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ABSTRACT

It is imperative to quickly diagnose project failure at a quick glance without having to research on it. Political climates, for example, are quick diagnostic tools for project failures or analysis. Because, a country is going through serious political instability, development projects cannot survive. Such is a case with Zimbabwe as a country. This is true to the sense, considering that development efforts will be channeled towards political development rather than socio-economic development. This paper is a background to the study on the impact of project failure on the socio-economic development in Zimbabwe with specific reference to Masvingo Province. The objectives are to highlight the background of most project failures that takes place in Zimbabwe. The researcher highlighted his own models of conducive environment for successful socio-economic development projects and an extrapolated model of unconducive environment for socio-economic development projects success. In these models, the research stressed that the three core pillars of project management which are accountability, responsibility and good governance are main targets of corruption which is an ill most irresponsible governments endure. In some fashion, the researcher concluded and recommended that project success takes place in positive environments.
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It is of paramount importance to note that Zimbabwe inherited, socially, politically, economically and technologically, dualistic socio-economic system at its independence that were envisaged to promote development (Vurayai, 2012). Originally and historically, the socio-economic system was mainly composed of a white dominating relatively capital intensive modern sector including commercial farms, mines, modern manufacturing and information technology service units (CARA/IOM, 2010). There also existed side by side a largely neglected peasant sector characterized by low per capita incomes, wide spread poverty, disease and undeveloped infrastructure (Protracted Relief Programmes, 2012:42). Following independence in 1980, the government embarked on a programme of centralized economic planning and socialist oriented policies in order to be able to develop (Mubvumbi and Kamete, 1999, Murisa, 2011 and Palen, 2001). Today, Zimbabwe’s socio-economic system is a basket of confusing socio-politico-economic hegemony contemplative of proper implementative policies and programmes extracting itself from the world’s worst scenario of poverty at its height (Protracted Relief Programme, 2012).
Rwelamila (2012) argues that there is a strong relationship between socio-economic development and project management whereby development either in the public or private sector is not possible without successful implementation of projects. However, (Latif and Maunganidze, 2003) postulated that, it is also inherent that successful implementation of projects relies heavily if not totally on the socio-economic temperature of the organizations in a country, thus Zimbabwe as in this case should have set a socio-economic temperature cultivative of successful implementation of socio-economic development projects in all sectors.

Smith (1970:6) in Steyn and Schmikl (2013) propounds that the purpose of all organisations is to add value to Nations who in turn add value to the world at large. Thus, organisations are set forth as wealth creation mechanisms and if successful should be in a position to create wealth through profiteering which adds value to a nation (Dyk, 2014).

According to Smith (1970:6) in wealth creation, organisations make profit. After making profit they re-invest in the areas of specialization that they made profit from. Through this process, value is being created together with a chain through which lives of people involved are enhanced.

Steyn and Schmikl (2013) took the point of organisations in terms of governments, whereby their argument is that if all governments are responsible for their citizens and their major purpose of formulations is to enhance the lives of their citizens. Thus, a responsible government is responsible for its citizens who would in turn formulate responsible organizations which are successful and thus implement successful projects. If the situation is not a health situation then, that would mean project failures and the whole socio-economic scenario crumbles.
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**Figure1.1: Conducive Socio-economic Temperature (Steyn and Schmikl, 2013 ideology):**

Source: Own source

However, a Zimbabwean scenario is reflective of a completely different situation. The governments delve into corruption as an area of specialization (Rusvingo, 2014). Thus, the culture and value of most Zimbabweans has been corrupted to an extent that forms of organisations are meaningless and hence the complete informalisation of the
economy (Vurayai, 2012). Clements and Guido (2009) argue that African governments should develop large scale projects that effect development. They went on further to argue that African governments must maintain what they have, which may be of value. Besides, they must also add value in terms of creation of new projects. A situation that is non-existent in Zimbabwe (Rusvingo, 2014).

According to Gray (2008) in most African countries, value addition has never been done by most governments. Gray (2008) further argued that, one government after another, plunder the existing resources for personal benefits and thus corruption is heightened instead. In Zimbabwe for example, efforts to stop corruption are lip-sung by the government without much practical solutions put in terms of policy formulation against corruption (Rusvingo, 2014). Rusvingo (2014) argues that corruption in Zimbabwe has been cancerous to an extend that it is a political ploy rather than crime.

An extrapolative theory of Project Management against Corruption was explored in this research. Whereby the triangulation of Project Management Core Values as elaborated below against corruption’s major pillars are corroborated.

According to Rusvingo (2014) they are these three core values (Accountability, Responsibility and Good Governance) of project management that are prone to corruption. They form the cornerstones for corruption. Corruption thrives on these three values and they are the same values that are completely unidentifiable in less developed countries such as in Zimbabwe.

Theoretically:

- **Accountability:**

  It is one of the core values of project management which is of high significance in the project cycle from project inception (which most call “The Front End Loading” or “Project Conception” phase, to the final stages in the project cycle of
Monitoring and Evaluation. Without accountability no project can achieve success at any point in its life cycle. This is significant in all types and magnitude of project. Without accountability there is no project success, there is instead project failure (Project Management Book of Knowledge (PMBoK), 2013).

However, accountability is non-existent in corrupt situations. No-one wants to be held accountable for anything in corrupt situations where corrupt tendencies are prevalent. Either resources are looted without accountability or resources are misappropriated and no one can account for that and hence project failure becomes an ultimatum (Project Management Zimbabwe (PMZ), 2014).

b. Responsibility:

It is one of the major pillars in project management. With responsibility, each player or stakeholder knows his/her position and part in the project and becomes responsible for that position and success is guaranteed. Without responsibility, there is confusion in a project at whatever stage, thus failure is an ultimatum (Management Book of Knowledge (PMBoK), 2013).

However, without giving specific examples in Zimbabwe but in a corrupt situation you will never find anyone owning up to any responsibility. It is never possible to pin point problem orientation because everyone claims no responsibility for anything. Because no one is responsible for anything, there is no time scheduling and deadlines are non-existent let alone anyone responsible for accountability, therefore no project can thrive first stages on its inception in such a situation (Meyer, 2013).

c. Good governance:

According to Chelonis, Bastilla, Brown, and Gardner (2007) in a narrower sense, governance deals with maximizing the shareholder’s wealth while in a broader perspective, it considers the welfare of all the stakeholders and the society within which an organization is established. It is one area which looks at the overall management of the whole project/organisation, the ethics and codes of conduct which governs operational environment. It deals with how ethics can make governance more meaningful.

Thus, good governance should look at all stakeholders and not just shareholders alone. Good governance is something which comes from within the provisions of companies act should be followed both in letter and spirit.

Larson (2009) argues that the biggest challenge in Africa especially Sub-Sahara is how to maintain value and also to Add Value especially in areas of socioeconomic development like Agriculture, Infrastructure, Health, Education etc of the citizens. Larson (2009) further argues that, these areas are pools of small scale to large scale projects which enhance lives of citizens and add value to the nation.

However, the hypothetical argument of this study is the impact of project failures on the socio-economic development of Zimbabwe. Thus, it is not only the project success or
failure that is of paramount importance in Zimbabwe. In many occasions it is the socio-economic climate that is deterrent to project implementation and hence project success or failure (Clemence and Guido, 2009). While in many cases where project failure is supposed to be recorded, because of the socio-economic development climate, the failed project may be categorized as a success (Chelonis; Bastilla; Brown, and Gardner, 2007). Is it lack of understanding or lack of knowledge of what socio-economic development is all about or is it sheer stubbornness instilled by corrupt tendencies?

According to Vurayai (2012) socio-economic development is the process of social and economic development in a society. Socio-economic development is measured with indicators, such as GDP, life expectancy, literacy and levels of employment. Changes in less-tangible factors are also considered, such as personal dignity, freedom of association, personal safety and freedom from fear of physical harm, and the extent of participation in civil society (http://www.wikipedia.com; Vurayai, 2012; Mupedziswa, 1992).

Thus, according to http://www.wikipedia.com, causes of socio-economic impacts are, for example, new technologies, changes in laws, changes in the physical environment and ecological changes. These are variables measured in this study to be exhibited as evidence of project success or failure’s impact on the Masvingo Province society.

Mupedziswa (1992) postulates that socio-economics (also known as social economics) is the social science that studies how economic activity affects and is shaped by social processes. In general it analyzes how societies progress, stagnate, or regress because of their local or regional economy, or the global economy (Kaseke, 1993).

However, the term Socio-economics is in many cases used as an umbrella term with at different scenarios. According to http://www.wikipedia.com the term 'social economics' may refer broadly to the "use of economics in the study of society." However, Kanidza, (1996) put forward his argument that, more narrowly, contemporary practice considers behavioral interactions of individuals and groups through social capital and social "markets" (not excluding for example, sorting by marriage) and the formation of social norms. In the latter, it studies the relation of economics to social values (http://www.wikipedia.com in Kanidza, 1996).

On the other hand Mandaza, (2012) argues that, a distinct supplemental usage of socio-economics describes social economics as "a discipline studying the reciprocal relationship between economic science on the one hand and social philosophy, ethics, and human dignity on the other" toward social reconstruction and improvement or as also emphasizing multidisciplinary methods from such fields as sociology, history, and political science. Mandaza, (2012) put forth this point in criticizing mainstream economics for its alleged faulty philosophical premises (for example the pursuit of self-interest) and neglect of dysfunctional economic relationships, such advocates tend to classify social economics as heterodox (Mandaza, 2012).

Dhemba, (1995) stated that, in many cases, socio-economists focus on the social impact of some sort of economic change or major economically impactive project. He further argued that, such changes might include a closing factory, market manipulation, the signing of international trade treaties (projects), new natural gas projects, etc. Such social effects can be wide-ranging in size, anywhere from local effects on a small
community to changes to an entire society/country (Dhemba, 1995). Examples of causes of socioeconomic impacts include new technologies such as cars or mobile phones, changes in laws, changes in the physical environment (such as increasing crowding within cities), and ecological changes (such as prolonged drought or declining fish stocks) (Government of Zimbabwe, 1994). Alcock, (1993) argues that, these may affect patterns of consumption, the distribution of incomes and wealth, the way in which people behave (both in terms of purchase decisions and the way in which they choose to spend their time), and the overall quality of life (Alcock, 1993).

Thus, according to this study, the goal of socio-economic study is generally to bring about socio-economic development, usually by improvements in metrics such as GDP, life expectancy, literacy, levels of employment, etc.

In the case of Zimbabwe, especially with specific reference to Masvingo Province, it will be difficult to discuss the socio-economic situation of the country in particular the Masvingo Province without looking directly into the Zimbabwe Land situation because Zimbabwean economy is agrarian.

However, Westendoff and Eade, (2002) postulated that, Zimbabwean land history is riddled with a plethora of problems whereby in Zimbabwe's land problem, the central issue, is that of the history of unequal land distribution in Rhodesia. Palmer (1980:9) in his analysis of existing land pressures, of population projections and of the relative use being made of the land led to his conclusion that 'if the development problems of an independent Zimbabwe are to be addressed comprehensively, then marginal changes in the distribution of land will not be sufficient'. According to Riddell, (1979:10) the land question is crucial both for rural development and, more importantly, for the whole economy, which needs to be shifted away from an externally-oriented socio-economic growth path unless a more internally and self-reliant socio-economic development path is taken, economic growth is likely, as at present, to be characterised by growing unemployment and widening income differentials (Riddell, 1979).

According to Riddell (1979), two conditions were seen to be necessary to achieve serious land redistribution, that is, a government with organs or organizations committed to achieving these goals, and a constitution which would allow a substantial restructuring of land. While Riddell (1979:10) is silent on the first of these conditions, he contended that the proposed Lancaster House constitution seemed to indicate that the second condition would not be satisfied. The cost to the new government of acquiring 75 per cent of the European land would be Rhodesian $733 million (by 1978), a burden far too heavy financially for the regime (p. 11). This, and other factors, led Riddell (1979) to conclude that the proposed constitution would make it 'well nigh impossible to carry out a comprehensive land resettlement programme (p. 12) and therefore at any rate or any time, this project may not be likely to be a success.

However, according to Wimmer, (2010) Zimbabwe has in the past 10 years dominated international headlines for a number of reasons; the worsening conditions of poverty, a land reform programme that did not adhere to acceptable norms of transfer of property, contested elections and the general decline in the economy. Beginning in the late 1990s the country experienced an economic decline that has eroded livelihood capacities of both the urban and the rural population. Various analyses have discussed the nature of the crisis from various backgrounds with different emphasis and
ideological leanings. Although there is some consensus on the nature and scope of the economic decline and its effects on social development there is no agreement amongst scholars and even policy practitioners on the causes of this crisis. The failure to comprehensively grasp the interrelated factors that led to what can be called ‘Zimbabwe’s tipping point’ have also led to the formulation of inadequate policy interventions to respond to the ‘crisis’ that ensued (Rusvingo, 2014).

There was a coincidence between the beginning of the new millennium and the beginning of what in journalistic terms if regarded as the ‘Zimbabwe crisis’-this is shorthand for a very complex process of state failure. In fact what was referred to as the Zimbabwean was a three dimensional interrelated form of collapse which included the political crisis centered on increasing tendencies of authoritarianism on the part of the state and supporting structures. This, according to Steyn and Schmikl, (2014)’s ideological extrapolation, is a classic organization failure.

This was compounded by contestations around election results and the ‘rule of law’ in general. The other critical dimension to the crisis was the economic meltdown whose causes are multifaceted; ranging from economic mismanagement on the part of government to structural constraints within the local economy and also the international economic system. It is estimated that the economy has shrunk by over 30% since 2000 (Moyo and Yeros, 2007).

Inflation accelerated through 2006, and by 2007 the country was officially experiencing hyperinflation, with prices rising more than 50% every month (Scoones, et al, 2010:26). This continued through 2007 and 2008 with inflation peaking at 231m% towards the end of 2008 (Chimhowu, 2009). Unemployment is said to be at 70%. The third dimension of the ‘crisis’ is the collapse of social service delivery.

On the food security side, the country had been assigned the responsibility of ensuring that there are enough food stocks within the sub-region by the SADC hence the term the ‘bread basket’ of the region. By the close of the 1990s studies of the outcomes of land reform carried out by the Zimbabwe Household Dynamics Study (ZRHDS), (1990) led by Bill Kinsey showed how resettled farmers’ real income had more than doubled over the period between 1982-83 and 1994-5 (Kinsey 1999). These positive trends in food security, health and education delivery were soon to disappear with the onset of the ‘crisis decade’.

In July 1990 the government released an economic policy statement, “A Framework for Economic Reform (1991-1995)”, in which it announced a major policy shift from state-led economic development towards a market based approach. The five year programme was premised on orthodox reform packages prescribed by the IMF, including public sector reform, trade liberalisation, deficit reduction and creation of a ‘favourable climate’ for economic growth, the target of which was five percent per annum (Sachikonye, 2003). The immediate social outcomes from the ESAP period were a decline in social service delivery due to the introduction of user fees at health centres and school fees in an environment of declining employment. Formal employment decreased from 1990 so that, by 1995, 20 000 workers had lost public sector jobs and 25 000 had lost jobs in the private sector (Murisa, 2004:23). The impact of adjustment on welfare is critical; by 1998, 60 percent of the population was earning
less than US$1 a day, and 80 percent of these lived in the rural areas (UNDP, HDR, 1999). The same 1999 report ranked Zimbabwe 130th out of 170 on the Human Development Index. The burden of adjustment was borne by the ordinary working people based in the cities and countryside. Thus, a complete indication of governmental failure to create value or add value to its citizenry. All the projects being implemented in this period, despite magnitude experience failure in one way or the other (Murisa, 2004).

The economic meltdown that began in the late 1990s but increased in intensity in 2000 has also been associated with the shrinking of industrial activity, through the closure of many manufacturing concerns and downsizing of some, and consequent high unemployment rates (estimated to be in the range of 70 percent of the total labour force). The economic decline in turn affected the social reproduction capacities of both urban and rural households. Formal sector urban employment shrunk from 3.6 million in 2003 to 480,000 in 2008 (Mail and Guardian, 18 January 2009) and even those who managed to retain their jobs were in most cases receiving wages that are below the poverty datum line, mostly eroded by the hyperinflationary environment. The social dimensions of the crisis have been the most visible and the impact has been devastating on the majority of the ordinary working people. The social crisis is characterised by the decline or absolute collapse of social service delivery in housing, health and education, and the erosion of household incomes leading to an increase in cases of food insecurity and general vulnerability (Mushita and Mpande, 2006).

Mushita and Mpande (2006) further elaborated that, the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP), (2000), has led to radical changes in the size, composition and number of participants in agricultural production. Despite the overall increase in the number of farmers (landholders), there has been reduced food production due to declining support to agriculture from the fiscus, late and poor land preparation due to limited tillage capacity, unsustainable financing mechanism for the sector and the generally unfavourable macro-economic environment. As such, the main staple cereals (maize, wheat and sorghum) and the high nutritional value commodities (meat, milk, groundnuts, and soya beans) as well as oil seed derivatives have been in short supply. This, according to Mushita and Mpande (2006) has extended food insecurity beyond normal effects of drought and broadened the base of the food insecure and vulnerable. On real terms, all agricultural projects were failing in their inception phase during this period.

On the Education and Literacy side, Zimbabwe is a signatory to the Dakar Declaration which among other things commits African countries to the goal of achieving education for all by the year 2015. At independence the Government of Zimbabwe aggressively pursued an education for all policy. Education, like health delivery, was mostly financed from government income supplemented by large amounts of assistance from donor governments. Donor funds and loans were used for school and classroom construction to teacher training to curriculum development to administration. Most of this assistance was channeled through government. School fees, where they existed, were minimal and affordable for most, especially for primary school. Teacher training colleges were increased, to an extent that each province had at least two training colleges. Primary and secondary school teachers were part of the burgeoning middle class in the late 1980s and had higher salaries than their counterparts in the sub-region. By the late
80's, however, the amounts that government was channeling to schools for operating costs was decreasing.

According to Harrison in Osei-Hwedie (1995:93), the vision of an egalitarian Zimbabwean society by the year 2000 envisaged after Independence in 1980 has been blurred by the failure of development programmes to alleviate poverty and reduce inequalities (adding value to its citizenry), particularly in the country's rural areas. As a result of market-based economic reforms, drought and other interplaying factors, the poor and disadvantaged sections of the population have become further marginalised, thus making development efforts futile (project failure). To this effect, Harrison in Osei-Hwedie (1995:93) vividly describes the process of development as, "U... the often tragic story of the hopes, frustrations, efforts and failures, suffering and conflicts of thousands of people in Africa."

A report which appeared in the History World (2007, p. 1) states that as early as the 11th century, Zimbabwe was seen as having a great potential for development. It stated, “The plateau between the rivers Zambezi and Limpopo, in Southeast Africa offers rich opportunities for human settlement. Its grasslands make excellent grazing for cattle.” Many centuries later, this observation was to become a reality (History World 2007:1).

Chelonis, Bastilla, Brown, and Gardner, (2007) avers that, since the year 2000, developments in the country’s economy have slowly been producing an unmitigated disaster as the country struggled with what some authors claim is an ideological contest (Hwami, 2010). The Zimbabwean economy has been on the brink of collapse with formal employment estimated to be between 5% and 10%. Unemployment has been getting worse since the early 2000s. The World Bank (2003) reported that 81.8% of the secondary school leavers in Zimbabwe were unemployed in the period 1999 to 2001.

Inflation reached unprecedented levels over the past few years. It was 164,900% in February 2008 (Central Statistics Office, 2008). However, a Professor of Applied Economics at the Johns Hopkins University, Steve Hanke (2008) reports that by 2008 Zimbabwe had entered the hyperinflation zone with the highest monthly inflation rate of 79,600,000,000%. At the same time, in January 2009, the Zimbabwean dollar had become valueless with economists reporting that Z$ 100,000,000,000 was equivalent to US$ 2.5.

Chelonis, Bastilla, Brown, and Gardner, (2007) further argued that, today, the country continues to face some of the greatest challenges in development due to this socio-economic meltdown. Many people have left the country as economic refugees. They have gone to neighbouring countries such as Botswana and South Africa. Others have gone overseas, to the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States among the popular destinations (Chelonis, Bastilla, Brown, and Gardner, 2007). Zimbabwe is naturally endowed with natural resources and human capital. It has the potential to develop successfully given the natural and human resources as well as technology available in the country. Before the land redistribution programme, Zimbabwe was regarded as the bread-basket of the Southern African region, being self-sufficient and a net exporter of food. The economy experienced negative growth in the period 1998 to 2000. This was caused by a number of factors, such as prolonged droughts,
hyperinflation and a critical shortage of foreign exchange (Chelonis, Bastilla, Brown, and Gardner, 2007).

The country tried a number of policy changes in order to turn around the economy, starting with the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP) (Government of Zimbabwe, 1991a). However, the economy continued to decline. As a result the government has been finding it difficult to provide all the funding required in education and other sectors (Todaro, 1982). Yet the demand for education, especially higher education has increased tremendously in the last decade. The expenditure per student in higher education is over 300% of GNP per capita, yet for primary education, it is only 19% of GNP per capita (World Bank, 2003). This phenomenon is a result of the rapid expansion of the university sector, which began working conditions, as well as political instability in the country have been the push factors that have made many professionals leave the country.

The discussion above has shown that Zimbabwe faces a real and significant crisis of socio-economic development whose roots is multifaceted but can be traced to the process of decolonization, the economic liberalization programme and economic mismanagement on the part of government (Todaro, 1982). However, whatever way it is viewed, project failures become the bedrock of all economic failures experienced. Another important realization is the fact that the Government of National Unity (GNU) or election into power of a new political party will not necessarily resolve these issues overnight but that should not be a permit for government to abdicate responsibility in resolving the identified issues (Todaro, 1982).

In pursuit of a new trajectory of accelerated economic growth and wealth creation, the Government of Zimbabwe has formulated a new plan known as the Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (Zim Asset): October 2013 - December 2018 (Vurayai, 2014). Zim Asset was crafted to achieve sustainable development and socio-economic equity anchored on indigenization, empowerment and employment creation which will be largely propelled by the judicious exploitation of the country’s abundant human and natural resources (Rusvingo, 2014).

The interventions identified for implementation in this Plan are mainly informed by the ZANU PF Central Committee Report to the 13th National Peoples Conference of 2012 which gave birth to the ZANU PF Manifesto, His Excellency the President’s speeches at the occasion of his inauguration and the Official Opening of the First Session of the 8th Parliament of Zimbabwe, National Development Priorities and the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as well as the new Constitution.

During the plan period, the economy is projected to grow by an average of 7.3%. It is expected to grow by 3.4% in 2013 and 6.2% in 2014 and continue on an upward growth trajectory to 9.9% by 2018 as shown in table 1 below.
Table 1.1 : Growth targets for Zim Asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, hunting and fishing</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity and water</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution, hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and communication</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic services</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP at market prices</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Finance and Economic Development

The above growth projections are anchored on the successful implementation of Zim Asset, a dream which as yet has never been able to be measured in terms of its success so far or whether it is attainable at all. Thus, the anchor on which this study found its strength from.

Overall Assumptions of the Zim Asset Plan

According to the Zim Asset Manifest, (2014), the following broad assumptions will anchor the growth of the economy during the period 2013 –2018:

- a. Improved liquidity and access to credit by key sectors of the economy such as agriculture;
- b. Establishment of a Sovereign Wealth Fund;
- c. Improved revenue collection from key sectors of the economy such as mining;
d. Increased investment in infrastructure such as roads, communication, etc.

This Results Based Agenda is built around four strategic clusters that will enable Zimbabwe to achieve economic growth and reposition the country as one of the strongest economies in the region and Africa. The four strategic clusters identified are: Food Security and Nutrition; Social Services and Poverty Eradication; Infrastructure and Utilities; and Value Addition and Beneficiation.

No doubt, this cluster approach will enable Government to prioritise its programmes and projects for implementation with a view to realizing broad results that seek to address the country’s socio-economic challenges. Given the resource constraints, Government will come up with robust and prudent fiscal and monetary policy measures to buttress and boost the implementation of Zim Asset. Government ministries and agencies, the private sector and development partners, and the nation at large are therefore called upon to work together in championing the implementation of this Results Based Agenda.

The implementation of Zim Asset will be underpinned and guided by the Results Based Management (RBM) System and will be used as a basis for the macroeconomic budgetary framework by Treasury, commencing with the 2014 fiscal year. Zim Asset is a cluster based Plan, reflecting the strong need to fully exploit the internal relationships and linkages that exist between the various facets of the economy. These clusters are as follows:

- Food Security and Nutrition;
- Social Services and Poverty Eradication;
- Infrastructure and Utilities; and
- Value Addition and Beneficiation.

To buttress the aforementioned clusters, two sub-clusters were also developed namely Fiscal Reform Measures and Public Administration, Governance and Performance Management. To ensure the successful implementation of Zim Asset, key strategies, success factors and drivers have been identified as implementation pillars.

The successful implementation of the Zim Asset Plan will be anchored on sustainable economic empowerment and employment creation programmes for the citizenry. The main thrust of the SMEs and Co-operatives policy will be on creating and growing opportunities for business, skills development and provision of funding for indigenous business ventures especially start-ups and those run by previously disadvantaged individuals.

In order to achieve financial inclusion of innovative youth and women in the formal sector, SEDCO will be recapitalized to finance the development of these projects. In pursuance of the aforementioned sustainable developmental thrust, Government will continue with the “Look East” Policy to unlock the inflow of potential investment into the country.
A clarification from the Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (Zim Asset) Handbook “Towards an Empowered Society and a Growing Economy” OCTOBER 2013- DECEMBER 2018 states that:

On Infrastructure and Utilities Cluster

- In order for the Zimbabwean economy to register growth in a manner that is both competitive and effective, there is need for the country to undertake work in critical areas such as the development of a robust, elaborate and resilient infrastructure.

- The Infrastructure cluster is focused on the rehabilitation of infrastructural assets and the recovery of utility services in Zimbabwe. These services relate to:
  
  i. Water and Sanitation infrastructure;
  ii. Public Amenities;
  iii. Public Amenities;
  iv. Information Communication Technology (ICT);
  v. Energy and Power Supply;
  vi. Transport (road, rail, marine and air).

Already the acidic test for this Zim Asset recipe has proven the extrapolated theory of project management against corruption to be effective. The socio-economic temperature for such a model even to move past inception phase has proven to be a mammoth task for the Zimbabwean Government. Even though it is a Result Based Management System (RBMS), the three pillars of corruption are thriving on the three core values of project management and therefore project failure is imminent. However, this study’s endeavour is to measure the impact of project failure herein referred to as organizational failure on the socio-economic development of Zimbabwe with specific reference to Masvingo Province. The application of such a Result Based Management System to a province like Masvingo, which is similar in characteristics to any of the other nine provinces is what this study explores.
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