

# Exploring the Effect of Beneficiary Engagement on International Development Projects' Performance: a Project Life Cycle Perspective

Anintya HAPSARI<sup>1</sup>, Ying-Yi CHIH<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Portfolio Manager, Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office - British Embassy Jakarta, Indonesia, E-mail address: Anintya.Hapsari1@fcd.gov.uk.*

<sup>2\*</sup> *Professor in Project Management, Research School of Management, College of Business and Economics, The Australian National University, Australia. E-mail address: ying-yi.chih@anu.edu.au (Presenting Author)*

**Abstract:** Many international development (ID) projects have continued to fail to deliver their intended socio-economic benefits to the beneficiary (i.e., a group of primary recipients of these benefits). In this research, drawing from project stakeholder and benefit management literature, we investigated how ID project performance is perceived by beneficiary, how beneficiary is engaged, and how such engagement contributes to ID project performance. The results from thirteen semi-structured interviews with those leading beneficiary engagement in ID projects in Indonesia showed that, as compared with other projects, ID projects place a stronger emphasis on benefit realization when it comes to performance evaluation given their focuses on achieving socio-economic objectives. Beneficiary engagement during the entire life cycle was found to be critical to benefit realization in ID projects. Although the specific methods employed can vary, the beneficiary engagement in ID projects usually take a participatory and longer-term perspective, aiming to facilitate not only the benefit realization but also the sustainability of the benefits over time. This research extends prior project stakeholder and benefit management literature to a specific stakeholder group (i.e., beneficiary) in a unique context (i.e., ID projects). It also offers practical insights to assist organizations effectively plan and manage beneficiary engagement in future ID projects.

**Key words:** international development project, stakeholder engagement, beneficiary, project benefits, project performance.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

International development (ID) projects are projects that are “*tasked with achieving the overarching goal of economic growth or poverty reduction through not-for-profit, humanitarian, and/or socio-economic objectives*” (Ika & Donnelly, 2017 [1], p. 44). These projects are important means for governments and/or not-for-profit organizations (e.g., World Bank and United Nations) to provide development assistance (e.g., poverty alleviation, education and health improvement; Khang & Moe, 2008 [2]) to developing countries. Despite their importance, ID projects are prevalently found to fail to deliver their intended socio-economic benefits to the *target beneficiary*; and/or the projects' funding organizations were not able to demonstrate the benefits these projects delivered (OECD, 2018 [3]; Julian, 2016 [4]). This is concerning given the significant and increasing investments made to such projects. For example, the investment in development assistance funds has increased from USD105.6 billion to USD146.6 billion from 2006 to 2016 (OECD, 2018 [3]). The *targeted beneficiary* of an ID project is a group of primary recipients (e.g., a community) of the socio-economic benefits that the project aims to deliver (Ika & Hodgson, 2014 [5]; Khang & Moe, 2008 [2]). Their perception and evaluation of these delivered benefits, therefore, play a significant role in determining ID project

performance. An active beneficiary engagement, throughout the project life, is thus critical in supporting and maximising the delivery of ID projects' social and economic benefits.

Rich literature has offered valuable insights into the important roles of stakeholders in project benefit realization (e.g., Chang et al., 2013 [6]; Chih & Zwikael, 2015 [7]; Chih et al., 2019 [8]). These studies however are limited in several ways. First, as project benefits are dynamic and will be subjectively perceived by different stakeholders (Davis, 2017 [9]), the engagement strategies throughout the project life need to be tailored to specific stakeholder groups and project context (Turkulainen et al., 2015 [10]). This means a consideration of: who the stakeholder is, in which stage of project life that the engagement occurs, and the type of project. However, there remains limited research that examines the roles of the beneficiary (i.e., a specific stakeholder group) and their engagement strategies throughout the life of ID projects (i.e., a specific project context). Second, although prior studies (Ward & Chapman, 2008 [11]) have suggested a life-cycle perspective to stakeholder engagement, it remains unclear how the beneficiary may be engaged in ID projects, including the post-project phase (Breese, 2012 [12]). Finally, ID projects are more complex than other projects due to their distinctive characteristics, including the involvement of multiple layers of stakeholders. Ironically, despite their importance, ID projects received limited research attention in the project management literature (Ika & Donnelly, 2017 [1]; Khang & Moe, 2008 [2]). This research thus aims to address these limitations by investigating: (1) how the beneficiary is engaged throughout ID projects' life cycle, (2) what the challenges are and (3) how such engagement contributes to ID project performance.

## **2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

### **2.1 Project performance in ID projects**

Project performance has been increasingly conceptualized from the value creation (or benefit realization) perspective (Breese, 2012 [12]). Significant research attention has been devoted to understanding the concept of value and the process of value creation. Collectively, these prior studies (e.g., Chang et al., 2013 [6]; Davis, 2017 [9]; Turner & Zolin, 2012 [13]) have suggested that project value will be subjectively perceived by different stakeholders, contingent upon their needs and objectives; and evolve over time throughout project life cycle. It is thus critical to consider diverse stakeholders' perspectives and engage them through an ongoing process in creating project value. Similarly, ID project performance is multidimensional, and assessed from the aspects of efficiency (e.g., resource utilization), relevance (e.g., alignment with the priorities of the country, beneficiary and the funding organizations), effectiveness (e.g., meeting project objectives), impact (e.g., visible changes and benefits delivered to the beneficiary) and sustainability (e.g., project benefits are likely to continue after funding has ceased) (Ika et al., 2012 [21]; Khang & Moe, 2008 [2]). In ID projects, a stronger emphasis is often placed on the benefit related criteria (e.g., effectiveness, impact and sustainability) owing to their primary focuses on delivering socio-economic benefits (e.g., social, environmental and economic improvement) to targeted beneficiary. In such projects, project outputs (e.g., physical infrastructure and educational programs) are generally viewed as means to generate these benefits.

ID project performance management is challenging due to several distinct characteristics of such projects (Ika et al., 2010 [14]; Ika & Hodgson, 2014 [5]; Khang & Moe, 2008 [2]). First, ID projects are not-for-profit; and their objectives are generally less perceptible (i.e., intangible) and quantifiable. Their objectives (e.g., poverty alleviation and social transformation) can also be very long-term oriented. In such contexts, project performance evaluation can be highly ambiguous and uncertain. Second, ID projects usually involve diverse and multilayered stakeholders (e.g., funding organization, project implementation entities, and the targeted beneficiary), who can have different motivations, needs and level of expertise owing to their diverse social, political, cultural and geographical backgrounds. Balancing these stakeholders' expectations to achieve desirable project performance is thus challenging.

### **2.2 Stakeholder engagement activities during project life**

The life of an ID project can be loosely categorized into three phases, namely the planning, the implementation/operation, and the evaluation (Julian, 2016 [4]; Khang & Moe, 2008 [2]). The project planning phase focuses on identifying and justifying the needs and developing plans for a new ID project; and subsequently, developing a project proposal for project funding organization's consideration and approval. The implementation/operation phase is where the planned activities outlined in the project proposal are executed, monitored and controlled. The project evaluation phase focuses on

completing and evaluating the project. The former entails an official project closure (e.g., complete the final project report and capture lessons learned); while the latter focuses on assessing the benefits delivered from the project and the sustainability of such into the future.

Stakeholder engagement aims to build and maintain robust relationships with stakeholders to empower them to actively participate in a project’s decision-making process. Effective engagement enables stakeholders to express their opinions and aspirations about the project and, more importantly, shape the project direction (Turner & Zolin, 2012 [4]). As stakeholder groups and their views can change over time, the stakeholder engagement needs to be a continuous process throughout the project life (Ward & Chapman, 2008 [11]). However, the objectives for stakeholder engagement and the engagement strategies to be employed can vary across project phases. Table 1 summarized the common stakeholder engagement objectives and activities in each of the project phases.

**Table 1.** Stakeholder engagement objectives and activities

Phases	Example Stakeholder Engagement Objective	Example Engagement Activities
Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disseminate project content and plan, establish conduct guidelines and clarify team objectives</li> <li>Identify the beneficiary’s needs and determine the intervention to address these needs</li> </ul>	Planning/Design workshops/Forums Focus groups/Interviews/Surveys Public consultation and engagement Establish contractual agreements
Implementation & operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elaborate the project goals and maintain and advance motivation</li> <li>Disseminate progress information to the public; and develop problem-solving channels</li> </ul>	Project documentation sharing Presentations/Meetings/Workshops Target consultation Respond to stakeholders’ grievances Continous monitor and updates
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitate information exchange related to the project undertakings and results; and collect and document lessons learned for future projects</li> <li>Collect data from the beneficiary on the project results</li> </ul>	Meetings/workshops/Public forums Training sessions/ Project assets and liabilities transfer Post-project evaluation workshops and/or surveys

### 2.3 Service-dominant logic (SDL) as a theoretical framework

Service-dominant logic (SDL) is a theoretical framework developed to understand how value is co-created by various actors (Vargo & Lusch, 2016 [15]). SDL suggests that service, “*a process of using one’s resources for the benefit of another entity*” (Vargo & Lusch, 2008 [16], p.7), is the basis of all exchange; and value is the primary purpose of service exchange. Value is created for various actors when their operant resources (e.g., knowledge and skills) are integrated through interactions (Grönroos & Voima, 2013 [17]). In SDL, value often refers to the value for customers, namely the “*value-in-use*”. Customers derive value only from using the goods/offerings provided by an organization and such value is phenomenologically and experientially assessed by the customers. Similarly, in ID projects, project value (e.g., socio-economic benefits) is considered from the beneficiary’s perspective. This value will only be created when the beneficiary invests their own resources (e.g., time and knowledge) to utilize the project outputs (e.g., physical infrastructure and education programs). In this instance, the beneficiary perception of the value will be subjectively affected by their contextual environment and utilization experience. Beneficiary engagement is thus important means to understand beneficiary’s context (e.g., their needs) and help them develop the required operant resources (e.g. skills and knowledge) to utilize the ID projects’ offering, leading to improved benefit realization.

## 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Participants and recruitment procedure

This explorative research involved qualitative semi-structured interviews. The unit of analysis is “an ID project”. We first identified ID projects in Indonesia that are either completed (or close to be completed); and as such would allow an investigation the beneficiary engagement practices throughout the entire project life. These ID projects are characterized by having a complex web of stakeholders, being operated in dynamic political environment, and aiming to deliver long-term social and economical benefits. We then sent the invitation emails to the project managers (or equivalent managerial roles) and

asked them to also refer us to their team members who were responsible for engaging stakeholders. A total of 13 participants (i.e., 7 males and 5 females with an average of 14 years' industry experience) have agreed to participate. Table 2 shows the project and participant profiles.

**Table 2** Project and participant profiles

Proj. ID	Project Description	Targeted Beneficiary	Budget*/ Duration	Interview Participants ID	Role Description
A	Provide access to electricity through the use of renewable energy	School and village communities that have noaccess to electricity	4.3 million; 2.5 years	A1	Field manager who oversees beneficiary engagement.
				A2	Community engagement officer who provide training to beneficiary
				A3	Field implementer who manages stakeholder coordination
B	Establish capacity-building forum to improve poor rural women's leadership; and their access to government facilities	Poor rural women entitled for Government Social Protection program	N/A; 7.5 years	B1	Steering committee member who develops engagement strategies.
				B2	National coordinator who develops and implements project activities; manages funder relationship
				B3	Coordinator who implements capacity-building activities.
C	Provide access to water & sanitation in rural areas	Low-income community in villages	1.6 billion; 14 years	C1	Team leader who represents the funding organization
D	Hold capacity-building training for government officials for improved service delivery	Target district government officials	5,000; 5 years	D1	Manager who manage project delivery.
E	Build capability of health professionals to address children's health problems	Pregnant women, children under 2 & and local community	134 million; 5 years	E1	Project manager who coordinates project planning, implementation and monitoring
				E2	Project management specialist who supports implementation.
F	Develop safe & responsible mining practices	Community of small-scale gold miners	5.5 million; 5 years	F1	Country project manager who oversees the overall project delivery
G	Increase primary school community awareness & capability on disaster risk management	The primary school community	52,000; 6 months	G1	Project manager who manages the overall project delivery
				G2	Project officer who facilitates beneficiary engagement activities

\*Budget is in USD

### 3.2 Data collection and analysis

One-on-one semi-structured interviews were conducted with the participants. The interview questions focused on the ID project's background, participants' role, perceived project performance, the employed beneficiary engagement practices across different project phases and their effect and challenges, and participants' demographic information. Each interview lasted for approximately 30 to 90 minutes. All interviews were recorded and analyzed through an iterative process. Specifically, we first get familiar with each interview case and grasp each participant's general conception. We then analyzed the data systematically to identify emerging patterns across cases corresponding to our research questions and cluster relevant interview quotes. In this process, we further contrasted our empirical findings with theoretical references to ensure the consistency between the data and the theory.

## 4. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Project performance in ID projects

Our findings revealed a strong emphasis on benefit realization in participants' assessment of the multifaceted ID project performance (Khang & Moe, 2008 [2]). The multiple-facet project performance

dimensions of ID project are well explained by a Project Manager (A1): *“The performance of the project can be perceived from several aspects. One of them would be whether the project has successfully met the targets. Thankfully, this project has fulfilled that, and we even managed to generate output that exceeds the targeted quantity. Then, we can also perceive it from how beneficiaries benefited from the project. For example, the community was able to generate income as a result of their engagement in this project. The community also benefited directly from the project; for example, they are now able to access electricity to carry out their businesses. [In this project] we also want women to be economically empowered by utilising electricity. And we can see when women were given opportunities to perform activities, particularly in relation to energy, they can manage them well.”* This benefit-oriented view of project performance may be attributed to ID projects’ focuses on delivering socio-economic benefits (Ika et al., 2010 [14]). Its unique ‘accountability-for-results’ culture also holds the funding organizations accountable for the investment of the development fund, linking directly to the delivered benefits.

#### **4.2 Beneficiary engagement practices during project life cycle**

Our results showed that stakeholder engagement practices employed varied across different project phases depending on the engagement objectives.

**The planning phase.** Our results showed that the beneficiary engagement in the planning phase primarily aims to (1) understand beneficiary’s needs, (2) present them with alternative interventions that can address these needs, and (3) allow them to reach an agreement about the proposed interventions. This is illustrated by C1 (Project Team Leader), *“We involved them [beneficiary] in meetings, explained options available and helped the community decide the most suitable [intervention] options for them.”* This is consistent with the prior literature suggesting that capturing project beneficiary’s needs, sharing project options and seeking feedback from them is critical in the project planning phase (Julian, 2016 [4]; Turkulainen et al., 2015 [10]). In this regard, our interviewees have mentioned various beneficiary engagement methods, such as conducting need assessment, formal and informal meetings, surveys, focus groups, interviews, participatory mapping and direct observation. This well illustrated in, *“All team members lived in with the [beneficiary] community for six months; and engaged them in focus group discussions, through in-depth interviews, direct observations, participatory mapping, and participatory rural appraisal to understand issues facing women”* (B3, Project Team Member). These examples revealed a strong emphasis on “participatory” approaches to allow beneficiary (often a community) to be actively involved in identifying their needs and co-designing the projects.

**The implementation/operation phase.** The beneficiary engagement during implementation/operation phase aims to: (1) reemphasize the project objectives and plans, (2) co-develop project deliverables and the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, and (3) facilitate the knowledge transfer. The importance of continuous beneficiary engagement in this phase is highlighted by almost all interviewees. In several cases, the beneficiary is actively engaged in training sessions, infrastructure installation, implementation activities, and government advocacy processes. This was illustrated in comments such as: *“Beneficiaries were heavily involved and taught even throughout the soil digging process and when covering the cables on the ground. All these technical activities were all taught, so they have understanding that they build this themselves and use it for themselves”* (A1, Project Manager). The active beneficiary engagement in this phase can have a longer-term advantage. By participating in the co-production of project deliverables, the beneficiary can develop a sense of ownership and gain the knowledge required to utilize them, enhancing future benefit realization.

Our interviewees also mentioned several beneficiary engagement approaches, such as regular meetings (formal and informal), site visits, implementation planning sessions, participatory audit, setting up a learning centre and appointing local leaders. Similarly, beneficiary engagement in this phase remains strongly “participative”. In addition, it is heavily rooted in the community. For example, five projects we studied appointed community leaders (selected from the beneficiary group) to assist in promoting and facilitating all ID project activities and in advocating project goals. This participative and community rooted nature can help maintain and sustain beneficiary motivation to engage, contributing to continuous stakeholder engagement (Turkulainen et al., 2015 [10])

**The evaluation phase.** Supporting Turkulainen et al. (2015) [10], our findings showed that during the evaluation phase, beneficiary is engaged mainly to evaluate the project performance (e.g., benefit realization) and lay the ground for post-project engagement. Example engagement methods included site visits, formal meetings, end-line surveys, impact evaluation and setting a new organization. In ID projects, because of its long-term orientation, it is critical to sustain the beneficiary engaging relationship into future (Ika et al., 2010 [14]). It is thus possible that a new organization or alliance will be set up.

This is described by A1 (Project Manager): *“The young people recruited for the [new] organization, they continuously led and were responsible for the maintenance and operation until today. By doing this, we showed the beneficiary that the intervention was still performed continuously. As I said earlier, the project hand over is more than a document transfer, but we highly consider the sustainability of this project.”* This finding highlights ID projects’ emphasis on pos-project beneficiary engagement.

### 4.3 Effect of beneficiary engagement on ID project performance

Our results suggest that the beneficiary engagement across project phases are all critical in their own ways, as illustrated in the comment such as, *“Ideally, they need to be involved and engaged at every phase, as this project is basically their project. We only came to facilitate.... We did not bring new things. Considering their capacity, we are only helping them to help themselves. Because when the disaster happens, they are the only people who can help themselves.”* (G2, Project Team Member). This continued beneficiary engagement can enhance ID project performance in a number of ways.

First, it allows the beneficiary’s diverse needs to be comprehensively captured and properly formulated. These can not only inform the development of the supporting project outputs but also serve as a baseline for future project performance evaluation (Chih & Zwikael, 2015 [7]; Zwikael et al. 2018 [18]). This view is captured in the comment such as *“These [engagement activities] resulted in a holistic knowledge about the village and women in the villages, which became the basis for module development”* (B3, Project Team Member). This positive link between front-end beneficiary engagement and ID project performance (e.g., benefit realization) can be explained by SDL provision that *“a service-centered view is inherently beneficiary oriented and relational”* (Vargo & Lusch, 2016 [15], p. 8). To this end, project benefits are beneficiary-oriented focusing on resolving their concern. Beneficiary’s benefits are realized when they utilize project deliverables in their contexts; and when their operant resources (e.g., contextual knowledge) are integrated with others. In this regard, this early (and ongoing) engagement will allow the beneficiary to bring their operant resources and the project team to offer their technical skills to jointly identify the beneficiary’s real needs and develop optimal alternatives that can potentially maximize beneficiary’s value-in-use.

Second, the engagement allows the team to mitigate the project uncertainties related to beneficiary. This is illustrated by A3 (Project Team Member): *“We could evaluate each activity performed. It [engagement] facilitates the beneficiary to share their challenges and what needs to be improved. There is a reciprocal relationship from this correlation.”* Indeed, SDL views engagement as interactive opportunities that allow different stakeholders to reconcile their value concerns/conflicts; and co-develop mutually acceptable solutions. As stakeholders’ needs evolve over time, these engagements also allow stakeholders (including beneficiary) to express their changing needs and the project team to adjust the project directions accordingly to increase the certainty in ID project benefit realization.

Third, our interviewees believed that beneficiary engagement promotes the beneficiary’s sense of ownership over an ID project, making them more likely to utilize the deliverables they co-develop. This, in turn, can enhance ID project benefit realization. This view is captured in: *“At the early stage, all information pertaining to the project budget and activity, output and outcomes were disseminated to all beneficiaries in schools. We expected that schools would build a sense of ownership”* (G2, Project Team Member). This sense of ownership can also increase beneficiary motivation for engagement. As suggested in SDL, continuous interactions are fundamental to project value creation as they facilitate the integration and exchange of various resources (Vargo & Lusch, 2016 [15]). A motivated beneficiary would be more willing to contribute to defining ID projects’ target benefits and co-developing project deliverables. As they are actively involved in this process, they are more likely to utilize the deliverables and felt accountable for project benefit realization.

Fourth, the “participative oriented” engagement in ID projects allow beneficiary to develop relevant knowledge and skills that are required to utilize project deliverables to meet their needs (i.e., benefit realization) (Vargo & Lusch, 2016 [15]). This is described by G1 (Project Manager): *“As they [beneficiary] were actively engaged in this project, they understood the activity steps involved in disaster risk reduction. They also understood risk analysis; they did it all themselves, including the development of a contingency plan.”* This learning process, however, is reciprocal. The team is also able to adjust the project deliverables to accommodate the beneficiary’s varying knowledge and skills, as noted in, *“There are also evaluations on these [training] modules: we assessed the community’s level of understanding, what needs to be improved and what other knowledge that they want to learn. From there we understand which module we need to focus on”* (B3, Project Team Member). Indeed, SDL highlights the importance of different actors’ reciprocal learning and adaptive processes in value creation.

Fifth, active community-focused beneficiary engagement will lead to sustainable engagement beyond project completion, as explained by an interviewee: *“The more [beneficiary] participation, the more sustainable the system would be. If something [of the system] is broken, they are willing to fix and maintain the facilities”* (C1, Project Manager). This is because, through their engagement, the beneficiary acquires the knowledge and skills required not only to utilize project deliverables but also to maintain them. As previously noted, the community-rooted beneficiary engagement in ID projects can involve the appointment of local community leaders to ensure the projects’ long-term benefits are monitored and realized. In ID projects, project resources are withdrawn at the time of project completion. Yet, given such project’s long-term orientation, project benefits are unlikely to be realized at that time. In this case, the responsibilities of benefit realization will be shifted back to beneficiary, and thus requires a sustainable beneficiary engagement.

Finally, beneficiary engagement is essential to determine the ID project performance. This link is highlighted in comments such as, *“The beneficiary would be asked about the things they received from this program and this information will determine the result of evaluation process”* (E1, Project Manager). The project evaluation process is integral to examining whether and to what extent that the ID projects address the beneficiary needs. This evaluation allows the beneficiary to validate the project benefits delivered to them, the project team to obtain an overview of the project performance and the funding organizations to demonstrate the results generated from their investments.

#### **4.4 Beneficiary engagement challenges in ID projects**

Our findings further revealed three major challenges in beneficiary engagement in ID projects.

First, as compared with other project types, ID projects tend to have more diverse stakeholder groups, and subject to complex social, cultural and political environments (Ika & Hodgson, 2014 [5]; Khang & Moe, 2008 [2]). These features are likely to affect beneficiary’s motivation and commitment to engage in ID projects. For example, the social and cultural norms in a community may influence beneficiary’s commitment to engage and their views (e.g., levels of support) about the project. The political processes and government regulations may also affect the levels and forms of beneficiary engagement. The beneficiary engagement in ID projects thus need to take a broader perspective (i.e., more than just the individual stakeholders) to take each project’s surrounding contextual features into account. This complexity is highlighted in: *“The theory we introduced through the project is not linear; this can be influenced by various social concepts, for example, intolerance, radicalism, extremism, patriarchy. The social protection system is also evolving depending on the government and this influences the advocacy process associated with it”* (B3, Project Team Member).

Second, ID projects’ beneficiary is likely to be disadvantaged and/or vulnerable groups in a society, who may not have the necessary means (e.g., skills and knowledge) and resources (e.g., time) to engage. For example, one of our interviewees described: *“The level of a beneficiary’s engagement is highly influenced by the beneficiary’s educational background. It was not easy to engage them throughout the project implementation as they were not fully aware that the issue we were addressing was critical”* (E1, Project Manager). As such, understanding these distinct beneficiary characteristics becomes critical in developing appropriate engagement practices.

Thirdly, it can be difficult to schedule a time (given how diverse this group is) and get the required resources for beneficiary engagement. This is illustrated in comments such as: *“Another challenge is associated with event scheduling as they were also busy with other activities. We provided them a monthly work plan to work with their schedule”* (D1, Project Manager); and *“The challenge is the availability of financial resources to support the continuity of the activities”* ( B3, Project Team Member). This lack of resources is more evident in post-project completion phase when the human and financial resources were withdrawn from the project, making the post-project beneficiary engagement even more challenging. To address this resourcing issue, in some projects, new organizations funded by local governments may be established to manage the continuous beneficiary engagement.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

This research provides important theoretical insights into how performance is perceived in ID projects, how beneficiary is engaged, and how such engagement may contribute to ID project performance beneficiary. It highlights the importance of contexts (e.g., project types and stakeholder groups) in future project stakeholder and benefit management research. It also offers several practical insights to assist organizations effectively plan and manage beneficiary engagement in future ID projects. First, the

discovered engagement methods and associated managerial challenges can serve as references for the life cycle beneficiary engagement in other ID projects. Second, ID project teams need to take a longer-term perspective to develop a clear link between beneficiary engagement and project benefit realization (i.e., how this stakeholder engagement may contribute to project benefit realization a number of years from now). Finally, the ID project teams should consider the governance structure, accountability and resources required for continuous beneficiary engagement beyond project completion.

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. A. Ika, J. Donnelly, "Success conditions for international development capacity building projects," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 44–63, 2017.
- [2] D. B. Khang, T. L. Moe, "Success criteria and factors for international development projects: A life-cycle base framework," *Project Management Journal*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 72–84, 2008.
- [3] The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), "Development Co-operation Report," 2018.
- [4] R. Julian, "Is it for donors or locals? The relationship between stakeholder interests and demonstrating results in international development," *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 505–527, 2016.
- [5] L. A. Ika, D. Hodgson, "Learning from international development projects: Blending Critical Project Studies and Critical Development Studies," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 32, no. 7, pp. 1182–1196, 2014.
- [6] A. Chang, Y. Y. Chih, E. Chew, A. Pisarski, "Reconceptualising mega project success in Australian Defence: Recognising the importance of value co-creation," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 31, no.8, pp. 1139–1153, 2013.
- [7] Y. Y. Chih, O. Zwikael, "Project benefit management: A conceptual framework of target benefit formulation. *International Journal of Project Management*," vol. 33, no.2, pp. 352–362, 2015.
- [8] Y. Y. Chih, O. Zwikael, S. L. D. Restubog, "Enhancing value co-creation in professional service projects: The roles of professionals, clients and their effective interactions," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 599–615, 2019.
- [9] K. Davis, "An empirical investigation into different stakeholder groups perception of project success," *International Journal of Project Management*, 35, no.4, pp. 604–617, 2017.
- [10] V. Turkulainen, K. Aaltonen, P. Lohikoski, "Managing project stakeholder communication: The Qstock Festival case," *Project Management Journal*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 74–91, 2015.
- [11] S. Ward, C. Chapman, "Stakeholders and uncertainty management in projects," *Construction Management and Economics*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 563–577, 2008.
- [12] R. Breese, "Benefits realization management: Panacea or false dawn?" *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 30, no.3, pp. 341–351, 2012.
- [13] R. Turner, R. Zolin, "Forecasting success on large projects: Developing reliable scales to predict multiple perspectives by multiple stakeholders over multiple time frames," *Project Management Journal*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 87–99, 2012.
- [14] L. A. Ika, A. Diallo, D. Thuillier, "Project management in the international development industry: The project coordinator's perspective," *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 61–93, 2010.
- [15] S. L. Vargo, R. F. Lusch, "Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, vol. 44, pp. 5–23, 2016.
- [16] S. L. Vargo, R. F. Lusch, "Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, vol. 36, pp. 1–10, 2008.
- [17] C. Grönroos, P. Voima, "Critical service logic: making sense of value creation and co-creation," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, vol. 41, pp. 133–150, 2013.
- [18] O. Zwikael, Y. Y. Chih, J. R. Meredith, "Project benefit management: Setting effective target benefits," *International Journal of Project Management*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 650–658, 2018.