

Critical Success Factors for Development Initiatives: Which Local System Attributes Help Shape Development Outcomes?

Sibel McGee, PhD, PMP, ANSER
Frances Veasey, MS, PMP, ANSER

Overview

This report presents preliminary findings of exploratory research conducted by ANSER analysts in support of the *Local Systems Practice (LSP)* activity funded by United States Agency for International Development's (USAID) *localworks* program. LSP, a three-year activity by a consortium of six organizations, aims to directly assist USAID Missions and local partners with using systems-based approaches to address complex development challenges. The main goal of the LSP activity is to enhance locally-owned and led development through application of, and learning from, systemic tools and approaches.

As part of the groundwork accomplished during the first year of the LSP activity, the consortium members have developed three (3) learning statements that will be refined and tested through concrete country engagements during the remaining time of this activity. One of these learning statements focuses on identification of systemic factors endemic to the local context that may contribute to development outcomes:

Local systems achieving positive development outcomes may have common attributes, which are likely to come together in varying levels of intensity in different contexts.¹

Although it is clear that development success is a function of many factors (e.g., project management activities, donor reputation and capabilities, country context, project type/sector), the nature of those factors and how they come together to shape development outcomes is not well-understood. This learning statement focuses on the impact of local system on development outcomes and explores the possibility that certain qualities in a country context may facilitate development success. There is limited research on the local system-related attributes, and, in particular, how much of the variation in development outcomes those attributes explain (as opposed to the other factors mentioned above).

In light of the complexities involved in engaging with the socio-political soft systems associated with development efforts, assuming an automatic link between development (project or program) success and the presence of a list of discrete attributes would be naïve. Instead, this learning

¹ This learning statement represents an exploratory effort to identify country specific insights and findings about various local system factors that may be shaping or conditioning development outcomes. Although informative, such insights and empirical observations will not add up to sufficient number of observations to identify patterns that may hold across different country contexts. However, as a long-term reflective learning effort, the consortium anticipates the testing and refinement of this statement to potentially continue after expiration of the LSP activity, as proof-of-concept framework and accumulated knowledge can be taken over by members of the broader community of interest to include development as well as systems researchers and practitioners. Over time, aggregate data and observations from different development projects and country engagements by various development actors can answer this learning statement more authoritatively and with a critical mass of evidence.

statement is based on the belief that the levels and combinations of these attributes, rather than mere absence or presence of them, influence the development outcomes. Moreover, these attributes may be related to one another in such a way that potential tradeoffs between them may make certain combinations more conducive to development success. Similarly, these relationships can help our understanding of the ways in which local communities can remedy potential shortcomings in a key attribute with the help of others that they have at higher levels. If such knowledge existed, development practitioners would be in a better position to identify priorities for capability enhancement or resource allocation to assist local communities in achieving their development objectives.

The exploratory research reported here serves as the groundwork to the learning statement cited above and was conducted to compile a preliminary list of local system attributes that may contribute to positive development outcomes.

Research Question

This research effort aimed to answer the following questions:

1. Are there qualities or attributes of local (country) systems that development researchers and practitioners have found to be critical in informing and shaping development outcomes?
2. What is the level of research and evidence pertaining to the impact of factors inherent to a local system/context on development outcomes?

Methodology

To answer these research questions, the research team followed a two pronged approach: literature review and qualitative data analysis.

Data Collection: To understand the existing knowledge and evidence on this topic, the research team first conducted a review of the prior research and extant literature. Given time and resource limitations, this literature review was meant to be exploratory rather than exhaustive. The research team reviewed samples of work by researchers and practitioners from various fields to include project management, public administration and international aid and development. The sources reviewed ranged from peer reviewed journal articles to development blogs, reports from non-governmental organizations, government agency documents and project evaluations. All sources reviewed were in the public domain and unclassified. The research team reviewed approximately sixty (60) sources, thirty three(33) of which were determined to contain relevant information and were included in the subsequent qualitative analysis. While some of these sources contained hard evidence in the form of statistical analysis across distinct development projects, others offered empirical observations and insights based on individual practitioner experiences or case (i.e., individual project in a particular country context) studies. **Appendix 1** provides bibliographic information on those sources that were included in the analysis.

Data Analysis & Synthesis: The research team made sense of the information reviewed and collected through qualitative data analysis. Specifically, the team conducted a modified *constant comparison technique* (Glaser & Strauss 1967; Strauss & Corbin 1998; Leech & Onwuegbuzie 2008; Bernard et al. 2017) to document its findings, identify commonalities amongst sources, and develop higher level attribute categories for emerging themes. Constant comparison technique “provide[s] researchers with a systematic and creative process for analyzing data;

and...assist [them] in identifying, creating, and seeing the relationships among components of the data when constructing a theme” (Onwuegbuzie, Leech, and Collins 2012, p.13).

The research team first reviewed each document compiled to determine whether it contained relevant information. The relevant sections of sources reviewed were marked during this initial filtering stage. Then, marked sections of each relevant source were reviewed a second time and given one or multiple descriptor or code (open coding stage). This process was repeated for all documents that were determined to contain relevant information. These codes were documented in an excel sheet along with the supplementary information to include bibliographic citation, page number, conceptual sub-elements, broader context, project type, donor entity, and evidence presented (if applicable). The documented codes were then clustered based on conceptual similarity and merged into higher level categories (axial coding stage). These higher level categories were then reviewed for further parsimony and relevance based on evidence and generalizability and were refined into a final list of attributes (selective coding stage).

Preliminary Insights

General observations: Although the main purpose of this research effort was to identify a set of local system attributes that may be contributing to development outcomes and did not intend to develop a complete theory, the study team has noted high level observations on the state of the research in pertinent fields. As these observations have shaped and, in some cases, confined our findings, documenting them here is in order:

- In the field of international aid and development, the question of what contributes to development success is under-researched. Project evaluations often focus on what worked and what did not without an assessment of the factors that hindered or facilitated success.
- Those sources that tackled the question of “critical success factors” presented significant limitations: First, these sources defined project success differently from the LSP activity. The majority of sources reviewed focused on project level success (i.e., outputs) rather than broader outcomes and long-term effects. Those that focused on broader outcomes did not necessarily emphasize locally-led and owned development as a success criterion. As such, although local system-related attributes mentioned in these sources are noted, it is not clear whether they are as influential in bringing about locally-led and owned development as other development outcomes. As such, the list of attributes gathered and reported here will require further testing across (country and project) cases to assess validity and relevance.

Second, the majority of sources that assessed success factors contributing to positive development outcomes focused on project management related factors. This may be explained by the desire to understand things that the development practitioners can control. However, in a systems-based assessment, understanding things that are beyond practitioners’ control is essential as this knowledge can provide insights into how we can adjust our strategies to influence behavior or trigger change in things that are beyond our immediate control. Additionally, factors that may not be within practitioners’ control have implications for the potential success of various intervention strategies, and an understanding of these implications can inform donors’ decisions on strategic planning, prioritization of efforts and resource allocation.

- Some sources discussed local system/community-related issues in the context of project management strategies, giving limited insights into inherent qualities of a local system and how they shape development outcomes. For instance, working with local communities to gain local stakeholder buy-in, facilitate participatory processes, and establish shared goals and accountability measures have been noted in the literature extensively as a success factor. However, these speak more to project management strategies or procedures than inherently local system-related success factors. The learning statement investigated here is more interested in understanding, for example, if there is a relationship between development outcomes and the diversity (in the form of social cleavages present within a local system) of local stakeholders. This type of insight may have implications for local stakeholder buy-in as well as the potential success of participatory processes, issues that have been tackled extensively in literature that adopted more of a project management lens.
- The majority of sources that went beyond project management-related success factors noted local system attributes, often in passing, with generic, catch-all terms such as “local context” or “local environment.” These terms were utilized to provide a laundry list of disparate factors that authors/practitioners suspected may have been influential. Others have adopted a generic typology of factors such as political, social, economic, and legal. As local system attributes have not been properly assessed or taken the center-stage in these discussions, there has often been limited clarification about the perceived nature of relationships between these factors and development outcomes (e.g., proportional or inverse) or interactions amongst these attributes.
- The majority of sources provided limited evidence or empirical data analysis to substantiate suspected relationships between development success and attributes referenced. Assertions often relied on anecdotal evidence and individual observations. As such, attributes reported here will require further testing across (country and project) cases to assess validity and relevance.

Attributes Identified: Following the aforementioned methodology, the research team reviewed and analyzed the thirty three (33) sources that were determined to be relevant to the research question. **Appendix 2** presents axial coding results and how themes emphasized by different sources were mapped to align with various emerging code clusters. After multiple iterations of coding, the following seven (7) attributes were identified as local system- related factors² that may contribute to positive development outcomes:

1. Institutional and policy framework
2. Quality of governance
3. Economic health
4. Social cleavages
5. Political support
6. Civil society infrastructure

² The attribute of “history of conflict or war” was not included in the final list of attributes as it represents a discrete factor, which either existed or not. Those sources that provided a positive account of this attribute suggested that the advantage associated with the post-conflict environment has a temporal element in that it pertains only to the first 4-5 years of post-conflict era (Chauvet et al 2010; Collier 2002). The temporary post-conflict environment advantage is further complicated by the necessary second-tier conditions (e.g., absorptive capacity and project sector).

7. Attitudes towards change

These seven attributes are intended to form the basis of a proof-of-concept analytic framework. This framework is designed to aid thinking related to the assessment of a local engagement context and how it may influence the desired development outcomes. **Table 1** provides definitions for these attributes as well as the constitutive dimensions (or sub-elements) providing conceptual clarity to what each attribute entails. While the dimensions have largely been synthesized from the sample literature reviewed, the definitions have been stipulated by the research team based on a general understanding of these concepts, their relevance to the development field as well as the limited information offered in the resources reviewed.

For example, the attribute of **social cleavages** is defined as “divisions or fault-lines in a community or society.” A local system can be assessed for social cleavages by reviewing presence, type (e.g., ethnic, tribe, class, race, religion, region and gender) and extent of cleavages (single fault line to multiple fault lines) present within that community, and the potential influence of those cleavages in societal processes such as inclusion, mutual trust and collaboration.

Similarly, the attribute of **civil society infrastructure** refers to the network of non-governmental (private) groups and organizations working in a country independent of profit concerns to promote public interest. When assessing civil society infrastructure in a given local system, existing grassroots arrangements and social networks can be reviewed along the dimensions of breadth and capacity of local groups/organizations; their national and international connections and social capital (credibility, legitimacy, influence); autonomy from government control; accountability to stakeholders; and the extent of local traditions for activism and volunteerism.

Table 1: Local System Attributes Critical for Development Outcomes

No	Attribute	Definition	Sub-elements
1	Institutional and Policy Framework	The capacity (systems and means) of the public sector to effectively govern and administer public affairs.	The extent of development; maturity; and effectiveness of public domain institutions, policies, regulations, rules and procedures.
2	Quality of Governance	The traditions, principles and practices by which government authority is exercised in a country.	Rule of law; accountability; transparency; feedback channels; operating space for civil society; and political fragility.
3	Economic Health	Overall economic conditions present in a country.	Level of economic development and growth; the broader socio-economic conditions such as equality in education/income attainment; strength of private sector; competition laws and regulations; relationships between gov't and private sector.
4	Political Support	State and political leadership support.	Number; diversity; and influence (socio-political capital) of development initiative supporters within the state/political circles.

5	Social Cleavages	Divisions/fault-lines in a community or society.	Nature (class, race, ethic, tribe, religion, region, gender, etc.); and extent of cleavages (single fault line to multiple fault lines); influence of cleavages in societal processes (e.g., inclusion, mutual trust, collaboration)
6	Civil Society (CS) Infrastructure	The network of private groups and organizations working in a country independent of government control or profit concerns to promote public interest.	Breadth and capacity of CS groups/organizations; their national and international connections and social capital (credibility, legitimacy, influence); autonomy from gov't control; accountability to stakeholders; and local traditions of activism and volunteerism.
7	Attitudes Towards Change	Local values and perspectives about doing things differently.	Cultural receptivity (openness) to change; willingness to trust and work with outsiders; presence of rigid (formal or informal) rules and norms; prior (positive or negative) experience with projects initiating change.

These attributes do not exist in discrete quantities; instead, they are contemplated to exist on a continuum. A given local system may have varying degrees and combinations of these seven attributes. **Table 2** presents a preliminary identification of extreme points for each attribute along with their conceptual characterization. For example, **quality of governance** (which refers to the traditions, principles and practices by which government authority is exercised in a country) is a function of the level of adherence to rule of law; accountability mechanisms and tools; transparency; effectiveness of feedback channels; operating space for civil society and political fragility (see **Table 1**). On one end of the spectrum, there is *authoritarian governance*, in which the exercise of authority is not bound by rule of law, there is no or minimal accountability measures, transparency into decision-making and related actions is low, there is no or limited feedback channels as well as liberties and support essential for civil society mobilization; and political fragility is high. The other end of the spectrum represents *liberal governance*, in which rule of law is a key principle in governance practices; there is strong and extensive accountability measures; transparency into decision-making and related actions is high; there is extensive and diverse feedback channels as well as liberties and support for civil society mobilization; and political fragility is low. In most cases, however, the quality of governance for a local system will lay somewhere in-between these two extremes, as absolute cases are likely rare in reality.

Table 2: Local System Attributes and their Conceptual Extremes

No	Attribute	Conceptual Extremes
1	Institutional and Policy Framework	Weak: Institutionalization and specialization of governance functions is low; policies, if they exist, are unclear or contradictory; regulations are burdensome and inhibit initiative; there is a lack of processes for creating change or frameworks that do exist actively inhibit new initiatives. Strong: Mature institutions for organizing communities exist; roles are well defined; procedures exist for local communities to organize themselves and make changes to policies when needed; policies and regulations are clear, conducive to initiative, and there is a straightforward mechanism for engaging with policy makers.

2	Quality of Governance	<p>Authoritarian: Political leadership unchecked by local populations; exercise or control of legal and justice frameworks outside rule of law or democratic principles; there is little space for local populations to organize without patronage; low levels of transparency or accountability make it difficult for citizens to effect change; political instability endangers sustainability of efforts due to loss of patronage/political will.</p> <p>Liberal: Political systems are stable and responsive to local populations; civil society and activists operate freely and effectively; local populations have access to unbiased legal system; political leadership is stable or mechanisms exist for continuing projects despite transfer of power.</p>
3	Economic Health	<p>Poor: Economic indicators (GDP, growth) are poor; weak private sector unable to meet local demands; high levels of inequality; stagnation.</p> <p>Strong: Economic indicators (GDP, growth) are consistently strong and/or able to rebound after cyclical down periods; private sector is strong; regulations and environment encourage competition and entrepreneurship; government has strong monetary policy and is able to effectively promote economic growth.</p>
4	Social Cleavages	<p>Low: Few factions exist, or where they do, competition is limited to the direct domain of the faction and does not impact other social interactions; effective mechanisms exist for resolving conflict between factions when it occurs.</p> <p>High: Society is highly divided into ideological, cultural, political, or other factions; competition between factions is a major element across multiple aspects of society; few agreed-upon mechanisms exist to resolve conflict between factions.</p>
5	Political Support	<p>Low: Political leadership is hostile to development initiatives or social change; change-makers in the community have little support or face active resistance by politicians; competition between political parties limits ability to gain support across party lines.</p> <p>High: Political leadership welcomes development initiatives, tolerates or fosters social change, and regularly works across party lines.</p>
6	Civil Society (CS) Infrastructure	<p>Weak: CS does not exist or is not allowed to operate openly; CS exists but is ineffective in terms of social capital, influence, or maturity; few connections or linkages exist to promote effective CSOs; minimal staff or local population with experience implementing development programs.</p> <p>Strong: CS is a strong and respected segment of society; CSOs have high amounts of social capital, access to and influence on political leaders; organizations, groups and movements are highly networked horizontally and vertically; and are supported by experienced and effective staff drawn from local population.</p>
7	Attitudes Towards Change	<p>Hostile: Culture is very rigid in its outlook toward change; local population rejects outsiders or new knowledge in favor of only following traditions; development projects have not been attempted or have failed.</p> <p>Hospitable: Culture may have formal or informal rules and norms, but they are flexible in application or context; society is open and welcoming to outsiders; local culture values learning and critical thinking above obeying traditions or hierarchies; development projects have been successful, leading to a favorable impression among local population regarding ability to make positive changes.</p>

Some implications of the conceptualization presented here requires further discussion. First, the characterization of identified local system attributes on a continuum may prompt one to believe that the right hand side of the spectrum is always preferable and that there is a correlation (if not a causal relationship) between higher levels of each attribute (i.e., right hand side of the spectrum) and effectiveness of a particular local system. This type of thinking may be problematic for two reasons: First, we present the continuum style conceptualization merely to represent the idea that levels of attributes are not standard or discrete, but vary across different local contexts with implications for development outcomes. As such, rather than expressing a normative preference or judgment in itself, the spectrum is for assessment of how various engagement outcomes can be mapped to the nature and level of different attributes of the local system. For example, there is

conflicting evidence in the literature about whether governance arrangements need to be grounded in democracy for higher development success. Although the right side of the spectrum for quality of governance (i.e., liberal governance) is closely associated with a democratic tradition, a strict requirement for a democratic regime favors a normative preference that may not be shared or required by different communities across the world. Additionally, some of the key dimensions of a liberal governance tradition (e.g., feedback channels and operating space for civil society) may be present in a local system even though the local regime may not fully qualify as a traditional democracy. For the purposes of development initiatives, favoring functionality over form and understanding implications for development projects' implementation and outcomes may be more helpful.

Second, it is likely that no single attribute alone necessarily ensures success or triggers failure of a development project. This is because while each attribute has a potentially unique contribution to development outcomes, it is most likely the overall net impact resulting from the interactions of various attributes with each other and with the intervention that determine the final outcome. Additionally, development outcomes may be informed by the potential tradeoffs between different attributes (i.e., the inadequacy of one attribute may be offset by high levels of another attribute). For example, in reviewing the list of potential attributes, it is clear that attributes 5, 6 and 7 are concerned with societal (soft-system) qualities. How these attributes relate to other, more structural attributes (government capacity and quality) is unclear at this point. How different levels of attributes come together in different local system contexts to inform development outcomes remains to be seen and tested through real country engagements.

Finally, the assessment of a local system along the attributes noted here will reveal the nature of a local context at a particular point in time. The make-up of a local system may, however, evolve over time as the broader environment, local requirements, or stakeholder expectations change in light of updated needs, new information, experiences, and socio-political learning. As such, the framework offered here is intended to be used as part of an iterative assessment process that updates practitioners' understanding of a local systems' living context.

Assumptions and Limitations

Since this report presents preliminary results of a limited literature review effort, the framework presented here is far from perfect. This preliminary effort has been informed by a set of assumptions and is characterized by a number of limitations, both of which are discussed below in detail.

Assumptions:

1. The development engagement context has a unique influence on development outcomes. This is driven by the conviction that the same project implemented across distinct local systems may yield dramatically different results.
2. The local system-related attributes inform but do not ensure success or failure of a development effort. Other factors contributing to the development outcomes in the context of particular development engagement (e.g., project type and sector, project management activities and strategies, and project staff competencies) also need to be assessed for a complete picture.

3. A framework that explicitly considers and maps different local system-related attributes to different development outcomes may offer helpful insights into ways in which local systems shape and condition development results. This understanding may facilitate targeted strategies to assist local communities in reaching their development objectives.
4. An enhanced understanding of the relationships between local system attributes and development outcomes can also inform project management activities and strategies that may potentially remedy those aspects of the local system that are anticipated to challenge project implementation or progress.
5. Understanding influence of the local system attributes on development outcomes is a long term research agenda. Subsequent to the refinement of the framework presented here and development of a respective measurement scheme, aggregate data and knowledge attained through different country engagements over time may lend itself to more robust assessments. Through this process, the research team may be able to identify potential patterns that may hold across different countries or regions, informing practitioners' and donors' strategic and resource decisions.

Limitations:

This preliminary effort has several limitations.

1. The development literature offers a limited number of resources that examine the local system's impact on development outcomes, and sources that do note environmental influences often do not go beyond offering anecdotal evidence and practitioners' personal experiences. Although local system attributes presented here appear to impact both the objective performance and subjective quality (in the eyes of its stakeholders) of the development engagement and outcomes based on various researcher and practitioner accounts, there is limited, and at times conflicting, understanding and evidence on the precise nature of this impact and the direction of causality.
2. Some sources appeared to mix a local system's inherent qualities with emergent outcomes (qualities) that development projects often aim to improve with the hopes that those qualities will contribute to better development outcomes. Although we took note of all the factors mentioned, there is varying levels of evidence for each factor.
3. Each attribute captured in this report represents highly complex and "thick" concepts. This is partly explained by the fact that there is no universal agreement in the limited literature on which local system attributes contribute to positive development outcomes. As such, different attributes noted at disparate levels of abstraction by various researchers and practitioners needed to be rolled into higher level categories to find conceptual commonalities across themes that may otherwise appear unrelated or only lend themselves to an endless laundry list. The resulting, high level attributes pose a particular challenge for measurement. Namely, determining where a given local system falls precisely on a respective spectrum requires defining and conceptualizing all dimensions of each attribute so that the local context can be rated separately and reasonably precisely for each dimension. For example, for quality of governance, level of accountability is a dimension that can be conceptualized as presence and effectiveness of checks and balances, and independent enforcement systems. Level of accountability can, then, be measured through a scale of 1-low, 2-partial, 3-significant, and 4-full (each scale point needs to be further defined conceptually). Once a local system is assessed for all dimensions of the quality of governance attribute in this way, ratings can then be

aggregated into a composite score to represent that local system's standing with regard to this attribute. During such conceptualization, the relative significance of various dimensions can also be reflected in the measurement system through a corresponding weighting arrangement. However, such an extensive conceptualization and measurement scheme is beyond the scope of this initial effort. Our purpose here is to establish a preliminary conceptual reference point to enable a high level assessment of a local system for its potential impact on development engagements and consideration of implications for project implementation, management, and success.

4. The extreme points (for each attribute) have been defined as an initial reference point and requires further conceptual development and refinement. They are offered here as part of a proof-of-concept framework with the intention that practical experiences and knowledge attained during the course of concrete country engagements and project implementations will help refine their conceptual clarity and determine their practical utility to development practitioners. As such, the list of attributes as well as their extremes are presented here as provisional and in need of further refinement and testing.

The Way Forward

The list of attributes presented here will be refined and tested through LSP consortium's country engagements. Results will be reported and shared with the broader community of interest.

References

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., N.L. Leech, and K.M.T. Collins. (2012). "Qualitative Analysis Techniques for the Review of the Literature." *The Qualitative Report* 17(56): 1-28, <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol17/iss28/2/> (accessed on Nov 28, 2017).

Glaser, B.G. and A.L. Strauss. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Straus, A.L. and J. Corbin. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Leech, N.L. and A.J. Onwuegbuzie. (2008). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Compendium of Techniques for School Psychology Research and Beyond. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23: 587-604.

Bernard, H.R., A. Wutich and G.W. Ryan. (2017). *Analyzing Qualitative Data: Systematic Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix 1: Sources Reviewed

1. Ika, Lavagnon A., Amadou Diallo, and Denis Thuillier. 2012. "Critical Success Factors for World Bank Projects: An Empirical Investigation," *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(1): 105-116.
2. Khang, Do Ba, and Tun Lin Moe. 2008. "Success Criteria and Factors for International Development Projects: A Life-Cycle-Based Framework," *Project Management Journal*, 39(1): 72-84.
3. Barakat, Ouafa, Abdelaziz Bendou, and Juan Carlos Martin. 2015. "Success Factors for Local Development Project Management Case of Taroudant Province-Morocco," *Journal of North African Research in Business*, pp.1-15.
4. Chauvet, Lisa, Paul Collier, and Marguerite Duponchel. 2010. "What Explains Aid Project Success In Post-Conflict Situations?" *Policy Research Working Paper* (no: 5418), the World Bank: Washington, DC.
5. Kealey, Daniel J., David R. Protheroe, Doug MacDonald, and Thomas Vulpe. 2005. "Re-examining the Role Of Training In Contributing to International Project Success: A Literature Review and an Outline Of A New Model Training Program," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(3): 289-316.
6. Kwak, Young Hoon. 2002. "Critical Success Factors in International Development Project Management," Paper presented at the 10th Symposium Construction Innovation and Global Competitiveness, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.614.5509&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
7. Collier, Paul. 2002. *Aid, Policy, and Growth in Post-Conflict Societies*. Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit: Dissemination Notes (no: 2), <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCPR/214578-1111751313696/20480205/AidpOlicyGrowthNote2.pdf>.
8. Bulman, David, Walter Kokma and Aart Kraay, 2015. "Good Countries or Good Projects? Comparing Macro and Micro Correlates of World Bank and Asian Development Bank Project Performance" *Policy Research Working Paper* (no: 7245), World Bank Group: Washington, DC., <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/113351468191342102/Good-countries-or-good-projects-comparing-macro-and-micro-correlates-of-World-Bank-and-Asian-Development-Bank-project-performance>.
9. Hill, T.R., E.L. Nel and P. Illgner. 2007. "Partnership For Success- Community-Based Economic Development: A Case Study of Ngolowindo Cooperative, Malawi" *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 25: 573-590.
10. USAID. 2014. *Local Systems: A Framework for Supporting Sustained Development*. Washington, DC., <https://www.usaid.gov/policy/local-systems-framework>.
11. Dichter, Thomas. 2014. *The Capable Partners Learning Agenda on Local Organizational Capacity Development*, the Learning Agenda on Local Capacity Development, https://usaidearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/LA-Complete-Final-Report-to-USAID_2.20.14.pdf.
12. USAID. ND. *Local Capacity Development Suggested Approaches: An additional help document for ADS 201*, https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2496/Local_Capacity_Development_Suggest_Approaches_1.pdf.

13. McKechnie, Alastair and Fiona Davies. 2013. *Localizing Aid: Is It Worth the Risk?* Center for Aid and Public Expenditure, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8456.pdf>.
14. Brinkerhoff, Derick W. 2012. *A Selective Review of USAID-Funded Development Management Research and Practice: Relevance for Strengthening Country Systems*. USAID: Washington, DC., http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadz975.pdf.
15. Struyk, Raymond J. 2007. "Factors in Successful Program Implementation in Russia during the Transition: Pilot Programs as a Guide," *Public administration and Development*, 27: 63-83.
16. Chenoweth, Erica, Kyleanne Hunter, Pauline Moore, Tricia Olsen, Jonathan Pinkney and Heidi Reynolds-Stenson. 2017. *Struggles from Below: Literature Review on Human Rights Struggles by Domestic Actors*, Research and Innovation Grants Working Papers Series, USAID: Washington DC., <https://www.iie.org/-/media/Files/Programs/USAID-Democracy-Fellows-and-Grants/LAQ/DRG-Center-Working-Paper-DU-LAQ-Literature-Review.ashx?la=en&hash=7F6D3C1B7990415263E6E9CD944111E840920AD2>.
17. Rogers, Beatrice, Carisa Klemeyer, Ameya Bondre and Jamie Fierstein. 2017. *Sustaining Development: Results from a Study of Sustainability and Exit Strategies among Development Food Assistance Projects—India Country Study*. FHI 360/Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance III Project (FANTA): Washington, DC., <https://www.fantaproject.org/sites/default/files/resources/India-Exit-Strategies-Report-Jan2017.pdf>.
18. Sterling, Eleanor J., Erin Betley, Andres Gomez, Amanda Sigouin, Cynthia Malone, Felicity Arengo, Mary Blair, Georgina Cullman, Chris Filardi, Kimberley Landrigan, Kelley Roberts, and Ana Luz Porzecanski. 2016. *Measuring Impact- Stakeholder Engagement for Biodiversity Conservation Goals: Assessing the Status of the Evidence*. USAID: Washington, DC., http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00M2M6.pdf.
19. Muriithi, Ndiritu, and Lynn Crawford. 2003. "Approaches to Project Management in Africa: Implications for International Development Projects." *International Journal of Project Management*, 21(5): 309-319.
20. Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2004. "Aid, policy and growth in post-conflict societies." *European Economic Review*, 48(5): 1125-1145.
21. Dollar, David, and Victoria Levin. 2005. "Sowing and Reaping: Institutional Quality and Project Outcomes in Developing Countries," *Policy Research Working Paper* (no: 3524), World Bank: Washington, DC, <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/8885> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO."
22. Feeny, Simon, and Vu Vuong. 2017. "Explaining Aid Project and Program Success: Findings from Asian Development Bank Interventions," *World Development* 90 (2017): 329-343.
23. Pinho, Ana Paula Borges. 2014. *Community Philanthropy—The Missing Link between Local Communities and International Development*, Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society, City University of New York: New York, http://www.philanthropy.org/resources/documents/AnaBorgesPinho_CommunityPhilanthropy_TheMissingLink.pdf.
24. Wallace, Lance. 2016. "Professor Touts Keys to International Community Development Success." *GA Tech News Center*, March 11, 2016,

- <http://www.news.gatech.edu/2016/03/11/professor-touts-keys-international-community-development-success>.
25. Ghazala, M., and R. Vijayendra. 2011. *Evaluating Community Based and Community Driven Development: A critical review of the Evidence*. Working Paper, Development Research Group, World Bank: Washington, DC, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTECAREGTOPCOMDRIDEV/Resources/DECstudy.pdf>.
 26. Jacobstein, David. 2015. *Organizational Capacity Development Measurement*, USAID, https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2496/Capacity_Development_Measurement_Recommendations_Final_Draft_5.11.2017_1.pdf.
 27. USAID. 2012. *Guatemala Country Development Cooperation Strategy 2012-2016*, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1862/GuatemalaCDCS.pdf>.
 28. International Fund for Agricultural Development. 2009. *Sustainability of Rural Development Projects - Best Practices and Lessons Learned by IFAD in Asia*. Occasional Papers, <https://www.ifad.org/documents/10180/538441f4-bb55-4e99-9e23-854efd744e4c>.
 29. Spring, Anita and Kimberley Swallow. 2015. *Feed the Future Learning Agenda- Literature Review: Improved Gender Integration and Women's Empowerment*, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pa00kmc7.pdf.
 30. Snetro-Plewman, Gail, Marcela Tapia, Valerie Uccellani, Angela Brasington and Maureen McNulty. 2007. *Taking Community Empowerment to a Scale- Lessons from Three Successful Experiences* (Health Communication Insights.) Baltimore: Health Communication Partnership based at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health/Center for Communication Programs, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadu087.pdf.
 31. Root Change. 2013. *New Directions in Local Capacity Development: Embracing a Systems Perspective*, the Learning Agenda on Local Capacity Development, https://usaidthinkinglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/new_directions_lcd.pdf.
 32. Land, Tony. 2000. *Implementing Institutional and Capacity Development: Conceptual and Operational Issues*, European Centre for Development Policy Management Discussion Paper (no: 14), Paper prepared for the Workshop on "Operational Approaches to Institutional and Capacity Development", Harare, Zimbabwe, 27-29 October 1999, <http://ecdpm.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/DP-14-Implementing-Institutional-Capacity-Development-Operational-Issues.pdf>.
 33. Munteanu, Valentin, Laura Brancu and Delia Gligor. 2013. A Pest-C Multifactor Analysis for Human Resources Development Projects' Implementation in Public Universities in Romania, *European Journal of Science and Technology*, 2(3): 141-154.

Appendix 2: Axial Coding Results

Factor	Source Number	Saliency	Notes
I Institutional and Policy Frameworks			
Favorable Institutional Frameworks	1, 5, 8, 10, 14, 21, 25, 32, 33	9	1: institutional environment; 5: health, effectiveness, and friendliness of organizations on which the project depends; 8: institutional quality in recipient country; 10: weak institutions; 14: strong institutions to manage development; 21: functioning political institutions that are conducive to aid, 25: enabling institutional environment; 32: wider organizational environment and policy framework; 33: institutional environment
Public Sector Management & Institutions	8, 13, 14, 20	4	8: public sector management and institutions; 13: functioning public financial management systems; 14: effective public administration; 20: macroeconomic management
Implementation Capacity	4, 8, 17, 28, 32	5	4: good implementation capacity; 8: policy implementation capacity; 17: functional infrastructure at the national and state levels (capacity); 28: sufficient follow through capacity; 32: individual, organizational, sectoral and societal capacities
Security and Justice	6, 10, 27	3	6: role of local courts in arbitration, natural disasters, acts of terrorism, war, conflict, coup; 10: civil unrest, natural disasters; 27: security and justice
Clear Policies	2, 6	2	2: clear policies by... recipients to sustain activities and results; 6: inconsistencies in policies, laws and regulations;
Good Policy Environment	8, 9	2	8: good policy environment; 9: supporting policy environment
Compatible Rules & Procedures	2	1	2: compatible rules and regulations;
Regulatory Environment	5, 6, 12, 33	4	5: regulator environment, 6: absence of appropriate regulatory systems; 12: regulations affecting local organizations and local private sector; 33: regulatory conditions (poor quality of regulations)
II Quality of Governance			
Good Local Governance	3, 14, 16, 22, 25, 33	6	3: democracy; 14: democratic governance system, 16: regime type (impacts domestic civic actors' ability to advocate etc.), 22: level of democracy (negative evidence); 25: transparent, accountable and democratic governance; 33: poor institutional governance
Local Accountability	10, 14, 32, 33	4	10: local accountability, strong accountability relationships; 14: institutions that address accountability issues, audit/oversight agencies, courts that enforce contracts, procurement laws, anti-corruption statutes; 32: accountability; 33: accountability
Rule of law	16, 21; 33	3	16: strong independent legal institutions, independent judiciary; 21: rule of law; 33: effective, impartial, transparent and stable legal system
Corruption	6, 10, 12, 13 15	5	6: corruption; 10: corruption; 12: degree of corruption; 13: corruption; 15: clientalism and corruption
Saliency of Politics	1, 3, 7, 14	4	1: need for political activity in the country; 3: (lack of) political considerations; 7: politicized context; 14: saliency of politics, elite pacts, societal cleavages and historical legacies that shape how public policy deliberations take place, decisions are made, resources are allocated, patronage in procurement;
Transparency	3, 6, 14, 32	4	3: transparent (local governance); 6: lack of transparency in policy decisions; 14: transparency; 32: transparency
Operating Space for Civil Society, Individual	8, 12, 16, 31	4	8: civil liberties and political rights (no evidence); 12: enabling environment for civil society organizations and individual

	Activists, and the Private Sector			liberties; 16: regime openness on ability to organize horizontally, 31: Freedom (Freedom house index)
	Feedback Channels	10	1	10: feedback channels
	Changes in Power (Political stability)	6, 10, 13, 14, 33	5	6: political instability, changes in power, political uncertainty, frequent change of governments, abrupt change of policies, political take over or military coup; 10: fragility, political stagnation; 13: fragile states; 14: stability among economic, political and socio-cultural dimensions; 33: instability
III	Economic Health			
	Economic Health	1, 4, 5, 8, 15, 16, 22, 25, 31, 33	10	1: favorable economic condition; 4: level of economic development & growth, income growth rate, per capita income; 5: general health of the economy; 8: real GDP growth rates; 15: complex bureaucratic or unstable fiscal environments; 16: level of economic development; 22: GDP per capita; 25: economic inequality; 31: socio-economic conditions (HDI); 33: macroeconomic environment
IV	Social Cleavages			
	Polarization of Social Strata	6, 9, 14, 25	4	6: polarization of social strata; 9: cohesive community; 14: social cleavages, contestation and conflict among social groups (is there a negotiated order among equal partners), 25: community homogeneity
	Social Inclusion & Equity	1, 8, 10, 20	4	1: Favorable social conditions; 8: social inclusion and equity; 10: inequity; 20: policies for social inclusion
V	Political Support			
	Supportive State	9, 14, 17	3	9: supportive state; 14: supporting public sector environment; 17: resources, capacity and commitment (motivation) of gov't entities
	Political Support & Leadership	5, 15, 32	3	5: political climate; 15: degree of local leadership support, role of political leadership, political support, autonomous and accountable leadership; 32: political leadership support
VI	Civil Society Infrastructure			
	Civil Actors & Advocates	16, 24, 30	3	16: domestic actors, domestic activism, 24: preexisting local organization with a track record of success; 30: dynamic leaders, existing community groups, volunteers, political leaders, champions
	Supportive NGOs	3, 9, 23	3	3: communal structures support; 9: supportive NGOs; 23: partner in country
	Social Infrastructure	9	1	9: social infrastructure;
	Civil Society Infrastructure	3, 11, 16, 32	4	3: institutional and organizational framework; 11: civil society infrastructure; 16: strength of civil society, civil society capacity for mobilization and its autonomy from gov't control; 32: capacity of civil society organizations
	Social Capital of CSOs	5, 12, 31	3	5: health, effectiveness and friendliness of organizations; 12: perceived legitimacy and relevance of local organizations; 31: social capital of local organizations
	Local Organizations with Regional, National and International Links	14, 16, 26	3	14: local organizations with regional and national linkages; 16: domestic civic actors with dense network of horizontal, vertical, and transnational relationships, cross-national ties; 26: quality and breadth of relationships of organizations
	Durable CSOs and NGOs	11, 12	2	11: (lack of) projectization; 12: sustainability of organizations
	Relationship between CSOs, Private Sector, & Government	11, 12, 14, 16, 32	5	11: CSO's local resource mobilization ability; 12: Relationship between CSOs, Private Sector, national and subnational government; 14: public-private partnerships; 16: connections between activists and political elite; 32: relationship between NGOs, private sector and government

	Interconnected Civil Society	16, 30	2	16: density of social networks, interpersonal trust, horizontal and vertical ties, linkages across diverse civil society, social networks, transnational ties, 30: horizontal networks
	CSO and Gov't Accountability to Local Stakeholders & Autonomy	11,12, 15, 16, 18	5	11: accountability of CSOs to their local constituents; 12: accountability to local stakeholders; 15: autonomous and accountable leadership, 16: autonomy from government; 18: autonomous governance
VII	Attitudes Toward Change			
	Community Culture	1, 3, 5, 6, 12, 14, 16, 19, 29, 32, 33	11	1: favorable cultural conditions; 3: community culture; 5: congeniality of the host country, cultural distance; 6: traditions, values, customs and beliefs; 12: informal practices & social norms; 14: openness to learning; 16: congruence with local norms; 19: individualism & collectivism, masculinity/femininity, power distance; 29: female empowerment; 32: cultural realities; 33: a population's optimism/pessimism, relationships with public institutions, corruption
	Cultural Receptivity	6, 9, 10, 18	4	6: hostility due to religion, customs, ethnicity, resistance of beneficiaries to new social values, standards, technology; 9: willingness of community to engage with outsider & learn from them, 10: unexpected resistance to change; 18: peer pressure and social norms
	Resilience	10, 28	2	10: durability and adaptability of local systems; 28: household and community resilience
	Success of or Experience with a Previous Development Project	3, 15, 33	3	3: success of a similar project; 15: past experience, institutional memory and individual experience; 33: experience in implementing EU-funded projects
	Discrete Factors			
	Conflict			
	History of Conflict or War	4, 6, 7, 10, 20	5	4: post-conflict environment, duration since conflict; 6: conflict, war or revolution; 7: post conflict context; 10: conflict; 20: post conflict environment and aid saturation

Notes:

Source Number: Number associated with a source as listed in Appendix 2.

Salience: Number of sources that note a particular factor.