



Performance of National Agricultural Advisory Services projects in Uganda

Performance of
NAADS projects
in Uganda

Does stakeholder commitment matter?

155

Hassan Bashir, Sheila Namagembe, Sudi Nangoli, Joseph M. Ntayi
and Mohammed Ngoma

Makerere University Business School, Kampala, Uganda

Abstract

Purpose – The increased poor performance of National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) projects in Uganda has become a concern of many stakeholders. Many NAADS projects have been undertaken with an aim of developing the poor in the country but none of them were successful. This paper therefore aimed at examining the performance of NAADS projects which were set up by the government in 2001 to eradicate poverty in Uganda.

Design/methodology/approach – The study adopted a cross-sectional and quantitative survey research design. Data was sought from farmers and coordinators of the projects. Mukono district was used as a case study and a sample of 323 NAADS projects were used, covering a wide range of agricultural activities.

Findings – The research findings showed low performance levels of the NAADS projects and raised pertinent questions on the influence of NAADS stakeholders' commitment to the performance of the projects. It was there recommended that an urgent review of NAADS policy and practices be done to ensure that project managers and coordinators discuss with farmers the personal benefits of carrying out activities of NAADS such that farmers fill a great deal of personal meaning of the project to their lives.

Originality/value – This is the first study to document the effect of stakeholder commitment on the performance of National Agricultural Advisory Services projects in Uganda. The poor people in Uganda have really not been committed to the NAADS projects despite the willingness of the government to take them out of poverty. One of the reasons is that they don't see themselves achieving any benefits from these projects, the projects require high costs of agricultural extension services which cannot be afforded by the farmers and also because the poor people lack farmer groups to participate in the NAADS projects. Rural farmers look as if they do not have technical or professional connections to participate and take advantage of the projects.

Keywords NAADS, Project performance, Stakeholder commitment, Project management, Uganda

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

The increasing turbulence in the modern business environment has made it necessary for many organizations both private and public to adopt project approach as the means to achieving organizational goals. Each project, however, strives for excellence and success yet is by definition a unique task normally subjected to severe restrictions on budget and time (Andersen, 2006). A project has therefore to perform well in terms of the planned budget, time and the quality of the project processes and outputs (Munns



The authors would like to extend their appreciation to Makerere University Business School that funded this study, and the MUBS Principal, Professor Balunywa Wasswa, the Dean, Professor Ntayi Joseph, and Dr Mohammed Ngoma for the work well done.

and Bjeirmi, 1996), so as to fulfill the intended objectives of satisfying the stakeholder's needs (Baccarini, 1999; Shenhar *et al.*, 2001). Failure to achieve this, the project will be branded unsuccessful and failed.

In Uganda the government has started many projects in order to eradicate poverty. A case in point is the District Development Project (DDP), Entandikwa scheme and Bonna Bagaggawale. These projects aimed at giving low-income earners financial support in form of capital to start small businesses. According to DDP pilot report of 2000, these projects were mismanaged and failed to achieve the set objectives. The government also established the Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF) projects as a transitory tool and funding mechanism to assist Northern Uganda to catch up with the rest of the country in matters of development. However, according to NUSAF report of 2008, this project did not live to the expectations of the government. In 2001 the government established the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) projects to eradicate poverty through enhancement of agriculture. However, according to the NAADS secretariat report of 2007/2008, NAADS projects had registered 60 percent failure rate with some projects in districts like Kotido registering 100 percent failure rate while projects in more than ten districts registering a failure rate of above 90 percent.

As a result of this high failure rate of poverty eradication projects in Uganda, the poverty level has remained high with more than 31 percent of Ugandan population living below a dollar a day. According to Steers (1977), the weak performance of projects can be attributed to the low commitment of the key stakeholders to the projects. The NAADS Secretariat Report (2003/2004) points out that in districts like Kotido farmers who are the principle beneficiaries of the projects were not involved in the projects activities thus registering 100 percent failure rate. The Auditor General's Report (2008) also indicates that NAADS coordinators spent most of the money on workshops which were never attended by farmers.

It is therefore probable that there is a link between stakeholder commitment to the project and performance of poverty eradication projects (Crawford *et al.*, 2005; Koh and Boo, 2001). The challenge for project champions is to ensure commitment of key stakeholders in project activities so as to improve performance of poverty eradication projects in Uganda.

Literature review and conceptual analysis

Past studies have defined commitment in many different ways. Mowday *et al.* (1979) and Porter *et al.* (1974) defined organization commitment as the relative strength of an individual's identification with, and involvement in, a particular organization. According to Moorman (1993) commitment is an enduring desire to maintain a valued relationship. Dwyer *et al.* (1987) described commitment as the existence of an implicit or explicit pledge of relational continuity of exchange partners. Morgan and Hunt (1994) described commitment as exchange partner believing that an ongoing relationship with another is so important as to warrant maximum efforts at maintaining it. Kanter (1968) with her argument that different types of commitment result from the different behavioral requirements imposed on employees by the organization, suggests three different forms of commitment: continuance commitment (member's dedication to the survival of the organization; this is caused by requiring members to make personal sacrifices to join or remain with an organization); cohesion commitment (attachment to social relationships in an organization brought on by such techniques as public renunciation of previous social ties or by engaging in ceremonies

that enhance group cohesion); and control commitment (member's attachment to the organization's norms that shape behavior in desired directions; it exists when employees believe their organization's norms and values serve as a model for suitable behavior). Porter *et al.* (1974) characterized commitment by three factors. These factors are a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) conceptualized three components of organizational commitment: affective (i.e. employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization); continuance (i.e. commitment based on the costs that the employee associates with leaving the organization); and normative (i.e. employee's feeling of an obligation to stay with the organization).

A project is a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service or results. It is an undertaking with defined scope, time and budget to create a unique output. Project performance can be viewed narrowly as achievement of intended outcomes in terms of project specification, completing the activities on time, completing the project on the agreed budget, only carrying out activities within the scope and with requisite performance (technical requirements) (Atkinson, 1999; Pinto and Slevin, 1988; Wateridge, 1998). According to PMI Standards Committee (2004) and Bryde (2003), this is the golden or the iron triangle measurement of project performance, i.e. if the project is completed on time, within budget, according to agreed specification, it will have performed well. This is the operational mindset, which is influenced by the "get the job done" approach (Dvir *et al.*, 1998). Several studies support the inclusion of customer satisfaction as a fourth dimension of project performance (Lipovetsky *et al.*, 1997; Lim and Mohamed, 1999; Zwikael and Globerson, 2006; Kerzner, 2006; Voetsch *et al.*, 2004; Bryde, 2003). This study therefore adopts the measurement of project performance in terms of schedule, project quality, customer satisfaction, time management and achieving project objectives.

Various scholars have established that commitment has a positive influence to organizational performance (Lum *et al.*, 1998; Sims and Kroeck, 1994). Commitment to the project affects its performance (Benkhoff, 1997; Brett *et al.*, 1995). Stakeholders with strong affective commitment remain with the project because they want to, and they attach strong belief in and acceptance of the project's goals and values. According to Tansky *et al.* (1997), affective organizational commitment connects a worker to the organization's goals and values because of the strong cognitive desire to belong to the organization (Steers, 1977). A worker therefore bonds with organization because he or she chooses to do so (McElroy and Mills, 2000), thus improving performance. Stakeholders with strong continuance commitment remain attached to the project because they need to, and they are willing to exert a considerable effort on behalf of the organization. According to Becker's (1960) side-bet theory, employees form sunken costs, such as monetary, social, physical, psychological, lost opportunities and so forth and the greater the sunken costs a person develops with an organization, the less likely he or she is willing to leave employment with the organization. This means that the sacrifice of leaving becomes so great that the employee becomes bonded to the organization (Jaros *et al.*, 1993). Therefore, commitment to the organization occurs under continuance commitment because the investments made with an organization tie the person to that organization (McElroy and Mills, 2000). It reflects a sense of being locked in place because of the high costs of leaving. According to Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972), this type of commitment is a structural phenomenon

which occurs as a result of individual – organizational transactions and alterations in investments over time. According to, continuance commitment is also referred to as calculative commitment where an employee calculates in some manner the costs and benefits of working for a given organization and it is these calculations that determine the level of commitment to the organization. Stakeholders with strong normative commitment remain in the project because they feel they ought to, due to their strong loyalty to the project (Schappe and Doran, 1997). This is so because according to Jaros *et al.* (1993) normative commitment involves acceptance of the norms of the organization and the need to be loyal to employers. It therefore makes the employee fill a sense of duty or obligation to be committed to the organization because it has employed him/her Jaros *et al.* (1993). It is this that pressurizes the employee to act in a way that meets the organizational goals and interests (Allen and Meyer, 1990). According to Wiener (1982), the stronger the normative commitment, the stronger is the person's predisposition to be guided in his actions by such internalized standards rather than by a consideration of the consequences of these actions. Thus, committed individuals may exhibit certain behaviors not because they have figured that doing so is to their personal benefit, but because they believe that it is the "right" and moral thing to do (Wiener and Vardi, 1980).

In their study of antecedents (causes) and consequences (results) to organizational commitment, Steers (1977) and Aven (1988) conclude that highly committed employees are more likely to have higher levels of participation, remain with the organization for longer periods and make more contributions for achieving organizational objectives, higher levels of involvement in their jobs and exert considerably more effort on behalf of the organization. According to Etzioni's (1961) commitment model focussing on employee compliance with organizational objectives, any actual or perceived authority or power organizations have over individuals is rooted in the nature of employee commitment in the organization. This means that organizations have substantially less authority or power over employees who have lower levels of commitment. Etzioni (1961) concludes that when employees have higher levels of commitment to organizational objectives, the organization will have more authority and power over these employees.

Hypothesis

The purpose of this study is to establish whether commitment of stakeholders influences the performance of NAADS projects in Uganda. To achieve this goal, the following hypotheses are formed for examination in this study:

- H1. There is no affective, continuance, normative and cohesion commitment among the stakeholders of NAADS projects.
- H2. Affective, continuance, normative and cohesion commitment positively affects performance of projects.

Methodology

The study adopted a cross-sectional and quantitative survey design. Correlational and regression designs were adopted to explain the relationships between stakeholder commitment and project performance and the extent to which the components of stakeholder commitment explain project performance. The study sample consisted of 323 projects of the 2,062 NAADS projects undertaken in the 28 sub-counties of

Mukono district. Mukono district was selected to be the study area because the district has had the benefit of being first on many government pilot programs (NAADS baseline study report of 2002). Two categories of stakeholders of the project were considered, these included coordinators and project beneficiaries (farmers). This study adopted a multi-stage sampling procedure in order to get representative views of the various stakeholders on performance of NAADS projects. This involved using proportionate sampling to select the 323 projects and 370 project stakeholders (respondents) who comprised of 356 farmers and 14 NAADS coordinators. Simple random sampling was used to select respondents of the two categories (farmers and project coordinators) from each project. The response rate was 88.5 percent. Primary data were collected through administering questionnaires which contained structured questions relating to each study variable in question. The respondents answered based on the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statements in the questionnaire. Secondary data were also used.

Commitment to the project was measured using the instrument developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and Kanter (1968). This involved testing commitment to the project in terms of four categories: affective (stakeholder's emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the project activities), continuance (commitment based on the costs that a stakeholder associates with abandoning the project), normative (stakeholder's feelings of obligation to stay with the project) and cohesion commitment (attachment to social relationships in an organization). Each of the four categories was measured by items on a five-point scale, where 5 represented "strongly agree" and 1 represented "strongly disagree." Project performance was measured using five dimensions: schedule overrun (this tests whether the project committed outputs were delivered within the agreed timeframe), cost overrun (whether the committed outputs were produced within the agreed budget), project quality (whether all committed outputs were delivered and met agreed quality standards), customer satisfaction (whether the project customers achieved all the targeted outcomes), achieving project objectives (whether the government achieved its major objectives, the major one being reducing poverty level) (NAADS Secretariat Report, 2003/2004; Kerzner, 2006; Voetsch *et al.*, 2004). Each of the five categories was measured by items on a five-point scale, where 5 represented "strongly agree" and 1 represented "strongly disagree." The research instrument was examined for its reliability by using Cronbach's α value and the results showed that the instrument was reliable with a coefficient of 0.915. Data analysis were done using SPSS version 16.0.

Results and discussion

The study used factor analysis with principal component analysis to extract variables from the questionnaire and to analyze them. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was 0.908 and Bartlett's test was significant at ($\chi^2(231) = 3,769.7, p < 0.001$) thus implying that factor analysis was a suitable model for analysis in this study. The communalities for each of the variables were within the range of 0.287-0.786. Variables with a communality of 0.55 were considered to have a strong variance and variables with a communality of < 0.55 were considered to have a weak variance. This is shown in Table I.

Variables 1-8 represented affective commitment, with variables 2 (I enjoy discussing my project with people outside it), 3 (I really feel as if this project's problems are my own), 4 (I think that I could easily become as attached to another project as I am to this one) and 8 (I feel a strong sense of belonging to my project) having the strongest

	Initial	Extraction
(1) I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this project	1.000	0.562
(2) I enjoy discussing my project with people outside it	1.000	0.748
(3) I really feel as if this project's problems are my own	1.000	0.735
(4) I think that I could easily become as attached to another project as I am to this one	1.000	0.777
(5) I feel like part of the family when with project team members	1.000	0.287
(6) I feel emotionally attached to this project	1.000	0.466
(7) This project has a great deal of personal meaning for me	1.000	0.686
(8) I feel a strong sense of belonging to my project	1.000	0.714
(9) I feel I have an obligation to remain part of this project	1.000	0.786
(10) Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my project now	1.000	0.670
(11) I would feel guilty if I left my project now	1.000	0.623
(12) This project deserves my loyalty	1.000	0.682
(13) I have a sense of obligation to the people in this project	1.000	0.631
(14) I owe a great deal to this project	1.000	0.419
(15) I am afraid of what might happen if I quit this project without having another one lined up	1.000	0.472
(16) It would be very hard for me to leave this project right now, even if I wanted to	1.000	0.661
(17) Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave this project now	1.000	0.707
(18) It would be too costly for me to leave this project right now	1.000	0.752
(19) Right now remaining part of this project is a matter of necessity as much as desire	1.000	0.759
(20) I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this project	1.000	0.777
(21) One of the few serious consequences of leaving this project would be the scarcity of available alternatives	1.000	0.647
(22) One of the major reasons I continue working with this project is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another project may not match the overall benefits that I have here	1.000	0.643

Table I.
Extracted communalities
for variables of
commitment

Note: Extraction method: principal component analysis

variances of 0.748, 0.735, 0.777 and 0.714, respectively. Variables 9-14 represented normative commitment, with variable 9 (I feel I have an obligation to remain part of this project) having the strongest variance of 0.786. Variables 15-22 represented continuance commitment with variables 17 (Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave this project now), 18 (It would be too costly for me to leave this project right now), 19 (Right now remaining part of this project is a matter of necessity as much as desire) and 20 (I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this project) having the strongest variance.

A factor analysis with principal component method using varimax rotation was also applied to all the variables to determine any underlying components for each variable and validate whether the respondents perceived the four components of commitment to be distinct. The components of commitment included: affective, continuance, normative and coherent commitment.

The results as indicated in Table II, showed a four factor loadings with eigenvalues > 1.0 for all the components of commitment. The total variance explained was 64.57 percent. A closer examination revealed that for factor 1 (affective), the total variance explained was 7 percent. For factor 2 (continuance), the total variance explained was

	1 Affective	2 Continuance	3 Cohesion	4 Normative
I enjoy discussing my project with people outside it	0.839			
I really feel as if this project's problems are my own	0.826			
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this project	0.583			
It would be too costly for me to leave this project right now		0.828		
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this project		0.822		
Right now remaining part of this project is a matter of necessity as much as desire		0.810		
Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave this project now		0.804		
One of the few serious consequences of leaving this project would be the scarcity of available alternatives		0.780		
One of the major reasons I continue working with this project is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another project may not match the overall benefits that I have here		0.766		
It would be very hard for me to leave this project right now, even if I wanted to		0.755		
I am afraid of what might happen if I quit this project without having another one lined up		0.606		
I think that I could easily become as attached to another project as I am to this one			0.870	
I feel I have an obligation to remain part of this project				0.839
I feel a strong sense of belonging to my project				0.792
This project has a great deal of personal meaning for me				0.784
This project deserves my loyalty				0.761
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my project now				0.674
I feel emotionally attached to this project				0.646
I would feel guilty if I left my project now				0.642
I have a sense of obligation to the people in this project				0.640
I owe a great deal to this project				0.505
Eigenvalues	1.541	9.231	1.065	2.369
Percentage of variance explained	7.004	41.959	4.839	10.767
Cumulative percentage of variance explained	7.004	48.963	53.802	64.569

Notes: Extraction method: principal component analysis. Rotation method: varimax with Kaiser normalization. Rotation converged in six iterations

Table II.
Rotated component matrix

41.96 percent, for factor 3 (cohesion), the total variance explained was 4.84 percent and for factor 4 (normative) the total variance explained was 10.767 percent. This implied that continuance commitment has the highest variance explained followed by normative commitment, followed by affective commitment and cohesion commitment having the least variance.

Zero-order Pearson correlations among study variables were used and is presented in Table III.

Affective commitment (mean = 4.0962, SD = 0.79167), continuance commitment (mean = 3.8633, SD = 0.99206), cohesion commitment (mean = 3.2238, SD = 1.45298) and normative commitment (mean = 3.9151, SD = 0.84981), exists among stakeholders of NAADS projects which leads to performance of NAADS projects (mean = 3.6718, SD = 0.46686). This finding partially rejects *H1* (there is no affective, continuance, normative and cohesion commitment among the stakeholders of NAADS projects). The finding shows that there is relatively high affective commitment with low continuance, normative and cohesion commitment.

Results from Table III also revealed a strong positive relationship between commitment and performance of NAADS projects ($r = 0.303^{**}$, $p < 0.01$). Results also showed that affective, normative and continuance are positively related to performance of NAADS projects with the parameters: $r = 0.318^{**}$, $p < 0.01$; $r = 0.363^{**}$, $p < 0.01$; and $r = 0.315^{**}$, $p < 0.01$, respectively. These results are in support of *H2* and consistent with Lum *et al.* (1998) and Allen and Meyer (1990) who concluded that commitment has a positive influence to organizational performance. They are also consistent with Benkhoff (1997) and Brett *et al.*, (1995) who contend that commitment to the project affects its performance. Tansky *et al.* (1997) argued that stakeholders with strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to, and they attach strong belief in and accepts the organization's goals and values yet stakeholders with strong continuance commitment remain attached to the organization because they need to, and they are willing to exert a considerable effort on behalf of the organization. Becker's (1960) asserted that stakeholders with strong normative commitment remain in the project because they feel they ought to, due to their strong loyalty to the project. This implies that if stakeholders feel emotionally attached to the project and has an obligation to remain part of the project; this will probably improve the quality of products and services that the project comes up with, on a timely basis.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Affective (1)	4.0962	0.79167	1.00					
Continuance (2)	3.8633	0.99206	0.304**	1.00				
Cohesion (3)	3.2238	1.45298	0.051	-0.131*	1.00			
Normative (4)	3.9151	0.84981	0.438**	0.619**	0.007	1.00		
Commitment to the projects (5)	3.7712	0.62970	0.619**	0.628**	0.548**	0.725**	1.00	
Performance of NAADS projects (6)	3.6718	0.46686	0.318**	0.315**	-0.059	0.363**	0.303**	1.00

Notes: *,**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 and 0.01 levels, respectively (two-tailed)

Table III.
Zero-order Pearson correlations

Hierarchical regression analysis

Hierarchical regression analyses were carried out with variables entered simultaneously within each hierarchical step. Colinearity diagnostics were examined for all items entered at each step and found to be within the recommended range (VIF < 4 and tolerance > 0.20; O'Brien and Marakas, 2007). The regression results are showed in Table IV.

Affective commitment was entered in model 1 and predicted 14.8 percent of the variance in performance of NAADS projects. ($R^2 = 0.148, p < 0.01$). The R^2 change was 8.9 percent and the F change statistics was significant (F statistics = 24.299, $\beta = 0.303$, F change of 0.00), supporting $H2$. When a second model was run entering continuance commitment, both affective commitment and continuance commitment were significant predictors of performance of NAADS projects with a predictive potential of 21.7 percent, the R^2 change was 6.9 percent and the F change statistics was significant (F statistics = 20.298, $\beta = 0.279$, F change of 0.00). This implied that continuance commitment predicted 6.9 percent of the variance in performance of NAADS projects thus supporting $H2$. When continuance commitment was introduced the β coefficient for affective commitment reduced from 0.303 to 0.233. A third model was run entering cohesion commitment, the results revealed that the predictive potential of the three variables remained 21.7 percent, the R^2 change dropped to 0.00 percent and the F change statistics was insignificant (F statistics = 0.23, $\beta = -0.09$, F change of 0.879). The β coefficient for affective commitment slightly increased from 0.233 to 0.234, the β coefficient continuance commitment reduced to 0.277 from 0.279 on the introduction of cohesive commitment. This meant that cohesion commitment did not influence and predict performance of NAADS projects, thus partially rejecting $H2$. In model 4 normative commitment was entered in the regression

Variables	Model 1 affective	Model 2 continuance	Model 3 coherent	Model 4 normative	Collinearity statistics	
					Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	2.634	2.352	2.366	2.297	na	na
Age group	0.056	0.052	0.052	0.060	0.922	1.084
Gender	-0.082	-0.032	-0.032	-0.037	0.907	1.102
Marital status	0.021	-0.003	-0.003	-0.006	0.927	1.078
Number of years worked in such projects	0.169	0.144	0.142	0.140	0.957	1.045
Highest education attained	0.055	0.030	0.029	0.042	0.983	1.018
Affective	0.303	0.233	0.234	0.185	0.970	1.031
Continuance		0.279	0.277	0.177	0.884	1.131
Cohesion			-0.009	-0.018	0.914	1.094
Normative				0.173	0.507	1.974
R	0.385	0.466	0.466	0.482	na	na
R^2	0.148	0.217	0.217	0.232	na	na
Adjusted R^2	0.126	0.193	0.190	0.202	na	na
F statistics					na	na
Significance	0.000	0.000	0.879	0.034	na	na
R^2 change	0.089	0.069	0.000	0.015	na	na
F change statistics	24.299	20.298	0.023	4.524	na	na
Significance F change	0.000	0.000	0.879	0.034	na	na

Table IV.
Hierarchical regression
analysis with performance
of NAADS projects as the
dependent variable

model and results showed that the predictive potential of the four variables (affective, continuance, cohesion and normative) increased to 23.2 percent, the R^2 change increased to 0.15 percent and the F change statistics was insignificant (F statistics = 4.524, $\beta = 0.173$, F change of 0.034). This implied that normative commitment predicted 1.5 percent of the variance in performance of NAADS projects, thus partially supporting $H2$. The β coefficient for affective commitment slightly reduced from 0.234 to 0.185, the β coefficient continuance commitment reduced to 0.177 from 0.277 while the β coefficient reduced from -0.09 to -0.18 with the introduction of normative commitment.

The results in models 1, 2 and 4 were consistent with the findings of Lum *et al.* (1998), Sims and Kroeck (1994), Benkhoff (1997) and Brett *et al.*, (1995) who have established that commitment has a positive influence to organizational performance therefore commitment to the project affects its performance while in model 3 with the introduction of cohesion commitment the results showed a significant difference therefore they were inconsistent with the views of the authors.

Policy and managerial implications

At the policy level, there is need to increase commitment of key stakeholders of NAADS projects. This can be done by ensuring that project coordinators discuss with farmers the personal benefits of carrying out activities of the projects such that farmers feel a great deal of personal meaning of the project to their lives. The procedures and guidelines should be clearly communicated to all stakeholders such that they are willing to be part of the project. This will make farmer feel like spending the rest of their career carrying out project activities.

Theoretical implications

Our study looked at performance of NAADS projects in Uganda by looking at the effect of stakeholder commitment. Stakeholder commitment was found to be a very important predictor of the performance projects. Few studies have been carried out in relation to project performance and our study makes a number of contributions to the theory and study of project performance in relation to the study variables. The study contributes to an understanding of stakeholder commitment to project performance in a developing country. Given that most studies on project performance are more in developed countries and few in the developing countries, further research in the area can be carried out in these projects. This has been covered in studies of Allen and Meyer (1990), Aven (1988), Standards Committee (2004) and Bryde (2003).

Conclusion

From the discussion, it can be concluded that stakeholders of NAADS projects have low commitment to the projects' activities. However, this commitment can be increased in order to improve performance of the projects. The correlation and regression models show that commitment to the project strongly and positively correlates and predicts performance of NAADS projects. Implying that in order to improve performance of NAADS projects, commitment of stakeholders to the projects activities has to be increased.

Limitation of the study

The major limitation of this study was that it focussed on stakeholders of NAADS projects in Mukono districts. This may limit the generalization of the findings to all

NAADS projects in Uganda due to different factors affecting stakeholders in the different localities. The other limitation is that most of the farmers were illiterate which posed a problem of language barrier. Though the researcher spent time with respondents trying to interpret the questionnaire for them in local language (Luganda) this might have caused some biasness and common understanding of the questionnaire. However, more research be carried out in the same area due to the limited literature, since the results showed on cohesive commitment were found not to be significant and no research has been carried to support the finding, further research be done in this area and lastly stakeholder commitment goes hand in hand with project communication therefore further research should also focus on the effect of project communication on stakeholder commitment and project performance in low-developing countries.

References

- Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990), "The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 1-18.
- Andersen, E.S. (2006), "Toward a project management theory for renewal projects", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 15-30.
- Atkinson, R. (1999), "Project management: cost, time and quality, two best guesses and a phenomenon, its time to accept other success criteria", *International Journal of Project Management* 1999, Vol. 17 No. 6, pp. 337-342.
- Auditor General Report (2008), *Report on National Agricultural Advisory Services Program*, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), (NAADS), Kampala.
- Aven, F.F. (1988), "A methodological examination of the attitudinal and behavioral components of organizational commitment", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 40, pp. 3420A.
- Baccarini, D. (1999), "The logical framework method for defining project success", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 25-32.
- Becker, H.S. (1960), "Notes on the concept of commitment", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 32-40.
- Benkhoff, B. (1997), "Ignoring commitment is costly: new approaches establish the missing link between commitment and performance", *Human Relations*, Vol. 50 No. 6, pp. 701-726.
- Brett, J.F., Cron, W.I. and Slocum, J.W. (1995), "Economic dependency on work: a moderator of the relationship between organizational commitment and performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 261-271.
- Bryde, J.D. (2003), "Project management concepts, methods and application", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 23 No. 7, pp. 775-793.
- Crawford, L.H., Hobbs, J.B. and Turner, J.R. (2005), *Project Categorization Systems: Aligning Capability with Strategy for Better Results*, Project Management Institute, Upper Darby, PA.
- Dvir, D., Lipovetsky, S., Shenhar, A. and Tishler, A. (1998), "In search of project classification: a non-universal approach to project success factors", *Research Policy*, Vol. 27 No. 9, pp. 915-935.
- Dwyer, F., Schurr, R.P. and Sejo, O. (1987), "Developing buyer-seller relationships", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51, April, pp. 1-27.
- Etzioni, A. (1961), *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations*, 3rd ed., Free Press, New York, NY.

- Hrebiniak, L. and Alutto, J. (1972), "Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 17, pp. 555-572.
- Jaros, S.J., Jermier, J.M., Koehler, J.W. and Sincich, T. (1993), "Effects of continuance, affective, and moral commitment on the withdrawal process: an evaluation of eight structural equation models", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 951-995.
- Kanter, R.M. (1968), "Commitment and social organisation: a study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 499-517.
- Kerzner, H. (2006), *Project Management: A Systems Approach to Planning, Scheduling and Controlling*, 9th ed., Wiley, New York, NY.
- Koh, H.C. and Boo, E.H. (2001), "The link between organizational ethics and job satisfaction: a study of managers in Singapore", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 309-324.
- Lim, C.S. and Mohamed, M. (1999), "Criteria of project success: an exploratory re-examination", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 243-248.
- Lipovetsky, S., Tishler, A., Dvir, D. and Shenhar, A. 1997, "The relative importance of defense projects success dimensions", *R&D Management*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 97-106.
- Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F. and Sirola, W. (1998), "Explaining nursing turnover intent: job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment?", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 305-320.
- McElroy, B. and Mills, C. (2000), *Managing Stakeholders*, Gower Handbook of Project Management, Gower, Aldershot.
- Moorman, R.H. (1993), "The Influence of cognitive and affective based on job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour", *Human Relations*, Vol. 46 No. 6, pp. 759-775.
- Morgan, R.M. and Hunt, S.D. (1994), "The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58 No. 3, pp. 20-38.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1979), "The measurement of organizational commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 224-247.
- Munns, A.K. and Bjeirmi, B.F. (1996), "The role of project management in achieving success", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 81-87.
- NAADS Secretariat Report (2003/2004), *Report on Performance of National Agricultural Advisory Services Program*, Ministry Of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), Kampala.
- O'Brien, J.A. and Marakas, G.M. (2007), *Introduction to Information Systems*, McGrawHill, New York, NY.
- Pinto, J.K. and Slevin, D.P. (1988), "Project success: definitions and measurement techniques", *Project Management Journal*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 67-71.
- PMI (2004), *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge*, Project Management Institute, Newton Square, PA.
- Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R. and Boulian, P. (1974), "Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 59 No. 5, pp. 603-609.
- Schappe, S.P. and Doran, A.C. (1997), "How does fair treatment affect employee commitment to an organization? A field study of financial holding company employees", *The Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 191-201.
- Shenhar, A.J., Dvir, D., Levi, O. and Maltz, A. (2001), "Project success: a multidimensional strategic concept", *Long-Range Planning*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 699-725.
- Sims, R.L. and Kroeck, K.G. (1994), "The influence of ethical fit on employee satisfaction, commitment and turnover", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 13 No. 12, pp. 939-948.
- Steers, R.M. (1977), "Antecedents and outcomes and organizational commitment", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 46-56.

- Tansky, J.W., Gallagher, D.G. and Wetzel, K.W. (1997), "The effect of demographics, work status, and relative equity on organizational commitment: looking among part-time workers", *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 315-326.
- Voetsch, R.J., Cioffi, D.F. and Anbari, F.T. (2004), "Project risk management practices and their association with reported project success", in Wikstrom, K. and Artto, K. (Eds), *Proceedings of Sixth IRNOP Project Research Conference*, Turku, pp. 680-697.
- Wateridge, J. (1998), "How can IS/IT projects be measured for success?", *International Journal of Project Management*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 59-63.
- Wiener, Y. (1982), "Commitment in organizations: a normative view", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 7, pp. 418-428.
- Wiener, Y. and Vardi, Y. (1980), "Relationships between job, organization, and career commitments and work outcomes: an integrative approach", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 26 pp. 81-96.
- Zwikael, O. and Globerson, S. (2006), "From critical success factors to critical success processes", *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 44 No. 17, pp. 3433-3449.

Further reading

Project Management Institute Standards Committee (1994), *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge*, PMBOK® Exposure Draft, Project Management Institute, Newton Square, PA.

About the authors

Hassan Bashir is a graduate of the Bachelor of International Business, Masters in Business Administration (Project Major). His teaching and research interests are in project management, international business, negotiation, contract management and strategic communication. He has over six years' experience in teaching at the university.

Sheila Namagembe is a graduate of the Bachelor of Business Administration (Procurement Major), Master of Science in Procurement and Supply Chain Management and is a member of the Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply. Her teaching and research interests are in ethics, supply chain management, public procurement, negotiation, contract management, green purchasing and project management. Sheila Namagembe is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: snagembe@mubs.ac.ug

Sudi Nangoli is a lecturer in the Department of Business Administration at Makerere University Business School. He holds a Master of Business Administration (project management) and a Bachelor of Business Administration (Accounting) and ACCA (UK). He has over six years' experience in teaching at the university. His teaching and research interests are in project management, strategic management, business administration and auditing.

Joseph M. Ntayi is the Dean, Faculty of Computing and Management Science at Makerere University Business School. He holds a PhD (Marketing), a Master of Business Administration (Marketing) and a Bachelor of Commerce (Marketing). He has over 15 years' experience in teaching at the university, project management, research and consultancy. His teaching and research interests are in procurement, business ethics, industrial marketing, and purchasing and supply chain management.

Mohammed Ngoma is the Dean, Graduate Research Centre at Makerere University Business School. He holds a PhD (Marketing), a Master of Business Administration in Marketing and a Bachelor of Commerce (Marketing). He has over 15 years' experience in teaching at the university, project management, research and consultancy. His teaching and research interests are in marketing, project management, international business and supply chain management.