# An Evaluation of Clients Role towards Efficiency in Projects Execution in Kenya

# Abednego Oswald Gwaya, Sylvester Munguti Masu, Githae Wanyona

Abstract - Clients play a crucial role in construction projects: they provide the sites, arrange for financing, invest their funds and define the scope. While projects are being executed; they coordinate with consultants and contractors, dictate the level of scope change management and ensure regular flow of construction funds either individually, as corporate and or through commitment to financiers.

The relationship of the client with other team members and or the level of coordination can affect the performance of construction projects. If clients are going to appreciate and promote the practice of project management then they are going to get value for their money; considering the fact that project management was introduced to ensure efficiency in performance of construction projects.

This paper examines the role of clients in ensuring the efficiency of construction projects performance in Kenya

Key Words: Project Management, Efficiency, Teamwork, **Project Planning And Project Execution.** 

## I. INTRODUCTION

The human factor has been proven to be an important issue affecting quality (Muchungu, 2012). Cultural issues such as attitudes, values, trust, behaviour, and environment are important factors affecting the alignment of teams toward the same objectives (CII 1997). People are the most valuable asset of an organization and it follows that the control of projects starts with the team development. The performance of the team determines the success or failure of a project. Teams and leadership has become a concern on the formation of teams. In fact the construction of the pyramids could only be accomplished through teamwork. A team must be assembled that will work in harmony and efficiently.

#### **II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CLIENT AND PROJECT TEAM**

The relationship between the client and project team is a complex one. A successful relationship between the client and project team depends largely on the level of trust and commitment. There may be different views between client and others involved in the team, as a result each has a different viewpoint. This leads to the need for a method to facilitate communication to enable each member in the team to work towards the same set of objectives. One method to facilitate communication is developing a project plan.

#### Manuscript Received on March, 2014

Gwaya Oswald Abednego \, Lecturer- Construction Management, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT) NAIROBI, KENYA.

Sylvester Munguti Masu, Senior Lecturer- Real Estate and Construction Management, University of Nairobi (UON), NAIROBI, KENYA.

Wanyona Githae, Senior Lecturer- Construction Management, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT) NAIROBI, **KENYA** 

This will help communicate project objectives more effectively between the project team.

#### A. The Client And Project Team

Most construction project teams comprise three participants, the client with the need of the project; the designer, and the contractor. The business and project objectives of each are understandably different, which often creates complex relationships within project teams. If these relationships are not managed properly they could adversely affect a project's performance (Kerzner, 2013). However, the success of the project lies on the ability of the project team to manage the objectives and any conflict that may arise. Several investigations have been conducted into explaining the way clients communicate their needs to their consultants (Newman et al 1990, Murray et al 1990)

With the increasing competition in the construction business environment, there is need for good client and project team relationships. For example, in order for the project team to obtain information upon on which it can act with confidence, the members of the project team need to have the ability to understand the structure of their client's organization and their relationship to others with an interest in the project. In particular, they should understand the decision-making mechanism of the client's organization and where the authority for decisions is vested.

#### B. Relationship Between Client And Project Team

A successful project means that both the client and the project team have to work in a spirit of trust, openness and collaboration to identify the appropriate objectives for the project. Burke (2007) illustrated the benefits of project team adopting a more positive approach to defining client's needs. Decisions made by the project team will contribute to those taken by the client. The internal organization and external environment of the client's organization will determine the timing and sequence of the decision points. According to Burke, (2007) there is increasingly intricate nature of the client organizations stating that "there are complex systems of different interests".

The client and other project team members should share values. It is important that client/end user needs and priorities of objectives are understood by the project team. Several studies have been conducted concerning the way clients communicate their needs to others (Newman et al 1990, Murray et al 1990), and the studies of the Construction Industry Institute (CII) for example Rowings et al 1987. The CIT (1996) suggested that the relationships between client and members of the project team must be expressed in contractual arrangements that:

Deal with key issues •

& Sciences Publication

• Are clear

Published By:



- Are compatible with each other
- Balance risk, responsibility and reward

## **III. METHODOLOGY**

A survey research approach was used on 80 members out of which 32 members responded. This was a response rate of 40%. Descriptive statistics were used to do the analysis and the discussions of the results were carried out with a view of establishing how the Clients role can enhance performance of construction projects.

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used in the study; although qualitative approach was only used to obtain Clients' views on project management application.

# **IV. DISCUSSIONS OF RESULTS**

## A. Client Views On Project Management

Clients through their project managers were asked to give their opinions on the current status of project management in Kenya towards effective and efficient execution of projects.

Most of the clients indicated that they prefer traditional arrangement but still wanted to maintain a strong presence while project implementation is underway. They also observed that a lot of potential does exist especially with the new tools now available to assist in project management application. It was also noted that there is a big difference between projects where project management is employed with those that do not.

They finally indicated that they would prefer to be proactively engaged in scope definition, project management and evaluation of project performance results. They concurred for a structured project management application in Kenya.

From the foregoing it is noted that by adopting a structured project management model application shall ensure effective and efficient execution of construction projects. Adoption and proper implementation of project management is now inevitable.

Clients through their project managers were asked to give their opinions on the current status of project management in Kenya towards effective and efficient execution of projects.

Most of the clients indicated that they prefer traditional arrangement but still wanted to maintain a strong presence while project implementation is underway. They also observed that a lot of potential does exist especially with the new tools now available to assist in project management application. It was also noted that there is a big difference between projects where project management is employed with those that do not.

They finally indicated that they would prefer to be proactively engaged in scope definition, project management and evaluation of project performance results. Thev concurred for a structured project management application in Kenya.

From the foregoing it is noted that by adopting a structured project management model application shall ensure effective and efficient execution of construction projects. Adoption and proper implementation of project management is now inevitable.

Clients through their project managers were asked to give their opinions on the current status of project management in Kenya towards effective and efficient execution of projects.

Most of the clients indicated that they prefer traditional arrangement but still wanted to maintain a strong presence while project implementation is underway. They also observed that a lot of potential does exist especially with the new tools now available to assist in project management application. It was also noted that there is a big difference between projects where project management is employed with those that do not.

They finally indicated that they would prefer to be proactively engaged in scope definition, project management and evaluation of project performance results. They concurred for a structured project management application in Kenya.

From the foregoing it is noted that by adopting a structured project management model application shall ensure effective and efficient execution of construction projects. Adoption and proper implementation of project management is now inevitable.

**B.** Factors Considered During Project Management **Execution** Plan

Table 1.1: Factors in Project	et Execution plan in (%)
-------------------------------	--------------------------

				Ver
Factors in				У
Project	Rarel	Somet		ofte
Execution plan	у	imes	Often	n
Assessing project				
environment	12.5%	56.3%	31.3%	
Commissioning				
and hand over				12.5
procedures	6.3%	12.5%	68.8%	%
Developing				6.3
project objectives		18.8%	75%	%
Financing the				6.3
project	12.5%	25%	56.3%	%
Health and safety				
plan		18.8%	81.3%	
Organizational				
resourcing and				
project definition	6.3%	56.3%	37.5%	
Planning and cost				
control			75%	25%
Procurement				12.5
approach			87.5%	%
Quality control				
and environment				
plans		25%	75%	
Safety and				
construction				
strategy	50%	25%	25%	
Use of value				
management and				
engineering				
procedures	12.5%	12.5%	75%	

Source: Field survey 2013

Clients' respondents were asked to identify the major considerations for clients while evaluating the project management execution strategies. The indicators are crucial to the measurement of success or failure of projects. This

question was to authenticate the responses from project consultants on key project

Published By:

& Sciences Publication



management performance indicators. This question was also to validate the responses in the previous question on some of the responses. Proper execution is the dependent variable while the rest are independent variables. The overall ranking on the variables when using scores often and very often are as shown in table 1.2.

<b>Fable 1.2 Factors in project execution</b>	l plan
considerations ranked	

Factors in Project Execution	Score (%)	Rank
Plan		
Planning and cost control	100%	1
Procurement approach	100%	1
Commissioning and handing		
over procedures	81.3%	3
Developing project objectives	81.3%	3
Health and safety plan	81.3%	3
Quality control and		
environmental plans	75	6
Use of value management and		
engineering procedures	75	6
Financing the project	62.8	8
Organization resourcing and		
project definition	37.5	9
Assessing project environment	31.3	10
Safety and construction	25	11
strategy		
Safety and construction strategy	25	11

# Source: Field survey 2013

From table 1.2; planning and cost control and procurement approach factors were the most considered by construction clients. The next set of factors considered were commissioning and handing over procedures, developing project objectives, health and safety plan at 81.3%. Quality control and environmental plans and use of value management and engineering procedures at 75% were ranked 6<sup>th</sup> most important. Financing the project at 62.8% and ranked at position 8 finished the factors that are most crucial. Organization resourcing and project definition, assessing the project environment and safety and construction strategy were the least important at 37.5%, 31.3% and 25% respectively. The observations from this question tally with the previous question especially on health and safety and the importance attached to costing and quality as shown in figure 1.1.



Figure 1.1: Factors considered in project execution plan

Source: Field survey 2013

The clients apply/use project tools as pre-planning project management strategies. Table 1.3 illustrates the level of current tools under use in Kenya.

Fable 1.3:	Tools used	by companies	during p	re-project
	pla	anning in (%)		

NeveRarelySometiernkTools UsedrRarelyOftennAgreement37.5mes12.5%18matrix%43.8%12.5%118Alignment%25%37.5%191thermomet31.323719er%25%37.5%6.317Benchmark18.8%43.8%%91ing6.3%75%16.331Brainstorm18.8%43.8%%911learnt from6.3%37.5%%111previous6.3%37.5%%%1010definition18.8%43.8%%%1010rating18.8%43.8%%%1010definition25%31.3%%103rating18.8537.5%33index18.825%31.3%%103Value25%31.3%%1033index18.825%31.3%%103ferinition3537.5%%333index18.831.3%%133index18.825%31.3%%13fow12.5%37.5%% </th <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>V</th> <th>Ra</th>						V	Ra
Neve Tools UsedNeve rRarelySometi mesOffe of tein g of teAgreement matrix37.5 %43.8%12.5%IIAgreement thermomet31.3 erIIIgr%25%37.5%IIBenchmark ing6.3%75%IIIBenchmark ingIIIIIbernomet ing18.8%43.8%%%IIbernomet ingIIIIBrainstorm ingIIIIIbernomet ingIIIIIbernomet ingIIIIIbernomet ingIIIIIbernomet ingIIIIIbernomet ingIIIIIbernomet ingIIIIIbernomet ingIIIIIbernomet ingIIIIIbernomet indexIIIIIbernomet indexIIIIIbernomet indexIIIIIbernomet indexIIIIIbernomet indexIIIIIbernomet indexIIIIIbernomet indexIIIIIbernomet indexIII						er	nk
Neve         Rarely         Someti mes         Ofte n         g te n           Agreement         37.5         Rarely $n$ $n$ $n$ Agreement         37.5 $43.8\%$ $12.5\%$ $n$ $n$ $n$ Alignment $\%$ $43.8\%$ $12.5\%$ $n$ $n$ $n$ Alignment $31.3$ $a$ $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$ er $\%$ $25\%$ $37.5\%$ $n$ $n$ $n$ Benchmark $a$ $a$ $a$ $a$ $n$ $n$ ing $6.3\%$ $75\%$ $m$ $n$ $n$ $n$ learnt from $n$ $12$ $n$ $n$ $n$ previous $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$ projects $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$ definition $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$ freqretis $n$ $n$						у	in
Neve         Someti         Ofte         te           Tools Used         r         Rarely         mes         n         n           Agreement $37.5$ mes         12.5%         1         8           Adignment $\%$ $43.8\%$ $12.5\%$ 1         9           Alignment $\%$ $25\%$ $37.5\%$ 1         1           er $\%$ $25\%$ $37.5\%$ 1         1           Benchmark         6.3% $75\%$ $\%$ $6.2$ $7$ Brainstorm         18.8% $43.8\%$ $\%$ $\%$ 1           Igentrifrom         18.8% $43.8\%$ $\%$ $\%$ 1           previous $6.3$ $37.5\%$ $\%$ $\%$ 1           Iearnt from $12$ $6$ $12$ $6$ nt by $6.3\%$ $37.5\%$ $\%$ $\%$ objectives $18.8\%$ $5.5$ $5.5$ $5.5$ objectives $18.8$ $5.5$ $5.5$ $5.5$ $5.5$ <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>of</th> <th>g</th>						of	g
Tools Used         r         Rarely         mes         n         n           Agreement $37.5$		Neve		Someti	Ofte	te	
Agreement matrix $37.5$ %         43.8% $12.5%$ $a$	<b>Tools Used</b>	r	Rarely	mes	n	n	
matrix         %         43.8%         12.5%           9           Alignment thermomet $31.3$ er          9         9           Benchmark ing $6.3\%$ 75%          9           Benchmark ing $6.3\%$ 75%          7           Brainstorm ing $18.8\%$ 43.8%         %         7           Lesson          12         1           learnt from previous          43.8         .5           projects $6.3\%$ 37.5%         %            Manageme nt by          18.8%         43.8%             Project           10           10           definition rating index         18.8                  Scope definition checklist                  Work                 Manageme nt by<	Agreement	37.5					8
Alignment thermomet $31.3$ $er$ $25\%$ $37.5\%$ $ar$ $9$ Benchmark ing $6.3\%$ $75\%$ $6.3$ $7$ Benchmark ing $6.3\%$ $75\%$ $\%$ $7$ Brainstorm ing $18.8\%$ $43.8\%$ $\%$ $7$ Lesson $18.8\%$ $43.8\%$ $\%$ $1$ learnt from previous $122$ $1$ projects $6.3\%$ $37.5\%$ $\%$ $6$ Manageme nt by $18.8\%$ $43.8\%$ $5$ $6$ Project definition rating index $18.8$ $75\%$ $10$ $10$ Scope definition engineerin g programs $6.3\%$ $37.5\%$ $\%$ $3$ Value engineerin g programs $6.3\%$ $37.5\%$ $37.5\%$ $37.5\%$ $37.5\%$ Work process $12.5\%$ $37.5\%$ $\%$ $33$ Mongeme index $12.5\%$ $37.5\%$ $\%$ $33$ $6.3\%$ $12.5\%$ $37.5\%$ $\%$ $50\%$ $\%$	matrix	%	43.8%	12.5%			
thermomet er $31.3$ $\otimes$ $25\%$ $37.5\%$ $and$ $and$ Benchmark ing $6.3\%$ $75\%$ $6.3$ $7$ Benchmark ing $6.3\%$ $75\%$ $\%$ $7$ Brainstorm ing $131.3$ $3$ $3$ Ing $18.8\%$ $43.8\%$ $\%$ $\%$ Lesson $122$ $122$ $122$ $6$ projects $6.3\%$ $37.5\%$ $\%$ $\%$ Manageme $122$ $6$ $122$ $6$ nt by $18.8\%$ $43.8\%$ $\%$ $10$ Project $18.8\%$ $43.8\%$ $\%$ $10$ definition $18.8\%$ $37.5\%$ $10$ $10$ rating $18.8$ $75\%$ $10$ $10$ definition $25\%$ $31.3\%$ $\%$ $3$ value $25\%$ $31.3\%$ $\%$ $3$ engineerin $37.5\%$ $\%$ $3$ $3$	Alignment						9
er       %       25%       37.5% $($ $($ Benchmark       6.3%       75%       %       7         ing       6.3%       75%       %       6.       2         Brainstorm       1       31.3       3       3         ing       18.8%       43.8%       %       %       9         Lesson       1       12       1       1         learnt from       43.8       .5       1       1         previous       6.3%       37.5%       %       %       9         Manageme       18.8%       43.8%       %       %       10         definition       18.8%       43.8%       %       %       10         rating       18.8       43.8%       %       %       10         definition       75%       1       1       10         scope       31.3%       %       10       10         definition       37.5       3       3       3         widefinition       37.5       3       3       3         gprograms       6.3%       12.5%       37.5%       %       1         Work	thermomet	31.3					
Benchmark ing         6.3%         75%         6.3         7           ing $6.3\%$ 75%         %         -           Brainstorm         31.3         3         -           ing         18.8% $43.8\%$ %         %           Lesson         1         12         1           learnt from         12         12         1           previous         6.3% $37.5\%$ %         %           Manageme         18.8% $43.8\%$ %         %           Nobjectives         18.8% $43.8\%$ %         %           Project         18.8% $43.8\%$ %         %         10           definition         18.8         .5         10         10           definition         75%         1         1         10           Scope         31.3%         %         1         1           Value         25%         31.3%         %         1         1           g programs         6.3%         12.5%         37.5%         %         1         3           definition         3         3         3         3 </td <td>er</td> <td>%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>37.5%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	er	%	25%	37.5%			
ing $6.3\%$ $75\%$ $\%$ $\%$ $Brainstorm131.333ing18.8\%43.8\%\%\%1Lesson1121212previous43.8.5126projects6.3\%37.5\%\%\%Manageme12618.8.5objectives18.8\%43.8\%\%\%Project18.8\%43.8\%\%\%objectives18.8\%43.8\%\%10definition18.8.510rating37.5\%-16-16Scope25\%31.3\%\%-16Value25\%31.3\%\%-16work25\%37.5\%\%-16Work-12.5\%37.5\%\%-16Work-12.5\%37.5-16flow-12.5\%50\%\%-16$	Benchmark				6.3		7
Brainstorm       18.8%       43.8%       %       %         Lesson       18.8%       43.8%       %       %       1         learnt from       12       12       1         previous       6.3%       37.5%       %       %       1         previous       6.3%       37.5%       %       %       1         previous       6.3%       37.5%       %       %       1         Manageme       18.8%       43.8%       %       %       1         objectives       18.8%       43.8%       %       %       10         definition       18.8       10       10       10       10         definition       75%       1       1       1       1         Scope       25%       31.3%       %       1       1         Value       25%       31.3%       %       1       3         engineerin       37.5       3       3       3         g programs       6.3%       12.5%       37.5%       %       1       3         Work       3       3       3       3       3       3       3       3         1	ing	6.3%	75%		%		
Brainstorm       31.3       3         ing       18.8%       43.8%       %       %         Lesson       12       12         previous       43.8       .5       12         previous       6.3%       37.5%       %       %         Manageme       18.8%       43.8%       %       %         Mobility       18.8%       43.8%       %       %         Project       18.8       10       10         definition       75%       1       1         Scope       31.3%       %       1         definition       25%       31.3%       %       1         Value       33       3       3       3         engineerin       37.5       3       3       3         g programs       6.3%       12.5%       37.5%       %       1         Work       3       3       3       3       3         indagram       12.5% <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>6.</td> <td>2</td>						6.	2
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Brainstorm				31.3	3	
Lesson       Image in the second secon	ing		18.8%	43.8%	%	%	
learnt from       12       12         previous       43.8       .5         projects       6.3%       37.5%       %       %         Manageme       12       6         nt by       18.8%       43.8%       %       %         objectives       18.8%       43.8%       %       %         Project       18.8%       43.8%       %       %         objectives       18.8%       43.8%       %       %         Project       18.8       10       10       10         definition       75%       1       1       10         scope       37.5       3       3       3         definition       25%       31.3%       %       1         Value       37.5       3       3       3         engineerin       37.5       3       3       3         g programs       6.3%       12.5%       37.5%       %       1         Work       3       3       3       3       3         engineerin       37.5       3       3       3         flow       12.5%       50%       %       1 <td>Lesson</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td>	Lesson						1
previous projects         43.8         .5           Manageme nt by         6.3%         37.5%         %         %           Manageme nt by         12         6           objectives         18.8%         43.8%         %         %           Project         18.8%         43.8%         %         %           Project         18.8%         43.8%         %         %           Index         18.8         10         10           definition         75%         1         1           Scope         37.5         3         3           definition         25%         31.3%         %         1           Value         37.5         3         3           engineerin         37.5         3         3           g programs         6.3%         12.5%         37.5%         %         1	learnt from					12	
projects         6.3%         37.5%         %         %           Manageme nt by         12         6           nt by         18.8%         43.8%         %         %           Project         18.8%         43.8%         %         %           Project         18.8%         43.8%         %         %           Project         18.8         43.8%         %         %           Project         18.8         10         10           definition         75%         1         1           Scope         37.5         3         3           definition         25%         31.3%         %         1           Value         37.5         3         3           engineerin         37.5         3         3           g programs         6.3%         12.5%         37.5%         %         1           Work         3         3         3         3         3           process         12.5%         50%         %         1         3	previous				43.8	.5	
Manageme nt by objectives         18.8         12.5         6           Project         18.8%         43.8%         %         %         %           Project         18.8%         43.8%         %         %         10           definition         -         -         -         10           rating         -         -         -         -         10           index         18.8         -         -         -         -         -           (PDRI)         %         75%         -         -         -         -         -           Scope         -         -         37.5         -         3         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -	projects		6.3%	37.5%	%	%	
nt by objectives         18.8%         18.8%         18.8%         %         %           Project         18.8%         43.8%         %         %         10           definition         18.8         10         10         10           rating         18.8         10         10         10           index         18.8         10         10         10           (PDRI)         %         75%         10         10           Scope         37.5         3         3           definition         25%         31.3%         %         10           Value         37.5         3         3         3           engineerin         37.5         37.5         3         3           g programs         6.3%         12.5%         37.5%         %         1           Work         3         3         3         3         3           process         37.5         37.5         3         3           flow         12.5%         50%         %         4         4	Manageme					12	6
objectives         18.8%         43.8%         %         %           Project         18.8%         43.8%         %         %         10           definition         18.8         10         10         10           rating         18.8         18.8         10         10           index         18.8         10         10         10           (PDRI)         %         75%         10         10           Scope         37.5         31.3%         10         10           definition         25%         31.3%         %         10           Value         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5           g programs         6.3%         12.5%         37.5%         %         10           Work         3         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5           Work         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5           flow         12.5%         50%         %         10         37.5	nt by				18.8	.5	
Project definition rating index         18.8         10           (PDRI)         %         75%         -         -           Scope definition checklist         %         75%         -         -           Value engineerin g programs         25%         31.3%         %         -           Work process flow         -         37.5         3         3           12.5%         37.5%         %         -         -	objectives		18.8%	43.8%	%	%	
definition rating index         18.8         Image: Constraint of the state of th	Project						10
rating index       18.8       75%       1         (PDRI)       %       75%       3         Scope definition       37.5       3         checklist       25%       31.3%       %         Value engineerin g programs       37.5       3         g programs       6.3%       12.5%       37.5%       %         Work process flow       37.5       3       3         flow       12.5%       50%       %       3	definition						
index         18.8         Image: Constraint of the system         Image: Consystem         Image: Constraint of the system </td <td>rating</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	rating						
(PDRI)         %         75%	index	18.8					
Scope definition checklist         25%         31.3%         %         3           Value engineerin g programs         25%         31.3%         %         3           Work process flow         37.5         37.5         3           12.5%         37.5%         %         3	(PDRI)	%	75%				
definition checklist         37.5         37.5           Value         25%         31.3%         %           Value         37.5         37.5           g programs         6.3%         12.5%         37.5%         %           Work         37.5         37.5%         37.5%         37.5%           process         37.5         37.5%         37.5%         37.5%           flow         37.5         37.5%         37.5%         37.5%	Scope						3
checklist         25%         31.3%         %         3           Value         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5           g programs         6.3%         12.5%         37.5%         %         37.5           Work         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5           flow         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5         37.5	definition				37.5		
Value         3           engineerin         37.5           g programs         6.3%           12.5%         37.5%           Work         3           process         37.5           flow         37.5           diagram         12.5%	checklist		25%	31.3%	%		
engineerin g programs         37.5         37.5           Work process flow         12.5%         37.5%         %           37.5%         37.5%         37.5%         37.5%	Value						3
g programs         6.3%         12.5%         37.5%         %           Work         3         3         3           process         3         37.5         3           flow         37.5         4         3           diagram         12.5%         50%         %	engineerin				37.5		
Work process flow diagram3312.5%50%%	g programs	6.3%	12.5%	37.5%	%		
process flow 37.5 diagram 12.5% 50% %	Work						3
flow diagram 12.5% 50% %	process						
diagram 12.5% 50% %	flow				37.5		
	diagram		12.5%	50%	%		

Source: Field survey 2013

From table 1.3; the use of tools shown in the matrix during pre-project planning as part of project management strategies is dismal. Lessons learnt from previous projects at 66.3% is the only reasonably considered factor. The rest like project definition index is rarely or never used at 93.8%. Other factors not usually used are agreement matrix, alignment thermometer and benchmarking. Scope definition checklist, value engineering and brainstorming are inadequately used at 37.5%. Ideally, clients play a significant role in construction projects and clear scope definition is useful. The role of clients in construction projects can be rated at 18% overall for successful projects execution otherwise if they do not cooperate with consultants, it is very rare for project performance to achieve above 70% on overall performance success. The perfection

of these tools usage will go a long way in ensuring efficiency in the construction

Published By:

& Sciences Publication



59

industry with closer coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the performance of construction projects.

# V. PRE-PROJECT MANAGEMENT **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

# A. Early Project Management Requirement Indications

An inquiry was carried out to establish the occurrence of early project management requirements problems attributed to clients. The results are presented under table 1.4. The results show that clients authorized project execution before completing pre-project planning, allocated insufficient time for conducting pre-project planning and experienced poorly established priorities between project objectives all at 81.3%. Other factors which occurred as part of early project management problems include; lack of leadership at 75.1% and poor communication between team members at 50%; which can be considered neither a serious problem nor not a problem as such. The rest of the indicators were not significant problems as per the table hereunder with lack of experience with new technology and unclear definition of team members' roles at 18.8% indicating that the two factors are insignificant problems. The indication is that in Kenya new technology is embraced readily and team members' roles are clearly identified.

# **Table 1.4: Occurrences of pre-planning performance** problems in (%)

	r r			ĺ ĺ		Off	D
						on	N O
						en	a
						and	n
						ver	k
						У	i
						ofte	n
			So		Ve	n	g
			met		ry	com	
Performance	Nev	Rar	ime		oft	bin	
Indicators	er	ely	S	Often	en	ed	
Authorization of						81.3	1
Project execution		12.			62		
before designs		5	6.3	18.8	.5		
Insufficient budget						81.3	1
for pre-project		12.			37		
planning		5	6.3	43.8	.5		
Insufficient time						37.5	8
for conducting							_
pre-project							
planning	6.3	6.3	50	12.5	25		
Lack of a clear						43.8	7
process for							
pre-project							
planning	63	25	25	18.8	25		
Lack of experience						18.8	9
with new		12	62		12	10.0	<i>´</i>
technology	63	5	5	63	5		
teennology	0.5	12	5	0.5	31	75.1	4
Lack of leadership	63	5	63	43.8	3	,	
Luck of feudership	12	31	0.5	15.0	6	50.1	5
Lack of team skills	5	3	6.3	43.8	3	50.1	5
Poor		5	0.0			50	6
communication						50	
between team		12	37		12		
members		5	57.	37.5	5		
Poorly established		5	5	51.5		813	1
nriorities between		18			31	01.5	1
project objectives		8		50	3		
Unclear definition		0		50		18.8	0
of team members!		13	37		6	10.0	7
noloo		43.	57.	12.5	0.		
roles		8	3	12.5	3		

Source: Field survey 2013

# VI. USE OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT TOOLS IN **SCOPE DEFINITION**

Respondents were asked to rate how often they employed various project management tools while defining scope. Prepare conceptual estimates, define deliverables, document project scope and preliminary design are the mostly used tools. On the other hand use of partnership approach to spread risk, use of tools for evaluating completeness of scope before start of detailed design is rarely used. More details are shown on figure 1.2. Since some of the tools are strongly used and others rarely used it cannot be concluded that the construction industry in Kenya is superior or inferior to the other developing countries. However developed countries have perfected these tools and they use all of them but mutually exclusively.

Respondents were asked to rate how often they employ various factors while defining the scope. It was noted that 93.8% of the respondents rarely use partnership approach to spread risk as a tool to scope definition, while 100% confirmed conceptual estimates forms a crucial tool when producing a scope definition. Figure 1.2 shows the summary on how often various tools are used while defining a scope.



production Source: Field survey 2013

# VII. FORMALIZATION OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT MODEL IN KENYA

Table 1.5 shows the frequency distribution on the factors that formalizes the model for project management. It's clearly shown that all factors are considered to be critical for model formation.



60

Published By:

& Sciences Publication

					Very	Ran
		_			impo	king
		Le			rtant	
		SS ·		Ver	&	
Factors for		ım		y	impo	
Model	Un	po	<b>.</b> .	Imp	rtant	
Formalizati	cert	rta	Import	orta	comb	
on	ain	nt	ant	nt	ined	
Acceptable					100	1
quality			12.5	87.5		
Completion					93.8	3
within						
budget		6.3	12.5	81.3		
Completion					93.8	3
within time	6.3		12.5	81.3		
Documented					93.8	3
procedures	6.3		50	43.8		
Environment					93.8	3
al						
sustainabilit						
у	6.3		62.5	31.3		
Policy and					93.8	3
procedure						
manuals	6.3		68.8	25		
Satisfaction					93.8	3
of client's						
objectives			62.5	37.5		
Satisfaction					87.5	9
of project	12.					
users	5		50	37.5		
Scope					100	1
definition						
and						
management			25	75		

 Table 1.5: Formalization of project management model

 in (%)

Source: Field survey 2013

After thorough literature review and formulation of research instruments; a number of factors considered important towards a formalized project management model were evaluated. From table 1.5 it is clearly shown that all factors are considered to be critical for model development. All the nine factors are considered to be 87.5% to 100% when using important or very important combined as a measure. This is an indication of the importance attached to them by clients towards a formalized project management model. For better analysis the researcher opted to subject the variables to factor analysis/technique/method.

# VI. FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE FORMALIZATION OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT MODEL

 Table 1.6: Factor that contribute to the formalization

 of project management model

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Scope definition and management	4.7500	.43994	2
Completion within budget	4.6875	.78030	4
Completion within time	4.7500	.56796	2
Acceptable quality	4.8750	.33601	1

Policy and procedure manuals	4.1875	.53506	9
Satisfaction of client's objectives	4.3750	.49187	5
Environmental sustainability	4.2500	.56796	7
Satisfaction of project users	4.2500	.67202	7
Documented procedures	4.3750	.60907	5

Source: Field survey 2013

Descriptive statistics demonstrated that all factors were critical as they were having a mean of 4 and above as shown in table 1.6. Figure 1.3 demonstrates the cumulative percentages distribution in respect to important and least important.



Figure 1.3 Importance of formalization factors Source: Field survey 2013

# VIII. PROJECT OBJECTIVES ALIGNMENT ON CURRENT PROJECT MANAGEMENT MODELS

For any organization to align its objectives on the current existing models, they have to use the following measures as shown in table 1.7. All respondents confirmed that they often have regular meetings to keep communications open, 87.6% ensured appropriate stakeholders representation as well as use of teamwork which was having the same weight. In general all measures were considered positively for the alignment of project objectives when using current models of project management.

Table 1.7: Measures used to align the project objectiveson current project management models in (%)

Measures on Project alignment	Rar ely	Som etim es	Ofte n	Very often
Assess and identify				
potential areas of		12.5	62.5	
disagreement		%	%	25%
Ensure appropriate				
stakeholders		12.5	56.3	
representations		%	%	31.3%

Published By: Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering & Sciences Publication



# An Evaluation Of Clients Role Towards Efficiency In Projects Execution In Kenya

Regular meetings				
to keep				
communications			43.8	
open			%	56.3%
		37.5	56.3	
Use of contractors		%	%	6.3%
	6.3	12.5	43.8	
Use of specialists	%	%	%	37.5%
Use of			43.8	
sub-contractors		50%	%	6.3%
Use of tools to				
ensure team	18.8		56.3	
agreement	%	25%	%	
Use of tools to				
ensure team focus	18.8	18.8	56.3	
on objectives	%	%	%	6.3%
Use teamwork and				
team building	6.3	6.3	68.8	
programs	%	%	%	18.8%

Source: Field survey 2013

Further, looking at the relationship between measures which are rarely used against the most often used measures on project management, the study shows that on average 50% of subcontractors are used as a measure on project alignment. Most of the respondents confirmed that at least 80% often use most of the measures except for those ones who use team agreement, and contractors and team focus measures which constituted 56.3% and 62.6% respectively.

# IX. FACTORS AFFECTING PROJECT PERFORMANCE FUNCTIONS

All factors are considered to be critical in the performance of project management functions with leadership style, legislation support requirements and training & competences being rated as the most important factors as shown under Table 1.8. All the three are given an importance rating of 100%. Generally out of the nine factors only personality traits receives a score of 12.5% as uncertain otherwise no variable receives a score of more than 6.3% as less or least important meaning all these variables are crucial towards effective project management.

<b>Table 1.8:</b>	Factors affecting project performance
	functions in (%)

Factors affecting project managemen t functions	Least impo rtant	Less import ant	Unce rtain	Imp orta nt	Ver y Imp orta nt
	6.004	6.004	6.004	37.5	43.8
Culture	6.3%	6.3%	6.3%	%	%
Leadership				12.5	87.5
style				%	%
Legislation					
support					
requirement				18.8	81.3
s				%	%
Personality			12.5	31.3	
traits	6.3%		%	%	50%
Procurement					68.8
methods			6.3%	25%	%

Project				
management			12.5	81.3
approach		6.3%	%	%
Project				
management				68.8
policies	6.3%		25%	%
Project risk			12.5	81.3
management		6.3%	%	%
Training				
and				
Competenci			12.5	87.5
es			%	%

Source: Own field survey, 2013

Figure 1.4 illustrates the strength of rating against individual factors, leadership style, Legislation, and training competencies constituted 100% with culture being rated the least at 81.3%. The data has a high correlation to the reporting that was reported by the practitioners in the construction industry hence showing the reliability of the data collected.



Figure 1.4 Project management functions factors Source: Field survey 2013

# X. CONCLUSION

Clients play a crucial role in the performance of construction projects. However, their level of appreciation of project management is low. But the research has identified factors considered by clients in project execution as planning and cost control, procurement approach, development of project objectives, health and safety, commissioning and hand over procedures, quality control and use of value management respectively as very important. The level of participation for clients in pre-project planning especially on tools used is inadequate and need to be addressed for efficiency in the construction industry in Kenya to be realized. Clients in Kenya experience the problems of authorizing work to start before scope is finalized at 81.3%; other equally important challenges are poorly established project priorities, insufficient budget for pre-project planning both also at 81.3%. These challenges have to be addressed for construction industry efficiency.

Published By: Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering & Sciences Publication



## REFERENCES

- Burke, R. (2007). Introduction to Project Management. Burke 1. Publishing, USA.
- CII, 1997. Alignment during pre-project planning: A key to project success. Implementation resource 113-3.
- 2. CIT 1996. Benchmarking best practice report: Briefing and design, Construct IT Centre of excellence, Salford, UK (ISBN: 1-900491-33-8).
- 3. Kerzner, H. (2013). Project management: A systems approach to planning, scheduling and controlling. Wily & Blackwell.
- 4. Muchungu, P. K.(2012). The contribution of human factors in the performance of construction projects in Kenya. Unpublished Phd. Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- 5. Murray, J.P., Hudson, J., Ganeson, R.N. and Toft, B., 1990. An expert system approach to Client briefing. Building Economics and Construction Management: subject D: Expert system (2), pp. 538-548.
- 6. Newman, R., Bacon, V. and Dawson, S. 1990. Brief formulation and design of building. Report at Oxford Polytechnic.
- 7. Rowing, J., Nelson, M. and Perry, K., 1987. Project objective setting by owners and contractors, University of Texas at Austin, source document 31, the University of Texas at Austin, the construction Industry Institute.

#### **AUTHORS' PROFILES**

#### 1. ABEDNEGO GWAYA



## A. Academic Professional Qualification

B.A (Bldg. Econ.) Hons; University of Nairobi, MSc. (Civil Eng.); Makerere, Ph.D (Constr. Eng. & Mngt.); Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT) M.A.A.K. (Q.S); C.I.Q.S.K; Registered Q.S.

#### **B.** Specialization

Construction Project Management, Civil Engineering Construction, Contract Documentation, Project Management Modelling, Project Procurement Systems and General Quantity Surveying.

#### 2. DR. SYLVESTER MUNGUTI MASU



#### A. Academic Professional Qualification

B.A (Bldg. Econ.) Hons. M.A (Bldg. Mngt). Ph.D (Constr. Mngt.); University of Nairobi M.A.A.K. (Q.S); A.C.I. Arb; F.I.Q.S.K; Registered Q.S, (Q182). F.I.C.P.M (K).

#### **B.** Specialization

Construction Project Management, Construction Contract Documentation, Arbitration and Dispute Resolution, and General Quantity Surveying.

#### 3. DR. WANYONA GITHAE



#### A. Academic Professional Qualification

B.A BLDG ECONS (U.O.N), M. Engineering (Kyoto University, Japan), PhD (UCT), RSA

#### **B.** Specialization

Construction Project Management, Construction Contract Documentation, Project Risk Management, Project Procurement Systems and General Quantity Surveying.



63

Published By:

& Sciences Publication