

Otonde, Mbawi Geoffrey; Yusuf, Muchelule; Achayo, Muchelule Saada; Kenyatta, Jomo

Article

The role of project success Among Kenyan Universities: A case of Kisumu County

The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT)

Provided in Cooperation with:

North American Institute of Science and Information Technology (NAISIT), Toronto

Suggested Citation: Otonde, Mbawi Geoffrey; Yusuf, Muchelule; Achayo, Muchelule Saada; Kenyatta, Jomo (2017) : The role of project success Among Kenyan Universities: A case of Kisumu County, The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT), ISSN 1923-0273, NAISIT Publishers, Toronto, Iss. 24, pp. 17-34

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/178839>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.


If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

An official publication of The North American
Institute of Science and Information Technology

ISSN:1923-0265

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF

Management Science and Information Technology



NAISIT
PUBLISHERS ■■■

www.naisit.org

The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT)

NAISIT Publishers

Editor in Chief

J. J. Ferreira, University of Beira Interior, Portugal, Email: jjmf@ubi.pt

Associate Editors

Editor-in-Chief: João J. M. Ferreira, University of Beira interior, Portugal

Main Editors:

Fernando A. F. Ferreira, University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal and University of Memphis, USA

José M. Merigó Lindahl, University of Barcelona, Spain

Vanessa Ratten, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

Assistant Editors:

Cristina Fernandes, Polytechnic Institute of Castelo Branco, Portugal

Jess Co, University of Southern Queensland, Australia

Marjan S. Jalali, University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal

Editorial Advisory Board:

Adebimpe Lincoln, Cardiff School of Management, UK

Aharon Tziner, Netanya Academic College, Israel

Alan D. Smith, Robert Morris University, Pennsylvania, USA

Ana Maria G. Lafuente, University of Barcelona, Spain

Anastasia Mariussen, Oslo School of Management, Norway

Christian Serarols i Tarrés, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain

Cindy Millman, Business School -Birmingham City university, UK

Cristina R. Popescu Gh, University of Bucharest, Romania

Dessy Irawati, Newcastle University Business School, UK

Domingo Ribeiro, University of Valencia, Spain

Elias G. Carayannis, Schools of Business, USA

Emanuel Oliveira, Michigan Technological University, USA

Francisco Liñán, University of Seville, Spain

Harry Matlay, Birmingham City University, UK

Helen Lawton Smith, Birkbeck, University of London, UK

Irina Purcarea, Adjunct Faculty, ESC Rennes School of Business, France

Jason Choi, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, HK

João Ricardo Faria, University of Texas at El Paso, USA

Jose Vila, University of Valencia, Spain

Kiril Todorov, University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria

Louis Jacques Filion, HEC Montréal, Canada

Luca Landoli, University of Naples Federico II, Italy

Luiz Ojima Sakuda, Centro Universitário, Brazil

Mário L. Raposo, University of Beira Interior, Portugal

Marta Peris-Ortiz, Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain

Michele Akoorie, The University of Waikato, New Zealand

Pierre-André Julien, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Canada

Radwan Karabsheh, The Hashemite University, Jordan

Ricardo Chiva, Universitat Jaume I, Spain

Richard Mhlanga, National University of Science and Technology, Zimbabwe

Rodrigo Bandeira-de-Mello, Fundação Getulio Vargas – Brazil
Roel Rutten, Tilberg University - The Netherlands
Rosa Cruz, Instituto Superior de Ciências Económicas e Empresariais, Cabo Verde
Roy Thurik, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Sudhir K. Jain, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India
Susana G. Azevedo, University of Beira Interior, Portugal
Svend Hollensen, Copenhagen Business University, Denmark
Walter Frisch, University of Vienna, Austria
Zinta S. Byrne, Colorado State University, USA

Editorial Review Board

Adem Ögüt, Selçuk University Turkey, Turkey
Alexander B. Sideridis, Agricultural University of Athens, Greece
Alexei Sharpanskykh, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Ali Kara, Pennsylvania State University -York, York, USA
Angilberto Freitas, University of Grande Rio, Brazil
Arminda do Paço, University of Beira Interior, Portugal
Arto Ojala, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
Carla Marques, University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Portugal
Carla Pereira, University of Beira Interior, Portugal
Cem Tanova, Çukurova University, Turkey
Cristiano Tolfo, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brazil
Cristina S. Estevão, Polytechnic Institute of Castelo Branco, Portugal
Dario Miocevic, University of Split, Croatia
Davood Askarany, The University of Auckland Business School, New Zealand
Debra Revere, University of Washington, USA
Denise Kolesar Gormley, University of Cincinnati, Ohio, USA
Dickson K.W. Chiu, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong
Domènec Melé, University of Navarra, Spain
Dina Miragaia, University of Beira Interior, Portugal
Emerson Mainardes, FUCEPE Business School, Brazil
Eric E. Otenyo, Northern Arizona University, USA
George W. Watson, Southern Illinois University, USA
Gilnei Luiz de Moura, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Brazil
Jian An Zhong, Department of Psychology, Zhejiang University, China
Joana Carneiro Pinto, Faculty of Human Sciences, Portuguese Catholic University, Lisbon, Portugal
Joaquín Alegre, University of Valencia, Spain
Joel Thierry Rakotobe, Anisfield School of Business, New Jersey, USA
Jonathan Matusitz, University of Central Florida, Sanford, FL, USA
Kailash B. L. Srivastava, Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India
Karin Sanders, University of Twente, The Netherlands
Klaus G. Troitzsch, University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany
Kuiran Shi, Nanjing University of Technology, Nanjing, China
Liliana da Costa Faria, ISLA, Portugal
Luiz Fernando Capretz, University of Western Ontario, Canada
Lynn Godkin, College of Business, USA

Maggie Chunhui Liu, University of Winnipeg, Canada
Marcel Ausloos, University of Liège, Belgium
Marge Benham-Hutchins, Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas, USA
María Nieves Pérez-Aróstegui, University of Granada, Spain
Maria Rosita Cagnina, University of Udine, Italy
Mayumi Tabata, National Dong Hwa University, Taiwan
Micaela Pinho, Portucalense University and Lusíada University, Portugal
Paolo Renna, University of Basilicata, Italy
Paula Odete Fernandes, Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Portugal
Paulo Rupino Cunha, University of Coimbra, Portugal
Peter Loos, Saarland University, Germany
Pilar Piñero García, F. de Economía e Administración de Empresas de Vigo, Spain
Popescu N. Gheorghe, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania
Popescu Veronica Adriana, The Commercial Academy of Satu-Mare and The Bucharest University of Economic
Studies, Bucharest, Romania
Ramanjeet Singh, Institute of Management and Technology, India
Ricardo Morais, Catholic University of Portugal
Ruben Fernández Ortiz, University of Rioja, Spain
Ruppa K. Thulasiram, University of Manitoba, Canada
Soo Kim, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ, USA
Wen-Bin Chiou, National Sun Yat-Sem University, Taiwan
Willaim Lawless, Paine College, Augusta, GA, USA
Winston T.H. Koh, Singapore Management University, Singapore

The International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT)

NAISIT Publishers

Issue 24 - (Apr-Jun 2017)

Table of Contents

- 1 **TOWARDS A CONCEPTUAL CLARITY MODEL FOR INTEGRATING
CUSTOMER CROWDSOURCING AND SOCIAL CRM**
AMIN A. SHAQRAH, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia
TALAL H. NOOR , Taibah University, Saudi Arabia
- 17 **THE ROLE OF PROJECT SUCCESS AMONG KENYAN UNIVERSITIES. A CASE
OF KISUMU COUNTY**
MBAWI GEOFFREY OTONDE, University of Agriculture and Technology , Kenya
MUCHELULE YUSUF, University of Agriculture and Technology , Kenya
MUCHELULE SAADA ACHAYO, University of Agriculture and Technology , Kenya
JOMO KENYATTA , University of Agriculture and Technology , Kenya
- 35 **ROLE OF METADATA IN COUNTY GOVERNANCE PERFORMANCE: A CASE
OF COUNTY GOVERNMENTSIN KENYA**
NEYOLE MISIKO JACOB, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture at Technology,
Kenya
MUCHELULE YUSUF, Umma University , Kenya
CAROLYN MWASAA MBINYA, Umma University –Kajiado, Kenya
- 40 **RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VARIABLES AND ATTRIBUTES FOR
ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS MODEL**
TENGGU ADIL TENGGU IZHAR, Universiti Teknologi MARA , Malaysia
TORAB TORABI, La Trobe University, Australia
M. ISHAQ BHATTI, La Trobe University, Australia

This is one paper of
The International Journal of Management Science and
Information Technology (IJMSIT)
Issue 24 - (Apr-Jun 2017)

The role of project success Among Kenyan Universities. A case of Kisumu County**Mbawi Geoffrey Otonde,****Muchelule Yusuf,****Muchelule Saada Achayo****Jomo Kenyatta****University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT) Kenya.****ABSTRACT**

The main purpose of the study was to assess the factors influencing project performance among Kenyan Universities in Kisumu County. The study used Contingency Theory, Complexity Theory and Regulatory Fit Theory (RFT). The study used a combination of cross-sectional and descriptive survey. This particular study, 36 project managers and 327 employees were drawn. The study employed stratified random sampling technique in which the researcher sub-divided his population of 3 public and private universities in the region. Purposive sampling technique was used to draw a sample from population. In this study the sample consisted 30% of the target population. This study employed the use of questionnaires for project manager. A value of Cronbach alpha above 0.70 was used as a reasonable test of scale reliability. This entailed the use of mode, percentages for descriptive statistics and chi square for inferential statistics. Multiple regression models enabled the researcher to test the hypothesis stated. The study found that planning and management support have a positive and significant effect on project performance. There is also need for highly qualified personnel for the project and employees that are committed to working for the project. It is therefore imperative for project planners to define the project objectives.

Keywords: planning, management support, project performance, Universities

1.1 introduction

Performance of the project is considered as a source of concern to both public and private sector clients. Kumaraswamy (2002) remarked that project performance measurement include time, budget, safety, quality and overall client satisfaction. Thomas, Macken, Chung and Kim, (2002) defined performance measurement as monitoring and controlling of projects accordingly on a regular basis. Kuprenas (2003) stated that project performance measurement means an improvement of cost, schedule, and quality for design and construction stages. Long, Ogunlana, Quang and Lam (2004) stated that a project performance measurement is related to many indicators such as time, budget, quality, specifications and stakeholders' satisfaction.

The failure of any construction project is mainly related to the problems and failure in performance. Moreover, there are many reasons and factors which attribute to such problem. In US, Long, Ogunlana, Quang and Lam (2004), remarked that performance problems arise in large construction projects due to many reasons such as: incompetent designers/contractors, poor estimation and change management, social and technological

issues, site related issues and improper techniques and tools. Success of construction projects depends mainly on success of performance. Chan and Kumaraswamy (2002) stated that construction time is increasingly important because it often serves as a crucial benchmarking for assessing the performance of a project and the efficiency of the project organization. Cheung, Suen and Cheung (2004) identified project performance categories such as people, cost, time, quality, safety and health, environment, client satisfaction, and communication. It is obtained by Navon (2005) that a control system is an important element to identify factors affecting project effort. Pheng and Chuan (2006) obtained that human factors played an important role in determining the performance of a project. Ling (2007) obtained that the most important of practices relating to scope management are controlling the quality of the contract document, quality of response to perceived variations and extent of changes to the contract.

The high prestige and esteem that the public universities in Kenya enjoyed in the 1970s and early 1980s no longer exists, caused by a plethora of problems. Today, some public universities are seen as institutions that are nearly on the brink of collapse and almost beyond help. However, African Governments are committed to the development of university education on the premise that higher education is a most sensitive area of investment. It is politically and socially sensitive in that universities need both highly-trained people and top-quality research to formulate policies, plan programs, and implement projects that are essential to university development. As a county, Kisumu has only one university, four satellite colleges, one national polytechnic, five youth polytechnics and various ranges of private colleges. Considering that the county is home to over 968,909 persons, of whom the youth comprise over 53 percent of this, the county is trailing in providing tertiary education to this population. With Maseno University considered as the major university present in the county, university campuses such as Nairobi University has recorded low enrolment from the residents within the county. Majority of students are from schools without the county.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Studies (Abagi, 2010; Blair, 2008; Chen, 2008) have shown that the cost of university education per student in Africa is needlessly high compared to other levels of education. In many African countries, for example, a class of thirty or forty children in primary school could receive a year's schooling for the annual cost of a single student at university level (Blair, 2008). This high cost of university education in Africa has been attributed to poor project planning on the part of the institutions (Abagi, 2010). The situation is made worse by their failure to successfully implement projects (World Bank, 2006) the above challenges have not only increased wastage in higher education, but have also affected the quality and relevance of university education on the continent.

In Kenya, the annual admission was reduced to 8,028 in the 2004/05 academic year compared to about 11,000 during the previous academic year (Abagi & Okumbe, 1993; GOK, 2005). More than 50% of projects initiated by universities in Kenya are unsuccessfully implemented (World Bank, 2009), a situation if it persists it will lead to closure of many public universities, if not so, low services quality. However, the

challenge for the decade of the 1990s has been how to manage the university projects effectively in the context of fiscal constraints so that resources could be efficiently utilized on these projects to meet the missions of the universities. This research therefore sought to look into the factors that had seen the universities fail in their projects within the county. It also looked into the strategies put in place in project implementation in increasing success rates.

H₁: There is significant influence of project planning on project performance among Kenyan universities in Kisumu County.

H₂: There is significant influence of management support on project performance among Kenyan universities in Kisumu County.

Theoretical Framework

The Theory of Projects

The theory of project is provided by the transformation view on operations. In the transformation view, a project is conceptualized as transformations of inputs to outputs. There are a number of principles, by means of which a project is managed. These principles suggest, for example, decomposing the total transformation hierarchically into smaller transformations, tasks, and minimizing the cost of each task independently (Shenhar, 2003).

Understanding of management is based on three theories management-as-planning, the dispatching model and the thermostat model. In management-as-planning, management at the operations level is seen to consist of the creation, revision and implementation of plans. This approach to management views a strong causal connection between the actions of management and outcomes of the organization. The dispatching model assumes that planned tasks can be executed by a notification of the start of the task to the executor. The thermostat model is the cybernetic model of management control that consists of the following elements: there is a standard of performance; performance is measured at the output; the possible variance between the standard and the measured value is used for correcting the process so that the standard can be reached (Lenard, 1998).

This underlying theoretical foundation of project management has been evaluated through four sources of evidence the plausibility and consistency of the theory in itself; empirical validity; competing theories; and alternative methods based on competing theories (Koskela & Howell, 2002). The evidences from these four sources turn out to be strikingly consonant, indicating that the underlying theoretical foundation of project management is deficient.

Regarding the theory of project, the partial models of operations as flow and value generation add the consideration of time, variability and customer to the conceptualization provided by the transformation model (Koskela, 2000). Similarly, the

theoretical foundation of management has to be extended. Regarding planning, the approach of management-as-organizing adds the idea of human activity as inherently situated (Johnston & Brennan, 1996).

Thus, planning should also focus on structuring the environment to contribute to purposeful acting. Concerning managerial execution, the language/action perspective, originated by Winograd and Flores (1986), conceptualizes two-way communication and commitment, instead of the mere one-way communication of the classical communication theory. The scientific experimentation model of control of Shewhart (Shewhart & Deming, 1939) focuses on finding causes of deviations and acting on those causes, instead of only changing the performance level for achieving a predetermined goal in case of a deviation. The scientific experimentation model adds thus the aspect of learning to control.

Review of variables

Project Planning and Project Performance in Universities.

The need for planning in project development and delivery is crucial because of the complex nature of resources, processes, activities and parties that are involved. Naoum *et al.* (2004) describe planning as one of the key tools that stakeholders use to ensure that construction projects are successful hence high performance. The primary measure of construction planning effectiveness in a study conducted by Faniran, Oluwoye, and Lenard (1994) is the ability of a construction firm to achieve its clients' time, cost and quality objectives.

In another study, Faniran, Oluwoye, and Lenard (1998) maintain that in construction projects the objective of planning is the completion of a prescribed amount of work within a fixed time, at a previously estimated cost and to specified standards of quality. Project plans are derived from and prepared to achieve project objectives. Although project objectives are not limited to project delivery time, cost and quality, since these are the primary objectives of a project and also the primary measures of project performance, the assertions by Faniran *et al.* (1998) are correct. In other words, the measures of the effectiveness of project planning and the measures of the performance of the project itself are the same. Therefore the planning of a successful project can be regarded as effective while that of a failed project can be described as ineffective.

Project planning is a process that is continuous throughout the delivery of a project. For this reason, project planning can be classified according to project delivery stage. Faniran *et al.* (1998) classify project planning into pre-construction and construction planning. These two categories of planning can otherwise be referred to as pre-contract and contract planning. Based on project stages, project planning can again be classified into conception, design, tendering and construction planning and even planning to close the delivery of a project. These various stages are carried out by professionals or parties in-house or outsourced engaged and paid by clients. The level of planning done in the development and delivery of a project will to a considerable extent depend on the

professionals involved. Variation in the level of project planning between public and private sector projects will therefore be as a result of differences in the professionals engaged or project plans prepared during project delivery. This understanding prompts the evaluation of the levels of project planning in public and private sector projects and its impact on project performance (Josephson, 2007).

Ling (2004) asserts that in project planning, project objectives are first defined; thereafter the strategies to achieve them are formulated and presented as project plans and these are used in evaluating the achievement of the objectives. Project planning can therefore be regarded as the process of defining project objectives, determining the framework, methods, strategies, tactics, targets and deadlines to achieve the objectives and the techniques of communicating them to project stakeholders.

The process of project planning requires that clients' expectations and available resources be defined first, matched to set project objectives, so that available options are identified and evaluated and the most appropriate frameworks, strategies and tactics to achieve the objectives are selected. It ends with communicating the objectives and the frameworks, methods, strategies, targets/deadlines to achieve them to people, parties and organizations concerned with their implementation, monitoring and control. The end products of project planning are numerous project plans that represent defined strategies to achieve defined project objectives thus high project performance (Chan, 2002).

These plans communicate both project objectives and the strategies for achieving them, and they are the basis for determining the achievement of project objectives that otherwise refer to the success and high performance of a project. While planning is a process that requires effort, plans are the results of the process and the efforts put in. Planning that does not produce a plan can therefore be regarded as an effort without result. Planning efforts can be in the form of design, tendering and programming and the results are design documents, tender plans, charts, schedules and programs of resources and works to be carried out (Michele, 2007).

Each of the plans serves a specific purpose that has to do with achievement of specific project objectives. For this reason, project sponsors are often encouraged to ensure that many of these plans are prepared during project development by engaging professionals who are qualified to prepare them. However, while the preparation of these plans is expected to enhance the success of a project, it may also prolong its delivery time (Bowen, 2007).

Sommerville, Craig, and McCarney (2004) described the documentation of information which invariably refers to planning as a key enabler to the running of any project, and identified inadequate documentation as one of the causes of conflicts. Pheng and Ting (1998) remarked that while every effort has to be made to ensure that all aspects of the design are discussed and reviewed, the time spent on the development of design should not be too long to the extent of affecting the overall construction time and the achievement of the client's desired financial objectives. In a study of factors influencing design development time of commercial properties in Singapore, the researchers

discovered that the larger the design team, the longer it takes to complete design development. The preceding stage of project implementation or production involves the implementation of the plans prepared. The effectiveness of the plans is measured by project success Ling (2004). The preparation of project plans is used in this study for the measurement of the level of project planning.

Faniran *et al.* (1998) described project planning as the process of determining appropriate strategies for the achievement of predefined project objectives. They classified project planning into preconstruction and construction planning. Preconstruction planning is regarded as pre-contract planning which refers to the planning done during the conception, design and tendering stages of a project while construction planning often refers to contract planning which describes the planning done during the construction of a project thus high performance.

In another classification of project planning, Dvir, Raz and Shenhar (2003) identified three levels of project planning, namely: the end-user level where planning focuses mainly on the functional characteristics of the project end-product, the project deliverables that are needed to support the functional requirements, and the project management level that focuses on planning the activities and processes that need to be carried out to ensure that the technical work proceed effectively. These three levels of planning can otherwise be regarded as project conception planning, project design planning and contract planning. What is understood from the review above is that different forms of planning are carried out in each of the five stages namely: conception, design, tendering, construction and closeout (Puthamont & Charoenngam, 2004) in a project and project planning can be categorized by the stage at which it is done.

2.4.2 Management Support and Project Performance in Universities

With a strongly increasing share of companies' spending for project-organized undertakings, the generally expected advantage in controllability for single projects comes along with a loss of transparency and hence effectiveness of the overall project landscape (Elonen & Artto, 2003). Thus, a structured and proactive management of the project landscape gets increasingly important in order to promote high project performance. Good project management is becoming a key competence for companies handling numerous projects simultaneously (Killen, Hunt & Kleinschmidt, 2008; Martinsuo & Lehtonen, 2007). A project portfolio is seen as a group of projects that compete for scarce resources and are conducted under the sponsorship or management of a particular organization (Dye & Pennypacker, 2002).

Existing approaches focus on describing what project portfolio management comprises, or should comprise. They address the processes, tasks, tools and instruments of PPM. This is of course a necessary clarification, but is by far not sufficient. Without analyzing who is responsible for the newly arising issues and how the key actors should cooperate and cope with their tensions, project portfolio management can neither be understood nor be implemented successfully (Cooper, Edgett & Kleinschmidt, 2001).

Although literature recognizes the elements that should constitute portfolio success (Elonen & Artto, 2003), it remains difficult to capture the overall management system outcomes. That might be because project portfolios are dynamic, multiply interdependent systems that constantly change and develop. Hence, there is a need for a comprehensive success framework that is capable to cover the system as a whole and additionally takes into consideration that changes made within a management system will take some time to have an effect and success is realized at different points in time (Jonas Kock & Gemuenden, 2010). Beyond that, for a firm's long-term success, solely financial measures to evaluate corporate success are insufficient (Shenhar, Dvir, Levy & Maltz, 2001). This has led to the development of multi-dimensional success measurement models, such as The Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan and Norton, 1996) and sophisticated success dimensions (Dvir & Shenhar, 1992).

In project management literature it has also been suggested that project portfolio success should also be examined multi-dimensionally on the single project, portfolio, and corporate level (Blomquist & Müller, 2006; Müller, Martinsuo & Blomquist, 2008). Furthermore, system evaluation models often look at inputs, processes, and outcomes (Bou-Llusar, Escrig-Tena, Roca-Puig & Beltran-Martin, 2009; Chang & Leu, 2006; Cohen & Bailey, 1997). The argument goes that it is not sufficient to assess end results only, but it is also necessary to consider how good processes are managed.

Finally, derived from Shenhar's *et al.* (2001) notion regarding the project success dimensions of business success and preparing for the future' and according to (Richard, Devinney, Yip & Johnson, 2009), I propose to distinguish the outcome measures between portfolio success and corporate success (Dammer, 2008; Gemünden & Lettl, 2006). This construct comprises three complementary constructs: information quality, allocation quality, and cooperation quality. Although these qualities are distinct, it is argued that they are closely related, and that their complementarities are essential for success. Information quality refers to the transparency that is achieved over the whole scope of projects of a certain project portfolio (Elonen & Artto, 2003), and is understood as multidimensional, using multiple criteria, such as: relevance, understandability, accuracy, conciseness, completeness, understandability, currency, timeliness, and usability of information (Dammer, 2008; Petter, Delone & McLean, 2008).

Allocation quality refers to an effective and efficient distribution of human resources among the portfolio (Fricke & Shenhar, 2000). Thereby the quality of resource allocation also depends on the quality of information available and the company's capability to process information (Jacob & Kwak, 2003). Cooperation quality refers to the interplay between different management roles typically involved during a project portfolio management process cycle. It particularly focuses on the quality of cross-project cooperation (Yuan, Zhang, Chen, Vogel & Chu, 2009) in terms of mutual assistance of different project teams and conflict solving between project managers.

In practice, managerial tasks that are executed by the management seem to be inextricably interwoven with their management role attributes such as clarity, significance or competence (Dammer, 2008). For portfolio managers there are several

standards from diverse project management institutions which suggest a broad range of crucial tasks divided into groups of multiple phases. The recent literature on portfolio management theory in contrast analyzes critical success factors predominantly separately or by modeling certain aspects and their relationship with success (Killen *et al.*, 2008; Martinsuo & Lehtonen, 2007; Payne & Turner, 1999; Sanchez, Robert, Pellerin, 2008; Soderlund, 2004).

Previous studies Faridi and El-Sayegh (2006), Iyer and Jha (2005), Navon (2005), Love, Tse, and Edwards (2005) and Ugwa and Haupt (2007) have addressed factors affecting project performance. The findings from previous studies have only concentrated on desk review of how project planning affect performance of organization, those studies however, have not shown effect of project planning on project firms performance. Most of the studies in the literature review have used descriptive statistics and no inferences were done. Moreover, no hypothesis were tested and sample most of the sample and target population were small. In addition, these studies have given little attention to performance of universities in Kenya giving a dearth gap in the existing literature, this study will address the above gap by addressing effect of project planning, management support, human capital communication monitoring, evaluation and control on project performance. The recent literature above has not identified the link between project planning, managerial support, human resources and monitoring and evaluation and project performance. In addition, only few studies have been conducted in Africa particularly in Kenya creating a dearth gap in existing literature. Only few studies include a broader range of tasks instead of focusing on certain activities in depth. The literature above is not sufficient to link project planning, management support, human and procurement performance in among Kenyan universities in Kisumu County.

Material and methods

The study used a combination of cross-sectional and descriptive survey. This study targeted 12 project managers and 97 employees drawn from three universities in Kisumu County (University HR database, 2015). The accessible population constituted project managers and employees working in that project. The sample size for the study will be 85 participants to whom questionnaires will be provided. The items in the questionnaires and interview schedule were availed to the supervisors to rate the ability of each item and its relevancy to the study. Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was then computed to determine how items in the instrument correlated. The study collected both quantitative and qualitative data therefore descriptive and inferential statistics was used to analyze the data.

Results and discussions

Table 1 presents the results on project performance. As evidenced in the table, 45.5% (30) of the respondents agreed that most of the project initiated are of good quality (mean = 4.15, SD = 0.73). Similarly, 56.1% (37) of the respondents agreed somewhat that they are able to minimize cost (mean = 3.89, SD = 0.9). Besides, 42.4% (28) of the respondents agreed somewhat that there has been improvement in service delivery in the

community (mean = 3.86, SD = 1.04). Also, 54.5% (36) of the respondents agreed somewhat that their project is achieving the expected targets (mean = 3.82). Finally, 53% (35) of the respondents agreed somewhat that most of their project are completed with the given timeline (mean = 3.67, SD = 1.06). In general, performance had a mean of 3.88 and a standard deviation of 0.52. This is related to Blomquist & Müller (2006) determinant of project performance in firms, made use of a set of questions to measure the extent an organization uses program and portfolio management techniques and tools. Dammer, (2008) in his study asserts that organizations are very aware of just how critical effective communications is to the success of strategic projects and, ultimately, organizational success. This suggests that the majority of organizations have opportunities to identify problem areas and chart a course to improve the effectiveness of their project communications.

Table 1: Project Performance

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Most of our project are completed with the given timeline	3.67	1.06
We are able to minimize cost	3.89	0.9
Our project are achieving the expected targets	3.82	0.96
Most of the project initiated are of good quality	4.15	0.73
There has been improvement in services delivery in the community.	3.86	1.04
Performance	3.88	0.52

Project Planning

The study sought to determine the effect of project planning on project performance in universities. The findings are illustrated in table 2. As evidenced in the table, 57.6% (38) of the respondents strongly agreed that they develop preliminary budgets and cost estimates (mean = 4.29, SD = 0.94). Further, 63.6% (42) of the respondents agreed somewhat that they conduct market research (mean = 4, SD = 0.78). Also, 51.5% (34) of the respondents agreed somewhat that procurement planning helps to determine if expectations are realistic (mean = 3.88). As well, 47% (31) of the respondents agreed somewhat that they plan their procurement plan so that they are able to decide what to buy, when and from what sources (mean = 3.86). Finally, 42.4% (28) of the respondents agreed somewhat that they involve all stakeholders in the processes in order to discuss particular procurement requirements (mean = 3.68, SD = 0.88). Project planning summed up to a mean of 4.05 and standard deviation of 0.36. Concurrently, Naoum, Fong, and Walker (2004) echoes that project planning is a key tool that is utilized by stakeholders in order to realize the success of construction projects.

Table 2: Project Planning

	Mean	Std. Deviation
We plan our procurement plan so that we are able to decide what to buy, when and from what sources.	3.86	0.94
Our procurement planning helps to determine if expectations are realistic	3.88	0.97
We involved all stakeholders in the processes in order to discuss particular procurement requirements.	3.68	0.88
We develop preliminary budgets and cost estimates	4.29	0.94
We conduct market research and/or a pre-solicitation conference	4	0.78
We develop preliminary budgets and cost estimates	3.83	0.9
Planning	4.05	0.36

Management Support

The researcher also sought to establish the effect of management support on project performance in universities. The results of the study are as presented in table 4.8. From the study, 63.6% (42) of the respondents agreed somewhat that the university management provides them with all the resources they need to complete the management (mean = 3.86, SD = 0.93). In the same way, 54.5% (36) of the respondents agreed somewhat that the university top management shows a lot of interest and concern with the project (mean = 3.77). Also, 78.8% (52) of the respondents agreed somewhat that they are highly motivated by the university management (mean = 3.71, SD = 0.8). Finally, 47% (31) of the respondents agreed somewhat that the university management ensures that are adequately provided with funds (mean = 3.58, SD = 1.02). Generally, management support summed up to a mean of 3.73 and standard deviation of 0.65. From the foregoing findings, it is evident that management support is key if high project performance is to be realized. Particularly, good project management is highly considered by companies handling a number of projects simultaneously since this attribute leads to the success of a project (Killen *et al.*, 2008; Martinsuo & Lehtonen, 2007).

Table 3 Management Support for project

	Mean	Std. Deviation
The university management ensure we are adequately provided with funds	3.58	1.02
The university top management show a lot of interest and concern with the project	3.77	0.96
We are highly motivated by the university management	3.71	0.8
The university management provide us with all the resources we need to complete the management	3.86	0.93
Management support	3.73	0.65

Hypothesis testing

Pearson Correlations results in table 4 showed that Management support was the second component that was positively related with project performance ($r = 0.674$, $p < 0.01$). Planning was positively associated with project performance as shown by $r = 0.569$, $p < 0.01$. Findings provided enough evidence to suggest that there was linear relationship between planning and management support with project performance. Table 4 illustrates the model summary of multiple regression model, the results showed that the five predictors (planning and management support) explained 63.6 percent variation of project performance. This showed that considering the five study independent variables, there is a probability of predicting project performance by 63.6% ($R^2 = 0.636$). Study findings in ANOVA table 4 indicated that the above discussed coefficient of

determination was significant as evidence of F ratio of 21.003 with p value $0.000 < 0.05$ (level of significance). Thus, the model was fit to predict project performance using, planning and management support.

The results of multiple regressions, as presented in table 4 revealed that planning has a positive and significant effect on project performance with a beta value of $\beta_1 = 0.352$ (p-value = 0.001 which is less than $\alpha = 0.05$). Therefore, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and it is accepted that for each unit increase in planning, there is 0.352 unit increase in project performance. Also, the effect of planning was stated by the t-test value = 3.45 which implies that the standard error associated with the parameter is less than the effect of the parameter. The findings of the study are also in line with Chan, (2002) who echoes that project planning represents defined strategies to achieve defined project objectives thus high project performance. As well, Sommerville, Craig and McCarney, (2004) describes project planning as a key enabler to the running of any project. However, (Bowen, 2007) is of the opinion that though project planning enhances the success of a project, it at times prolongs its delivery time leading to poor implementation of the project.

Furthermore, the results of table 4 showed that the standardized coefficient beta and p value of management support was positive and significant (beta = 0.258, $p < 0.05$). Thus, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and it is accepted that, management support has a positive and significant effect on project performance. Thus, for each unit increase in management support, there is 0.258 unit increase in project performance. The effect of management support is shown by the t-test value of 2.222 which implies that the effect of management support surpasses that of the error by over 2 times. Also, the effective and efficient distribution of human resources in undertaking a project enhances the chances of the project succeeding (Fricke & Shenhar, 2000). Besides, mutual assistance of different project teams and conflict resolving between project managers heightens the success of a project (Yuan, Zhang, Chen, Vogel & Chu, 2009).

Table 4.14: Coefficient of Estimate

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics		correlations zero-order
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF	
(Constant)	-0.26	0.565		-0.461	0.646			
Planning	0.507	0.147	0.352	3.45	0.001	0.582	1.718	.569**
management support	0.218	0.098	0.258	2.222	0.03	0.451	2.217	.674**
R2	0.636							
Adjusted R2	0.606							
F	21.00							
Sig.	.000							

Dependent Variable: project performance

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study has established that project planning plays a key role in the success of a project. Since project planning is integral in every organization and pervades at all levels, It is therefore imperative for project planners to define the project objectives they intend to accomplish and the strategies to be employed so as to achieve the said objectives. Besides, management support needs to be enhanced. Therefore, it is utmost necessary to have mutual assistance of different project teams and conflict resolving between project managers. There is also need for the university management to provide all the resources needed to complete the project. Also, a lot of interest and concern with the project needs to be emphasized.

REFERENCES

- Abagi, J.O. (2010). *Revitalising University Education in Africa: Addressing what is and what is not the issue.* In Press
- Adams, J., Khan, H. T., Raeside, R., & White, D. (2007). *Research methods for graduate business and social science students*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Anglim, J. (2007). Modelling skill acquisition in. acquired brain injury. *Australian Psychologist*, 42(1), 39-48.
- Baker, T.L. (1994), *Doing Social Research* (2nd Edn.), New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Blair, R.D. (2008). *Financial Diversification and Income Generation at African Universities*. Geneva: W. B.
- Blomquist, T., & Müller, R. (2006). Practices, Roles, and Responsibilities of Middle Managers in Program and Portfolio Management. *Project Management Journal*, 37(2), 52–66.
- Bou-Llusar, J.C., Escrig-Tena, A.B., Roca-Puig, V. & Beltran-Martin, I., (2009). An empirical assessment of the EFQM excellence model: evaluation as a TQM framework relative to the MBNQA model. *Journal of Operations Management* 27(1), 1–22.
- Bourne, L., & Walker, D. H. T. (2006). Visualizing stakeholder influence- two Australian examples. *Project Management Institute*, 37, 5-21.
- Bowen, D. E. & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-Firm Performance Linkages: The Role of the Strength of the HRM System. *Academy of Management Review*,
- Carrillo, P.M. Kamara, J.M., & Anumba, C.J. (2005). *Knowledge Management in Construction: Cross-project Knowledge Management*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Chan, D. w. m. & Kumaraswamy, M. M., (2002), Compressing construction durations: lessons learned from Hong Kong building projects, *International Journal of Project Management*, 20, 23–35.
- Chan, S.H. (2013). The roles of user motivation to perform a task and decision support system (DSS) effectiveness and efficiency in DSS use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(1), 217–228.
- Chang, A.S., & Leu, S.-S., (2006). Data mining model for identifying project profitability variables. *International Journal of Project Management* 24(3), 199–206.

- Chao, R.O. & Kavadias, S., (2008). A theoretical framework for managing the new product development portfolio: when and how to use strategic buckets. *Management Science*, 54(5), 907–921.
- Chen, C. H. (2008). Why do teachers not practice what they believe regarding technology integration? *The Journal of Educational Research*, 102(1), 65-75.
- Cheung S.I, Suen H C.H. & Cheung K K.W., (2004), PPMS: a Web-based construction *Product Innovation Management*, 16(4), 333–351.
- Cooper, R.G., Edgett, S.J., & Kleinschmidt, E.J., (2001). *Portfolio Management for New Products*. Cambridge, MA.: Perseus Pub.
- Craig, R. (2004). *Meta-evaluation of goal achievement in CARE projects* (DOC). Atlanta: CARE.
- Crawford, L., Cooke-Davies, T., Hobbs, B., Labuschagne, L., Remington, K. & Chen, P., (2008). Governance and support in the sponsoring of projects and programs. *Project Management Journal*, 39(S1), 43–55.
- Dammer, H., (2008). *Multi-project management*. Gabler, Wiesbaden: GWV Fachverlage.
- Dammer, H., Gemünden, H.G., & Lettl, C., (2006). Qualitäts dimensionen Des Multiprojekt-Managements. Eine Konzeptionelle Analyse. *Zeitschrift für Führung und Organisation* 75, 148–155.
- Faniran, O.O., Oluwoye, J.O. and Lenard, D. (1994) ‘Effective construction planning’, *Construction Management and Economics*, 12(6), 485-499.
- Faniran, O.O., Oluwoye, J.O. & Lenard, D. (1998). Interactions between construction planning and influence factors, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 124(4), 245-256.
- Federal Government of Nigeria, (2009). *Appropriation acts of the Federal Republic of Nigeria from 2000-2008*, Lagos: Federal Government Press.
- Fricke, S. E., & Shenhar, A. J. (2000). Managing Multiple Engineering Projects in a Manufacturing Support Environment. *IEEE transaction of Engineering Management*, 47(2), 258–268.
- Johnston, R.B. & Brennan, M. (1996). Planning or Organizing: the Implications of Theories of Activity for Management of Operations. *Omega, Int. J. Mgmt. Sc.*, 24(4), 367-384.
- Jonas, D., Kock, A., & Gemuenden, H.G., (2010). *The impact of portfolio management quality on project portfolio success*. Paper presented at EURAM 2010, Rom, Italy.
- Josephson, P.E. & Lindstrom, J. (2007). Measuring performance in construction projects. In R. Milford and T.O. Haupt (eds). *Construction for Development: Proceedings of CIB 2007 World Building Congress*. Cape Town, ZA, South Africa, 14–18 May. Rotterdam: International Council of Building Research (CIB).
- Jwan, J. & Ong’ondo, C. (2011). *Qualitative Research: An Introduction to Principles and Techniques*. Eldoret: Moi University Press.
- Kaplan, R.S., & Norton, D.P., (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. (2nd ed.). Holt: Rinehart and Winston.

- Killen, C.P., Hunt, R.A., & Kleinschmidt, E.J., (2008). Project portfolio management for product innovation. *The International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, 25 (1), 24–38.
- Koskela, L. (2000). *An exploration towards a production theory and its application to construction*. Espoo, VTT Building Technology. 296 p. *VTT Publications*; 408. Retrieved from <http://www.inf.vtt.fi/pdf/publications/2000/P408.pdf>
- Koskela, L. & Howell, G. (2002a). *The underlying theory of project management is obsolete*. Paper to be presented at the PMI Research Conference, August 2002, Seattle.
- Koskela, L. & Howell, G. A. (2002b). *The theory of project management -problem and opportunity*. Working paper. VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland and Lean Construction Institute.
- Kothari, C. R., (2009). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (Paperback). New Delhi: New Age International Pvt Ltd Publishers.
- Kothari, C.R. (2007). *Quantitative techniques*. New Delhi: UBS Publishers LTD.
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology and Techniques*. (2nd ed.).n New Delhi: new age international (p) limited publisher.
- Kotler, P. (2000). *Administracao de Marketing* (10th edition), London: Prentice Hall Publishers.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610 .
- Kumaraswamy, M.M., & Chan, D.W. M. (2002), Compressing construction durations: lessons learned from Hong Kong building projects, *International Journal of Project Management*, 20, 23–35.
- Kuprenas, J. A., (2003). Project management actions to improve design phase cost performance, *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 19(1), 25-32.
- Lehtonen, T. W., (2001). Performance measurement in construction logistics, *International Journal of Production Economics*, 69, 107-116.
- Leonard, D., (1998). The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation, *California Management Review*, 40(3), 112-132.
- Ling, F. Yean, Y., Low, S.P., Wang, S.Q. & Lim, H.H., (2007). Key project management practices affecting Singaporean firms' project performance in China, *International Journal of Project Management*.
- Ling, F.Y.Y. (2004). Key determinants of performance of DBB projects in Singapore', *Building Research and Information*, 32(2), 128-139.
- Ling, F.Y.Y. & Chan, S.L. (2002). *Performance evaluation of alternative project procurement methods. Research brief*. Singapore: National University of Singapore.
- Ling, F.Y.Y., Chan, S.L., Chong, E. & El, P. (2004). Predicting performance of design-build and design-bid-build projects, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 130(1), 10-20.
- Long, N.D., Ogunlana, S., Quang, T. & Lam, K.C., (2004). large construction projects in developing countries: a case study from Vietnam, *International Journal of Project Management*, 22, 553–561.

- Love, P.E.D., Tse, R.Y.C. & Edwards, D. J. (2005). Time-cost relationships in Australian building construction projects, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 131(2), 187–194.
- Marjolein, C., Janita, A. & Vos, F.J. (2008). Investigating the use of the stakeholder notion in project management literature: a meta-analysis, *International Journal of Project Management*, 26(3), 749-757.
- Martinsuo, M., & Lehtonen, P., (2007). Role of single-project management in achieving portfolio management efficiency. *International Journal of Project Management* 25(1), 56–64.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in Education. A Conceptual Introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Merton, R.K., (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*, NY: The Free Press.
- Michell, K., Bowen, P., Cattell, K., Edward, P. and Pearl, R. (2007). *Stakeholder perceptions of contractor time, cost and quality management on building projects*, in proceeding of the CIB World Building Conference on Construction for Development, Cape Town, 14-18 May, 231-240.
- Milton, J.S., & Arnold, J.C. (2003). *Introduction to Probability and Statistics: Principles and Applications for Engineering and the Computing Sciences*, 4e. N.Y: McGraw-Hill.
- Mugenda, O.M & Mugenda. A.G. (1999). *Research methods. Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Nairobi: ACTS Press.
- Müller, R., Martinsuo, M., & Blomquist, T. (2008). Project Portfolio Control and Portfolio Management Performance in Different Contexts, *Project Management Journal*, 39(3), 28-42.
- Naoum, S., Fong, D. & Walker, G. (2004). *Critical success factors in project management*, in proceedings of International Symposium on Globalization and Construction, Thailand, 17-19 September.
- Naoum, S.G. (1999). *An investigation into the performance of management contracts and the traditional method of building procurement*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Brunel: Brunel University.
- Navon, R. (2005). Automated project performance control of construction projects, *Automation in Construction*, 14, 467– 476.
- Neto, J.B., Mourao, Y.R., Ferreira de Freitas, A.A. & Aves, T.L. (2007). *A method to evaluate and manage client requirements in housing projects*, in proceedings of the CIB World Building Conference on Construction for Development, Cape Town, 14-18 May, 310-321.
- Ngechu, M. (2004), *Understanding the research process and methods. An introduction to research methods*. Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Nsubuga, E. H. K. (2000). *The teacher as a professional*. Kampala: MK Publishers
- Nubi, T.O. (2001). Comparative study of construction industries in Nigeria and Egypt', *Construction*, 18(1), 18-33.
- O'Leary, Z. (2009). *The Essential Guide to Doing Your Research Project*. London: Sage
- Okumbe, J.A. & Abagi, O. (1993). *Financing of Education in Kenya*, UNDP/Government of Kenya Project – 1993 UNDP/ Government of Kenya Project
- Okun, B.O. (2009). *The impact of time-overrun on the final cost of Federal Government projects*, Unpublished MSc thesis, Lagos: University of Lagos.

- Oso W.Y, & Onen D (.005). *A General Guide to Writing Research Proposal and Report: A Handbook for Beginning Researchers*. Kisumu: Option Press and Publishers.
- Oso, W. & Onen, D. (2009). *A hand book for beginning researchers: a general Guide to writing research proposal and report*. Nairobi.JKF Publishers,
- Parsons, T., (1961). Suggestions for a sociological approach to the theory of organizations, in: *Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Payne, J.H. & Turner, R.J., (1999). Company-wide project management: the planning and control of programmes of projects of different type. *International Journal of Project Management* 17(1), 55–59.
- Petter, S., Delone, W. & McLean, E., (2008). Measuring information systems success: models, dimensions, measures, and interrelationships. *European Journal of Information Systems* 17(3), 236–263.
- Peil, M. (1995). *Academics and African government: a shaky relationship*. In Myers, D. (Ed.). *Reinventing the Humanities*, Australian: Australian Scholarly, Publishing.
- Pfeffer, J., (1982). *Organizations and Organization Theory*, Pitman, Marshfield.
- Pheng, L. S. & Chuan, Q. T., (2006). Environmental factors and work performance of project managers in the construction industry, *International Journal of Project Management*, 24, 24–37.
- Pheng, L.S. & Ting, D.L.L. (1998). Factors influencing design development time of commercial properties in Singapore', *Facilities*, 16(1/2), 40-51.
- Pinto, J.K. & Slevin, D.P. (1998). Project success: Definitions and management techniques. *Project Management Journal*, 19(1), 67–71.
- Project Management Institute, (2004) *Project management body of knowledge (PMBOK)*, Pennsylvania: The Project Management Institute Inc.
- Puthamont, S, & Charoenngam, C. (2004). Strategic project selection in public sector: Construction projects of the Ministry of Defence in Thailand. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25(2), 178–188.
- Reichelt Kimberly and Lyneis James, (1999). The dynamic of project performance: Benchmarking the drivers of cost and schedule overrun, *European management journal*, 17(2), 135-150.
- Richard, P.J., Devinney, T.M., Yip, G.S. & Johnson, G., (2009). Measuring organizational performance: towards methodological best practice. *Journal of Management*, 35(3), 718–804.
- Robinson, H. S., Anumba, C. J., Carrillo, P. M., & Al-Ghassani, A. M. (2005). Business performance measurement practices in construction engineering organisations. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 9(1), 13-22.
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research*, (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publication.
- Sanchez, H., Robert, B., & Pellerin, R., (2008). A project portfolio risk–opportunity identification framework. *Project Management Journal*, 39(3), 97–109.
- Sanders, J. (2004). *Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook*. Retrieved from www.wkkf.org
- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research* (3rd ed.).New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007) *Research methods for business students* (4th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.

- Shenhar, A., Dvir, D., & Raz, T., (2003). An empirical analysis of the relationship between project planning and project success. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21(2), 89-95.
- Shenhar, A.J., Dvir, D., Levy, O., & Maltz, A.C., (2001). Project success: a multidimensional strategic concept. *Long Range Planning*, 34(6), 699-725.
- Shewhart, W. A. & Deming, W. E. (1939). *Statistical Method from the View point of Quality Control*. Washington: The Department of Agriculture.
- Söderlund, J., (2004). On the broadening scope of the research on projects: are view and a model for analysis. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(8), 655-667.
- Sommerville, J., Craig, N. & McCarney, M. (2004). Document transfer and communication between distinct construction professionals, in proceedings of COBRA 2004 *International Construction Research Conference*, Leeds, 7-8 September.
- Thomas, S.R., Macken, C.L., Chung, T.H. & Kim, I. (2002). *Measuring the Impact of the Delivery System on Project Performance: Design-Build and Design-Bid-Build NIST GCR 02-840*. Austin, US: Construction Industry Institute
- Uzzi, B. (1996). The Sources and Consequences of Embeddedness for the Economic Performance of Organizations: The Network Effect. *American Sociological Review*, 61, 674-698.
- Vincent, K.O. & Joel, E.R. (1995). *Principles of Total Quality*. London: Kogan Page
- Walker, D. M. (2004). The GAO Answers the Question: What's in a Name, *Roll Call*. July 19
- Weimer, J.(1995), "Developing a Research Project "In Research Technique in Human Engineering. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall ISBN 0-13-097072-7.
- Winograd, T. & Flores, F. (1986). *Understanding Computers and Cognition: A New Foundation for Design*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Woodward, J., (1965). *Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yuan, M., Zhang, X., Chen, Z., Vogel, D.R., & Chu, X., (2009). Antecedents of coordination effectiveness of software developer dyads from interacting teams: an empirical investigation. *Engineering Management, IEEE Transactions*, 56(3), 494-507