Analysis of Dominant Factors of External Involving Stakeholders Success of a Construction Project in Aceh Province

Rinaldy[1], Zulyaden[2]

[1,2](Department of Civil Engineering, Teuku Umar University, Meulaboh West Aceh, Indonesia)

Abstract: In the execution of a task, issues or snags frequently emerge, both inside and remotely. On the off chance that this issue isn't settled as expected, it will end up being a question or a snag to the opportune culmination of the undertaking true to form by all gatherings. This review means to recognize predominant factors other than partner factors (outer partners) that are the reason for issues or questions that outcome in delays in project achievement in the execution of development projects in Aceh Area dependent on worker for hire insights. The strategy utilized in this review is a consolidated technique, to be specific subjective and quantitative strategies through the dispersion of polls. The absolute populace of project workers is 496 workers for hire, through the Slovin recipe, an example of 84 project workers is gotten. For factual investigation of the information cycle legitimacy and unwavering quality tests were completed, while for information examination was done with the assistance of Measurable Items and Administrations Arrangements (SPSS) form 22. From the consequences of examination dependent on worker for hire discernments, it was gotten that the undertaking condition factor was the principle predominant factor that frustrated venture culmination in Aceh Area.

Keywords: predominant, outer partners, frustrated venture, projects, Aceh Area

I. INTRODUCTION

Development projects are a progression of exercises that are just done once and are by and large present moment [1]. In the execution of an undertaking, all gatherings included unquestionably trust that the venture can be finished as per the normal objectives. The normal targets incorporate, among others, that the undertaking is finished on schedule, doesn't surpass the set spending plan and the quality is met [2]. This review intends to recognize prevailing components other than partner factors (outside partners) that are the reason for issues or debates that outcome in delays in project accomplishment in the execution of development projects in Aceh Area dependent on worker for hire discernments.

Development projects include associations between the principle project components (partners), including proprietors, workers for hire and experts. Association is basic for the smooth execution of an undertaking [3]. In the undertaking execution measure, these three primary components communicate with one another. Collaboration, coordination and correspondence are fundamental for make the undertaking a triumph. Hindrances in project execution will emerge if the venture destinations are not accomplished true to form. In the event that these impediments are not dealt with as expected, there will be issues or debates between components engaged with project execution. Debate is a condition that happens because of a confound between the objectives or targets to be accomplished, both inside the individual and according to others. Many components can cause questions, aside from the partner factor itself, there are likewise factors outside the partner, including agreement and particular factors, human asset factors and venture condition factors. These elements can influence work proficiency and efficiency, so it will meddle with project execution and progression. In settling debates that happen in development projects, associations/workers for hire need powerful administration to oversee questions by recognizing and dissecting the reasons for questions [4].

The ventures noticed are development projects that have been finished from 2008-2015, with the wellspring of assets coming from the Aceh Income and Use Financial plan (APBA). Respondents were addressed to all groupings of development administrations (project workers) going from halfway capabilities, specifically M1, M2, and significant capabilities, in particular B1, B2. The absolute populace of project workers is 496 workers for hire, through the Slovin equation, an example of 84 workers for hire is gotten. For factual investigation of the information cycle, legitimacy and unwavering quality tests were completed, while for information examination was done with the assistance of Measurable Items and Administrations Arrangements (SPSS) form 22.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This examination utilizes a blended technique, which is a strategy that consolidates subjective and quantitative methodologies. Subjective techniques are utilized to get respondents' discernments as words, from

the Likert scale utilized in the survey. For this situation the type of the word being referred to begins from exceptionally not persuasive, not powerful, less compelling, persuasive, and extremely powerful. Quantitative techniques are utilized to acquire the discernment figures got from the respondents. For this situation, the number being referred to is the respondent's answer score beginning from 1,2,3,4 and 5 which is then dissected to get the determined R, Cronbach Alpha, and the mean worth.

2.1. Factors Causing Disputes at the Construction Implementation Stage

Debates at the execution stage happen in case what is contained in the agreement doesn't coordinate with what is done in the field [5]. On the off chance that the debate isn't settled quickly, it can cause misfortunes and issues that will proceed later on and affect the disappointment or postponement of the progression/achievement of venture execution. The components that cause questions in development tasks can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Factors that Cause Disputes

Variable	Indicator	Source
Agreement and particular factors	Incomplete work agreements (contracts) and construction documents	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	Unclear document distribution flow	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	There are confusing terms in the contract documents	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	There are terms that can have multiple meanings in the contract document	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	There is a difference in the meaning of a contract in a foreign language with the same contract and in Indonesian	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	The occurrence of variation orders throughout the construction period, by not recording, reporting or anticipating the effects of changes in time and costs	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	The number of change orders or job changes that result in additional work	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	Double meaning in contract documents	Kissiedu (2009)
	Location conditions that are different from the description in the contract document	Kissiedu (2009)
	Differences in interpretation of specifications	Kissiedu (2009)
	Unclear scope	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)
	Unclear specifications	Shahab (2000)
	Material Criteria	Hellard (1997)
	Working method	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)
	Unclear risk allocation	Filley (1975)
	Unclear powers and responsibilities	Shahab (2000)
Human asset factors	Placement of personnel does not match their expertise	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)
	Low productivity	Shahab (2000)
	Not good quality	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	The number of workers who do not match the needs	Kissiedu (2009)
	Recruitment process and origin of labor	Hellard (1997)
Venture condition factors	Significant degree of undertaking vulnerability	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)
	Extremely intricate work	Shahab (2000)
	The undeniable degree of trouble in completing the work	Frenn, Lowe and Speek(1997)
	Hardware and material postponements	Hellard (1997)

	Low usefulness	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)
	Absence of assets	Filley (1975)
	Absence of value control systems	Shahab (2000)
	Innovative turn of events	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)
	Changes to neighborhood guidelines	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Changes in economic situations	Kissiedu (2009)
	Language issue	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)
	Work standard issue	Shahab (2000)
	Way to deal with critical thinking	Hellard (1997)
	Indistinct and inadequate depiction of exercises in Bill of Amount (BQ)	Kissiedu (2009)
	Incapable correspondence between project components	Kissiedu (2009)
	Disarray of the term quality control with quality affirmation	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	Helpless undertaking organization	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	Gear inactive time isn't powerful	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
	There is an irreconcilable situation	Filley (1975)
	There is a correspondence hindrance	Filley (1975)
	There is an old unsettled clash	Filley (1975)
	There is no normal (agreement)	Filley (1975)

2.2. Validity Test

The legitimacy test used to quantify the legitimacy or legitimacy of an instrument for this situation is a poll [6]. This legitimacy test can be detailed as follows.

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\{N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\}\{N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\}}} \quad \text{...} \quad (2.1)$$

Where:

r_{xy} = Relationship coefficient between factors X and Y;

$\sum X$ = The quantity of scores got from the tried respondents;

$\sum Y$ = The absolute score of all things of every tried respondent; and

N = Number of respondents.

The standards for assessing the legitimacy test are assuming R count > R table, the survey questions are legitimate, as well as the other way around on the off chance that R count < R table, the poll questions are substantial

2.3. Reliability Test

The instrument is supposed to be solid if the instrument can reliably deliver similar outcomes each time an estimation is made [6]. This unwavering quality test can be defined as follows.

$$r_i = \left[\frac{k}{k-1}\right]\left[1 - \frac{\sum \sigma b^2}{\sigma t^2}\right] \quad \text{..} \quad (2.2)$$

Where:

r_i = Instrument reliability;

k = Number of inquiries;

$\sum \sigma b^2$ = Number of thing variations; and

σt^2 = Total variance.

The equation for thing fluctuation and complete change is as per the following.

$$\sigma b^2 \;=\; \frac{\sum x^2 - \dfrac{\left(\sum x^2\right)}{N}}{N} \quad\text{..} \quad (2.3)$$

$$\sigma t^2 = \frac{\text{\textit{the sum of the squares of the total score}} \;-\; \dfrac{\text{\textit{the sum of the squares of the total score}}}{N}}{N} \quad\text{\textasciitilde\textasciitilde\textasciitilde}\quad (2.4)$$

Where:

$\Sigma x2$ = Number of squares of variance per item; and

N = Numerous respondents.

The standards for surveying the unwavering quality test are in the event that Cronbach Alpha > 0.6, the factors in the poll are solid, as well as the other way around assuming Cronbach Alpha < 0.6, the factors in the survey are not dependable [7].

2.3. Descriptive Analysis

Graphic examination is a measurement that serves to portray or give an outline of the item under study through example or populace information all things considered, without breaking down and making ends that apply to the public [8]. In this distinct insights, strategies for giving information ordinary tables and recurrence circulations, line and structured presentations, pie outlines, pictograms will be introduced, clarifications of gatherings through mode, middle, mean, and gathering variety through norm and deviation ranges. The mean can be planned as follows [9].

$$Me \;=\; \frac{\sum x_i}{n} \quad\text{...}\quad (2.5)$$

Where:

Me = Mean (average);

$\sum$ = Sigma (number);

Xi = Worth x to I to n; and

n = Number of respondents

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Validity Test

Legitimacy test is utilized to decide the legitimacy of an assertion thing in the poll given to the respondent. The test standards on the off chance that the determined R count > R table, the proclamation thing is substantial, something else assuming the determined R count < R table, the articulation thing is invalid. The aftereffects of the legitimacy test that have been handled through SPSS programming are introduced in Table 2.

Table 2. Validity test

No.	Variable	R_{count}	R_{table}	Information
X1	Agreement and particular factors			
1	X1.1 – X1	0,917	0,212	Valid
2	X1.2 – X1	0,901	0,212	Valid
3	X1.3 – X1	0,903	0,212	Valid
4	X1.4 – X1	0,841	0,212	Valid
5	X1.5 – X1	0,940	0,212	Valid
6	X1.6 – X1	0,772	0,212	Valid
7	X1.7 – X1	0,857	0,212	Valid
8	X1.8 – X1	0,824	0,212	Valid
9	X1.9 – X1	0,935	0,212	Valid
10	X1.10 – X1	0,919	0,212	Valid
11	X1.11 – X1	0,485	0,212	Valid
12	X1.12 – X1	0,590	0,212	Valid
13	X1.13 – X1	0,438	0,212	Valid

14	X1.14 – X1		0,944	0,212	Valid
15	X1.15 – X1		0,767	0,212	Valid
16	X1.16 – X1		0,858	0,212	Valid
X2	Human asset factors				
1	X2.1 – X2		0,892	0,212	Valid
2	X2.2 – X2		0,943	0,212	Valid
3	X2.3 – X2		0,813	0,212	Valid
4	X2.4 – X2		0,787	0,212	Valid
5	X2.5 – X2		0,883	0,212	Valid
X3	Venture conditions factors				
1	X3.1 – X3		0,882	0,212	Valid
2	X3.2 – X3		0,911	0,212	Valid
3	X3.3 – X3		0,877	0,212	Valid
4	X3.4 – X3		0,945	0,212	Valid
5	X3.5 – X3		0,749	0,212	Valid
6	X3.6 – X3		0,792	0,212	Valid
7	X3.7 – X3		0,873	0,212	Valid
8	X3.8 – X3		0,903	0,212	Valid
9	X3.9 – X3		0,877	0,212	Valid
10	X3.10 – X3		0,464	0,212	Valid
11	X3.11 – X3		0,600	0,212	Valid
12	X3.12 – X3		0,460	0,212	Valid
13	X3.13 – X3		0,861	0,212	Valid
14	X3.14 – X3		0,863	0,212	Valid
15	X3.15 – X3		0,939	0,212	Valid
16	X3.16 – X3		0,767	0,212	Valid
17	X3.17 – X3		0,794	0,212	Valid
18	X3.18 – X3		0,869	0,212	Valid
19	X3.19 – X3		0,903	0,212	Valid
20	X3.20 – X3		0,823	0,212	Valid
21	X3.21 – X3		0,789	0,212	Valid
22	X3.22 – X3		0,816	0,212	Valid

The table above shows that the entirety of the assertion things contemplated have a determined R count > R table. In this manner, the legitimacy tests completed on all assertions in the survey are altogether substantial, so it very well may be proceeded with unwavering quality testing.

3.2. Reliability Test

Dependability test is utilized to decide if a variable in the survey given to respondents is solid or not. The standards for testing this dependability test on the off chance that the Cronbach Alpha worth on a variable > 0.6, the variable is solid, and the variable isn't dependable if the Cronbach Alpha worth on the variable is < 0.6. The aftereffects of the dependability test that have been handled through SPSS programming are summed up in Table 3.

Table 3. Reliability Test

No.	Variable	Cronbach Alpha	Information
X_1	Agreement and particular factors	0,966	Reliable
X_2	Human asset factors	0,914	Reliable
X_3	Venture conditions factors	0,975	Reliable

The table above shows that all factors on the survey have Cronbach Alpha > 0.6. In this manner, the dependability tests completed on all factors are generally solid, so they can be proceeded in information examination.

3.3. Descriptive Analysis

Enlightening investigation is utilized to decide the worker for hire's view of one of the fundamental components causing struggle in the execution of development project exercises. Coming up next are the consequences of each factor which are summed up in table 4 utilizing SPSS variant 22.

Table 4. Mean Factors Causing dispute

No.	Variable	Mean	Rating
X_1	Agreement and particular factors	4,138	3
X_2	Human asset factors	4,231	2
X_3	Venture conditions factors	4,239	1

In light of the table over, the consequences of the recognizable proof of the mean worth on the variables causing the question have a mean worth with a nearby stretch.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the table of mean factors above, it tends to be seen that the consequences of the distinguishing proof of the mean on the elements causing debates between partners in the execution of development projects in Banda Aceh, have mean qualities with extremely close spans. For the agreement and particular factors, the calculation results are 4.138, the human asset factors is 4.231 and the venture condition factors is 4.239. This implies that in the execution of development projects dependent on the worker for hire's insight, one of the principle factors causing questions is the venture condition factors whichhas an extremely close distinction in esteem with human asset factors, to be specific 0.008 and the distinction in esteem is 0.101 with agreement and particular factors.

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

[1]   Ervianto, WI 2004, Teori Aplikasi Manajemen Proyek Konstruksi, Salemba Empat, Yogyakarta
[2]   Syah, M 2004, Kiat Manajer yang Sukses, Binapura Aksara, Jakarta.
[3]   Dipohusodo, 1995, Manajemen Proyek & Konstruksi Jilid 2, Kanasius, Yogyakarta.
[4]   Ock, JH dan Han, SH 2003, Lesson Learned form Rigid Conflict Resolution in an Organization: Construction Conflict Case Study, Journal of Management in Engineering, April 2003.
[5]   Susila, H., 2012, Faktor-faktor Penyebab Konflikdalam Pelaksanaan Proyek Konstruksi, Jurnal Teknik Sipildan Arsitektur, Universitas Tunas Pembangunan Surakarta, Volume 11. No. 15, Maret 2012, ISSN: 2301-668X.
[6]   Priyatno, D 2010, Teknik Mudahdan Cepat Melakukan Analisis Data Penelitiandengan SPSS dan Tanya Jawab Ujian Pendadaran, Gaya Media, Yogyakarta.
[7]   Triton, BP, 2005, SPSS 13 Terapan Riset Statistik Parametrik, Andi, Yogyakarta.
[8]   Narbuko, C dan Achmadi, A 2004, Metodelogi Penelitian, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
[9]   Sugiyono, 2015, Statistik Nonparametrisuntuk Penelitian, Alfabeta, Bandung.