

## Project-Related Failures, and Problems of Quantitativeonly Enquiry.

ARCOM Doctoral Workshop Exploring the Impacts of Quantitative Research UCL, Bartlett School of Construction and Project Management, 1-19 Torrington Place, London - 26th February 2019.

> Danstan Bwalya Chiponde, Barry Gledson And Dave Greenwood.











# **Presentation Layout**

- ■Introduction
- ☐ Problem Background
- Research Aim
- ☐ Preliminary Literature Review Findings/Discussion
  - Relevance and Adequacy of Research into Project-related Failure
  - Use and Application of Failure-related Research
  - Barriers to Research in Project-related Failures in PBOs
  - Implications for Practitioners
- ☐ Conclusions and Recommendations



# Why Project-related Failures Research?

- ☐ Failures related to Project-Based Organisations (PBOs) remain a prominent concern.
- ■Examples include;



### **CROSSRAIL**

Presently Crossrail is reported as needing additional funding of:

# £1bn

It is facing a delay from its original planned completion date of:

# 1 year

Image Credit: Association for Project Management (APM), 'Crossrail', July 6, 2018, Flickr Creative Commons Attribution. Available at:



With **Carillion** there are reports of:

£1.5bn debts

**2,782** job losses

278

Contracts transferred, to protect a further

13,945

workers against jobs losses.

Image Credit: Elliott Brown, Future site of the Library of Birmingham -Baskerville Basin dig', August 15, 2009, Flickr Creative Commons Attribution Available at: <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/j.jps.com/nr.45boznicr">https://doi.org/10.1007/j.jps.com/nr.45boznicr</a>



More than

70

People lost their lives in the **Grenfell Tower** disaster (Gerrard 2018b)

Image Credit: Guido van Nispen, 'Grenfell Tower', January 5, 2018, Flickr



|                                       | d have a huge impact on stakeholders of the built environment titioners and researchers, and that |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ☐These cases should also end failure. | courage more efforts in trying to measure, understand and mitigate                                |
|                                       |   |
|                                       |   |
|                                       |   |
|                                       |   |

## Introduction and Background

#### **Measurement of Project Failure**

- □Over time, the subject of failure has been receiving attention from the construction sector.
- ☐ Yet, no acceptable standard of measuring failure exists even after generating of several models.
- ☐ Huge reliance on the iron triangle (time, cost and quality) and each of those variables present challenges as observed by Atkinson (1999, p. 337) that;

"Time and costs are at best, only guesses, calculated at a time when least is known about the project. Quality is a phenomenon, it is an emergent property of people's divergent attitudes and beliefs, which often change over the development life-cycle of a project".

- ☐ In agreement, Pinto and Mantel (1990) concluded that quality is 'perceived'.
- ☐ Hence how can we measure what we do not know?



# How?

#### **Measurement of Project Failure**



Hence, a question that can be asked is: What type of research approach is suitable for conducting enquiries around project related failure involving PBOs?









## Research in Project-related Failures

- ☐ Most common methods involve qualitative methods and mostly in the form of case studies
- ☐ Mainly focused on developing rules, indicators and support systems for failure assessment and mitigation (Atkinson 1999; Cope 2011; Pinto & Mantel 1990).
- □Cope (2011) noted that this 'reductionist' approach eclipses other dynamic and complex matters such as the social aspects surrounding failure.
- □ Liu *et al.*, (2017) acknowledges that research focusing on failure, and learning from failure, in PBOs is particularly under examined and most research is non-empirical (Hall *et al.* 2012).
- ☐ Hence, **more dynamic and pluralistic approaches** are now being advocated for in PBO related research (Winter *et al.*, 2006; Sage *et al.*, 2014; Sydow and Braun, 2018).



## Barriers to Research in Project-related Failures in PBOs

# Related To Nature And Understanding Of Project Failure:

- □ No agreed definition of project failure failure is transient and subjective.
- ■Most research is anecdotal related.
- ☐ Cause of project failure contingent to the project life cycle stages.
- ☐ Negativity associated with failure.
- □Lack of ownership of failure and the blame game.

#### **Barriers Related To The Nature Of PBOs:**

- ☐Temporary nature of PBOs
- ☐One-off nature of projects done by PBOs
- ☐ Several organisational units and fields involved.
- □Competition Reluctant to share information
- ■Social embeddedness.
- □Longer completion time.
- ☐ Limited number of certain type of projects.



# Use and application of failure-related research

Despite such difficulties in attaining data, the results of research into project-related failures offer rich sources of lessons (Cope 2011).

- ☐ For instance; increase economic and emotional resilience (Shepherd 2003).
- ☐ However, its use remains a challenge because most research is *anecdotal based*.
- ☐ Thus, such research findings/conclusions cannot be generalized.
- ☐ This was recently noted in the debate between Flyvbjerg et al., (2002) and Love and Ahiaga-Dagbui (2018) who argued around about the issue of the generalization of results, among other concerns.
- □ Essentially the implication is that the use of research output relating to project failure in PBOs, in both research and practice, is hampered by the earlier highlighted barriers.



# Implication for Practitioners

- □ As much as **standardised measurement frameworks** for project failure are being encouraged, it must be appreciated that there are inherent limitations to doing so, due to the **varying nature**, **type and stages of projects** (Atkinson 1999; Chen 2015).
- ☐ Further, more empirical studies should be performed especially recognising variously that each organisation and 'failure' differs (Burnes *et al.*, 2003; Cannon and Edmondson, 2005).
- ☐ Balance between quantitative and qualitative research because each saves a specific purpose.
- ☐ Attention should be given to both the social and technical systems in failure-related research (Sage *et al.*, 2014).
- ☐ The construction industry changes its perception of failure as being negative and realises that there are benefits that can be derived from failure such as learning.



#### Conclusion and Recommendations

- ☐ A standardised measurement framework for project failure remains a challenge due to the varying nature, type and stages of projects (Atkinson 1999; Chen 2015).
- ☐ However, Atkinson (1999) advises that the starting point could be the **iron triangle** and then other factors could be considered being perhaps limited to not more than **15 items**.
- ☐ Mixed approach Quantitative and qualitative research because each saves a specific purpose.
- ☐ For instance, in project failure, qualitative research can produce deeper understanding and insight while more quantitative method can help with explanation of how factors are related.





# Conclusion and Recommendations

- □ Debates on appropriate construction management research methodologies have long been held (see Dainty, 2008, Raftery et al., 1997, and Wing et al., 1998) and they are still on going.
- ☐ Hence faced with a challenge of deciding on the research method to be used, as recommended by Wing *et al.*, (1998), the guiding principle should always be suggested by considering *the nature of the problem at hand.*

#### Overall;

- ☐ Researchers should engage more in empirical research relating to failure while;
- □ **Practitioners** to view failure as source of lessons (not just negative), hence to be more willing to participate (in research) and share their failure lessons.



# The End & Thank You



## References

□ Atkinson, R., 1999. Project Management Cost, Time and Quality, two Best Guesses and a Phenomenon, it is Time to Accept other Success. International Journal of Project Management, 6(3), pp. 268 - 283.

Bakker, R. M., Cambre, B., Korlaar, L. & Raab, J., 2011. Managing the project learning paradox: A set-theoretic approach toward Project Knowledge Transfer. International Journal of Project Management, Volume 29, pp. 494-503.

Cannon, D. M. & Edmondson, A. C., 2005. failing to Learn and Learning to Fail (Intelligently); How Great Organisations Put Failure to Work to Innovate and Improve. *Long Range Planning*, Volume 38, pp. 299-319.

□Chan, P. W. & Ejohwomu, O., 2018. How Does Project Management Relate to Productivity? A Systematic Review of Published Evidence, Manchester: Association for Project Management.

□Flyvbjerg, B., 2014. What You Should Know about Mega Projects and Why: An Overview. Project Management Journal, 45(2), pp. 6-19.

Koskinen, U. K., 2012 . Organizational Learning in Project-Based Comapnies: A Process Thinking Approach. *Project Management Journal*, 43(3), pp. 40-49.

□ Koskinen, K. U., 2010. Recursive view of the project-based companies' knowledge production. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 14(2), pp. 258-268.

Liu, J., Geng, L., Xia, B. & Bridge, A., 2017. Never Let a Good Crisis Go to Waste: Exploring the Effects of Psychological Distance of Project Failure on Learning Intention. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 33(4), pp. 1-7.

Sage, D., Dainty, A. & Brookes, N., 2014. A Critical Argument in Favor of Theoretical Pluralism: Project Failure and the Many and Varied Limitations of Project Management. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(4), pp. 544-555.

Shepherd, D. A., 2003. Learning From Business Failure Propositions Of Grief Recovery For The Self-Employed. *Academy Management Review*, 28(2), pp. 318-328.

Stehlik, D., 2014. Failure: The Impartial Executioner of Leaders, Followers, and Their Organizations. Journal of Practical Consulting, 5(1), pp. 41-52.

□Swan, J., Scarbrough, H. & Newell, S., 2010. Why don't (or do) organizations learn from projects? *Management Learning*, 41(3), pp. 325-344. □Wilkinson, A. & Mellahi, K., 2005. Organisational Failure: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Long Range Planning*, 38(2005), pp. 233-238.

□Winter, M., Smith, C., Morris, P. & Cicmil, S., 2006. Directions for future research in project management: The main findings of a UK government-funded research network. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24(2006), pp. 638-649.

