The integration of project management and organizational change management is now a necessity

Henry A. Hornstein *

Algoma University, 1520 Queen Street East, Sault Ste. Marie, ON P6A 2G4, Canada

Received 28 October 2013; received in revised form 4 August 2014; accepted 21 August 2014
Available online 8 September 2014

Abstract

Project management processes and the training of new project managers (PM) must consider the impact of organizational change on the success and failure of project implementations. The case for requiring project managers to be conversant with organizational change management (OCM) is made by the author by reviewing supportive literature. In addition, PM certifying agencies like PMI and IPMA are strongly encouraged to include education on OCM to the certification process for new PMs.
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1. Introduction

Crawford and Hassner-Nahmias (2010) highlighted the increasing research interest in the use of projects as a way to institute change in organizations. Parker et al. (2013a) suggested that it is a business imperative for organizations to use project-based initiatives as levers for organizational change to ensure success. Söderlund (2010) indicated that increasing numbers of business projects incorporate change elements. This all being said, organizational change involves more than the rote adherence to a technical process. The management and organizational literatures have demonstrated time and time again that effective change management and leadership significantly influence the success implementation rates of organizational initiatives/projects (Gilley et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2005; Standish Group, 2013; Turner & Müller, 2005). However, academic and non-academic analyses of project outcomes seem to focus, with few exceptions, on project process versus the need to integrate technical and social/psychological issues (Hassner-Nahmias & Crawford, 2008; Leybourne, 2007). The current paper emphasizes the necessity of viewing projects as organizational change initiatives, and suggests that aspiring and current project managers (PMs) should be explicitly trained in applying organizational change methodologies and processes that integrate the aforementioned social/psychological perspectives in the implementation of projects, and/or include the competence in their project teams.

2. Project work and project management

Kerzner (2013) indicates that a project is any series of activities and tasks that have a specific objective to be completed within certain specifications; have a defined start and end date; have funding limits; consume money, people and equipment; and are multifunctional. Project management is the disciplined application of knowledge, skills, tools and techniques to project activities to meet the project requirements (Project Management Institute, 2013; Turner & Müller, 2005). Project management, as a term, first appears in 1953, arising in the US defense-aerospace sector (Johnson, 2002). The development of PERT (Planning and Evaluation Research Techniques) and CPM
(Critical Path Method) were outgrowths of the “new” discipline of project management, and were the first attempts initiated by the US military and Dupont, respectively, to create management tools for projects (Morris et al., 2012).

Gaddis (1959) seems to be the first to coin the term “project manager.” He saw this role as project integration, a middle-management function (Nickels et al., 2010), and by the late 1960s and early 1970s, ideas on organizational integration had begun to attract serious academic attention, e.g., Lawrence and Lorsch’s (1967) study on integration and differentiation, Galbraith’s (1973) on forms of integration, and Davis and Lawrence’s (1977) work on matrix organizations. But it is worth noting that this integration role did not and currently seldom includes the necessity to accommodate social/psychological issues. Instead, it focused on the traditional role of manager as planner, organizer, leader and controller (Nickels et al., 2010). Currently this still largely characterizes the role.

With the spread of the matrix organization and the US Department of Defense (DoD) project management techniques, many executives suddenly found themselves managing projects for the first time (Morris, 2012). Conferences and seminars on how to manage projects proliferated. The US Project Management Institute (PMI) was founded in 1969; the International Management Systems Association (also called INTERNET, now the International Project Management Association — IPMA) in 1972; and various European project management associations formed at the same time (Morris et al., 2012). Again, the perspective taken toward PM was essentially a middle-management one. It centered on the challenges of accomplishing the project goals that had been given, and on the tools and techniques for doing this; it was rarely the successful accomplishment of the project per se, which is after all what really matters. Worse, the performance of projects, already too often bad, was now beginning to deteriorate sharply (Morris, 2012).

3. Project Management Bodies of Knowledge (PM BoKs)

The seminal drive for the development of a PM BoK was the belief that there should be some form of certification of competence if it was to be considered a profession (Cook, 1977). The initial 1983 PMI PMBoK® had six knowledge areas; the most recent one has expanded to nine with five process groups as follows:

The five process groups are:

1. Initiating
2. Planning
3. Executing
4. Monitoring and controlling
5. Closing.

The nine knowledge areas are:

1. Project Integration Management
2. Project Scope Management
3. Project Time Management
4. Project Cost Management
5. Project Quality Management
6. Project Human Resource Management
7. Project Communications Management
8. Project Risk Management

The United Kingdom’s (UK) Association for Project Management (APM) has followed a similar path as the one adopted by PMI, but they saw the PMI’s model as too narrow. In 1991, they produced a broader document that gave recognition to matters such as objectives, strategy, technology, environment, people, business and commercial issues (Morris et al., 2006). Since then, the APM BoK has developed at least five revisions, and APM’s explicit advocacy of Agile Project Management is accompanied by a more direct acknowledgment of the need to include social system concerns (Charvat, 2003; Leffingwell, 2007; Sheffield & Lemétayer, 2013). To some extent, Agile focuses on the importance of culture, people development, self-management and self-discipline, participatory decision-making, customer focus and less bureaucracy. However, there has been little research evaluating the degree to which this focus has been demonstrated in practice, and what there is (e.g., Hope & Amdahl, 2011) suggests that while there is promise, Agile is not a homogeneous practice, and when applied in the IT industry, cross-disciplinary conflicts often get in the way of participation between technical designers and end-users. In 1998, the IPMA published its Competence Baseline to support its certification program, and imported almost wholesale the APM BoK (Morris, 2012).

4. Project management process

4.1. Success and failure

During the period between and including 1970s and 2000s, typically identified sources of project difficulties were: unclear success criteria, changing sponsor strategy, poor project definition, technology, concurrency, poor quality assurance, poor linkage with sales and marketing, inappropriate contracting strategy, unsupportive political environment, lack of top management support, inflation, funding difficulties, and inadequate manpower (Flyvbjerg et al., 2003; Meier, 2008; Miller & Lessard, 2000; Morris & Hough, 1987). No overt attention was paid to the impact of organizational change, although there was a growing interest in strategy (Arto et al., 2008), the impact of organizational culture (Shore, 2008), behavioral competencies of the project manager (Aitken & Crawford, 2008), and leadership (Müller & Turner, 2007), to name a few of the variables that recently have been examined more closely which are beyond the use of tools, techniques and practices of project management.

The topic of project success has been a significant concern in the PM literature (Cooke-Davies, 2002; Fortune & White, 2006). As noted above, much research has been conducted in an attempt to identify the factors that determine it. The findings, however, have tended to reflect the technical bias that characterized the approach adopted by most
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