

UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SYDNEY



An Interpretive Framework for Complexity in IT Projects

By Gaiyasudeen A Syed

*Professor Dr Shankar Sankaran PhD, Principal
Supervisor*

*Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy, Faculty of Design, Architecture and
Building, University of Technology Sydney, October 2015.*

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged.

In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student:

Gaiyasudeen A. Syed

Date:

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation as a tribute to my father Ansar Basha and my mother Razia Ansar for having encouraged and supported me in my learning and helping me become who I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My journey to complete this Doctoral Degree has been lengthy and tedious. It was difficult to find time to write as I was working full-time on strategic projects and changing jobs. I am indebted to a number of academics, professional colleagues, and my family, for without their support and guidance this achievement would not have been possible.

First and foremost, I acknowledge my gratitude to my supervisor Professor. Dr Shankar Sankaran for his guidance and encouragement throughout this fortuitous intellectual journey. His thought provoking observations, direction and support were instrumental in my continuing this research to completion.

I am thankful to academic scholars Dr Kaye Remington, Dr Svetlana Cicmil, Dr Julian Pollack, Dr Barbara Czarniawska and Dr Geeta Sankaran for their guidance and enlightening conversations. I would like to thank Dr Elisabeth Leigh for facilitating the research focus group sessions.

I am thankful to my professional colleagues who participated in this research, trusted me with their personal stories, and shared their experiences. I would like to thank my friends for their encouragement.

Finally, I have to thank my family who were supportive of this saga, my wife Meraj Syed and my sons Omar and Thaher, who provided me with their moral support to complete the thesis. I would like to thank my friend Yan Zhang for her encouragement.

ABSTRACT

*So learn that you may full and faultless learning gain,
Then in obedience meet to lessons learnt remain.*

- Valluvar (Thirukkural 391)

This research was prompted by the continuous failure rate in IT system implementation projects, in one of the largest telecommunication organisations in Australia where the researcher was working as a program manager. There was a consensus among the project management professionals that the human condition experienced by the role of a project manager has severe social implications. This research study is a response to the concern expressed in the project management community that existing project management methodologies are limited by their unduly normative and mechanistic approach.

Research in project management has confirmed that the conventional project definition is not inclusive of the social dimension and attempts to measure the project's success in simplistic terms, using scope, time and cost as parameters. Failing to recognise the inherent complexity (Murray 2000, p. 34) in IT projects is one of the prime reasons why many projects are considered failures. Recent research directions in project management have shown an urgent need to develop theories from project environment to reflect the complexity of projects. (Cicmil & Hodgson 2006; Cicmil et al. 2006; Kwak & Anbari 2009; So'derlund 2004; Williams 1999 ; Winter, Smith, Morris, et al. 2006).

In recent management publications of repute, the application of complexity theory principles has been widely suggested as an effective way to deal with organisational complexities (Sullivan 2011). Complexity theory has also drawn the attention of scholars and practitioners in the project management community. Emerging trends in project management research point to treating projects as complex adaptive systems (Austin et al. 2002; Harkema 2003; Milosevic 1989;

Pundir, Ganapathy & Sambandam 2007; Whitney & Daniels 2013; Whitty & Maylor 2009) learning and temporary organisations (Lundin & Söderholm 1995; Packendorff 1995; Turner & Müller 2003) and organisational techno-social processes (Small & Walker 2012).

A simple inquiry, namely, 'Can complexity theory principles be used to understand the projects better?' led to this research. Based on the literature review two primary research questions were formed:

1. What are the factors believed to cause complexity in IT projects?
2. How does human interaction engender social complexity in IT projects?

Given the explorative nature of this research, a 'constructionist' research paradigm with participant observer mode was adopted (Guba & Lincoln 1994; Strauss & Corbin 1990a; Strauss 1998). For more than two years, detailed data was collected in a large telecommunication organisation. Qualitative data analysis techniques, such as context analysis and grounded theory principles (coding and memo), were applied to narratives and observations collected in a case project.

In order to answer the research question, 'What are the factors believed to be causing complexity in IT projects?' a practitioner's definition of complexity was elicited through extensive interviews in the telecommunication organisation. The complexity factors in the real environment as experienced and perceived by practitioners were listed, analysed and classified. It became evident that the practitioner's view of complexity differs from a mathematical definition of complexity: the practitioner's is born of their experience. The practitioners mentioned such characteristics as 'uncertainty', 'unprecedented', and 'unexpected' to identify a project situation as 'complex'. However, the demarcation between complicated and complex was not distinguishable in practitioners' perception or understanding of complexity.

An Interpretive Framework for Complexity in IT Projects

The classification followed a typology of complexity factors found in the literature review: technological, structural, directional and temporal (Remington & Pollack 2007a).

The research has revealed that environmental, directional, temporal (time) and social complexities are prevalent; they are experienced mostly in comparison to technical and structural complexity and are contrary to the general belief that IT projects are complex due to technological factors.

It was found that complexity originates in three layers: the product, the project (organisational process) and the social. The research participants believed that not all situations in a project manifest complexity, but a few situations exhibit inherent complexity and it is experienced in spurts. As a result of this analysis, a construct called ‘tipping point’ has been proposed to refer to these atypical project situations in this research. A tipping point is defined as a state where projects experience chaos, conflict, contest and decision-making, and external intervention is required. When I cross-validated this construct with the research participants, they concluded that the number and frequency of tipping points were indicative of the level of complexity the project stakeholders were experiencing.

This research presents the analysis using headings complexity factors, echo of complexity, relationship, action-to-reaction, and emotions. The research has illustrated that, as all types of complexity factors require human interaction, they lead eventually to social complexity.

In order to explore deductively the second research question, ‘How does human interaction engender social complexity in IT projects?’ a framework using a range of lenses has been applied to a case project. These lenses are Context, Connectedness (Cohesion & Coupling) and Adaptive-Reflexive Response.

Giving preference to transformative teleology, a process perspective has been adopted to analyse the social complexity through the proposed lenses. The lens 'context' explored meaning creation, multi-dimensional interpretations and cognitive schemata at individual and organisational level.

The 'connectedness' lens attempted to demonstrate the influence of private networks beyond formal organisational boundaries and interconnectedness in project decision-making. The 'adaptive response' lens traced the dynamic creation of positions through deliberations in project tipping point situations. The 'reflexive response' lens depicted the time-phased reflexivity in project team members' interactions. The application of these lenses to the case project data attempted to unveil the unfolding complexity; it was concluded that these lenses were suitable for comprehending the underlying social complexity in IT projects.

Recently published literature on application of complexity theory frames to projects, concepts of the complex responsive process of power relating (CRPR) (Cicmil et al. 2009; Cooke-Davies et al. 2007; Stacey & Griffin 2005; Stacey 2000a) and in social theories, symbolic interactionism and organisational sense making (Weick 1995) have provided the necessary theoretical foundation to these lenses. Concepts such as Chaos Theory, Strange Attractors and Complex Adaptive Systems have been mapped in general terms to the project data.

This research has contributed to a body of project management knowledge by introducing 'context', 'connectedness' (Cohesion & Coupling) and 'adaptive-reflexive response' lenses as well as the construct 'tipping point' to comprehend underlying complexity in IT projects.

Further research can be carried out in other industries to confirm the complexity factors arrived at in this research. Agent-based models can be built as competing and cooperating (co-opting) mechanisms for complex scenarios in projects.

Explorative research can be carried out to develop other lenses to capture social complexity in projects. Cross-validating the framework across multiple industries can offset the bias associated with this qualitative research.

The framework is useful for the practitioner to understand project complexity, as the stakeholders do experience it in varying stages of a project. The classification of the complexity factors (static) may help the industry to acknowledge project complexity and create a typology of projects for better treatment through fostering a higher form of collaboration.

This thesis presents the results of an investigation to understand the nature of project complexity factors and how social complexity is generated in IT projects because of human interaction.

Papers Published

1. Syed, G. & Sankaran, S. 2009, 'Investigating an interpretive framework to manage complex information technology projects', *Proceedings of the International Research Network on Organizing by Projects*, Berlin.

1	Introduction	21
1.1	Statement of Research	23
1.2	Overview of Literature Review	24
1.3	Overview of Research Methodology	24
1.4	Overview of Research Design	25
1.5	Ethical Issues	25
1.6	Research Findings Summary	26
1.7	Contribution to Theory	27
1.8	Implications for practice	27
1.9	Thesis Map – chapters outline	27
1.10	Writing Style	28
1.11	Limitations	28
1.12	Key Definitions/Terms of References	28
2	Literature Review	30
2.1	Introduction	30
2.2	IT Projects – Failure Analysis	31
2.3	Reasons for Failure	36
2.4	Project Management Research directions	43
2.4.1	Why new approaches to Project Management?	43
2.4.2	Alternative Approaches – what is being proposed?	47
2.5	Summary	59
2.6	Complexity Theory	61
2.6.1	Chaos Theory	63
2.6.2	Dissipative Structures	64
2.6.3	Complex Adaptive Systems (CAS)	65
2.6.4	Network Theory	66
2.6.5	Systems Theory	67
2.7	Complex Responsive Processes of Power Relating	68
2.8	Complexity Theory applied to Management	71
2.9	Critical view on application of complexity theory metaphors	73
2.10	Project Complexity Frameworks - an examination	75
2.10.1	NTCP or Diamond Model	75
2.10.2	Remington & Pollack - Complexity Factors based Model	77
2.10.3	TOE Model	79
2.10.4	Goal-Method Model	79
2.10.5	Environment Classification Model	81
2.10.6	System Thinking for Project Complexity	81
2.10.7	MODEST Model	82
2.10.8	IS/IT Project Complexity	84
2.10.9	Project Complexity – Social Aspects	85
2.11	Social Theories	88
2.11.1	Symbolic Interactionism and other theories	88
2.11.2	Sense Making in Organisations	90
2.12	Summary	91
3	Research Design	95

3.1	Purpose and Question	95
3.2	The Company	97
3.3	Stages	100
3.4	Paradigm	101
3.4.1	Qualitative Research.....	101
3.4.2	Selecting a paradigm	102
3.5	Methodology	105
3.5.1	Ethnography	105
3.5.2	Case Study	108
3.5.3	Interviews	108
3.5.4	Events Observation.....	109
3.6	Data Analysis Process	109
3.6.1	Grounded Theory.....	110
3.6.2	Narrative Analysis.....	110
3.7	Documentation (Captions)	113
3.8	Validity	113
3.9	Bias	118
3.10	Ethical Issues	120
3.11	Summary	122
4	Stage 1 Field Definition of Complexity	124
4.1	Enrolment.....	124
4.2	Data Collection	126
4.3	Tools	126
4.4	Timeline	127
4.5	Stage 1 Data – Sample snapshots.....	127
4.6	Risks and Issues Analysis	153
4.7	Complexity in Xfone.....	156
4.8	Layers of Complexity.....	158
4.9	Notion of Tipping Point	158
4.10	Summary.....	164
5	Stage 2 Mapping Complexity to Theoretical Constructs	166
5.1	Technological Complexity.....	166
5.2	Structural Complexity	170
5.3	Environmental Complexity	176
5.4	Directional Complexity.....	185
5.5	Time pressure as complexity	191
5.6	Social Complexity.....	196
5.7	Links between Complexity Factors.....	201
5.8	Summary	203
6	Stage 3: Tracing Social Complexity	205
6.1	Research Set-up: Case Project	205
6.1.1	Suitability of the case project for this research:.....	207
6.1.2	Types of Stakeholders – Role ambiguity a reason for complexity.....	208
6.2	Data collection.....	211
6.3	Data – Narrations & Event Observations.....	211
6.4	Case Project Analysis.....	254
6.5	Lenses	264
6.6	Summary	270

7	Triangulation	272
7.1	Complexity Factors Triangulation	272
7.2	Focus Group – Reflections	274
7.3	Interviews.....	276
7.4	Summary	282
8	Discussion	284
8.1	Introduction	284
8.2	Field Definition of Complexity	286
8.3	Source of Complexity - Layers.....	289
8.3.1	Layer 1: Product Layer	289
8.3.2	Layer 2: Organisational Process – Project Management Layer	289
8.3.3	Layer 3: Social Layer	290
8.4	Notion of Tipping Point	292
8.5	Complexity factors and classification	294
8.5.1	Technological Complexity.....	295
8.5.2	Structural Complexity	297
8.5.3	Environmental Complexity	300
8.5.4	Directional Complexity	302
8.5.5	Time as a factor of complexity	308
8.5.6	Social Complexity.....	312
8.6	Complexity revealed through lenses.....	315
8.6.1	Interaction as pivotal aspects of a project	317
8.6.2	Recursion in Project Interaction	318
8.6.3	Teleology for this framework	321
8.6.4	Context	323
8.6.5	Connectedness – Cohesion & Coupling.....	332
8.6.6	Adaptive Response	341
8.6.7	Reflexive Response	346
8.7	Summary	350
9	Conclusion	355
9.1	Restatement of the research problem	355
9.2	Restatement of the research questions	357
9.3	Key contributions of this research based on the evidence	357
9.4	Contributions to Theory	367
9.5	Contributions to practice.....	367
9.6	Contributions to Policy/Organisational adaptation	368
9.7	Contributions to Methodology	369
9.8	Bias	369
9.9	Limitations.....	371
9.10	Future Directions	371
9.11	Concluding Remarks	373
10	References	375
11	Glossary	393
11.1	Abbreviations	393
11.2	Codes / Terms.....	395
11.3	Qualitative Techniques	395
12	APPENDICES.....	397

An Interpretive Framework for Complexity in IT Projects

12.1	RPM – Rethinking Project Management	397
12.2	Thematic Analysis of Case Project	398
12.3	Thematic Analysis of Case Project ... Continued	399
12.4	Thematic Analysis of Case Project ... Continued	400
12.5	Thematic Analysis of Voice Records.....	401

An Interpretive Framework for Complexity in IT Projects

Table of Figures

Figure 2-1 Research Directions.....	46
Figure 2-2 Project Complexity.....	60
Figure 2-3 Diamond Model.....	76
Figure 2-4 Goals & Methods – adapted from Turner et al.....	80
Figure 2-5 Systems Thinking-based classification adapted from Sheffield et al.....	82
Figure 2-6 MoDeST	83
Figure 2-7 Research gap.....	93
Figure 3-1 Research Stages	100
Figure 3-2 Narrative Analysis	111
Figure 3-3 Data Analysis Process	112
Figure 4-1 Thematic analysis of digital project narrative S05	129
Figure 4-2 Silverwater Contexts	137
Figure 4-3 Atlas Contexts	143
Figure 4-4 ETL Contexts in Play	146
Figure 4-5 Contexts in Play.....	152
Figure 4-6 Risks Category	154
Figure 4-7 Issue Category – Indication of Complexity.....	155
Figure 5-1 Interdependencies between Systems, Process and People	180
Figure 5-2 Systems undergoing change.	182
Figure 5-3 Interconnected Systems.....	183
Figure 5-4 Time pressure the vicious cycle	194
Figure 5-5 Social Complexity	199
Figure 6-1 Types of stakeholders according to their role in the case project	208
Figure 6-2 Project Organisation – Case Project.....	208
Figure 6-3 Case Project Timeline – Compression of Estimates	209
Figure 6-4 Case project risk map – Classified as complex by PMO risk scale.	209
Figure 6-5 Case project timeline.....	210
Figure 6-6 Case Project Analysis.....	254
Figure 6-7(PIN) Private Influencing Networks.....	259
Figure 6-8 Cohesion between project team members.....	260
Figure 6-9 Agents attending to tipping points at the same time. (NODEXL)	263
Figure 6-10 Lenses to analyse the tipping-point scenario.....	269
Figure 7-1 Triangulation - Participants’ Responses.....	274
Figure 8-1 Complexity manifests in project events	291
Figure 8-2 Time urgency – vicious cycle.....	310
Figure 8-3 Complexity Factors leading to Social Complexity.....	316
Figure 8-4 Interaction as pivotal aspect of project.....	318
Figure 8-5 Recursion.....	319
Figure 8-6 Analysis of Snapshot 6-22: Support process – multiple contexts	326
Figure 8-7 Perspectives	328
Figure 8-8: Power Relations.....	338
Figure 8-9: Perspective Navigation.....	343
Figure 8-10 Construction and changing of Position	345

An Interpretive Framework for Complexity in IT Projects

Table of Snapshots – Data Items

Snapshot 4-1	Definitions of complexity	127
Snapshot 4-2	Silverwater Narration from Program Manager MxL	136
Snapshot 4-3	Atlas 2: Narration from a PM SubXG:	139
Snapshot 4-4	ETL Project - PM DxH Narration.....	143
Snapshot 4-5	Cluster Outage Project - PM XRob- Narration.....	148
Snapshot 5-1	Technological Complexity	166
Snapshot 5-2	Structural complexity	170
Snapshot 5-3	Environmental Complexity	176
Snapshot 5-4	Directional Complexity.....	185
Snapshot 5-5	Time Pressure.....	192
Snapshot 5-6	Social Complexity.....	197
Snapshot 6-1	PM Narration.....	212
Snapshot 6-2	MA Narration - project set up:	217
Snapshot 6-3	Event Record Case Project Kick Off: AdPM.....	217
Snapshot 6-4	First Steering Committee – Event Observation <i>AdPM</i>	218
Snapshot 6-5	First Team Meeting – Event Observation <i>AdPM</i>	219
Snapshot 6-6	QQ Narration - Google Map use	220
Snapshot 6-7	Pi and MK Narration:.....	221
Snapshot 6-8	Government Schedule Session - Event Observation <i>AdPM</i>	221
Snapshot 6-9	Financial Figures - Event Observation <i>AdPM</i>	221
Snapshot 6-10	Narration from Network PM on Financial Figure:	222
Snapshot 6-11	Cost Control - PM & <i>AdPM</i> conversation	223
Snapshot 6-12	PM: Narration Govt. Stakeholders.....	223
Snapshot 6-13	PM: Narration Spain Systems connections	223
Snapshot 6-14	Pi: Narration Spain Systems connections	224
Snapshot 6-15	Vendor PM: Narration Spain Systems connections	224
Snapshot 6-16	PM: Narration – Funny QA Auditor	225
Snapshot 6-17	Project Room LAN Event Observation - <i>AdPM</i>	225
Snapshot 6-18	PM: Narration – External Ports.....	226
Snapshot 6-19	First Milestone Design completion Event Observation - <i>AdPM</i>	226
Snapshot 6-20	PM: Narration – Government Visitors.....	227
Snapshot 6-21	Testing Resource Event Observation - <i>AdPM</i>	228
Snapshot 6-22	Support Process Event Observation - <i>AdPM</i>	229
Snapshot 6-23	Coffee Session Event Observation - <i>AdPM</i>	230
Snapshot 6-24	PM’s frustration - conversation with AdPM.....	230
Snapshot 6-25	Support Process meeting Event Observation AdPM	231
Snapshot 6-26	ELAN Discussions Event Observation AdPM	233
Snapshot 6-27	MT Narration on WSDL (a technical software component).....	234
Snapshot 6-28	PM Narration WSDL	235
Snapshot 6-29	JW Narration on Lab Equipment	235
Snapshot 6-30	PM Narration EA Connectivity.....	236

An Interpretive Framework for Complexity in IT Projects

Snapshot 6-31 MK Narration - Test Manager.....	237
Snapshot 6-32 PM Narration Test Manager.....	238
Snapshot 6-33 MK Narration - Test Servers.....	238
Snapshot 6-34 CPU Failure - Event Observation AdPM.....	239
Snapshot 6-35 PM Narration - Summit Point	239
Snapshot 6-36 Milestone Success - Event Observation AdPM	240
Snapshot 6-37 Stage Closure Report - Event Observation AdPM.....	240
Snapshot 6-38 Blackadder Firewall - event observation AdPM.....	240
Snapshot 6-39 PM Narration - Black adder Firewall.....	241
Snapshot 6-40 Billing Architect - Event Observation AdPM.....	241
Snapshot 6-41 Defect Analysis - event observation AdPM.....	242
Snapshot 6-42 Production Readiness - Event Observation AdPM	242
Snapshot 6-43 Production Launch Plan - Event Observation AdPM	243
Snapshot 6-44 Soft Launch Plan - Event Observation AdPM	244
Snapshot 6-45 Soft Launch Plan - event observation AdPM.....	245
Snapshot 6-46 Soft Launch Plan - event observation AdPM.....	246
Snapshot 6-47 Soft Launch Plan - event observation AdPM.....	246
Snapshot 6-48 Post Implementation Review - event observation AdPM.....	247

An Interpretive Framework for Complexity in IT Projects

Table of Tables

Table 2-1 Failure Factors	38
Table 2-2 Research Directions Winter et al. (2006, p 642)	47
Table 2-3 Classical Project Management versus Rethinking Project Management. ..	50
Table 2-4 Project characteristics mapped to complexity theory concepts	59
Table 2-5 Diamond Model Classification	76
Table 2-6 Remington & Pollack Complexity Factors	77
Table 3-1 Key aspects of research paradigms (Guba and Lincoln 1994, p.106)	104
Table 3-2 Comparison of methodologies within each paradigm	106
Table 3-3 Validity check plan	115
Table 3-4 Validity checks	118
Table 3-5 Bias Mitigation Plan	119
Table 4-1 Text Analysis CRM Application Upgrade Snapshot 4-1 S09	133
Table 4-2 Categories of risks in age	153
Table 4-3 Categories of issues in open/closed state	154
Table 4-4 Voice Recordings sample data	162
Table 5-1 PMO Records showing environmental contention by multiple projects ..	178
Table 5-2 System changes (CRs) – application rollouts in different states at one point in time:	182
Table 6-1 QQ Interview Post-Implementation	249
Table 6-2 Number of tipping points with impact classification in different stages of the case project:	262
Table 6-3 Sample - Tipping Points captured:	262
Table 6-4 Agents in action on several tipping points scenarios	263
Table 7-1 Complexity Traced in category	272
Table 7-2 Sample Triangulation Questionnaire	273
Table 7-3 Summary of Response for the Triangulation Questionnaire	273
Table 8-1 Complexity originates in Layers	292
Table 8-2 Goals classified	304
Table 8-3 Theoretical basis and exposure	353
Table 9-1 Research finding summary	361