

# Effects of collaboration in projects on construction project performance

Patrik Löfgren

Luleå University of Technology

D Master thesis

Industrial Organization

Department of Business Administration and Social Sciences

Division of Industrial Organization

## Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge my supervisor Per Erik Eriksson, without his support and valuable input this paper would not have been possible. Special gratitude is also extended to those industrial practitioners who have responded and contributed with valuable input to the investigation. Finally, a grateful acknowledgement to the Swedish Construction Client Forum for their support during the process.

Luleå University of Technology April 15, 2009

Patrik Löfgren

## Abstract

Collaboration among project actors has been subjected to much attention in recent years within the field of construction management. Several case studies support the argument that collaboration has positive effects on project performance. There is however, a need for quantitative studies investigating statistical relationships between collaboration and performance. Collaborative tools (e.g. workshops, joint objectives, and teambuilding activities) are commonly used in order to establish a collaborative spirit among project actors. The purpose of this research is to investigate how collaborative tools affect collaboration and further collaboration's effect on project performance. The empirical data was collected through a survey responded to by 106 Swedish construction clients. Results from hierarchical regression analyses show a positive relationship between collaborative tools and collaboration suggesting that joint activities are crucial for collaboration to emerge. A positive relationship was also found between collaboration and project performance. The statistical results support previous case study findings where collaboration is positively affected by joint activities and project performance is enhanced by collaboration.

Keywords: Collaboration, partnering, collaborative tools, project performance

**Table of content**

- Introduction..... 1
- Collaborative tools’ effects on collaboration ..... 2
- Collaboration’s effect on project performance..... 2
- Methodology ..... 4
  - Sample ..... 4
  - Measure: Collaborative tools, collaboration and project performance ..... 4
- Presentation and analysis of empirical results..... 5
  - Usage of collaborative tools ..... 5
  - Project performance ..... 5
  - Collaborative tools’ effect on collaboration..... 6
  - Collaboration’s effect on project performance..... 6
- Discussion ..... 8
- Conclusions..... 9
- References..... 10

## ***Introduction***

The construction industry is a complex and high-risk multi-actor business that over a long period of time has received criticism for its relationships between contractor and client, where poor collaboration, ineffective communication, unbalanced risk allocation in contract provisions, limited trust, and lack of customer focus are cited amongst its shortcomings (Cheung et al., 2003, Eriksson et al., 2008). Partnering, a concept which provides a governance framework for the establishment of collaboration, can be beneficial for all parties involved if implemented successfully (Naoum, 2003, Eriksson, 2008). Case studies of construction partnering in Hong Kong (Chan et al., 2003), Sweden (Eriksson and Nilsson, 2008), the US (Naoum, 2003) and the UK (Bresnen and Marshall, 2000) argue that partnering increases the possibility that projects are completed within budget, on time, with the least number of conflicts, claims and work defects, and with a good client-contractor relationship.

Even though the greater part of earlier studies has favourable conclusions about partnering these studies can be criticized of being limited in scope and heavily reliant on supportive case studies as well as anecdotal evidence (Bresnen, 2007). The limitation of scope of case studies illustrates the need for quantitative studies on partnering effects on project performance. One quantitative study, conducted by Larson (1995), supports that partnering projects achieve superior results in controlling costs, technical performance, and in satisfying customers compared to projects without partnering. Another more recent investigation, conducted by Nyström (2008), did not however find any clear differences in project performance when comparing the performances of ten partnering projects with ten similar non-partnering projects. Hence, there is a comprehensible need for similar quantitative studies on how partnering and collaboration affect project performance today.

Partnering encourages the relationship between contracted parties to become more cooperative and team-based, which promotes the achievement of mutually beneficial goals (Larson, 1995). The usage of collaborative tools, such as joint objectives, joint project office, workshops and team building activities, will effectuate trust-building and collaboration (Naoum, 2003, Bayliss et al., 2004, Eriksson, 2008). Collaborative tools may also be useful in dispute resolution, risk balancing, problem solving, decreasing the risk of opportunism and enhancing a “win-win” situation (Cheung et al., 2003, Bayliss et al., 2004). If implemented right collaborative tools will instill, foster and maintain a collaborative spirit among project actors (Bayliss et al., 2004), for which reason they are argued to be a core component of partnering. The drawback with these activities is the cost associated with their implementation. To justify the use of collaborative tools it is therefore important that they really result in increased collaboration, as suggested in earlier case studies.

The purpose of this research is to investigate how collaborative tools affect collaboration and further collaboration's effect on project performance. First, a literature review was performed, ending up in the formulation of two testable hypotheses. Second, the hypotheses were empirically tested based on data collected through a large scale survey among Swedish construction clients.

## ***Collaborative tools' effects on collaboration***

The concept of partnering overhauls the traditional adversarial relationships between contracted parties with a shift towards more collaborative and caring environments. To facilitate effective partnering a range of methods and activities with the purpose to enhance the collaborative spirit among contracted parties, collectively named collaborative tools, is required (Bayliss et al., 2004), such as joint objectives, follow-up workshops, dispute resolution techniques, joint IT-database, joint project office, teambuilding activities, partnering facilitator, and joint risk management (Ng et al., 2002, Eriksson and Laan, 2007, Eriksson, 2008). The usage of joint objectives enables the client and contractor to see the wider benefits and will give little room for those who are not committed to the project (Gil, 2009). Joint objectives will therefore enhance the possibility of a "win-win" situation between contracted parties. Follow-up workshops have been identified as one of the most effective tools to effectuate a collaborative spirit and together with pre-project meetings it helps the project members to focus on potential problem areas and creates a possibility for face-to-face discussion (Larson, 1997, Cheng et al., 2001, Bayliss et al., 2004, Olsen et al., 2005). Dispute resolution techniques reduce the risk for litigations and claims that could harm the collaboration (Cheung and Suen, 2002). A joint IT-database, designed to reflect the projects strategic vision and environmental factors, is an effective tool to increase collaboration and information sharing among project actors due to its capability of providing available resources to users with minimal cost and time (Cheng et al., 2001). The establishment of joint project office has positive effects on developing a collaborative climate between contracted parties through the endorsement of openness in face-to-face meetings and identification with the project (Olsen et al., 2005, Swan and Khalfan, 2007). Teambuilding activities are an essential part of modern project management designed to enhance teamwork, socialization and collaboration among project members (Cheng et al., 2001, Jha and Misra, 2007). A partnering facilitator is critical in the initial phase of a partnering project due to the facilitator's possibility to form the process towards higher collaboration (Cheng and Li, 2002). A joint risk management approach where economic losses or gains, due to market change, are shared generates a sense of mutual trust and commitment to the project (Gil, 2009).

In the construction of a Swedish pharmaceutical plant the client used different collaborative tools extensively which resulted in a high emphasis on trust and participants solved problems in a collaborative manner (Eriksson and Nilsson, 2008). Hence, high usage of collaborative tools indicates bilateral governance and cooperation, whereas no or low use indicates market relationships and competition (Eriksson, 2008). In accordance with the above presented line of reasoning the following hypothesis has been formulated:

- *Hypothesis 1: The higher the usage of collaborative tools, the better the collaboration among contracted parties in a construction project.*

## ***Collaboration's effect on project performance***

In a quantitative study, with the limited scope of 20 projects, comparing ten partnering projects with ten similar non-partnering projects, Nyström (2008) did not find a general trend concerning the performance in terms of cost, construction time, quality, contract flexibility, or avoidance of disputes.

Despite these results there is nevertheless a common opinion that partnering has positive effects on project performance. Many of these arguments are however related to relational aspects of project performance. Several authors argue that client and contractor in more collaborative projects are highly satisfied with the quality of the relationship, particularly regarding open communication, information flows, innovate environment and decisions making (Bresnan & Marshall, 2000; Abudayyeh, 1994; Kiel, 2007). In projects with less trust and a more traditional adversarial client-contractor relationship organizational and project factors may force individuals into taking more untrusting relationships to others which could result in costly claims and litigation (McDermott et al 2005; Bresnan & Marshall, 2000). However, also the traditional project performance objectives of cost, time, and quality are argued to be affected by collaboration. A more collaborative spirit among project members have been found to improve *cost* performance, such as a virtual elimination of cost overruns, controlling overall costs, reducing administration costs and to be the most critical factor for a successful partnership (Naoum, 2003; Abudayye, 1994; Bresnan & Marshall, 2000; Larson, 1995; Kiel, 2007; Chen & Chen, 2007). Furthermore, construction projects with emphasis on collaboration rather than price and authority are more likely to eliminate *time* overruns (Naoum, 2003; Larson, 1995). Collaboration among project actors have also been found to improve *quality* by replacing the more traditional adversarial relationship with an atmosphere that fosters teamwork to achieve joint objectives (Chan et al, 2003).

In Sweden, the project participants in a case study of the construction of a pharmaceutical plant considered that the project success and the timely completion of the project below budget were highly facilitated by the collaborative approach (Eriksson & Nilsson, 2008). Hence, in construction projects with great uncertainty high levels of trust and collaboration could lead to increased efficiency (Kadefors, 2004). In line with these arguments the following hypothesis has been formulated.

- *Hypothesis 2: the higher the collaboration between contracted parties in a construction project the better the project performance.*

## ***Methodology***

### **Sample**

The empirical data were collected through a questionnaire to a population of 140 Swedish construction client organizations that are members of The Swedish Construction Client Forum (SCCF). The population consists of regional, national or international industrial and property companies, municipalities and regional authorities, and also government services and agencies. Hence, this population provides a suitable representation of Swedish construction clients. The organizations were initially approached by the CEO of SCCF through a letter describing the purpose of the investigation and its importance for SCCF and its members. In a second step the registered contact person were telephoned, in order to inquire their or other more suitable person's willingness to participate in the study. Consequently, it was up to the contact person to choose the most suitable persons, given that the survey involved procurement, project management processes and project performance. At this stage six respondents declined participation due to lack of time. In a third stage, questionnaires were posted to the 134 potential respondents that had agreed to participate in the investigation. After two reminders a total of 111 responses were received. In a fourth stage respondents who had not answered all questions were telephoned and asked to respond to these questions. This resulted in minimization of the amount of missing values. Nevertheless, in five responses there were a lot of missing values, for which reason they were discarded. Accordingly, 106 usable responses were received, resulting in a response rate of 76%.

### **Measure: Collaborative tools, collaboration and project performance**

In the questionnaire the respondents were asked to what extent they use different collaborative tools in their construction projects, how satisfied they are with the collaboration among project actors, and how satisfied they are with various aspects of project performance. The questions were measured using seven-point Likert scales anchored by 1 = very seldom/very dissatisfied and 7 = very often/very satisfied. The questions did not measure these aspects in a particular project but involved firm-level behavior and project performances in the clients' portfolios of procured and finished projects. Furthermore, three control variables were measured through a nominal scale: if the organization follows public procurement regulations or not, new construction/rebuilding projects or maintenance work, and local/regional or national/international market.



## ***Presentation and analysis of empirical results***

### **Usage of collaborative tools**

The most commonly used collaborative tool is joint objectives (4,35) followed by joint IT-database (4,26). The least common used collaborative tools are partnering facilitator (2,46) and joint project office (2,46). The eight items of collaborative tools (joint objectives, follow-up workshops, arena for relationship discussion and dispute resolution, joint IT-database, joint project office, teambuilding activities, partnering facilitator, and joint risk management) were subjected to principal component factor analysis (PCFA) with Oblimin rotation using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16. Oblimin rotation is justified when it is reasonable to expect correlation between perceptual dimensions (Hair, 1995). The Kaiser-Meyer-Okin (KMO) value was 0,87, exceeding the recommended value of 0,6 and the Bartlett Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance (0,00). The analysis on collaborative tools resulted in a one-dimensional factor with factor loadings between 0,39 and 0,80. Hence, collaborative tools will be computed into a single construct in later analysis. The computed construct of collaborative tools have Cronbach alpha CA = 0,84 and construct mean value MV = 3.24. The relatively low mean value indicates that collaborative tools are not used to a high extent by Swedish construction clients.

### **Project performance**

Generally the respondents are satisfied with project performances, see Table 1. They are most satisfied with high customer satisfaction (5.90) and least satisfied with time schedule minimized (4.70). The ten items of project performance are theoretically related to the four aspects of cost, time, quality and collaboration. In order to investigate if the empirical data supports such a grouping of performances the ten items were subjected to a PCFA with Oblimin rotation, which was forced into four solutions. The Kaiser-Meyer-Okin (KMO) value was 0.76 and the Bartlett Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance (0.00), supporting the expected four factor solution, explaining 41%, 14.6%, 9.8% and 9% of the variance respectively. The identified factors are; 1) Quality (CA = 0,87, MV = 5,76), 2) Time (CA = 0,60, MV = 5,17), 3) Cost (CA = 0,73, MV = 5,09) and 4) Collaboration (CA = 0,59, MV = 5,73). The fact that the item "life cycle cost is minimized" loads on both cost and quality can be explained by the fact that cost and quality is heavily inter-related from a life cycle perspective. To be able to address H2 the collaboration factor will be computed into a separate construct and used as an independent variable potentially affecting the performance factors quality, time and cost.

Table 1. Principal component factor analysis of project performance

	Item Mean	Factor 1 Quality	Factor 2 Time	Factor 3 Cost	Factor 4 Collaboration
Function according to specification	5.75	<b>0.91</b>	0.04	-0.127	-0.142
Expected quality is achieved	5.70	<b>0.90</b>	0.01	0.03	0.03
High customer satisfaction	5.90	<b>0.77</b>	-0.04	0.06	0.20
Time schedule is minimized	4.70	-0.09	<b>0.92</b>	0.02	0.07
Within time schedule	5.61	0.25	<b>0.60</b>	-0.30	-0.06
Within project budget	5.51	0.01	0.05	<b>-0.94</b>	-0.07
Project cost is minimized	4.95	-0.06	0.14	<b>-0.77</b>	0.16
Life cycle costs are minimized	4.87	0.32	-0.24	<b>-0.48</b>	0.20
Negotiations do not end up in disputes	5.18	-0.10	-0.05	-0.18	<b>0.87</b>
Good cooperation among project actors	5.41	0.30	0.19	0.12	<b>0.67</b>
Percentage of variance		42.16	14.76	9.70	8.74
Cronbach alpha (CA)		0.87	0.60	0.73	0.59
Factor mean value (MV)		5.76	5.17	5.09	5.73

## Collaborative tools' effect on collaboration

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to assess the ability of the collaborative tools constructs to predict levels of the collaboration construct, after controlling for the influence of three control variables (if the organization follows public procurement regulations or not, new construction/rebuilding projects or maintenance work, and local/regional or national/international market). Model 1 in Table 2 only consists of the control variables, explaining 2.4% of the variance in collaboration. In Model 2 collaborative tools were entered and the model as a whole explained 11.6% of the variance in collaboration. Hence, collaborative tools explained an additional 9.2% of the variance, which is a small but definite correlation (Hair, 1998). The control variables are not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ) and can be rejected whereas Model 2 was statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). H1 is therefore confirmed with a small but definite positive relationship between the usage of collaborative tools and collaboration among project actors ( $R^2$  change = 0.092).

Table 2. Hierarchical regression analysis testing hypothesis 1

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.15 <sup>a</sup>	0.024	-0.01	1.07	0.024	0.83	3	102	0.48
2	0.34 <sup>b</sup>	0.116	0.08	0.98	0.092	10.49	1	101	0.02

a. Predictors: (Constant), Public procurement regulation, new construction/rebuilding or maintenance work, Local/regional or national/international market

b. Predictors: (Constant), Public procurement regulation, new construction/rebuilding or maintenance work, Local/regional or national/international market, Collaborative Tools

## Collaboration's effect on project performance

Project performance is divided into three dependent variables; quality, cost and time and the collaboration construct functions as an independent variable. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to assess the ability of collaboration to affect the three factors of project performance, after controlling for the influence of four control factors (if the organization follows public procurement regulations or not, new construction/rebuilding projects or maintenance work,

local/regional or national/international market, and collaborative tools). Model 1 for each performance factor represents the results only from the control variables whereas Model 2 represents the results from control variables and collaboration, see Table 3.

The results from the three regression analyses show that none of the models 1 solutions are statistically significant ( $p > 0,05$ ). Bivariate regression analyses with collaborative tools as independent variable and the three performance factors as dependent variables were conducted. These analyses verify that there is no statistically significant relationship between collaborative tools and any of the three aspects of project outcome ( $p > 0,05$ ).

Collaboration's effects are statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) on all three aspects of project performance. Collaboration accounts for 23.7 % of the variance in quality, 22.1 % of the variance in cost and 4.5% of the variance in time. For quality and cost collaboration accounts for significantly more than the control variables which is not the case for time where control variables accounts for 7.9% compared to collaboration 4.5%. The effects collaboration has on quality and cost are moderately strong and its effect on time is small but definite (Hair, 1998). H2 is thus confirmed with a positive relationship between collaboration and all three aspects of project performance.

Table 3. Hierarchical regression analysis testing hypothesis 2.

	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
						R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
Quality	1	0.17 <sup>a</sup>	0.029	-0.01	0.92	0.029	0.74	4	101	0.56
	2	0.52 <sup>b</sup>	0.265	0.23	0.80	0.237	32.20	1	100	0.00
Cost	1	0.25 <sup>a</sup>	0.061	0.02	1.09	0.061	1.65	4	101	0.17
	2	0.53 <sup>b</sup>	0.283	0.25	0.95	0.221	30.85	1	100	0.00
Time	1	0.28 <sup>a</sup>	0.079	0.04	0.91	0.079	2.15	4	101	0.08
	2	0.35 <sup>b</sup>	0.124	0.08	0.89	0.045	5.18	1	100	0.03

a. Predictors: (Constant), Collaborative tools, new construction/ rebuilding or maintenance work, Local/regional or national/international market, Public procurement regulation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Collaborative tools, new construction/ rebuilding or maintenance work, Local/regional or national/international market, Public procurement regulation, Collaboration

## ***Discussion***

Even if the nature of collaborative tools is to instill, foster and maintain a collaborative spirit among project actors (Bayliss et al, 2004) the study show only a small but definite relationship between the usage of collaborative tools and the achievement of collaboration ( $R^2$  0,092). Even if H1 is confirmed it is not entirely in line with previous research which argues for a strong relationship between them. The difference in results could be explained by the difficulties in effective implementation of collaborative tools in a construction project. This study only investigates to what extent they use collaborative tools and do not address questions of implementation, time of implementation nor which actors that participated in the joint activities. The difference in results could also be explained by the criticism previous research received arguing that the studies in some extent is limited in scope and based on evidence from successful projects in which strong collaboration was achieved. Hence, the effect of collaborative tools on collaboration may be exaggerated if the relationship is not investigated on an industry level, including both successful and failed partnering relationships.

If a true collaborative approach is to take place it involves client decisions during the entire buying process, such as collaborative tools, joint specification and incentive-based compensation (Eriksson & Laan 2007). From a transaction cost economic perspective construction clients focus too much on price and authority in several decisions in the buying process (Eriksson & Laan 2007). A client that uses collaborative tools to some extent but in other aspects has too much focus on price and authority is not likely to instill, foster nor maintain a collaborative spirit among the project actors. Hence, a higher focus on trust and collaboration is needed in all stages of the buying processes. It is probably hard to create a collaborative spirit in a more adversarial relationship only by the use of collaborative tools.

The results from the factor analysis support previous research where project performance often is discussed in terms of time, cost, and quality. The positive relationship between collaboration and the three aspects of project performance that confirms H2 support previous research, where adversarial relationships have shown inferior results compared to more collaborative approaches (Larson, 1995). There is a distinctive difference in the strength of the relationships; both quality and cost are moderately strong affected by collaboration while the effect on time is small but definite. Collaboration's effect on quality and cost are in line with what could be predicted based on previous research, where quality and cost can be improved by parties working more closely together (Black et al 2000). Collaboration's smaller effect on time is harder to explain and more research on this relationship is needed. Much of the aspects measuring project performance are quantitative and it is possible that collaboration also is related to more qualitative aspects of project performance, such as improved morale, improved confidence in decision making, and improved job satisfaction. The bivariate regression analyses showed that collaborative tools do not have a significant direct effect on project performance. This suggests that collaborative tools are pointless if they do not result in increased collaboration.

## ***Conclusions***

This paper offers contributions that are important to the research on how project performance is affected by collaboration among project actors. The fact that there is only a small but definite relationship between collaborative tools and collaboration does not question the possible benefits of collaborative tools found in earlier research. There is an increasing recognition among practitioners that partnering is potentially beneficial to all parties involved. The problem lies in the traditional procurement methods where much focus is on price and authority. A move towards a more partnering approach calls for a more or less complete change in procurement methods. A traditional procurement method is not likely to achieve collaboration even with the use of collaborative tools because of the underlying focus on price and authority.

This investigation shows a moderately strong relationship between collaboration and factors of project performance supporting the importance of a collaborative approach in procurement. The theoretical contributions of the investigation are that the result provides statistical support to previous case study findings of the positive relationship between collaboration and project performance. The statistically none existing effect that collaborative tools have on project performance leads to the conclusion that collaborative tools should not be seen as tools to enhance project performance but to instill, foster and maintain a collaborative spirit. For practitioners the statistically significant positive relationship between collaboration and project performance may decimate eventual skepticism of the benefits that could be achieved through the implementation of collaborative relationships in construction projects. An additional practical implication is that construction clients should put a considerate effort in the implementation of collaborative tools because if they are not implemented successfully they will cost time and money without doing any good.

## **References**

- Abudayyeh, O. (1994) Partnering: A Team Building Approach to Quality Construction Management. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 10 (6), 26-29.
- Bayliss, R., Cheung, S., Suen, H. & Wong, S.-P. (2004) Effective Partnering Tools in Construction: A Case Study on MTRC TKE Contract in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22 (3), 253-263.
- Black, C., Akintoye, A. & Fitzgerald, E. (2000) An Analysis of Success Factors and Benefits of Partnering in Construction. *International Journal of Project Management*, 18, 423-434.
- Bresnen, M. & Marshall, N. (2000) Building Partnerships: Case Studies of Client-Contractor Collaboration in the UK Construction Industry. *Construction Management and Economics*, 18 (7), 819-832.
- Bresnen, M. (2007) Deconstructing Partnering in Project-Based Organisation: Seven Pillars, Seven Paradoxes and Seven Deadly Sins. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25 (4), 365-374.
- Chan, A., Chan, D. & Ho, K. (2003) An Empirical Study of the Benefits of Construction Partnering in Hong Kong. *Construction Management and Economics*, 21 (5), 523-533.
- Chen, W. T. & Chen, T.-T. (2007) Critical Success Factors for Partnering in Taiwan. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25 (5), 475-484.
- Cheng, E., Li, H., Drew, D. & Yeung, N. (2001) Infrastructure of Partnering for Construction Projects. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 17 (4), 229-237.
- Cheng, E. & Li, H. (2002) Construction Partnering Process and Associated Critical Success Factors: Quantitative Investigation. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 18 (4), 194-202.
- Cheung, S., Ng, T., Wong, S.-P. & Suen, H. (2003) Behavioral Aspects in Construction Partnering. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21 (5), 333-343.
- Cheung, S. O. & Suen, H. (2002) A multi-attribute utility model for dispute resolution strategy selection. *Construction Management and Economics*, 20 (7), 557-568.
- Eriksson, P. E. & Laan, A. (2007) Procurement Effects on Trust and Control in Client-Contractor Relationships. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 14 (4), 387-399.
- Eriksson, P. E. (2008) Procurement Effects on Coopetition in Client-Contractor Relationships. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 134 (2), 103-111.
- Eriksson, P. E. & Nilsson, T. (2008) Partnering the Construction of a Swedish Pharmaceutical Plant: Case Study. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 24 (4), 227-233.
- Eriksson, P. E., Nilsson, T. & Atkin, B. (2008) Client Perceptions of Barriers to Partnering. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 15 (6), 527-539.
- Gil, N. (2009) Developing Cooperative Project Client-Supplier Relationships: How Much to Expect from Relational Contracts? *California Management Review*, 51 (2), 144-169.
- Hair, J. F., Black, B., Babin, B., Anderson, R. E. & Tatham, R. L. (2006) *Multivariate Data Analysis* London, Prentice-Hall.
- Jha, K. & Misra, S. (2007) Ranking and classification of construction coordination activities in Indian projects. *Construction Management and Economics*, 25 (4), 409-421.
- Kadefors, A. (2004) Trust in Project Relationships - Inside the Black Box. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22 (3), 175-182.

- Keil, J. (2007) How partnering benefits the construction process. *Pipeline & Gas Journal*.
- Larson, E. (1995) Project Partnering: Results of Study of 280 Construction Projects. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 11 (2), 30-35.
- Larson, E. (1997) Partnering on construction projects: A study of the relationships between partnering activities and project success. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 44 (2), 188-195.
- McDermott, P., Khalfan, M. & Swan, W. (2005) Trust in construction projects. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, 10 (1), 19-31.
- Naoum, S. (2003) An Overview into the Concept of Partnering. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21 (1), 71-76.
- Ng, T., Rose, T., Mak, M. & Chen, S. E. (2002) Problematic Issues Associated with Project Partnering - The Contractor Perspective. *International Journal of Project Management*, 20 (6), 437-449.
- Nyström, J. (2005) The Definition of Partnering as a Wittgenstein Family-Resemblance Concept. *Construction Management and Economics*, 23 (5), 473-481.
- Olsen, B., Haugland, S., Karlsen, E. & Husoy, G. (2005) Governance of Complex Procurements in the Oil and Gas Industry. *Journal of Purchasing & Supply Management*, 11 (1), 1-13.
- Swan, W. & Khalfan, M. (2007) Mutual Objective Setting for Partnering Projects in the Public Sector. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 14 (2), 119-130.

## Appendix 1, Questionnaire

### 1. Allmänna frågor

Namn: .....

Företag/organisation: .....

1. Kön: man       kvinna

2. Ålder: 0-39 år     40-49 år     50-59 år     60-69 år

3. Upphandlar din organisation enligt lagen om LOU? (Markera med ett kryss)

Ja

Nej

4. Vilken av nedanstående typer av byggtjänstinvesteringar utgör den största delen av er investeringsvolym i kronor räknat? (Markera med ett kryss den byggtjänst som stämmer bäst)

Nyproduktion och/eller stora ombyggnader

Underhållsåtgärder

5. Hur stort geografiskt verksamhetsområde har er byggherreorganisation? (Markera med ett kryss den marknadstyp som stämmer bäst)

En lokal eller regional marknad (*inom en viss kommun, visst län eller liknande*)

En nationell eller internationell marknad (*inom eller utanför Sverige*)



## 2. Valsituationer under byggprocessen

I denna del av enkäten ställs frågor om 10 valsituationer (se fråga 6-15) som uppstår för beställaren under inköpsprocessen, från projektering till slutbesiktning.

6. Vem utför **specifikationen** av produkten som byggprocessen avser? (Markera med kryss det svarsalternativ som passar bäst in på varje aktör)

	Mycket sällan			Mycket ofta			
Detaljprojektering utförs av beställare och/eller projektör	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Huvudentreprenör ansvarar för detaljprojekteringen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Beställare, projektör och entreprenör arbetar gemensamt med detaljprojekteringen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Vilka typer av **ersättningsformer** använder ni vid upphandling av huvudentreprenör? (Markera med kryss det svarsalternativ som passar bäst in på varje ersättningsform)

	Mycket sällan			Mycket ofta			
Fast pris	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Löpande räkning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Löpande räkning med incitament/bonus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Vilka typer av **anbudsinfordran** använder ni vid upphandling av huvudentreprenör? (Markera med kryss det svarsalternativ som passar bäst in på varje typ)

	Mycket sällan/ aldrig			Mycket ofta			
Öppen anbudsinfordran ( <i>annonsering</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Något begränsad anbudsinfordran ( <i>beställare bjuder in ett flertal (minst 5) anbudsgivare</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Starkt begränsad anbudsinfordran (*beställare bjuder in ett litet antal (2-4) anbudsgivare*)

Förtroendeupphandling (*endast en entreprenör bjuds in att lämna anbud*)

9. Hur viktiga är nedanstående **utvärderingsparametrar** vid val av huvudentreprenör? (Markera med ett kryss det svarsalternativ som stämmer bäst in på varje parameter)

	Oviktigt						Mycket viktigt
Anbudssumma	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tidigare erfarenhet av anbudsgivaren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Redovisning av kvalitetssystem och miljöledningssystem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Redovisning av organisation, personal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Företagets storlek och finansiella stabilitet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Förändringsvilja (förmåga till nytänkande)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Referensobjekt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anbudsgivarens bedömda samarbetsförmåga med projektteamet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teknisk kompetens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. I vilken utsträckning använder ni standardiserade regelverk (AB, ABT, etc) vid kontraktsutformning avseende huvudentreprenör? Mycket sällan        Mycket ofta

11. Hur väljs och **upphandlas underentreprenörer**? (Markera med kryss det svarsalternativ som stämmer bäst in på varje tillvägagångssätt)

Mycket sällan        Mycket ofta

Beställaren väljer och upphandlar UE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Huvudentreprenören väljer och upphandlar UE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Beställare och huvudentreprenör väljer och upphandlar UE tillsammans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. I vilken utsträckning använder ni olika "verktyg"/metoder för att öka samverkan mellan de olika aktörerna i byggprocessen? (Markera med kryss det svarsalternativ som stämmer bäst in på varje verktyg)

	Mycket sällan			Mycket ofta			
Formulering av gemensamma mål	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uppföljningsworkshops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arena för relationsdiskussion/konfliktlösningstrappa	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gemensam projektdatabas ( <i>IT-verktyg</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
"Öppna böcker" ( <i>öppen redovisning av kostnader</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gemensamt projektkontor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teambuildingaktiviteter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partneringfacilitator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gemensam systematisk riskhantering	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Vem ansvarar för kontroll av utförda byggarbeten i era projekt? (Markera med ett kryss det svarsalternativ som stämmer bäst in på varje aktör)

	Mycket sällan			Mycket ofta			
Beställare	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utförare ( <i>entreprenör</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. Hur omfattande är **besiktningen** av färdig produkt? (Markera med kryss det svarsalternativ som stämmer bäst in på varje besiktningstyp)

	Mycket sällan					Mycket ofta	
Fullständig besiktning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Endast stickprov	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. I vilken utsträckning genomför ni era byggprojekt med partnering eller liknande samverkansform?

Mycket sällan						Mycket ofta
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Nedan finns en lista med beslutspåverkande faktorer som beställaren kan beakta vid de ovanstående 10 valsituationerna (fråga 6-15). Hur viktiga är följande faktorer att beakta vid de 10 valsituationerna? (Väg samman din analys så att du ger ett generellt svar som gäller alla 10 val tillsammans. Markera med kryss det svarsalternativ som passar bäst in på varje faktor)

	Oviktigt						Mycket viktigt
Tidskritiska faktorer för projektet ( <i>snäv tidsram</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Erfarenhet av genomförandeformen hos upphandlande organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ekonomiska faktorer för projektet ( <i>snäv budget</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Osäkerhet kring brister i specifikation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Risk för förändringar av specifikation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Svårighet att verifiera slutprodukt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grad av komplexitet hos produkten/projektet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Om det är ett enskilt projekt eller ett delprojekt av flera liknande projekt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Projektets ekonomiska storlek	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Projektets varaktighet i tid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LOU gäller för beställarorganisationen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Grad av unikheter hos produkten/projektet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Antalet potentiella anbudsgivare	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Konjunkturcykeln	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Osäkerheter i projektets omgivning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3. Projektresultat

17. Vilken faktor ser du som den viktigaste för att få fram det för beställaren mest önskvärda resultatet (projektframgång) av en byggprocess? (Markera med ett kryss)

Ökad konkurrens mellan aktörerna

Ökad samverkan mellan aktörerna

18. Hur nöjd är du med de projektresultat som ni uppnår? (Markera med kryss det svarsalternativ som stämmer bäst in på varje typ av projektresultat)

	Mycket missnöjd	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mycket nöjd
Pris/projektkostnad minimeras	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Projektbudget hålls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Livscykelkostnad minimeras	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maximerat värde relativt kostnaden	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Projekttiden minimeras	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tidplanen hålls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funktion enligt specifikation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Förväntad kvalitet erhålls	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hög kundtillfredsställelse hos brukaren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bra samverkan mellan olika projektaktörer uppnås	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Förhandlingssituationer leder ej till dispyter/tvister	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bra arbetsmiljö och säkerhet i projektet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bra projektresultat i sin helhet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>