Increasing the agriculture assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other (specified)……</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(v). Based on the cooperative performance improvement you appreciate in the question (iv), rate you level of agreement to the actual good performance of COOPRORIZ is the high contribution of the RCAG project management?

   a) On productivity and marketing: Strongly agree □; Agree □; Neutral □; Disagree □; Strongly disagree □

   b) On problem resolution and good leadership: Strongly agree □; Agree □; Neutral □; Disagree □; Strongly disagree □

   c) On general cooperative performance improvement: Strongly agree □; Agree □; Neutral □; Disagree □; Strongly disagree □

(vi). What should you suggest to improve the weaknesses if any in the relation COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA and any other Partner?

.............................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................

Thank you so much for responding to this questionnaire.
Dear Respondent,

My name is Reverien LINDIRO. I am a student at Mount Kenya University (MKU) in KIGALI. As part of my studies, I am required to carry out a research and I have decided to conduct it on the Project Management and Organizational Performance in the case of Rwanda Cooperative Agriculture Growth in COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA of Mukunguli.

I have already sent the questionnaire to sampled members from COPRORIZ-ABAHUZABIKORWA of Mukunguli and its partners including your organization. I would like to discuss with you the following questions and I expect truthful answers from you.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

II.1 Personal data on respondent

Name (facultative): …………………
Age: ……years
Gender: Women ☐ Male ☐
Education qualification: primary level ☐, Secondary level ☐, University level ☐; Other (specify)……………………………………..
Organization: ……………………………
Position occupied……………………

II.2 Basic Information’s on COOPRORIZ Mukunguli and RCAG project

(i) Do you know some mains problems that COPRORIZ Mukunguli was faced in the 3 last years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems of</th>
<th>Ranking the first three important problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Technical aspects in production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Financial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) How you appreciate the situation of the problems today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation of:</th>
<th>Extremely well (5/5)</th>
<th>Quite well (4/5)</th>
<th>Moderately well (3/5)</th>
<th>Slightly well(2/5)</th>
<th>Not at all well (1/5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Technical aspects in production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iii) How the RCAG Project had known the activities to perform with the COPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA?

a) baseline analysis in cooperative and members □; b) Meeting with local authorities □; c) Meeting in cooperative □; d) RCAG project staff visit □; e) Other (Specify)…………………

(iv) Do you know some activities conducted in Cooperative COPRORIZ ABAHUZABIKORWA in collaboration with the RCAG Project? If yes:

a) Training staff and farmers □; b) organize the Meeting with the others stakeholders’ □; c) construction of the Rice factory and others related assets □; d) Lobbying and supply in credit acquisition □; other (specify)…………………

(v) In the roles of the RCAG project, how you appreciate the main components of the project management as the contribution of the improvement of the COPRORIZ Mukunguli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In RCAG Project, the appreciation of:</th>
<th>Level of appreciation / 5 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Project Initiation phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Project Planning phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Project Execution and control phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Project activity Closing phase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv) Appreciation on success of RCAG in Mukunguli

a) If you think that the RCAG project is a success in Mukunguli, which level you appreciate that success?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success indication</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Time respect planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cost effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Quality of the work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) stakeholders satisfactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you so much for responding to this questionnaire.