Analysis Of Stakeholder's Dominant Factors Restrictedsuccessful Construction Projects In Aceh Province

Rinaldy[1], Zulyaden[2]

[1,2]Department Civil Engineering, Universitas Teuku Umar, Meulaboh 23617, Indonesia.
Corresponding Author:Rinaldy

Abstract:*In project execution, issues or deterrents regularly emerge in all issue, both outer and interior. In the event that this issue isn't dealt with as expected, it will end up being an obstruction or postponement in finishing the task on schedule true to form by all gatherings. The issue between the components in question (partners) in project execution is a state of contradiction or debates that exist among people and their associations with others where the objectives or goals to be accomplished are not accomplished as expected. This review expects to recognize the predominant variables that cause issues or debates between the components in question (partners) in project execution that outcome in delays in the progression of development projects in Aceh Territory dependent on worker for hire discernments. The technique utilized in this review is a consolidated strategy, to be specific subjective and quantitative strategies through the dissemination of polls. The free factors looked into are the proprietor factor, advisor factor and worker for hire factor, while the reliant variable is project achievement/achievement. 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 (workers for hire) going from transitional capabilities, specifically M1, M2, and significant capabilities, in particular B1, B2. The absolute populace of workers for hire is 496 project workers, through the Slovin equation, an example of 84 workers for hire is acquired. For factual examination of the information interaction legitimacy and unwavering quality tests were completed, while for information investigation was done with the assistance of Measurable Items and Administrations Arrangements (SPSS) variant 22. From the aftereffects of examination dependent on worker for hire discernments, it was acquired that the proprietor factor was the primary predominant factor repressing the progression of task execution. in Aceh Territory.*

Keywords:*Issues, Construction, Barriers, Projects, Stakeholders, Succession*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the execution of an undertaking, all gatherings included absolutely trust that the task 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 financial plan and the quality is met (Syah, M 2004). Development projects are a progression of exercises that are just completed once and are by and large present moment (Ervianto, WI 2004). This review means to recognize the prevailing variables that cause issues or debates between the components in question (partners) in project execution that outcome in delays in the progression of development projects in Aceh Territory dependent on worker for hire discernments.

Association is key for the smooth execution of an undertaking (Dipohusodo, 1995). Development projects include cooperations between the primary venture components (partners), including proprietors, workers for hire and experts. In the venture execution measure, these three primary components interface with one another. Participation, coordination and correspondence are fundamental for make the venture a triumph. Boundaries in project execution will emerge if the task targets are not accomplished true to form. On the off chance that these deterrents are not dealt with as expected, there will be issues or debates between components associated with project execution. Question is a condition that happens because of a jumble between the objectives or targets to be accomplished, both inside the individual and according to others. Many components can cause questions, one of which is simply the partner factor, including the proprietor factor, advisor factor and worker for hire factor. 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 distinguishing and examining the reasons for debates (Ock, JH and Han, SH 2003).

The noticed ventures are development projects that have been finished from 2008-2015, with the wellspring of assets coming from the Aceh Income and Use Spending plan (APBA). Respondents were addressed to all characterizations of development administrations (workers for hire) going from moderate capabilities, specifically M1, M2, and fundamental capabilities, in particular B1, B2. The absolute populace of project workers is 496 workers for hire, through the Slovin recipe, an example of 84 workers for hire is gotten. For factual investigation of the information cycle legitimacy and dependability tests were completed, while for information examination utilizing various straight relapse with the assistance of Measurable Items and Administrations Arrangements (SPSS) adaptation 22.

II. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

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 (Susila, H., 2012). 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
Owner Factor	Inability to react to issues in an opportune way	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Absence of correspondence between colleagues	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Hazy systems for allowing demands for data	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Helpless administration, oversight and coordination	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Win the most minimal bidder (project worker and specialist attitude)	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Absence of solidarity	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Hesitant to really look at development for lucidity and culmination	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Inability to name a venture director	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Contrasts in translation of significance in agreement records	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
	Blunder in the estimation of the task spending plan by the proprietor	Kissiedu (2009)
	Late installment from proprietor	Kissiedu (2009)
	Ridiculous assumptions from the proprietor	Hellard (1997)
	Slow to react to issues from the proprietor	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)
	Endorsement in regards to the worth of the charge or withdrawal of the proposition or time program has not been finished, bringing about work delays	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
Consultant Factor	Failure to know his responsibilities in accordance with the contract	Hall (2002)
	Estimation error	Hall (2002)
	Slow to provide information	Hall (2002)
	Design and specification errors due to lack of coordination between civil engineers, architects, mechanical and electrical engineers	Hall (2002)
	Incomplete drawings and specifications	Hall (2002)
	Incorrect calculation of work progress	Kissiedu (2009)
	Lack of experience from consultant	Frenn, Lowe and Speek (1997)
Contractor Factor	Lack of contractor management, supervision and coordination	Carmicheal (2002)
	Work late	Carmicheal (2002)

Failure to plan and implement job changes	Carmicheal (2002)
Failure to properly understand job prices or offers	Carmicheal (2002)
Lack of understanding of the agreement in the contract	Carmicheal (2002)
Reluctance to ask for explanation	Carmicheal (2002)
Poor job scheduling	Carmicheal (2002)
Starting project implementation work, before the implementation documents (contracts) have been processed	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
Execution of work begins without a pattern of work process sequences, time programs and critical lines (time schedule)	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
Site engineer or field coordinator who does not master the whole process	Poerdiyatmono (2007)
Contractor error in estimating the cost of work	Kissiedu (2009)
The contractor does not read and understand the documents properly	Kissiedu (2009)
Poor planning from the contractor so that it cannot meet the planned schedule	Kissiedu (2009)
There is no work spirit in the team	Kissiedu (2009)
Inexperienced or inexperienced contractor	Kissiedu (2009)
Not obeying orders	Kissiedu (2009)
Misuse of materials, skilled labor and implementation methods	Kissiedu (2009)
Changes in the scope of work outside the contract	Kissiedu (2009)
Lack of experience in handling projects from contractors	Marzouk, Mesteckawi and Ibrahim (2007)

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.

$$rxy = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\{N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\}\{N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\}}}$$

Where:

rxy = 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 (Priyatno, D 2010). This unwavering quality test can be defined as follows.

$$ri = \left[\frac{k}{k-1}\right]\left[1 - \frac{\sum \sigma b^2}{\sigma t^2}\right]$$

Where:

ri = 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.

$$\sigma b^2 = \frac{\sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x^2)}{N}}{N}$$

$$\sigma t^2 = \frac{\text{the sum of the squares of the total score} - \dfrac{\text{the sum of the squares of the total score}}{N}}{N}$$

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 (Triton, BP, 2005).

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 (Narbuko, C and Achmadi, A 2004). 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 (Sugiyono, 2015).

$$Me = \frac{\sum x_i}{n}$$

Where:

Me = Mean (average);

$\sum$ = Sigma (number);

Xi = Worth x to I to n; and

n = Number of respondents

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

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	owner Factor			
1	X1.1 – X1	0,907	0,212	Valid
2	X1.2 – X1	0,889	0,212	Valid
3	X1.3 – X1	0,899	0,212	Valid
4	X1.4 – X1	0,840	0,212	Valid
5	X1.5 – X1	0,938	0,212	Valid
6	X1.6 – X1	0,740	0,212	Valid
7	X1.7 – X1	0,826	0,212	Valid
8	X1.8 – X1	0,855	0,212	Valid
9	X1.9 – X1	0,910	0,212	Valid
10	X1.10 – X1	0,919	0,212	Valid
11	X1.11 – X1	0,541	0,212	Valid
12	X1.12 – X1	0,663	0,212	Valid
13	X1.13 – X1	0,531	0,212	Valid
14	X1.14 – X1	0,849	0,212	Valid
X2	Consultant Factor			
1	X2.1 – X2	0,869	0,212	Valid
2	X2.2 – X2	0,958	0,212	Valid
3	X2.3 – X2	0,782	0,212	Valid
4	X2.4 – X2	0,791	0,212	Valid
5	X2.5 – X2	0,884	0,212	Valid
6	X2.6 – X2	0,936	0,212	Valid
7	X2.7 – X2	0,903	0,212	Valid
X3	Contractor Factor			

1	X3.1 – X3	0,903	0,212	Valid
2	X3.2 – X3	0,865	0,212	Valid
3	X3.3 – X3	0,937	0,212	Valid
4	X3.4 – X3	0,758	0,212	Valid
5	X3.5 – X3	0,810	0,212	Valid
6	X3.6 – X3	0,866	0,212	Valid
7	X3.7 – X3	0,898	0,212	Valid
8	X3.8 – X3	0,887	0,212	Valid
9	X3.9 – X3	0,495	0,212	Valid
10	X3.10 – X3	0,618	0,212	Valid
11	X3.11 – X3	0,493	0,212	Valid
12	X3.12 – X3	0,858	0,212	Valid
13	X3.13 – X3	0,847	0,212	Valid
14	X3.14 – X3	0,933	0,212	Valid
15	X3.15 – X3	0,775	0,212	Valid
16	X3.16 – X3	0,817	0,212	Valid
17	X3.17 – X3	0,867	0,212	Valid
18	X3.18 – X3	0,902	0,212	Valid
19	X3.19 – X3	0,889	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	Owner Factor	0,960	Reliable
X_2	Consultant Factor	0,949	Reliable
X_3	Contractor Factor	0,972	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	Owner Factor	4,253	1
X_2	Consultant Factor	4,252	2
X_3	Contractor Factor	4,239	3

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 owner's condition factor, the computation results are 4.253, the consultant factor is 4.252 and the contractor factor 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 owner factor which has an extremely close distinction in esteem with the consultant, to be specific 0.001 and the distinction in esteem is 0.014 with the contractor factor.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writers might want to thank every one of the people who have added to the examination until the finish of this article.

REFERENCES

[1]   Syah, M 2004, Kiat Manajer yang Sukses, Binapura Aksara, Jakarta.
[2]   Ervianto, WI 2004, Teori Aplikasi Manajemen Proyek Konstruksi, Salemba Empat, Yogyakarta
[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 Konflik dalam Pelaksanaan Proyek Konstruksi, Jurnal Teknik Sipil dan Arsitektur, Universitas Tunas Pembangunan Surakarta, Volume 11. No. 15, Maret 2012, ISSN: 2301-668X.
[6]   Priyatno, D 2010, Teknik Mudah dan Cepat Melakukan Analisis Data Penelitian dengan 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 Nonparametris untuk Penelitian, Alfabeta, Bandung.