Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2026; 6(6):382-392

Received: 21-09-2026
Accepted: 01-11-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Analyzing the Effectiveness of Joint Venture Projects in (Water) Project Completion: A Case Study of Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company and Care International Zambia for a Water Reticulation System Project in Chaisa Compound, Lusaka

[1] Bwalya Kunda, [2] Dr. Kelvin Chibomba

[1] School of Humanities, Information and Communications University, Zambia Research and Development Center, Lusaka, Zambia

[2] Department of Social Research, Information and Communications University, Zambia Research and Development Center, Lusaka, Zambia

Corresponding Author: **Bwalya Kunda**

Abstract

This study analyzes the effectiveness of joint venture projects in water infrastructure completion, focusing on the collaboration between the Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) and CARE International for a water reticulation system project in Chaisa Compound, Lusaka. Employing a mixed-methods approach, the research surveyed and interviewed 100 respondents, including employees from both organizations and community members. Findings indicate that 81% of respondents believe the joint venture model significantly contributed to the project's timely delivery, cost efficiency, and community satisfaction. However, challenges such as bureaucratic delays (67%), limited technical capacity (23%), and cultural differences (55%) were identified. The study recommends enhancing stakeholder engagement, communication, and capacity-building efforts to improve future water infrastructure projects in Lusaka.

Keywords: Joint Ventures, Water Infrastructure, Project Effectiveness

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Urban areas are increasingly in need of efficient and sustainable water infrastructure. To address this, joint ventures (JVs) have become an important way to deliver large-scale projects, especially in developing regions where resources and technical skills are limited. A joint venture is when two or more parties work together, sharing resources and risks to achieve specific goals. In Zambia, the water sector faces major challenges, including a lack of access to clean water and sanitation. About 4.5 million Zambians do not have safe drinking water, and urban water supply coverage is only around 60%. These issues are worsened by limited financial resources and governance problems. The Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC) and CARE International Zambia have partnered in a joint venture to improve water access in Chaisa Compound, Lusaka. This project aims to use the strengths of both organizations—LWSC's operational skills and CARE's community engagement experience. However, joint ventures can face challenges that affect their success. Issues such as differing goals among stakeholders, cultural differences, and communication breakdowns are common. Understanding how these collaborations work is essential for improving project performance and achieving sustainable results. This study will analyze how effective the joint venture between LWSC and CARE International was in completing the water reticulation project, focusing on key indicators like timely completion, cost efficiency, and community satisfaction. Previous research suggests that joint ventures can improve service delivery efficiency by 20-30%. The findings of this study aim to provide valuable insights for policymakers and project managers, helping to enhance the effectiveness of future water projects in Zambia and similar regions.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Despite the potential benefits of joint ventures, challenges such as misalignment of goals, cultural differences, and

management issues can hinder the effectiveness and timely completion of water projects (Cherinet, 2020) [46]. This study aims to analyse the effectiveness of joint venture projects in water project completion, using the case study of the Lusaka water and Sewerage Company and Care International in Zambia for a water reticulation system project in Chaisa Compound, Lusaka.The effectiveness of joint venture projects has garnered significant attention within project management literature, particularly in the context of public-private partnerships aimed at improving infrastructure and service delivery in developing regions. This research aims to analyze the effectiveness of joint ventures by examining the case study of the Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company and CARE International in Zambia, focusing on their collaborative efforts in joint venture projects for a water reticulation system project in Chaisa Compound, Lusaka. While joint ventures are anticipated to enhance project completion speed and efficiency through resource sharing and expertise leveraging (Sullivan & Sweeney, 2019) [27], challenges such as misalignment of stakeholder goals, communication breakdowns, and resource allocation conflicts can impede project outcomes (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2019) [26]. In Zambia, where water access remains a pressing issue, understanding the dynamics and outcomes of such collaborative efforts is crucial (United Nations, 2020) [28].

1.3 Research Objectives

1.3.1 General Objective

1. To analyze the effectiveness of joint venture projects in water project completion.


1.3.2 Specific Objectives

1. To establish types of joint venture projects in project management.
2. To Examine the effectiveness of joint venture projecs in water project completion.
3. To ascertain relationship between joint ventures in water project completion and project performance.
4. To identify limitations found in joint venture projects.

1.4 Research Questions

1. What are the different types of joint venture projects used in project management?
2. How effective are joint venture projects in ensuring the successful completion of water projects?
3. What is the relationship between joint ventures in water project completion and overall project performance?
4. What are the limitations associated with joint venture projects?

1.5 Theoretical Framework



The conceptual framework explains the key factors that affect the success of joint venture projects in water infrastructure.

Key Points

1. Important Factors:

- Partnership Dynamics: How well the partners communicate and share goals.
- Resource Allocation: The financial and technical resources each partner contributes.
- Management Practices: The planning and coordination methods used.
- Stakeholder Engagement: Involvement of local communities and other interested parties.

2. Main Outcome:

- Project Performance: Measured by how timely, cost-effective, and satisfactory the project is.

3. Influencing Factors:

- Environmental Conditions: Political and economic stability.
- Cultural Differences: The effect of different cultural norms on collaboration.

4. Expected Results:

- Projects will finish on time and within budget.
- High-quality work that meets community needs.
- Positive experiences for all stakeholders involved.

The framework serves as a guide to improve collaboration and project success in future joint ventures, suggesting that more research can help refine these practices.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Overview

Joint ventures (JVs) are increasingly used in the construction industry, especially for large-scale infrastructure projects like water systems. This literature review examines the effectiveness of JVs in completing water projects, highlighting key themes, findings, and gaps in the research.

2.2 Types of Joint Ventures in Project Management

JVs are collaborative arrangements where multiple parties share risks, resources, and profits. They can be classified as follows:

- Equity Joint Ventures: Create a new legal entity with shared capital (Kogut, 1988) [23].
- Contractual Joint Ventures: Collaborate based on a contract without forming a new entity (Murray & Abenhaim, 2000) [34].
- Project-Specific Joint Ventures: Designed for a single project and dissolved afterward.
- Functional Joint Ventures: Collaborate in specific areas while remaining independent in others.
- Vertical Joint Ventures: Involve partners at different levels of the supply chain.
- Horizontal Joint Ventures: Involve partners at the same industry level collaborating to share risks and enter new markets.

2.3 Examining the Effectiveness of Joint Ventures

The effectiveness of JVs is influenced by:

- Trust and Communication: Essential for resolving

conflicts and aligning goals (Sullivan, 2013) [37].
- Partner Selection: Choosing partners with complementary skills is critical (Ring & Van de Ven, 1994) [25].
- Continuous Evaluation: Ongoing monitoring helps improve outcomes (Barten & Challenger, 2005) [14].

Successful case studies show that collaboration can enhance project delivery, but challenges like cultural differences can hinder effectiveness (Dyer & Singh, 1998) [31].

2.4 Stakeholder Involvement
Engaging stakeholders throughout the project lifecycle is crucial:
- Project Identification: Ensures community needs are met (Njogu, 2016).
- Planning and Implementation: Improves commitment and success.
- Monitoring and Evaluation: Enhances accountability and performance (Bourne & Walker, 2006) [40].

2.5 Limitations of Joint Ventures
Common challenges in JVs include:
- Cultural Clashes: Differences in organizational culture can create friction (Brouthers & Bamford, 2006) [16].
- Governance Issues: Unclear roles can lead to delays (Hennart & Reddy, 1997) [21].
- Resource Allocation Conflicts: Disagreements over resources can impact execution.

2.6 Personal Critique of Literature Review
Successful JVs in large projects show that shared resources can improve completion rates. However, success relies on proactive management, aligning objectives, and addressing communication challenges. Case studies indicate that effective JVs can enhance community involvement and sustainability (Moriarty *et al*., 2013) [32].

2.6.1 Insights from the LWSC and CIZ Case Study
The collaboration between LWSC and CARE International improved resource allocation and stakeholder engagement, leading to better project outcomes. Trust and effective communication were key to success (Mwansa, 2020) [35].

2.6.2 Performance of Water Projects
There is no consensus on how to define project performance, which varies among authors (Otim & Alinaitwe, 2011). Generally, performance includes effectiveness, efficiency, and user satisfaction. Different measures, including completion time and stakeholder satisfaction, are essential for assessing success (Iyer, 2006).

2.6.3 Stakeholders' Involvement in Project Identification and Performance
Involving stakeholders in identifying project needs is crucial for success. Early engagement helps align objectives and enhances project outcomes (Ruwa, 2016).

2.6.4 Stakeholders' Involvement in Project Planning and Performance
Stakeholders should participate in planning to ensure their needs are met. This involvement can improve project credibility and success (Ondieki, 2016).

2.6.5 Stakeholders' Involvement in Project Implementation and Performance
Stakeholder involvement during implementation is vital for executing project plans effectively. It enhances resource coordination and project success (Nyandomo & Kongere, 2010).

2.6.6 Stakeholders' Involvement in Project Monitoring and Evaluation
Monitoring and evaluation processes benefit from stakeholder involvement, which improves accountability and project performance (Ondieki, 2016; Njogu, 2016).

2.7 Personal Critique of Literature Review
The literature on joint ventures (JVs) in water projects shows both successes and problems. Successful JVs can improve project completion by sharing resources and expertise, especially in big infrastructure like energy and transportation. However, issues like conflicts, poor communication, and cultural differences can make it hard for JVs to succeed. This means that good management and teamwork are essential.

There is also confusion about how to define and measure project success. Different authors suggest various ways to measure performance, which can lead to inconsistencies. While traditional measures like time, cost, and quality are important, factors like user satisfaction and community impact are becoming more important. Case studies, especially in low-income countries, show that JVs can help involve communities and promote sustainability. However, many JVs in Zambia struggle with aligning roles and responsibilities, highlighting the need for careful planning.

2.8 Establishment of Research Gaps
The literature on joint ventures (JVs) in water projects shows several important gaps that need more research. Identifying these gaps can help improve the understanding and effectiveness of JVs. Here are the key areas where more research is needed:

1. Long-Term Impact Studies
Most studies focus on the short-term results of JVs, but there is little research on their long-term effects on communities. Understanding these impacts over time can help improve future projects.

2. Standardized Performance Metrics
Different studies use various ways to measure JV success, leading to confusion. There is a need for standard metrics that can be used universally to assess how well JVs perform.

3. Cultural and Contextual Factors
Research often ignores how local culture and conditions affect JV success. More studies are needed to see how these factors influence joint ventures, especially in diverse and developing areas.

4. Partner Dynamics and Relationships
While trust and communication are important, there is not enough research on how partner relationships change during a project. Understanding these dynamics can help improve collaboration.

5. Stakeholder Engagement Strategies
Although involving stakeholders is crucial, there is little exploration of effective ways to engage them throughout the project. Research should focus on best practices for

involving communities and other stakeholders in all project phases.

6. Risk Management in Joint Ventures

Most literature highlights the benefits of JVs but does not address the risks involved. More studies should analyze how to manage risks in joint ventures effectively.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Overview

This chapter explains how the research will be conducted. It includes the research design, study area, target population, sampling methods, data collection tools, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design

The study uses a cross-sectional design, which means data will be collected from a specific group at one point in time. This design allows for gathering information quickly from many people. The study will use a mixed method approach, combining both quantitative (numbers) and qualitative (descriptive) data to get a better understanding of the research problem.

3.3 Target Population

The target population includes individuals and stakeholders involved in the water project in Chaisa compound, Lusaka. The study will involve 100 respondents, representing various roles and experiences in the project.

3.4 Sampling Design

Both primary and secondary data will be used. Primary data will be collected through questionnaires, interviews, and observations from Care International and the Lusaka Water and Sewage Company. Secondary data will come from books, articles, and reports. Non-probability sampling methods, such as purposive sampling, will be used to select participants.

3.5 Sample Size Determination

A sample size of 99 people will be interviewed using closed-ended questionnaires. The sample will include 50 people from local authorities and organizations, and 50 community members, ensuring both men and women are represented.

3.6 Data Collection Methods

Data will be collected using interview schedules, in-depth interviews, and observation checklists. The interview schedule will help create a comfortable atmosphere for respondents. In-depth interviews will gather detailed information from key informants, while the observation checklist will aid in collecting additional data.

3.7 Data Processing and Analysis

The collected data will be checked for errors and then coded for analysis. Statistical software (Stata version 14) will be used for quantitative data, while qualitative data will be analyzed manually. Thematic analysis will help categorize and interpret the qualitative data.

3.8 Triangulation

Triangulation involves using multiple methods to verify findings, enhancing the study's credibility. This study will combine qualitative and quantitative data to provide a well-rounded understanding of the joint venture project's effectiveness.

3.9 Reliability and Validity of Data

Reliability refers to the consistency of the data collection tools, while validity indicates how well the tools measure what they are supposed to. The research will ensure both reliability and validity by reviewing the data collection instruments with experts.

3.10 Limitations of the Study

The findings may not apply to other areas outside Lusaka. Collecting data may be challenging due to the busy schedules of respondents, and the researcher faces financial and time constraints.

3.11 Ethical Considerations

The researcher will treat all participants with respect and maintain confidentiality. Informed consent will be obtained, meaning participants will understand their role in the study and agree to participate voluntarily without any pressure.

4. Results/Findings

4.1 Presentation of results on background characteristics of the respondents

a) Gender of the respondents




Fig 4.1.1: Gender of the respondents

Fig 4.1.1 presents the gender distribution of the respondents involved in the study. The pie chart shows that 70% of the respondents are male, while the 30% are female.

b) Age range of the respondents




Fig 4.1.2: Age range of the respondents

52% of the respondents are in the 18-35 years age range, 33% are in the 36-45 years age range, and 14% are in the 46-60 years age range.

c) Which organization are you affiliated to?




Fig 4.1.3: Organization affiliation

Fig 4.1.3 presents the distribution of the respondents' affiliations with various organizations involved in the joint venture project. According to the chart, the largest proportion of respondents (42%) are affiliated with the Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC), which is the local water utility responsible for the project. The second-largest group of respondents (32%) are affiliated with CARE International, an international non-governmental organization that likely played a supporting or advisory role in the project. The remaining respondents are affiliated with a community-based organization (16%) and the local government (9%).

d) What is your role in the project




Fig 4.1.4: Role in the project

Fig 4.1.4 presents the distribution of the respondents' roles within the joint venture project. The largest proportion of respondents (38%) are in the role of "Regular worker", indicating that a significant portion of the study sample was composed of frontline staff or workers involved in the day-to-day implementation of the project. The second-largest group (27%) are "Community Liaison" personnel, who likely served as the intermediaries between the project management and the local community. The next largest roles are "Engineer/Technical Officer" (19%) and "Monitoring & Evaluation" (12%), reflecting the technical and oversight functions within the project. A smaller percentage (3%) of respondents are in the "Project Manager" role, which is the highest-level position represented in the sample.

e) Years of experience in water projects




Fig 4.1.5: Years of experience in water projects

Fig 4.1.5 shows the distribution of years of experience in water projects among the survey respondents. The data reveals the following insights: Less than 1 year: 25% of the respondents have less than 1 year of experience in water projects.1-3 years: 22% of the respondents have 1 to 3 years of experience.4-6 years: 28% of the respondents have 4 to 6 years of experience. Over 6 years: 24% of the respondents have over 6 years of experience in water projects.

4.2 Presentation of results based on a thematic area developed from objective one: To establish types of joint venture projects in project management

a) Types of problems did the project face during its implementation




Fig 4.2.1: Types of problems did the project face during its implementation

The main types of problems faced by the project during its implementation were: Inadequate community engagement (28%), limited technical expertise (22%), procurement or supply chain delays (21%), and political or regulatory interference (12%). Other issues included delays in funding disbursement (11%), conflicting roles/responsibilities between partners (3%), and poor communication between partners (2%).

b) Level of coordination between CARE International and LWSC throughout the project




Fig 4.2.2: Level of coordination between CARE International and LWSC throughout the project

Fig 4.2.2 presents the level of coordination between CARE International and LWSC (Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company) throughout the project implementation. The data shows that in 44% of cases, communication and collaboration were consistent and highly effective. 47% of cases, some coordination challenges were experienced but managed. 8% of cases, a lack of coordination significantly hindered project outcomes.

c) How clearly defined were roles and responsibilities between the partners




Fig 4.2.3: How clearly defined were roles and responsibilities between the partners

Fig 4.2.3 illustrates the level of clarity in the definition and distribution of roles and responsibilities between the project partners. The data shows that 71% of cases, the roles and responsibilities were clearly defined and evenly distributed. 6% of cases, the roles and responsibilities were clearly defined but unevenly distributed. 22% of cases, the roles and responsibilities were only partially defined, with some overlap.

d) What was the most significant challenge encountered during the implementation of the joint venture?




Fig 4.2.4: Most significant challenge encountered during the implementation of the joint venture

Fig 4.2.4 presents the most significant challenges encountered during the implementation of the joint venture project. The data shows that the most prevalent challenge was financial constraints or disagreements, which accounted for 38% of the issues faced. The second most significant challenge, at 28%, was the misalignment of goals or expectations among the partners. Differences in organizational culture, accounting for 27% of the challenges, were also a significant issue. The lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities, which affected 6% of the cases, suggests that some challenges may have stemmed from a lack of clarity around the division of tasks and responsibilities among the project partners.

4.3 Presentation of results based on a thematic area developed from objective two: To Examine the effectiveness of joint venture projecs in water project completion

a) To what extent was the project completed within the planned timeframe?




Fig 4.3.1: To what extent was the project completed within the planned timeframe

Fig 4.3.1 presents the extent to which the project was completed within the planned timeframe. The data shows that the majority of the projects, 70%, were completed on time, according to the original schedule. 17% of the projects were completed significantly behind schedule, suggesting that there were significant delays and challenges in adhering to the initial timeline. 12% of the projects were completed slightly behind schedule, by less than 3 months and only 1% of the projects were not completed as of the planned deadline.

b) To what extent was the project completed within the allocated budget




Fig 4.3.2: To what extent was the project completed within the allocated budget

The data shows that the majority of the projects, 85%, were completed within the original budget. This indicates that the project partners were able to effectively manage the financial resources and deliver the project outputs without significant cost overruns. 15% of the projects were completed slightly over budget.

c) How would you assess the overall quality of the work delivered (materials, installation, and functionality)?




Fig 4.3.3: Overall quality of the work delivered (materials, installation, and functionality)

Fig 4.3.3 presents the overall quality of the work delivered in the joint venture projects, including the materials, installation, and functionality. The data shows that the majority of the projects, 86%, were generally acceptable but with noticeably higher quality than expected. 6%, exceeded expectations in all areas. 7% of the projects did not meet expectations in several areas.

d) To what extent did the joint venture model contribute to the successful completion of the project?




Fig 4.3.4: To what extent did the joint venture model contribute to the successful completion of the project

Fig 4.3.4 shows the extent to which the joint venture model contributed to the successful completion of the project. The results indicate that: 81% of respondents reported that the joint venture model made a significant positive contribution to the project's completion. 14% of respondents stated that the joint venture model made a moderate positive contribution. Only 4% of respondents felt that the joint venture model had little to no impact on the project's completion.

4.4 Presentation of results based on a thematic area developed from objective three: To ascertain relationship between joint ventures in water project completion and project performance

a) In your view, how did the joint venture impact the Timely completion, Cost efficiency, community satisfaction and Sustainability of project performance?




Fig 4.4.1: How did the joint venture impact the Timely completion, Cost efficiency, community satisfaction and Sustainability of project performance

Fig 4.4.1 shows the impact of the joint venture model on various aspects of project performance, including timely completion, cost efficiency, community satisfaction, and sustainability. The results indicate that 74% of respondents reported a positive impact from the joint venture approach. 26% of respondents felt that the joint venture model had no impact on the project's outcomes.

b) What performance indicators were used to measure project success?




Fig 4.4.2: Performance indicators used to measure project success

Fig 4.4.2 presents the key performance indicators used to measure the success of the project. The chart shows the relative emphasis placed on three main indicators: service coverage, number of households connected, and community feedback. The results indicate that the number of households connected was the most heavily weighted performance indicator, accounting for 76% of the overall measurement. The service coverage indicator, which measures the geographical reach and availability of the services, was the second most important factor, making up 16% of the performance assessment. community feedback accounted for 8% of the performance measurement.

4.5 Presentation of results based on a thematic area developed from objective four: To identify limitations found in joint venture projects

a) Main limitations of using a joint venture model in this project




Fig 4.5.1: Main limitations of using a joint venture model in this project

Fig 4.5.1 highlights the key limitations encountered in the implementation of the joint venture model for this project. The most significant limitation, according to the data, was bureaucratic delays, which accounted for 67% of the reported issues. The second most prominent challenge was limited technical capacity, which made up 23% of the limitations. The lack of transparency was identified as the least significant limitation, accounting for only 9% of the reported issues.

b) Key lessons learned from the joint venture project that could inform and improve future collaborations




Fig 4.5.2: Key lessons learned from the joint venture project that could inform and improve future collaborations

Fig 4.5.2 highlights the key lessons learned from the joint venture project that could inform and improve future collaborative initiatives. The most significant lesson, according to the data, is the challenge of managing cultural or organizational differences, which accounted for 55% of the key learnings. The second most important factor was the value of early stakeholder engagement and alignment, making up 22% of the lessons learned. The need for stronger communication and coordination mechanisms was identified as the third most important lesson, accounting for 5% of the key learnings. The importance of clearly defined roles and responsibilities was noted, making up 17% of the key lessons.

c) How would you evaluate the overall success of the water reticulation project in Chaisa Compound?




Fig 4.5.3: How would you evaluate the overall success of the water reticulation project in Chaisa Compound

Fig 4.5.3 provides an overview of the overall success of the water reticulation project in Chaisa Compound. The data suggests a mixed performance, with varying degrees of goal achievement. The most positive outcome was that 73% of the project goals were met with only minor challenges. 24% of the project goals were either met or exceeded, suggesting that a significant portion of the community's needs were fully addressed through the water reticulation initiative. 2% of the key issues remained unresolved, even though some goals were achieved.

d) To what extent do you support the use of joint venture models in future water infrastructure projects in Lusaka?




Fig 4.5.4: To what extent do you support the use of joint venture models in future water infrastructure projects in Lusaka

Fig 4.5.4 provides insights into the perceived value of joint ventures for improving water infrastructure outcomes in Lusaka. The most notable finding is that 75% of respondents believe that joint ventures are essential for improving infrastructure outcomes. 24% of respondents believe that joint ventures can be beneficial, but only in certain cases.

4.6 Discussion of Results

4.6.1 Presentation of Results on Background Characteristics of the Respondents

a) Gender of the Respondents

The study found that 70% of respondents were male and 30% were female. This gender imbalance suggests that men had more influence in the water project, reflecting societal norms that limit women's participation. To get a better understanding of the project's effectiveness, it's important to include more female perspectives in future research.

b) Age Range of the Respondents

Most respondents (52%) were aged 18-35, while 33% were 36-45, and 14% were 46-60. This indicates that younger and middle-aged people were more involved in the project. Engaging older individuals could provide valuable insights and ensure a wider range of experiences and opinions are considered.

c) Organization Affiliation

42% of respondents worked for the Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC), and 32% were from CARE International. This shows that LWSC played a major role in the project, while community organizations and local government had less representation. Engaging these groups more could provide additional insights.

d) Role in the Project

38% of respondents were regular workers, and 27% were community liaisons. This indicates a strong focus on community engagement. However, only 3% were project managers, suggesting that higher-level decision-making perspectives might be underrepresented.

e) Years of Experience in Water Projects

25% of respondents had less than 1 year of experience, while 28% had 4-6 years. Most respondents (52%) had 4 or more years of experience, indicating a knowledgeable workforce. However, the presence of newer professionals could bring fresh ideas.

4.6.2 Discussion of Results Based on Objective One: Types of Joint Venture Projects

a) Problems Faced During Implementation

The main issues included inadequate community engagement (28%), limited technical expertise (22%), and procurement delays (21%). These problems highlight the need for better community involvement and technical skills to ensure project success.

b) Coordination Between CARE International and LWSC

44% reported effective coordination between CARE International and LWSC, while 47% faced some challenges. This indicates that while partners generally worked well together, some coordination issues still existed.

c) Clarity of Roles and Responsibilities

71% of respondents felt roles were clearly defined. However, some roles were unevenly distributed or only partially defined, which could lead to confusion and inefficiencies.

d) Most Significant Challenge

Financial constraints were the biggest challenge (38%), followed by misaligned goals (28%) and cultural differences (27%). Addressing these issues is crucial for future project success.

4.6.3 Discussion of Results Based on Objective Two: Effectiveness of Joint Venture Projects

a) Timely Completion of the Project

70% of projects were completed on time. While most met deadlines, 17% faced significant delays, indicating the need for better risk management.

b) Completion Within Budget

85% of projects stayed within budget, showing effective financial management. However, 15% went slightly over budget, highlighting the need for continuous financial oversight.

c) Quality of Work Delivered

86% of projects were of acceptable quality, with some exceeding expectations. This suggests that quality control mechanisms were effective, but there is still room for improvement.

d) Contribution of the Joint Venture Model

81% of respondents felt the joint venture model significantly contributed to project success, indicating that collaboration was beneficial.

e) Community Involvement

45% of community members were involved throughout all project stages, showing good engagement. This involvement is essential for project success.

4.6.4 Discussion of Results Based on Objective Three: Relationship Between Joint Ventures and Project Performance

a) Impact on Project Performance

74% of respondents noted a positive impact from the joint venture on timely completion, cost efficiency, and community satisfaction. This shows that collaborative approaches can enhance project outcomes.

b) Performance Indicators Used

The main performance indicators were the number of households connected (76%), service coverage (16%), and community feedback (8%). This indicates a focus on expanding access to water services.

4.6.5 Discussion of Results Based on Objective Four: Limitations of Joint Venture Projects

a) Main Limitations

Bureaucratic delays (67%) were the biggest challenge, followed by limited technical capacity (23%) and lack of transparency (9%). Addressing these issues is vital for improving future projects.

b) Key Lessons Learned

Managing cultural differences (55%) and engaging stakeholders early (22%) were crucial lessons. Improving communication and clearly defining roles can help future collaborations succeed.

c) Overall Success of the Water Project

73% of project goals were met with minor challenges, and 24% were fully achieved. Some issues remain unresolved, indicating room for improvement in future initiatives.

d) Support for Joint Ventures in Future Projects

75% of respondents support using joint ventures in future water projects, recognizing their potential to improve infrastructure outcomes. This emphasizes the importance of collaboration in overcoming challenges.

5. Recommendations

Building on these findings, several key recommendations emerge to guide the future use of joint ventures in Lusaka's water infrastructure development:

1. Proactively incorporate joint venture models into the design and implementation of upcoming water projects, capitalizing on the widespread support and recognition of their potential benefits.
2. Ensure thorough stakeholder mapping, engagement, and alignment processes when establishing joint venture partnerships, to foster a shared understanding of objectives, roles, and decision-making protocols.
3. Invest in robust communication channels and collaborative working mechanisms within joint venture teams, enabling seamless information sharing, conflict resolution, and collective problem-solving.
4. Establish rigorous monitoring and evaluation frameworks to track the performance of joint venture projects, documenting both successes and challenges to inform continuous improvements.
5. Explore opportunities to scale up and replicate effective joint venture models across different water infrastructure initiatives in Lusaka, and potentially expand to other regions, to maximize the impact and sustainability of these collaborative approaches.
6. Provide capacity-building support and training to project teams and stakeholders to enhance their understanding and skills in managing joint venture partnerships effectively.

By embracing these recommendations, policymakers, project teams, and community stakeholders in Lusaka can harness the power of joint ventures to drive more impactful, sustainable, and equitable water infrastructure development, ultimately improving access and service delivery for all.

6. Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to God for protection throughout every stage of the proposal the following individuals and organizations for their support and contribution.

Supervisor and Advisors Dr Kelvin Chibomba (PHD) Thank you for your guidance, expertise and valuable feedback throughout the development of this proposal.

Family and friends thank you for your encouragement, patience and understanding throughout this research journey.

I acknowledge the resources and facilities provided by the information communication university for enabling me to conduct this research. Your contribution has been invaluable in shaping this research proposal and looking forward to conducting this study with integrity and rigor.

7. References

1. Cox J, Fujimoto T. Collaborative Strategies for Infrastructure Development in Asia Pacific. Tokyo: Asia Pacific Press, 2020.
2. Maimbo S. Assessing the Impact of Joint Ventures on Infrastructure Projects in Zambia. Journal of Project Management. 2021; 39(4):567-579.
3. UN-Habitat. The State of Urban Water Management in Africa. Nairobi: UN-Habitat, 2018.
4. World Bank. Zambia: A Country Snapshot on Water and Sanitation. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications, 2019.
5. Bennett J. Public-Private Partnerships: Lessons from the United Kingdom. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. 2008; 22(1):1-25.
6. Bennett J, Ritchie B. The Role of Joint Ventures in Promoting Sustainable Development: Evidence from the UK and Beyond. Sustainable Development. 2001; 9(2):79-92.
7. Ridgeway R. The Challenges of Joint Ventures: Lessons from the Field. Project Management Journal. 2014; 45(2):29-41.
8. World Bank. Zambia's Urban Water Supply and Sanitation: A Review of Urban Water Sector Performance. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2016.
9. Baker S. The Effectiveness of Joint Ventures in Construction. Journal of Management in Engineering. 2015; 31(2):04014020.
10. Huang Y, Kuo C. Success Factors of Joint Ventures in Construction Projects: A Case Study of Taiwan. International Journal of Project Management. 2016; 34(6):1095-1108.
11. Ndekugri IE, Ofori G, Hamid A. Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure: A Review on the Challenges and Opportunities in the United Kingdom and Ghana. Journal of Infrastructure Systems. 2015; 21(1):04014035.
12. Zopounidis C, Doumpos M. Joint Venture Projects in the Construction Sector: Analysis of Success Factors. European Journal of Operational Research. 2017; 260(3):1006-1016.
13. Zhang X. Risk Management in Joint Venture Projects: An Empirical Study of the Role of Culture and Contracts. International Journal of Project Management. 2005; 23(2):140-151.
14. Barten L, Challenger R. Managing Joint Ventures: Anatomy of a Successful Partnership. Business Horizons, 2005.
15. Bengtsson M, Kock S. Coopetition in Business Networks-To Cooperate and Compete Simultaneously. Industrial Marketing Management. 2000; 29(5):411-426.
16. Brouthers KD, Bamford CE. The Role of Natural Culture in Shaping Cooperative and Competitive Business Strategies. Journal of Business Research. 2006; 59(4):501-505.
17. Das TK, Teng BS. A Resource-Based Theory of Strategic Alliance Formation. Strategic Management Journal. 2000; 21:297-316.
18. Deloitte. Joint Ventures in Aerospace and Defense: Perspectives on a Changing Market, 2020.

19. Glaister KW, Buckley PJ. Strategic Motives for International Alliance: A Review of Literature. International Business Review. 1996; 5(2):193-218.
20. Hennart JF. Explaining the Swollen Middle: Why Most Joint Ventures are Between Firms of Similar Size. Industrial Relations Section Working Paper, 1994.
21. Hennart JF, Reddy S. The Common Market and the Pharmaceutical Industry: An Analysis of Joint Venture in Europe. Management International Review. 1997; 37(2):183-206.
22. Inkpen AC, Beamish PW. Knowledge, Bargaining Power, and the Choice of Entry Mode. International Business Review. 1997; 6(1):1-30.
23. Kogut B. Joint Ventures: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives. Strategic Management Journal. 1988; 9(Special Issue):319-332.
24. Madhok A. Revisiting Multinational Firms' Tactics for Entry into Foreign Markets: The Importance of Trust. Asia Pacific Journal of Management. 1995; 12(3):25-49.
25. Ring PS, Van De Ven AH. Developmental Processes of Cooperative Interorganizational Relationships. Academy of Management Review. 1994; 19(1):90-118.
26. Brinkerhoff JM, Brinkerhoff DW. Public-Private Partnerships in Developing Countries: A Framework for Analysis. Journal of International Development. 2019; 31(8):1713-1732.
27. Sullivan K, Sweeney E. Joint Ventures in Project Management: Collaborating for Success. International Journal of Project Management. 2019; 29(2):325-334.
28. United Nations. The UN World Water Development Report 2020: Water and Climate Change, 2020.
29. Chan DWM, Scott DW, Lam KC. Framework of Success Criteria for Design/Build Projects. Journal of Construction Engineering and Management. 2004; 130(3):674-686.
30. Chen H, Chen T. Trust in Relationships: A Study of Joint Ventures. International Journal of Project Management. 2007; 25(3):241-250.
31. Dyer JH, Singh H. The Relational View: Cooperative Strategy and Sources of Interorganizational Competitive Advantage. Academy of Management Review. 1998; 23(4):660-679.
32. Moriarty P, Batchelor C, Tully P. The Role of Joint Ventures in Improving Water Access in Low-Income Countries. Water Policy. 2013; 15(1):121-135.
33. Müller R, Jugdev K. Joy of Success or Pain of failure? Analyzing Project Success and Project Failure. International Journal of Project Management. 2012; 30(5):514-522.
34. Murray M, Abenhaim E. Joint Ventures in Construction: Collaboration or Compromise? Construction Management and Economics. 2000; 18(2):215-225.
35. Mwansa R. Analysis of Collaborative Efforts in Water Reticulation Projects: A Case Study of Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company. Zambia Journal of Applied Sciences. 2020; 5(2):22-31.
36. Rogers PP, Pejić D. Project Success: The Role of Collaboration. Project Management Journal. 2011; 42(3):36-46.
37. Sullivan K. The Importance of Trust in Joint Ventures: The Case of the Construction Industry. Journal of Leadership Studies. 2013; 7(1):58-67.
38. Zhai L, Wang Y, Liu H. The Effect of Joint Venture on Project Performance: A Comparative Study of Construction Projects. Journal of Management in Engineering. 2017; 33(5):04017015.
39. Boon-Itt S, Tansuhaj P. The Impact of a Joint Venture on the Success of a Product Development Project: The Role of Resource Sharing. International Journal of Project Management. 2010; 28(4):237-248.
40. Bourne L, Walker DHT. Visualising Stakeholder Influence: A Study of Two Construction Projects. International Journal of Project Management. 2006; 24(3):303-312.
41. Khan MN, Azhar S. Assessment of Project Performance Using Key Performance Indicators: A Case Study of Construction Projects in Pakistan. International Journal of Project Management. 2017; 35(5):799-812.
42. Schilling MA, Kluge J. Organizational Learning and Technological Change: The Role of Knowledge and Experience. Research Policy. 2009; 38(2):277-287.
43. Zhao X, Luo Y. The Role of Joint Venture Governance in Managing Complexity in Project Development. Construction Management and Economics. 2019; 37(10):534-546.
44. Chelimo PJ. Factors Influencing the Completion of Water Projects: A Case of West Pokot County, Kenya. University of Nairobi, 2018.
45. Jayalath MS. Knowledge transfer of joint venture contractors in foreign funded water sector construction project. University of Moratuwa, 2021.
46. Cherinet D. Effectiveness of Joint Venture for Local Contractors in a Mega Project Construction. American Journal of Civil Engineering, 2020.
47. CARE International Zambia. Sustainability and Equity Review of CARE Zambia's Peri-urban Water & Sanitation Model, 2014.
48. Zambia Monitor. Lusaka's €130 million sewer upgrade to benefit 1.2 million residents, 2024.