SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES

ISSN: 2582-7065 (Online) SAJSSH, VOL 3, ISSUE 1, PP. 30-41

Assessing The Challenges of Executing State Sponsored Projects in Ghana: A Case of Getfund Construction Projects in The Upper West Region

Abdul Ganiyu Iddrisu[1]

[1]*Mphil, MTECH, Bsc, HND, Nusrat Jahan Ahmadiyya College of Education – Wa*

Corresponding Author: Abdul Ganiyu Iddrisu, **Email:** g_iddrisu@yahoo.com

Received: 23rd November 2021 **Accepted:** 19th January 2022 **Published:** 8th February 2022

ABSTRACT

The core mandate of GETFund is to provide funding to supplement government budgetary allocations in the provision of educational infrastructure at all levels of education from pre-tertiary to tertiary level as stipulated in the (GETFund Act, 2000 Act 581). The study aims to evaluate the challenges and managerial skills adopted by GETFund contractors. The study's objective is to examine the challenges of GETFund construction projects, identify factors affecting GETFund projects and devise effective strategies to enhance effective GETFund project execution in the Region. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. Sixty-five clients, twenty-one consultants, and sixty-two contractors totaling one hundred and forty-eight were sampled for the study. Questionnaires, interviews, and observation were the main methods adopted for data collection. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The study revealed that the most leading challenges affecting the efficient execution of GETFund construction projects are political and financial. Furthermore, the most leading factors confronting efficient GETFund construction projects execution in the Region are cost and time. In addition, the study revealed that most of the contractors' agents executing GETFund projects do not have the requisite technical personnel, expertise, and resources, making it difficult to understand/interpret drawings and other specifications given to them by project consultants. The study recommended that professional regulatory bodies such as Building and Road Research Institute (BRRI) organize in-service training to improve the management skills of companies.

Keywords: GETFund, Assessing, Challenges, Factors, Construction Projects, Execution, Contractors, Consultants.

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

INTRODUCTION

The proper functional performance of any country is wholly dependent on the provision of standard and adequate infrastructure. Infrastructure thus plays a pivotal role in the development of every nation, of which Ghana is no exception (Ghana Infrastructural Fund GIIF Act,2014 Act 877). A critical assessment of the execution of construction projects in Ghana indicates that substantial funds from the taxpayer's money go into the construction industry. Therefore, failure or abandonment of such constructional projects has a crippling effect on the capabilities of the financiers or investors because once a decision is taken to execute a project, scarce resources are tied down for a long time (Olawale & Sun, 2010). The project may be the only future hope of the client and beneficiary; therefore, both expect nothing but project success. According to Roy (2005), it is evident that noticeable development and the aesthetic transformation of the environment are bound up with and predicted in the construction industry. The successful accomplishment reflects effectiveness; while performing the tasks to produce the best outcomes at the lowest cost from the same resources used is efficiency.

Effectiveness is doing the right things, whereas efficiency is doing these things better. The best performances maximize both effectiveness and efficiency (Lampel, 2001). Management and performance assessment is fundamental to the organizational improvement of which the constructional industry is no exception. With the recognition that long-term success involves fulfilling and assessing performance against all stakeholders' demands, including customers, consultants, contractors, and beneficiaries, the importance of management approaches and performance evaluation has risen. While quantifying the value of management assessment is difficult, it is clear that assessing and evaluating construction projects are crucial in determining the value for money (VFM). The subject of evaluation has become more concern to many countries at various levels of socio-economic development. Many have realized the need to improve the performance of construction projects J.H.M. Tah et al. (, 2000).

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Nkado (1995), Clients or customers are no longer content with minimal cost, adequate functional performance, increasing interest rate, inflation, and other commercials. Pressures, among other factors but shows concern of shortest possible time of having building projects completed. Jones et al. (1980) examined the records of more than 400 construction projects found that projects were rarely finished on time. Several unexpected problems and changes from the original design arise during the construction phase, leading to cost and time

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

overruns. The following are highlights and some of the factors that may cause inefficiencies in the execution and delivery of GETFund construction projects and their impact.

- Delay in payment of certificates for work done
- Modification of original design of projects
- Poor and effective management of the site
- Project cost overrun
- Financial related issues
- Unforeseen grounds conditions
- Weather conditions
- High-interest rate
- Dispute among parties
- Procurement issues
- Poor technical performance and
- Political interference.

Several unanticipated challenges and modifications from the initial design happen throughout the building phase, according to Chan & Kumaraswamy (2002), resulting in cost and time performance issues. Poor site management, unanticipated ground conditions, and slow decision-making by all project teams are the three most major issues creating delays and problems with time performance in local building projects, according to the findings. According to Okuwoga (1998), cost and time performance have been acknowledged as global issues in the building business. Dissanayaka and Kumaraswamy (1998) remarked that project complexity, client type, team experience, and communication are highly correlated with time performance, while project complexity, client characteristics, and contractor characteristics are highly correlated with cost performance. Reichelt and Lyneis (1999) obtained that the dynamic feedback process controls project schedule and budget performance. These processes include the rework cycle, feedback loops creating changes in productivity and quality, and effects between work phases. Both project managers and clients can use this connection to predict the average time it will take to finish a construction project.

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

Kuprenas (2003) stated that the process of a design team meeting frequency and written reporting of design phase progress was statistically significant in reducing design phase costs. Otherwise, project management training and a project management-based organizational structure were found to process that does not create a statistically significant reduction in design phase costs. Mckinsey and Company (2003) surveyed in India. They suggested that, on average, projects across sectors suffer from time and cost overruns to the tune of 20 to 25 percent, with some affected by more than 50 percent. This is based on projects recently completed or under implementation. Over-runs can be attributed both to customers and providers. Customer-driven delays include those in land acquisition, clearances, and frequent changes in the scope of projects. Delays occur due to inadequate human resources, low construction productivity, and insufficient planning at the providers' end. Frequent and long-drawn disputes between customers and providers also slow down the progress of construction work.

Frimpong et al. (2003) investigated the elements that contribute to groundwater construction project delays and cost overruns in Ghana. The study revealed the leading causes of delay and cost overrun as monthly payment difficulties from agencies, poor contractor management, and the problem of material procurement, poor technical performances, and escalation of material prices. Time as an essential indicator of a contractor's efficiency, professionalism, and competence, can evaluate the success of a project and compare contractors' performance (Xiao & Proverbs, 2002). Construction management is universally' proper that a project may be regarded as "successful" if completed on time (Chan & Kumaraswamy, 2002). Nevertheless, completing a project on time is even more important than the project's overall duration. It realistically reflects the contractors' ability to organize and control site operations to optimally allocate resources and to manage the flow of information to and from the design team and among the contractors (Lack of monitoring the risk condition of deliverables and activities throughout project execution increases the chance for a troubled project (Xiao & Proverbs, 2002). Since financial resources are the foundation on which any project is based, difficulties in this area can quickly bring the entire project to the brink of disaster.

Chan and Kumaraswamy (2002) offered particular technological and management techniques for increasing construction speed and, as a result, improving construction time performance. Effective communication, rapid information transfer between project participants, improved management selection and training, and comprehensive construction programs with advanced tools have all been mentioned to speed up performance. According to Mahmoud-Jouini, Midler, and Garel (2004), controlling speed in engineering, procurement, and construction

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

projects is crucial in the battle between creative enterprises. Customers might think of time as a resource, and in such a case, they will urge the contractor to improve their time management.

DATA BASE AND METHODOLOGY

The study's research approach is a descriptive survey, which entails watching and documenting a subject's behaviour without affecting it in any manner. It seeks to gather relevant information about the subject matter without manipulation and prejudice. The choice for using the descriptive survey method stems from the researcher's use of the survey to collect data. The descriptive survey method is also proper where it is impossible to test and measure a large number of samples needed for a more quantitative type of survey. The result of the descriptive study is a valuable tool for many areas of research; hence it is a choice for the researcher. The respondents were 69 public clients and 66 contractors with 22 Consultants from the four major firms in the Region working on GETFund projects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Significant challenges affecting the execution of GETFund construction projects in the Upper Region

To determine the significant challenges affecting the execution of GETFund construction projects in the Upper Region, seven imaginable questions were raised by the researcher for the literate contractors (foremen and artisans), consultants, and clients to rate their level of disagreement, neutral and agreement on all the seven significant challenges in a Likert scale, where; SD&D: strongly disagree, N: Neutral and disagree and A&SA: Strongly Agree and Agree, clearly stated in the table below.

Challenges Affecting Efficient Execution of GETFund Construction Projects (Contractors

CHALLENGES	SD/D		N		SA/A				
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Mean	SD	Rank
EQUIPMENT RELATED									
Lack of plant and equipmentn	*41*	*33.30%*	*11*	*8.90%*	*71*	*57.70%*	*2.24*	*0.93*	*3*
High cost of hiring/leasing	*90*	*73.20%*	*0*	*0.00%*	*33*	*26.80%*	*1.54*	*0.89*	*6*
Inadequate equipment	*47*	*38.20%*	*6*	*4.90%*	*70*	*56.90%*	*2.19*	*0.96*	*4*
Lack of good quality equipment	*53*	*43.10%*	*10*	*8.10%*	*60*	*48.80%*	*2.06*	*0.96*	*5*
Use of old equipment and lack of maintenance	*41*	*33.30%*	*2*	*1.60%*	*80*	*65.00%*	*2.32*	*0.94*	*2*
Constant breakdown of machine and equipment	*12*	*9.80%*	*0*	*0.00%*	*111*	*90.20%*	*2.8*	*0.6*	*1*
AVERAGE	***47.3***	***0.4***	***4.8***	***0.0***	***70.8***	***0.6***	***2.2***	***0.9***	
FINANCIAL RELATED									

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

Financial inadequacies	*17*	*13.80%*	*7*	*5.70%*	*99*	*80.50%*	*2.67*	*0.71*	*2*
High-interest rate	*8*	*6.50%*	*5*	*4.10%*	*110*	*89.40%*	*2.83*	*0.52*	*1*
Poor payment by a client	*44*	*35.80%*	*14*	*11.40%*	*65*	*52.80%*	*2.17*	*0.93*	*5*
Lack of resources to mobilize requirements on site	*43*	*35.00%*	*9*	*7.30%*	*71*	*57.70%*	*2.23*	*0.94*	*4*
Lack of capital	*41*	*33.30%*	*7*	*5.70%*	*75*	*61.00%*	*2.28*	*0.93*	*3*
AVERAGE	***31***	***0***	***8***	***0***	***84***	***1***	***2***	***1***	
HUMAN RESOURCES CHALLENGES									
Lack of qualified personnel	*39*	*31.70%*	*0*	*0.00%*	*84*	*68.30%*	*2.37*	*0.93*	*5*
Delay in delivery of services	*28*	*22.80%*	*6*	*4.90%*	*89*	*72.40%*	*2.5*	*0.84*	*4*
Poor programming of job execution	*37*	*30.10%*	*12*	*9.80%*	*74*	*60.20%*	*2.3*	*0.9*	*6*
Lack of technical expertise	*17*	*13.80%*	*1*	*0.80%*	*105*	*85.40%*	*2.72*	*0.7*	*2*
Lack of benefit for employees	*17*	*13.80%*	*6*	*4.90%*	*100*	*81.30%*	*2.67*	*0.71*	*3*
Insufficient, Skilled labor	*11*	*8.90%*	*3*	*2.40%*	*109*	*88.60%*	*2.8*	*0.59*	*1*
AVERAGE	***24.8***	***0.2***	***4.7***	***0.0***	***93.5***	***0.8***	***2.6***	***0.8***	
CLIENT RELATED CHALLENGES									
Poor designs by the client	*76*	*61.80%*	*0*	*0.00%*	*47*	*38.20%*	*1.76*	*0.98*	*3*
Poor did evaluation	*16*	*13.00%*	*2*	*1.60%*	*105*	*85.40%*	*2.72*	*0.68*	*1*
Changing specification and other	*75*	*61.00%*	*0*	*0.00%*	*48*	*39.00%*	*1.78*	*0.98*	*2*
Statement of requirement Unrealistic specification for goods, works, and services	*81*	*65.90%*	*0*	*0.00%*	*42*	*34.10%*	*1.68*	*0.95*	*4*
AVERAGE	***62.00***	***0.50***	***0.50***	***0.00***	***60.50***	***0.49***	***1.99***	***0.90***	
PROCUREMENT RELATED CHALLENGES									
Failure to give correct information on firms capability statement	*69*	*56.10%*	*2*	*1.60%*	*52*	*42.30%*	*1.86*	*0.99*	*3*
The limited supply of raw materials	*76*	*61.80%*	*8*	*6.50%*	*39*	*31.70%*	*1.7*	*0.92*	*4*
Delayed procurement procedures	*81*	*65.90%*	*0*	*0.00%*	*42*	*34.10%*	*1.68*	*0.95*	*5*
Materials sourcing	*65*	*52.80%*	*2*	*1.60%*	*56*	*45.50%*	*1.93*	*0.99*	*2*
Contract management challenges	*30*	*24.40%*	*6*	*4.90%*	*87*	*70.70%*	*2.46*	*0.86*	*1*
AVERAGE	***64.2***	***0.522***	***3.6***	***0.0292***	***55.2***	***0.4486***	***1.926***	***0.942***	
POLITICAL RELATED CHALLENGES									
Political interferences in contract activities	*21*	*17.10%*	*2*	*1.60%*	*100*	*81.30%*	*2.64*	*0.76*	*1*
Discrimination among bidders	*26*	*21.10%*	*2*	*1.60%*	*95*	*77.20%*	*2.56*	*0.82*	*3*
Influence of other organizations demanding tips before awarding a contract	*20*	*16.30%*	*5*	*4.10%*	*98*	*79.70%*	*2.63*	*0.75*	*2*
Lack of government support to groom local contractors	*27*	*22.00%*	*6*	*4.90%*	*90*	*73.20%*	*2.51*	*0.83*	*4*
AVERAGE	**23.5**	**0.1913**	**3.75**	**0.0305**	**95.75**	**0.7785**	**2.585**	**0.79**	
OTHER CHALLENGES									
Price fluctuation	27	22.00%	8	6.50%	88	71.50%	2.5	0.83	1
Low interest in the activities of the professional association	105	85.40%	0	0.00%	18	14.60%	1.29	0.71	4

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

Contractors always bid low to get contracts	85	69.10%	18	14.60%	20	16.30%	1.47	0.76	3
Weather unpredictability	63	51.20%	28	22.80%	32	26.00%	1.75	0.85	2
Language barrier	107	87.00%	0	0.00%	16	13.00%	1.26	0.68	5
AVERAGE	**77.4**	**0.6294**	**10.8**	**0.0878**	**34.8**	**0.2828**	**1.654**	**0.766**	
OVERALL AVERAGE	**47.1**	**0.4**	**5.2**	**0.0**	**70.7**	**0.6**	**2.2**	**0.8**	

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Equipment Challenges

The results, as indicated in table 4.5, show that: lack of plant and equipment, 57.70% (n = 71) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 8.90% (n = 11) respondents were undefined with the issue while 33.30% (n = 41) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the issue of lack of plant and equipment. Also, the results indicate that: the high cost of hiring/leasing, 26.80% (n = 33) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.00% (n = 00) respondents were neutral to the statement while 73.20% (n = 90) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the matter of High cost of hiring/leasing. Notwithstanding, the results show that: Inadequate equipment, 56.90% (n = 70) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 4.90% (n = 6) respondents were neutral to the statement while 38.20% (n = 47) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the question of Lack of Inadequate equipment. Also, the result shows that: lack of good quality equipment, 48.80% (n = 60) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 8.10% (n = 10) respondents were neutral to the statement while 43.10% (n = 53) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the question of lack of good quality equipment. Also, the results indicate that: use of old equipment and lack of maintenance, 65.00% (n = 80) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 1.60% (n = 2) respondents were undecided to the statement while 33.30% (n = 41) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the matter of the use of old equipment and lack of maintenance. To this end with equipment challenges, the results point that: constant breakdown of machine and equipment, 90.20% (n = 111) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.0% (n = 00) respondents were undecided to the statement while 9.80% (n = 12) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the matter of constant breakdown of machine and equipment.

Financial Challenges

The outcomes as indicated in table 4.5 display that: financial inadequacies, 80.50% (n = 99) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 5.70% (n = 07) respondents were neutral to the statement while 13.80% (n = 17) of the respondents were both strongly

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

disagree/disagree to the issue of financial inadequacies. Also, the results indicate that: high-interest rate, 89.40% (n = 110) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 4.10% (n = 05) respondents were neutral to the statement while 6.50% (n = 8) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of high-interest rate. Notwithstanding, the results again show that: poor payment by a client, 52.80% (n = 65) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 11.40% (n = 14) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 35.80% (n = 44) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of poor payment by the client. Also, the result indicates that: lack of resources to mobilize requirement on site, 57.70% (n = 71) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 7.30% (n = 9) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 35.00% (n = 43) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the question of lack of resources to mobilize requirement on site. To this end with financial challenges, the results point that: lack of capital, 61.00% (n = 75) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 5.7% (n = 7) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 33.30% (n = 41) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the matter of lack of capital.

Human Resource Challenges

The results as specified in table 4.5 show that: lack of qualified personnel, 68.30% (n = 84) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.0% (n = 7) respondents were undecided to the statement while 31.70% (n = 39) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the issue of lack of qualified personnel. Also, the results indicate that: delay in delivery of services, 72.40% (n = 89) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 4.90% (n = 6) respondents were neutral to the statement while 22.80% (n = 28) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of delay in delivery of services. Aside, the results show that: poor programming of job execution, 60.20% (n = 74) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 9.80% (n = 12) respondents were neutral to the statement while 30.10% (n = 37) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the human resource challenge of poor programming of job execution. Also, the result shows that: lack of technical expertise, 85.40% (n = 105) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.80% (n = 1) respondents were neutral to the statement while 13.80% (n = 17) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the question of lack of technical expertise. Also, the results indicate that: lack of benefit for employees, 81.30% (n = 100) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 4.90% (n = 6) respondents were neutral to the statement while 13.80% (n = 17) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the matter of lack of benefit for employees. To this end, with human

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

resource challenges, the results indicate that: low, skilled labor, 88.60% (n = 109) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the issue at hand, 2.40% (n = 3) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 8.90% (n = 11) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of low, skilled labor.

Client Challenges

The results, as indicated in table 4.5, show that: poor designs by a client, 38.20% (n = 47) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.0% (n = 0) respondents were neutral to the statement while 61.80% (n = 76) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of poor designs by the client. Also, the results indicate that: poor bid evaluation, 85.40% (n = 105) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 1.60% (n = 2) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 13.00% (n = 16) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the matter of poor bid evaluation. Apart, the results show that: changing specification and other, 39.00% (n = 48) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.0% (n = 0) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 61.00% (n = 75) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the question of changing the specification and other. To end with equipment challenges, statement of requirement unrealistic specification for goods, works, and services, 34.10% (n = 42) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.0% (n = 0) respondents were neutral to the idea while 65.90% (n = 81) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the issue of statement of requirement unrealistic specification for goods, works, and services.

Procurement Challenges

The outcomes as indicated in table 4.5 display that: failure to give correct information on firms' capability statement, 42.30% (n = 52) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 1.60% (n = 2) respondents were neutral to the statement while 56.10% (n = 69) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the issue of failure to give correct information on firms' capability statement. Also, the results indicate that: limited supply of raw materials, 31.70% (n = 39) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 6.50% (n = 8) respondents were undecided to the statement while 61.80% (n = 76) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of a limited supply of raw materials. All the same, the results again show that: delayed procurement procedures, 34.10% (n = 42) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.0% (n = 0) respondents were neutral to the statement while 65.90% (n = 81) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of delayed procurement procedures. Also, the result indicates that: materials sourcing,

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

45.50% (n = 56) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 1.60% (n = 2) respondents were neutral to the statement while 52.80% (n = 65) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the question of materials sourcing. To conclude with procurement challenges, the results point that: contract management challenges, 7.70% (n = 87) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 4.90% (n = 6) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 24.40% (n = 30) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the matter of contract management challenges.

Political Challenges

The results as indicated in table 4.5 display that: political interferences in contract activities, 81.30% (n = 100) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 1.60% (n = 2) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 17.10% (n = 21) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the issue of political interferences in contract activities. Also, the results indicate that: discrimination among bidders, 77.20% (n = 95) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 1.60% (n = 2) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 21.10% (n = 26) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of discrimination among bidders. Aside, the results show that: influence of other organizations demanding tips before awarding a contract, 79.70% (n = 98) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 4.10% (n = 5) respondents were neutral to the statement while 16.30% (n = 20) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the related political challenge of influence of other organization demanding tips before awarding a contract. To conclude with related political challenges, the results show that: lack of government support to groom local contractors, 73.20% (n = 90) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the issue at hand, 4.90% (n = 6) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 22.0% (n = 27) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of lack of government support to groom local contractors.

Other Challenges

The outcomes as indicated in table 4.5 display that: price fluctuation, 71.50% (n = 88) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 6.50% (n = 8) respondents were neutral to the statement while 22.00% (n = 27) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the issue of price fluctuation. Also, the results indicate that: low interest in the activities of a professional association, 14.60% (n = 18) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.0% (n = 0) respondents were uncertain to the statement while 85.40% (n = 105) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of low

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

interest in the activities of a professional association. All the same, the results again show that: contractors always bid low to get contracts, 16.30% (n = 20) of the constructors were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 14.60% (n = 18) respondents were undecided about the statement while 69.10% (n = 85) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the statement of contractors always bids low to get contracts. Also, the result indicates that: weather unpredictability, 26.00% (n = 32) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 22.8% (n = 28) respondents were undecided to the statement while 51.20% (n = 63) of the respondents were both strongly disagree/disagree to the question of whether unpredictability. To this end with other challenges, the results point that: the language barrier, 13.0% (n = 16) of the respondents were both strongly agree/ agree with the statement, 0.0% (n = 0) respondents were neutral to the statement while 87.5% (n = 107) of the constructs were both strongly disagree/disagree to the matter of language barrier. Overall, we understood that the generally held position of the respondents is that 45.7% (n = 165) were in agreement acknowledged in GETFund construction challenges, and the minority of the 41% (n = 148) were in disagreement with the Major challenges affecting the execution of GETFund construction projects in the Upper Region. Again, the mean scores in table 4.5 suggest that the most leading Challenges that affect efficient execution of GETFund construction projects are a related political challenge and related financial challenge with the highest mean score of (means = 2.6, 2.5) with a standard deviation of (std = *0.8*, 0.79***)*** respectively**.** This settles with prior studies by Fugar & Agyarkwa (2010) about the untimely payment of certificates by clients affecting efficient execution of GETFund construction projects.

CONCLUSION

From the study, it can be adduced from the assessment of construction projects that contractors executing various GETFund projects in Ghana, for that matter in the Upper West Region, lack the necessary administrative and managerial knowledge in the execution of their projects and should therefore be given a periodic training and orientation in order to increase their administrative and management techniques of such contractors and their firms in order to enhance value for money.

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103

REFERENCES

Chan, D. & Kumaraswamy, M.,. (2002). Compressing construction durations: lessons learned from Hong Kong building projects. *International journal of project management, 20*(1), 23-35.

Dissanayaka, S. M., & Kumaraswamy, M. M. (1998). Comparing contributors to time and cost performance in building projects. *Building and Environment, 34*(1), 31-42.

Frimpong, K., & Oluwoye, O. (2003). Causes of delay and cost overruns in construction of groundwater projects in a developing country; Ghana as a case study. *International Journal of Project Management, 21*, 321-326.

Fugar, F., & Agyarkwa, A. (2010). Delays in Building Construction in Ghana. *Australian Journal of Construction Economics and Building, 10*, 103-116.

GETFund, G. (2000, 05 09). *Ghana Education Trust Fund Act 2000, Act 581, Ministry of Education.* Republic of Ghana: Parliament of Ghana.

Ghana News. (2009, 4 7). *the construction problem in ghana the way forward*. Retrieved June 20th, 2019, from The construction problem in Ghana: The way forward.: Available at https://www.modernghana.com/news/124109/1/the-construction-problem-in-ghana-the-way-forward.html.

Jones, A. H., Martindale, J. R., Morris, J., & Morris, J. (1980). *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire:* (Vol. 2). Cambridge University Press.

Joppe, M. (2000). *The Research Process.* Retrieved February 25, 1998, from http://www.ryerson.ca/~mjoppe/rp.htm.

Kuprenas, J. A. (2003). Project management actions to improve design phase cost performance, *Journal of Management in Engineering, 19*(1), 25-32.

Lehtonen, T. W. (2001). Performance measurement in construction Logistics, *International Journal of Production Economics, 69*, 107-116.

Mahmoud-Jouini, S. B., Midler, C., & Garel, G. (2004). Time-to-market vs. time-to-delivery: Managing speed in Engineering, Procurement, and Construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management, 22*(5), 359-367.

Mckinsey, K., & Company. (2003). *The Practice of Business Statistics.* . New York: Freeman.

Nkado, R. N. (1995). Construction time-influencing factors: the contractor's perspective. *Construction Management and Economics, 13*(1), 81-89.

Okuwoga, A.,. (1998). Cost. Time performance of public sector housing projects in Nigeria, *Habital Intl., 22*(4), 389. 395.

Olawale, Y. A., & Sun, M. (2010). Cost and time control of construction projects: inhibiting factors and mitigating measures in practice. *Construction management and economics, 28*(5), 509-526.

Reichelt, K., & Lyneis, J. (1999). The dynamic of project performance: Benchmarking cost and schedule overrun drivers. *European management journal, 17*(2), 135-150.

Roy, M. (2005). Improving the Collaboration between Main Contractors and Subcontractors within Traditional Construction Procurement. *Journal of Construction Engineering, 11*.

Xiao, H., & Proverbs, D. (2002). Construction Time Performance: an evaluation of contractors from the UK and US. *Journal of Engineering Construction and Architectural Management, 9*(2), 81-89.

DOI: 10.48165/sajssh.2022.3103